

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Surrey County Council

February 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to division boundaries, and the number of councillors and division names.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council.

© Crown Copyright 2000

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>11</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>15</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>43</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Surrey: Mapping	<i>45</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from: – Surrey County Council – Surrey County Labour Party – Surrey Liberal Democrat Group – Mole Valley Labour Party – South West Surrey Liberal Democrats – Woking Liberal Democrats – The Reigate Society	<i>59</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>83</i>

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council on 24 August 1999.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Surrey:

- **In 34 of the 76 divisions, each of which is represented by a single councillor, the number of electors varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the county, and 12 divisions vary by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **By 2004 electoral equality is expected to worsen, with the number of electors forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 39 divisions and by more than 20 per cent in eight divisions.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 185–186) are that:

- **Surrey County Council should have 80 councillors, four more than at present, representing 80 divisions;**
- **as the divisions are based on district wards which have themselves changed as a result of the recent district reviews, the boundaries of all except 13 divisions will be subject to change.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each county councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 59 of the proposed 80 divisions the number of electors would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the county average, with three varying by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **This improved electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors in 61 divisions expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the county in 2004, with only one division varying by more than 20 per cent from the average.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited. Our proposals are set out in Figures 1 and 2 following this summary, and illustrated on the large map inside the back cover and in Appendix A.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 22 February 2000. We have not yet decided on our final recommendations and**

wish to use this period to seek further evidence. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses if, in our judgement, the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would be better served. It is important, therefore, that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.

- After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will determine when any changes come into effect.

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 17 April 2000:

**Review Manager
Surrey Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH	
1 Cobham	Cobham & Downside ward; Cobham Fairmile ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward (part)
2 Hersham	Hersham North ward; Hersham South ward
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	Claygate ward; Hinchley Wood ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward (part)
4 Molesey East & Esher	Esher ward; Molesey East ward
5 Molesey West	Molesey North ward; Molesey South ward
6 The Dittons	Long Ditton ward; Thames Ditton ward; Weston Green ward
7 Walton	Walton Ambleside ward; Walton Central ward (part); Walton North ward
8 Walton South & Oatlands	Oatlands Park ward; Walton Central ward (part); Walton South ward
9 Weybridge	St George's Hill ward; Weybridge North ward; Weybridge South ward
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH	
10 Epsom & Ewell North	Auriol ward; Cuddington ward; Ewell Court ward
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	Ewell ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Stoneleigh ward
12 Epsom & Ewell South East	College ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Woodcote ward
13 Epsom & Ewell South West	Court ward (part); Stamford ward; Town ward
14 Epsom & Ewell West	Court ward (part); Ruxley ward; West Ewell ward
GUILDFORD BOROUGH	
15 Ash	Ash Vale ward; Ash Wharf ward
16 Guildford Central	Christchurch ward; Holy Trinity ward
17 Guildford East	Burpham ward; Merrow ward
18 Guildford North	Stoke ward; Stoughton ward
19 Guildford South	Friary & St Nicolas ward; Onslow ward (part)
20 Guildford West	Onslow ward (part); Westborough ward
21 Horsleys	Effingham ward; Lovelace ward; Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Horsley and West Horsley)

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
22 Shalford	Ash South & Tongham ward; Pilgrims ward; Shalford ward (part – the parishes of Artington, Compton and Shalford (part – the parish wards of Peasmarsh and Shalford))
23 Shere	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Clandon and West Clandon); Send ward; Shalford ward (part – Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish); Tillingbourne ward
24 Worplesdon	Normandy ward; Pirbright ward; Worplesdon ward
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT	
25 Ashtead	Ashtead Common ward; Ashtead Park ward; Ashtead Village ward
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	Bookham North ward; Bookham South ward; Fetcham West ward
27 Dorking North	Box Hill & Headley ward; Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward; Dorking North ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward
28 Dorking Rural	Beare Green ward; Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward; Charlwood ward; Leith Hill ward; Okewood ward; Westcott ward
29 Dorking South	Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH	
31 Banstead East	Banstead Village ward; Chipstead, Hooley & Woodmansterne ward
32 Banstead South	Kingswood with Burgh Heath ward; Preston ward; Tadworth & Walton ward
33 Banstead West	Nork ward; Tattenhams ward
34 Horley East	Horley Central ward; Horley East ward
35 Horley West	Horley West ward; Salfords & Sidlow ward
36 Redhill Central	Redhill East ward; Redhill West ward
37 Reigate Central	Reigate Central ward; Meadvale & St Johns ward
38 Reigate North	Merstham ward; Reigate Hill ward
39 Reigate South	Earlswood & Whitebushes ward; South Park & Woodhatch ward
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH	
40 Addlestone	Addlestone Bourneside ward; Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)
41 Chertsey	Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey Meads ward; Chertsey St Ann's ward; Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
42 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	Egham Hythe ward; Egham Town ward (part); Thorpe ward
43 Englefield Green	Egham Town ward (part); Englefield Green East ward; Englefield Green West ward
44 Foxhills & Virginia Water	Foxhills ward; Virginia Water ward
45 Woodham & New Haw	New Haw ward; Woodham ward
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH	
46 Ashford	Ashford Common ward (part); Ashford East ward; Ashford Town ward (part)
47 Laleham & Shepperton	Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Riverside ward (part); Shepperton Town ward
48 Staines	Riverside ward (part); Staines ward (part); Staines South ward (part)
49 Staines South & Ashford West	Ashford North & Stanwell South ward (part); Ashford Town ward (part); Riverside ward (part); Staines ward (part); Staines South ward (part)
50 Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	Ashford North & Stanwell South ward (part); Stanwell North ward
51 Sunbury	Halliford & Sunbury West ward; Sunbury East ward
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	Ashford Common ward (part); Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Sunbury Common ward
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH	
53 Camberley East	Old Dean ward; St Pauls ward; Town ward
54 Camberley West	Frimley ward; St Michaels ward; Watchetts ward
55 Chobham & Bisley	Bisley ward; Chobham ward; Lightwater ward (part); West End ward
56 Frimley Green & Mytchett	Frimley Green ward; Mytchett & Deepcut ward
57 Heatherside & Parkside	Heatherside ward; Parkside ward
58 Windlesham	Bagshot ward; Lightwater ward (part); Windlesham ward
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT	
59 Caterham Hill	Chaldon ward; Portley ward; Queens Park ward; Westway ward
60 Caterham Valley	Harestone ward; Valley ward; Whyteleafe ward; Woldingham ward
61 Godstone	Bletchingley & Nutfield ward; Godstone ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
62 Lingfield	Burstow & Horne ward; Dormansland & Felcourt ward; Felbridge ward; Lingfield & Crowhurst ward
63 Oxted	Limpsfield ward; Oxted North & Tandridge ward; Oxted South ward
64 Warlingham	Tatsfield & Titsey ward; Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh ward; Warlingham West ward
WAVERLEY BOROUGH	
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – the parishes of Cranleigh Rural and Ellens Green); Cranleigh East ward; Cranleigh West ward; Ewhurst ward
66 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward; Farnham College ward; Farnham Monks ward
67 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward; Farnham Upper Hale ward; Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward
68 Farnham South	Farnham Bourne ward; Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward; Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward
69 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Charterhouse ward; Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall ward
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Holloway ward; Milford ward; Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Witley East parish ward of Witley parish)
71 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward; Haslemere North & Grayswood ward
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – the parishes of Alfold and Cranleigh (part – Elmbridge parish ward)); Blackheath & Wonersh ward; Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward; Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward; Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward; Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Hambledon parish)
73 Waverley Western Villages	Elstead & Thursley ward; Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward; Haslemere Hindhead ward
WOKING BOROUGH	
74 Woking East	Byfleet ward; West Byfleet ward
75 Woking North	Goldsworth East ward; Horsell West ward
76 Woking North East	Horsell East & Woodham ward; Maybury & Sheerwater ward
77 Woking North West	Goldsworth West ward; Knaphill ward
78 Woking South	Kingfield & Westfield ward; Mayford & Sutton Green ward; Mount Hermon West ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
79 Woking South East	Mount Hermon East ward; Pyrford ward; Old Woking ward
80 Woking West	Brookwood ward; Hermitage & Knaphill South ward; St John's & Hook Heath ward

Notes: 1 The constituent district wards are those resulting from the electoral reviews of the 11 Surrey districts which were completed in 1998. Where whole district wards do not form the building blocks, constituent parishes and parish wards are listed for parished areas.

2 The large map inserted at the back of the report illustrates the proposed divisions outlined above and the maps in Appendix A illustrate some of the proposed boundaries in more detail.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Surrey

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH					
1 Cobham	1	9,780	-3	9,842	-4
2 Hersham	1	9,143	-3	8,888	-5
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	10,241	1	10,607	3
4 Molesey East & Esher	1	9,160	-9	9,116	-12
5 Molesey West	1	9,578	-5	9,622	-7
6 The Dittons	1	10,736	6	11,589	12
7 Walton	1	10,713	6	10,873	6
8 Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,805	7	10,863	5
9 Weybridge	1	10,360	2	10,459	2
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH					
10 Epsom & Ewell North	1	11,589	15	11,418	11
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	1	11,118	10	11,049	7
12 Epsom & Ewell South East	1	9,428	-7	9,365	-9
13 Epsom & Ewell South West	1	10,193	1	11,595	13
14 Epsom & Ewell West	1	9,886	-2	10,296	0
GUILDFORD BOROUGH					
15 Ash	1	8,153	-19	8,997	-13
16 Guildford Central	1	9,596	-5	9,678	-6
17 Guildford East	1	10,065	0	10,154	-1
18 Guildford North	1	10,651	5	11,316	10
19 Guildford South	1	9,694	-4	9,776	-5
20 Guildford West	1	9,873	-2	9,932	-4
21 Horsleys	1	9,229	-9	9,334	-9
22 Shalford	1	11,408	13	11,607	13

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
23 Shere	1	9,307	-8	9,588	-7
24 Worplesdon	1	10,566	5	10,778	5
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
25 Ashtead	1	10,583	5	10,527	2
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,845	17	11,582	12
27 Dorking North	1	9,538	-6	9,445	-8
28 Dorking Rural	1	10,649	5	10,407	1
29 Dorking South	1	9,574	-5	9,614	-7
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,445	3	10,606	3
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH					
31 Banstead East	1	11,430	13	12,124	18
32 Banstead South	1	12,514	24	12,667	23
33 Banstead West	1	10,833	7	11,076	7
34 Horley East	1	9,663	-4	10,602	3
35 Horley West	1	7,966	-21	8,534	-17
36 Redhill Central	1	10,601	5	10,786	5
37 Reigate Central	1	10,659	5	10,969	6
38 Reigate North	1	9,672	-4	9,796	-5
39 Reigate South	1	11,225	11	11,782	14
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH					
40 Addlestone	1	11,276	12	11,357	10
41 Chertsey	1	9,956	-2	9,945	-3
42 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	1	11,261	11	11,246	9
43 Englefield Green	1	10,460	3	10,955	6
44 Foxhills & Virginia Water	1	8,440	-17	8,889	-14
45 Woodham & New Haw	1	8,621	-15	8,565	-17
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH					
46 Ashford	1	10,548	4	10,527	2

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
47 Laleham & Shepperton	1	10,308	2	10,183	-1
48 Staines	1	9,804	-3	9,728	-6
49 Staines South & Ashford West	1	10,065	0	10,714	4
50 Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	1	8,997	-11	9,385	-9
51 Sunbury	1	10,656	5	10,226	-1
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	9,896	-2	10,114	-2
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH					
53 Camberley East	1	10,332	2	10,573	3
54 Camberley West	1	11,421	13	11,307	10
55 Chobham & Bisley	1	10,645	5	10,610	3
56 Frimley Green & Mytchett	1	8,578	-15	9,364	-9
57 Heatherside & Parkside	1	9,599	-5	9,508	-8
58 Windlesham	1	11,287	12	11,329	10
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT					
59 Caterham Hill	1	9,619	-5	10,204	-1
60 Caterham Valley	1	9,890	-2	10,201	-1
61 Godstone	1	8,927	-12	8,948	-13
62 Lingfield	1	11,904	18	11,993	16
63 Oxted	1	11,296	12	11,530	12
64 Warlingham	1	7,987	-21	8,495	-18
WAVERLEY BOROUGH					
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	1	10,248	1	10,677	4
66 Farnham Central	1	10,148	0	10,222	-1
67 Farnham North	1	10,018	-1	10,108	-2
68 Farnham South	1	9,538	-6	9,488	-8
69 Godalming North	1	11,434	13	11,374	10
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	1	10,118	0	10,060	-2

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
71 Haslemere	1	8,931	-12	9,021	-12
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	1	10,487	4	10,527	2
73 Waverley Western Villages	1	9,152	-9	9,190	-11
WOKING BOROUGH					
74 Woking East	1	9,562	-5	9,598	-7
75 Woking North	1	10,812	7	10,833	5
76 Woking North East	1	9,631	-5	9,901	-4
77 Woking North West	1	9,690	-4	11,327	10
78 Woking South	1	9,564	-5	9,751	-5
79 Woking South East	1	9,620	-5	9,695	-6
80 Woking West	1	9,464	-6	9,398	-9
Totals	80	808,657	-	824,325	-
Averages	-	10,108	-	10,304	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on material provided by Surrey County Council.

Notes: 1 The electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor as each division is represented by a single councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors represented by each councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 Due to inaccuracies in the information provided, the total electorate figures for the boroughs of Spelthorne and Waverley differ marginally from the totals in Figures 4 and B2; however, we would expect this to have a minimal impact on variances.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 We are currently undertaking a review of the electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council. This report contains our draft recommendations, on which we are now consulting. Our review of the county is part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 In each two-tier county, our approach is first to complete the PERs of all the constituent districts and, when Orders for the resulting changes in those areas have been made by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, then to commence a PER of the county council's electoral arrangements. The Secretary of State made Orders for new electoral arrangements in the districts in Surrey, which we reviewed at the start of the PER programme in 1998 and we are now embarking on our county review in this area.

Our Approach to County Reviews

3 In undertaking all our PERs we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999) on our approach to county reviews.

5 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the County Council, and the number, boundaries and names of electoral divisions. Current legislation requires that county council electoral divisions should each return one councillor. In addition, the statutory Rules set out in the 1972 Act provide that each division should be wholly contained within a single district and that division boundaries should not split unwarded parishes or parish wards.

6 In considering the approach we should take to county reviews we valued the responses to the consultation we undertook in 1995 prior to the start of our PER programme, and the more recent discussions we have had with county council officers and the Local Government Association. We have also welcomed the opportunity to brief chief officers and, on an all-party basis, members of individual county councils, about our policies and procedures.

7 First, as with all our reviews, we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and configuration is most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

8 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the county as a whole. For example, we will continue to require justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any division. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in exceptional circumstances, and will require strong justification.

9 Similarly, we will seek to ensure that the number of county councillors representing each district area within the county is commensurate with the district's proportion of the county's electorate.

10 Third, the Rules provide that, in considering county council electoral arrangements, we should have regard to the boundaries of district wards. We attach considerable importance to achieving coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards. Where wards or groups of wards are not coterminous with county divisions, this can cause confusion for the electorate at local elections, lead to increased election costs and, in our view, may not be conducive to effective and convenient local government.

11 We recognise, however, that it is unlikely that optimum electoral equality and maximum coterminosity will be simultaneously achievable. In this respect, county reviews are different to those of districts. The Commission will seek to achieve the best available balance between electoral equality and coterminosity, taking into account the statutory criteria. While the proportion of electoral divisions that will be coterminous with the boundaries of district wards is likely to vary between counties, we would normally expect coterminosity to be achieved in a significant majority of divisions.

12 Where coterminosity is not possible in parished areas, and a district ward is to be split between electoral divisions, we would normally expect this to be achieved without dividing (or further dividing) a parish between divisions. There are likely to be exceptions to this, however, particularly where larger parishes are involved.

13 Fourth, we are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that county but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified; in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a county's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a county council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other counties.

14 Fifth, a further area of difference between county and district reviews is that we recognise it will not be possible to avoid the creation of some county divisions which contain diverse communities, for example, combining urban and rural areas. We have generally sought to avoid this in district reviews, in order to reflect the identities and interests of local communities. Some of the existing county council electoral divisions comprise a number of distinct communities, which is inevitable given the larger number of electors represented by each councillor, and we would expect that similar situations will continue under our recommendations in seeking the best balance between electoral equality, coterminosity and the statutory criteria.

15 Finally, before we started our county reviews the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, in July 1998, setting out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. The Government's proposals provided for elections by halves in alternate years for all two-tier authorities. This would mean that district and county councils would each move to a cycle of elections by halves, with elections for district councils and county councils taking place in alternate years. The White Paper also refers to local accountability being maximised where the whole electorate in a council's area is involved in elections each time they take place, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member divisions in county councils to reflect a system of elections by halves. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

16 In October 1998 we wrote to all local authorities, setting out our understanding of the White Paper proposals, following discussions that we had had with the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, the Local Government Association and the Association of London Government. In brief, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, and our present *Guidance*, until such time as the legislation changes. We have power only to recommend single-member divisions in county council areas.

17 As part of this review we may also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the county. However, we made some recommendations for new parish electoral arrangements as part of our district reviews. Furthermore, this is now a power that is open to district and unitary councils. We therefore only expect to put forward such recommendations during county reviews on an exceptional basis. In any event, we are *not* able to review the administrative boundaries *between* local authorities or parishes, or consider the establishment of new parish areas, as part of this review.

The Review of Surrey

18 We completed the reviews of the 11 district council areas in Surrey in October 1998, and the Secretary of State has since made the Orders for the new electoral arrangements. This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Surrey County Council. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1980 (Report No. 394).

19 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission's analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

20 Stage One of this review began on 24 August 1999, when we wrote to Surrey County Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the 11 district councils in the county, Surrey Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Surrey Association of Local Councils, parish and town councils in the county, the Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament with constituency interests in the county, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the County Council to publicise the review further. Further to a request from the County Council we extended this period by two weeks and the closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 14 December 1999.

21 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

22 Stage Three began on 22 February 2000 with the publication of this draft recommendations report, and public consultation on it will end on 17 April 2000.

23 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an Order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

24 The county of Surrey comprises the 11 districts of Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell, Guildford, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Tandridge, Waverley and Woking. With a population of approximately 1,018,003 (mid-1998), covering 167,011 hectares, it is the most densely populated shire county in England with a population density of 6.1 persons per hectare. Situated on the edge of London, Surrey is also bounded by Kent, East and West Sussex, Hampshire, Bracknell Forest, Windsor, Maidenhead and Slough. Surrey has strong economic and social relationships with London and the airports of Gatwick and Heathrow have a significant influence on the county's economy and environment. However, it also retains downland, heathland, forests and a number of picturesque towns and villages. The county is well connected by rail and road to the rest of the South East, with the M25, M3 and M23 running through the area.

25 To compare levels of electoral inequality between divisions, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors represented by the councillor for each division varies from the county average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

26 The electorate of the county is 809,444 (February 1999). The Council presently has 76 members, with one member elected from each division (Figure 4).

27 Since the last review of the County Council's electoral arrangements there has been an increase in the electorate in Surrey, with around 6 per cent more electors than two decades ago. The most significant growth in the county has occurred in Epsom & Ewell South West and Woking West divisions.

28 At present, each councillor represents an average of 10,651 electors, which the County Council forecasts will increase marginally to 10,849 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors in 34 of the 76 divisions varies by more than 10 per cent from the county average, in 12 divisions by more than 20 per cent, and in one division by more than 40 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Woking West division, in Woking borough, where the councillor represents 44 per cent more electors than the county average.

29 As detailed previously, in considering the County Council's electoral arrangements we must have regard to the boundaries of district wards. Following the completion of the reviews of district warding arrangements in Surrey, we are therefore faced with a new 'starting point' for considering electoral divisions. Our proposals for county divisions will be based on the new district wards as opposed to those which existed prior to the recent reviews. In view of the effect of these new district wards and changes in the electorate over the past 20 years which have resulted in electoral imbalances across the county, changes to most, if not all, of the existing county electoral divisions are inevitable.

30 In considering county council electoral arrangements, we have regard to the boundaries of district wards. The term 'coterminosity' is used throughout the report and refers to situations where the boundaries of county electoral divisions and district wards are the same, that is to say, where county divisions comprise either one or more whole district wards.

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH					
1 Claygate & Hinchley Wood	1	8,870	-17	8,973	-17
2 Cobham & Oxshott	1	11,980	12	12,055	11
3 Esher & Molesey East	1	9,133	-14	9,105	-16
4 Hersham	1	9,143	-14	8,888	-18
5 Molesey West	1	9,638	-10	9,668	-11
6 The Dittons	1	9,874	-7	10,910	1
7 Walton on Thames	1	10,574	-1	10,756	-1
8 Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,358	-3	10,378	-4
9 Weybridge	1	10,946	3	11,084	2
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH					
10 Epsom & Ewell North	1	11,582	9	11,397	5
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	1	10,641	0	10,425	-4
12 Epsom & Ewell South East	1	9,113	-14	9,259	-15
13 Epsom & Ewell South West	1	11,046	4	12,767	18
14 Epsom & Ewell West	1	9,832	-8	9,875	-9
GUILDFORD BOROUGH					
15 Ash	1	12,543	18	13,505	24
16 Guildford East	1	12,419	17	12,521	15
17 Guildford North	1	13,765	29	14,405	33
18 Guildford South	1	11,117	4	11,281	4
19 Guildford West	1	12,576	18	12,650	17
20 Horsleys	1	9,236	-13	9,268	-15
21 Shalford	1	7,895	-26	7,973	-27
22 Shere	1	8,428	-21	8,780	-19
23 Worplesdon	1	10,563	-1	10,778	-1
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
24 Ashtead	1	10,582	-1	10,527	-3
25 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,373	7	11,214	3

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
26 Dorking North	1	9,696	-9	9,504	-12
27 Dorking Rural	1	9,477	-11	9,350	-14
28 Dorking South	1	10,586	-1	10,612	-2
29 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,920	3	10,974	1
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH					
30 Banstead East	1	11,442	7	12,116	12
31 Banstead South	1	12,743	20	12,931	19
32 Banstead West	1	10,604	0	10,902	0
33 Horley East & Salfords	1	9,856	-7	10,641	-2
34 Horley West	1	8,236	-23	8,987	-17
35 Reigate Central	1	10,750	1	11,002	1
36 Reigate East	1	10,555	-1	11,114	2
37 Reigate North	1	10,065	-5	10,245	-6
38 Reigate South	1	10,312	-3	10,399	-4
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH					
39 Addlestone	1	12,910	21	12,984	20
40 Chertsey	1	9,237	-13	9,214	-15
41 Egham North	1	13,642	28	14,199	31
42 Egham South	1	12,130	14	12,504	15
43 New Haw	1	12,095	14	12,058	11
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH					
44 Ashford East	1	9,316	-13	9,000	-17
45 Ashford West	1	10,925	3	10,989	1
46 Laleham & Shepperton Green	1	9,947	-7	9,959	-8
47 Shepperton	1	10,328	-3	10,373	-4
48 Staines	1	10,982	3	11,462	6
49 Stanwell	1	8,349	-22	8,750	-19
50 Sunbury	1	10,426	-2	10,549	-3

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH					
51 Camberley East	1	10,318	-3	10,573	-3
52 Camberley West	1	11,129	4	10,998	1
53 Chobham & Bisley	1	9,027	-15	9,032	-17
54 Frimley Green & Mytchett	1	8,637	-19	9,364	-14
55 Heatherside & Parkside	1	9,872	-7	9,817	-10
56 Windlesham	1	12,879	21	12,907	19
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT					
57 Caterham Hill	1	9,619	-10	10,204	-6
58 Caterham Valley	1	9,899	-7	10,213	-6
59 Godstone	1	8,927	-16	8,947	-18
60 Lingfield	1	11,904	12	11,993	11
61 Oxted	1	11,296	6	11,530	6
62 Warlingham	1	7,976	-25	8,484	-22
WAVERLEY BOROUGH					
63 Farnham Central	1	9,529	-11	9,595	-12
64 Farnham North	1	9,701	-9	9,801	-10
65 Farnham South	1	10,490	-2	10,483	-3
66 Godalming North	1	10,852	2	10,760	-1
67 Godalming South & Rural	1	13,118	23	13,221	22
68 Haslemere	1	12,053	13	11,991	11
69 Waverley East	1	13,620	28	13,400	24
70 Waverley West	1	11,499	8	11,436	5
WOKING BOROUGH					
71 Woking East	1	9,389	-12	9,421	-13
72 Woking North	1	10,946	3	10,923	1
73 Woking South	1	10,990	3	11,126	3
74 Woking South East	1	11,767	10	12,086	11
75 Woking South West	1	9,957	-7	10,032	-8

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
76 Woking West	1	15,294	44	16,915	56
Totals	76	809,444	-	824,512	-
Averages	-	10,651	-	10,849	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Surrey County Council's submission.

Notes: 1 Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors represented by each councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Shalford division in Guildford borough were relatively over-represented by 26 per cent, while electors in Woking West division in Woking borough were significantly under-represented by 44 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 Due to inaccuracies in the information provided, the total electorate figures for the boroughs of Spelthorne and Waverley differ marginally from the totals in Figures 2 and B2; however, we would expect this to have a minimal impact on variances.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

31 At the start of the review, we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council.

32 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the County Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 40 representations during Stage One, including county-wide schemes from the County Council and Surrey County Labour Party, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the County Council and the Commission by appointment. A list of respondents is available on request from the Commission.

Surrey County Council

33 The County Council proposed a council of 75 members, one less than at present, serving 75 divisions. The County Council stated that it had invited views and representations from interested parties and that the review and its draft submission had been publicised.

34 The Council proposed that the number of county councillors representing Elmbridge and Spelthorne should be reduced by one, to eight and six respectively, while the number of county councillors representing Runnymede should be increased by one, to six. There would be changes to 60 of the existing 76 divisions, with 16 divisions retaining their existing boundaries.

35 Under the County Council's proposals the number of electors would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 32 of the proposed 75 divisions, and by more than 20 per cent in nine divisions. By 2004, the number of electors would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 27 divisions, with the number of electors in seven divisions continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. Under these proposals 44 divisions would be coterminous with district ward boundaries (59 per cent of the total number of proposed divisions in the county). The County Council's proposals are summarised in Figures B1 and B2 in Appendix B.

Surrey County Labour Party

36 Surrey County Labour Party (the Labour Party) proposed a council of 80 members, four more than at present, serving 80 divisions. It proposed that the number of county councillors representing Guildford, Runnymede, Waverley and Woking should be increased by one, to 10, six, nine and seven, respectively. There would be changes to 63 of the existing 76 divisions, with only 13 divisions retaining their existing boundaries. The Labour Party supported the County Council's recommendations for Epsom & Ewell, Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Tandridge.

37 Under the Labour Party's proposals, the number of electors would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 21 of the proposed 80 divisions, and by more than 20 per cent in three divisions. By 2004 the number of electors would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 18 divisions, with the number of electors in only one division continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. Under these proposals 51 divisions would be coterminous with district

ward boundaries (64 per cent of the total number of proposed divisions in the county). The Labour Party's proposals are summarised in Figures B3 and B4 in Appendix B.

38 The Labour Party also proposed an alternative option for Guildford, should a reduced council of 75 members be favoured. Under this nine-member scheme, for a 75-member council, four of the divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent and one by more than 20 per cent. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years to vary by more than 10 per cent in four divisions by 2004, with no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent. Of the nine divisions, three would be coterminous with district wards.

District and Borough Councils

39 We have received three representations from Reigate & Banstead, Runnymede and Surrey Heath borough councils. Reigate & Banstead Borough Council put forward proposals for Reigate & Banstead which were identical to those proposed by the County Council. Runnymede Borough Council supported the County Council's proposals for Runnymede. Surrey Heath Borough Council put forward identical proposals to the County Council's for Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham and Bisley, West End & Lightwater divisions.

Parish and Town Councils

40 We received representations directly from 12 parish councils. Ash Parish Council opposed any change to the existing boundaries between Ash and Shalford divisions. Bisley Parish Council opposed any enlargement of Chobham & Bisley division and proposed that West End be included in the division title. Brockham Parish Council argued that the parish should be combined with Betchworth and Buckland parishes and parts of Dorking town to form a Dorking North division. Cranleigh Parish Council argued that the majority of the parish should be contained in a Waverley East division. Horne and Lingfield & Dormansland parish councils opposed any change to the existing arrangements in Tandridge. Pirbright Parish Council supported being linked with Normandy and Worplesdon parishes and suggested that the division should be renamed Worplesdon, Normandy & Pirbright. Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council opposed any division of the parish. West Clandon Parish Council opposed combining Mellow and Burpham wards with the parishes of East and West Clandon. West End Parish Council supported retaining the existing arrangements in Chobham & Bisley division, but if change were necessary it proposed combining Bisley, Lightwater and West End wards within a division. It also supported the creation of a division including Bagshot, Chobham and Windlesham wards. Worplesdon parish councils supported retaining the existing arrangements in Guildford. Wotton Parish Council proposed that Dorking North division should be renamed with a title "more related to the area".

Political Groups

41 We received representations from a further 14 political groups. Englefield Green Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposal for Runnymede. Mole Valley Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposals for Mole Valley and Guildford. Addlestone Branch of Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association, Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association and Woodham & New Haw Branch of

Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association supported the scheme put forward by the five county councillors who represent Runnymede. South West Surrey Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposals for Waverley. Surrey Heath Conservative Association argued that the boundaries of Ash division, in Guildford borough, should be retained.

42 Mole Valley Labour Party proposed that the council size should be increased to 80 members, with six councillors representing Mole Valley and proposed a six member scheme for under a 76- or an 80-member council. It noted that a 66-member council would also offer accurate representation of districts and put forward a five-member scheme for a 66-member council. Under this scheme all five divisions would vary by less than 10 per cent. This level of electoral equality is predicted to continue over the next five years. All of the five divisions would be coterminous.

43 Runnymede Labour Group raised concerns regarding the County Council's proposals and the division of borough wards, arguing that any non-coterminous divisions should be drawn along the lines of polling districts, where possible.

44 The Liberal Democrat Group on Surrey County Council (Surrey Liberal Democrats) opposed the County Council's proposals for Mole Valley and Woking. It put forward alternative options for Mole Valley and supported Woking Liberal Democrats' proposals for Woking. Under the proposals for Mole Valley two wards would vary by more than 10 per cent by 2004 while all the divisions would be coterminous.

45 Guildford Liberal Democrats noted their support for the County Council's proposals for Guildford if the area were to be represented by nine councillors. However, they argued that the borough should be represented by 10 councillors and put forward proposals for a 10-division borough. Mole Valley Liberal Democrats supported a scheme identical to that put forward by Surrey Liberal Democrats. South West Surrey Liberal Democrats proposed an alternative scheme for Waverley borough under a 75-member council. They put forward identical boundaries to those proposed by the County Council and the Labour Party for Farnham Central, Farnham North and Godalming North divisions, and by the County Council for Haslemere division. Of the eight divisions, six would be coterminous. Under these proposals three divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average, improving over the next five years such that only one division would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.

46 Woking Liberal Democrats put forward alternative proposals that were suggested by the County Council during its consultation period. Under these proposals two divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average, to improve over the next five years, with no divisions varying by more than 10 per cent by 2004. Of the six divisions, none would be coterminous with district wards.

Other Representations

47 We received a further nine representations from a Member of Parliament, local groups, county councillors and a local resident.

48 Nick Hawkins MP supported the County Council's proposals for Guildford and Surrey Heath. Ashted Residents' Association expressed the view that the representation of the Ashted area, in Mole Valley district, should not be reduced in any way.

49 The Reigate Society proposed that the Reigate area should be represented by four divisions, each comprising two adjacent wards. Under their proposals five of the 10 divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent, while two would vary by more than 20 per cent from the county average, under an 80-member council. By 2004 this level of equality would improve such that five divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent, while one division would vary by more than 20 per cent.

50 Woodcote Residents' Society supported the County Council's proposals for Epsom & Ewell borough.

51 A local county councillor supported the County Council's proposals for Epsom & Ewell borough while another councillor supported retaining the existing boundaries of Ash division. A further county councillor supported an alternative option for Mole Valley, which was suggested by the County Council during its consultation period. The five county councillors representing Runnymede borough put forward an identical scheme to that proposed by the County Council.

52 A local resident proposed that we should address an anomaly in the boundary of South Merstham ward in Reigate & Banstead. However, this is not within the remit of this review.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

53 As with our reviews of districts, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors being “as nearly as may be, the same in every division of the county”.

54 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken, and to the boundaries of district wards.

55 We have discussed in Chapter One the additional parameters which apply to reviews of county council electoral arrangements and the need to have regard to the boundaries of district wards and coterminosity. We will also seek to ensure that the number of county councillors representing each district council area within the county is commensurate with the district’s proportion of the county’s electorate.

56 It is impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors in every division of a county. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

57 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, especially when also seeking to achieve coterminosity in order to facilitate convenient and effective local government. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review.

58 We therefore recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as the boundaries of district wards and community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an imbalance of over 10 per cent in any division. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in exceptional circumstances and will require strong justification.

Electorate Forecasts

59 The County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting a marginal increase in the electorate of 2 per cent from 809,444 to 824,512 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. The County Council’s forecasts were based on the 1997-2002 projections which

were prepared by each of the Surrey district councils, with amendments to take account of factors such as the location and rate of anticipated housing development between 2002 and 2004. It expects the growth to be spread across the county, with the largest increases being in Epsom & Ewell South West and Woking West divisions. The County Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates.

60 Runnymede Labour Group expressed concern regarding the electoral projections for the borough, arguing that there was likely to be growth in the area that had not been included in the County Council's calculations. However, the County Council argued that at the time that it drew up its forecasts the areas of concern were not intended for release for development until "after 2006", and emphasised that its forecasts were "the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time".

61 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science. We have examined the methodology and assumptions used by the County Council and are content that their figures represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We welcome further views on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

62 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government, although we are willing to carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

63 Surrey County Council presently has 76 members. The County Council proposed a council of 75 members which it suggested "would be appropriate". This involved changing the level of representation in three districts, to reduce the number of councillors in Elmbridge and Spelthorne by one, and to include another councillor in Runnymede.

64 The Labour Party proposed that Surrey should have an 80-member council, arguing that electoral equality across the county would be "significantly" better under an 80-member council than under a 75- or 76-member council. It pointed out that Surrey is a large county and it expressed the view that an 80-member scheme could "deliver County Council divisions which reflect natural communities more effectively", with particular regard to the representation of rural and urban areas in Guildford borough. Under their proposals Guildford, Runnymede, Waverley and Woking would each be represented by an extra councillor and no district would have fewer councillors than at present.

65 Mole Valley Labour Party supported the proposal that Surrey should be represented by 80 councillors. It argued that there would be greatly improved electoral equality under an 80-member council and that an 80-member council would aid the representation of communities. It noted that a 66-member council would also result in a more accurate representation of districts, however, it expressed particular concern regarding proposals to reduce the level of representation in Elmbridge either under a 66- or a 75-member council. It also expressed concern that a reduction in council size would have an adverse effect on the representation of minority interests in the county.

66 We have considered the issue of council size carefully, given the lack of consensus on this issue. Under an 80-member council each district would be more accurately represented, with the number of councillors per district being more evenly balanced than under a council size of 75 or 76. Under a 75-member council a number of districts would merit fractions of councillors. For example, Spelthorne would merit 6.5 councillors and Tandridge would merit 5.5 councillors, and therefore the level of representation of these districts, under a 75-member council, would necessarily be inaccurate. Under an 80-member council each of the districts merits a clearer level of representation; for example, Spelthorne merits 6.9 councillors and Tandridge merits 5.9 councillors. While we note that a 66-member council would also offer a more accurate representation of districts there was no support at Stage One for such a large reduction in council size.

67 Electoral equality would consequently improve under an 80-member council. Under the County Council's proposal for a 75-member council 32 divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average, while only 21 divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent under a modified 80-member scheme. Similarly, coterminosity would be improved under an 80-member scheme, from 59 per cent, under the County Council's proposals, to 64 per cent under a modified 80-member scheme.

68 We are keen to ensure that the identities and interests of local communities are reflected in our proposals, and we consider that an 80-member scheme would additionally help to ensure good community representation. We are particularly concerned that Guildford borough should be represented by an even number of councillors in order that the urban and rural areas of the borough can be represented equally, without any divisions combining rural and urban areas, given that the urban and rural areas merit equal numbers of councillors.

69 The Commission does not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but is prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. In the case of Surrey County Council, we believe such evidence is available for a small increase in council size. We have tested other council sizes from 66 to 80 councillors and have concluded that the best balance of representation is achieved with 80 members. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that, in Surrey, a council size of 80 members would best meet the statutory criteria.

Electoral Arrangements

70 We acknowledge the difficulties in seeking to address the current electoral equalities and the lack of coterminosity among existing county divisions, and we are grateful for the positive approach taken by the County Council and the Labour Party in submitting county-wide schemes. We have sought to build on these proposals and other submissions received in order to put forward electoral arrangements which would achieve further improvements in equality of representation throughout the county, better reflect the interests and identities of communities in the county, and result in a greater level of coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards.

71 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the Labour Party. As indicated above, we consider that the council size should be increased by four members to 80, as proposed by the Labour Party. We agree that there should be an increase in the number of councillors representing Guildford, Runnymede, Waverley and Woking districts, to ensure that each district has a level of representation commensurate with its share of the county's electorate. Our proposals would improve electoral equality, compared to the current arrangements, with the number of divisions where the number of electors would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average reducing from 34 to 22.

72 While we are recommending an 80-member council for Surrey, as proposed by the Labour Party, we note that it is possible to incorporate elements of other schemes into an 80-member proposal without having an adverse affect on electoral equality and to better reflect the range of views expressed. Therefore we are proposing to combine elements of the County Council's, the Labour Party's and Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals in our draft recommendations. We are also aware that there is considerable agreement on proposed division boundaries between the different schemes for individual districts.

73 We also acknowledge the difficulties faced in seeking to address the electoral inequality in Surrey while seeking to reflect communities and respect the district ward and parish boundaries in the county. Under our draft recommendations there would remain a relatively high degree of electoral imbalance in some areas, which we consider to be necessary in order to best reflect community identities and interests. Similarly, the districts of Epsom & Ewell and Spelthorne in particular would have poor coterminosity; however, the district warding patterns do not lend themselves to the creation of divisions which would be both coterminous and result in reasonable levels of electoral equality.

74 For the purposes of county divisions, the 11 districts in the county are considered in turn, as follows:

- (a) Elmbridge borough;
- (b) Epsom & Ewell borough;
- (c) Guildford borough;
- (d) Mole Valley district;
- (e) Reigate & Banstead borough;
- (f) Runnymede borough;
- (g) Spelthorne borough;
- (h) Surrey Heath borough;
- (i) Tandridge district;
- (j) Waverley borough;
- (k) Woking borough.

75 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A and on the large map at the back of this report.

Elmbridge borough

76 Under the current arrangements the borough of Elmbridge is represented by nine county councillors serving nine county divisions: Claygate & Hinchley Wood, Cobham & Oxshott, Esher & Molesey East, Hersham, Molesey West, The Dittons, Walton on Thames, Walton South & Oatlands and Weybridge. There is a fairly high degree of electoral imbalance in these divisions, with the number of electors represented by each councillor varying in four divisions by more than 10 per cent from the county average. Overall, relative to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, the Elmbridge area is over-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

77 The County Council proposed that the number of county councillors representing Elmbridge should be reduced from nine to eight, “in order to achieve a greater equality of representation across the county” under a 75-member council. It proposed that Cobham & Downside, Cobham Fairmile and Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon wards should be combined in a new Cobham & Oxshott division, and that Long Ditton, Thames Ditton and Weston Green wards should form a Ditton Green division. It also proposed that Claygate, Esher and Hinchley Wood wards should be combined in a new Esher, Claygate & Hinchley Wood division, while Hersham South and Oatlands Park wards would be linked with part of Hersham North ward to form a Hersham & Oatlands division.

78 The County Council proposed that Molesey division should comprise Molesey East and Molesey North wards and part of Molesey South ward, while Walton Central division would comprise the wards of Walton Central, Walton South and the remainder of Hersham North ward. It proposed that Walton Ambleside and Walton North wards should be combined with part of Molesey South ward to form Walton East division and that St George’s Hill, Weybridge North and Weybridge South wards should form a Weybridge ward, the boundaries of which are “almost identical” to those of the existing Weybridge division.

79 Under the County Council’s proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in two divisions and by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor projected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in only one division by 2004, with no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent. Four of the proposed eight divisions would be coterminous with borough wards.

80 The Labour Party argued that Elmbridge consists of a number of separate towns and villages, each of which has its own identity which should be reflected in the proposed divisions. It also argued that the River Mole forms a “significant natural barrier for electoral purposes”. It opposed the County Council’s proposal to include part of Molesey South ward in Walton East division, arguing that “Molesey is a community in its own right” and that this proposal would not allow for satisfactory representation of community identity. It also argued that the County Council’s proposals for the Molesey area would result in electors being separated from the remainder of the Walton division “by a reservoir and some geographical distance”.

81 The Labour Party proposed that Cobham division should comprise Cobham & Downside and Cobham Fairmile wards with part of Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward, while Hersham division should comprise Hersham North and Hersham South wards. It proposed that Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott division should include Claygate and Hinchley Wood wards and the remainder of Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward and that Esher and Molesey East wards should form Molesey East & Esher division. It suggested that Molesey North and Molesey South wards should form Molesey West division., while The Dittons division should comprise Long Ditton, Thames Ditton and West Green wards. It proposed that Walton should be divided into Walton and Walton South & Oatlands divisions, comprising Walton Ambleside and Walton North wards with part of Walton Central ward, and Oatlands ward, Walton South ward and the remainder of Walton Central ward, respectively. Finally, it proposed that Weybridge division should comprise St George's Hill, Weybridge North and Weybridge South wards.

82 Under the Labour Party's proposals for a council of 80 members, the number of electors per councillor would vary by less than 10 per cent in all nine divisions. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004. Five of the nine divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

83 We received no further representations regarding this area.

84 Having carefully considered the representations received, we propose adopting the Labour Party's proposals for Elmbridge. We note that the County Council's and the Labour Party's schemes are very similar in terms of electoral equality and coterminosity. The County Council's scheme would involve reducing the level of representation in the borough to eight members, while the Labour Party proposed retaining nine members, which would more accurately reflect the level of representation merited; the borough would be entitled to 8.4 councillors under a 75-member council and 8.9 members under an 80-member council.

85 While we recognise that the Labour Party's proposal would divide Walton Central and Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon wards, we consider that the division of wards is necessary in the interests of electoral equality. Also, we consider that the Labour Party's proposed non-coterminous boundaries would only divide areas which share transport and community links with the adjoining wards with which they would be combined. The County Council, however, proposed including part of Molesey South in Walton East division, thereby dividing this area from the rest of Molesey, with which it shares transport connections and facilities, to include it with parts of Walton, from which it is divided by open land and reservoirs. This proposal would not appear to be in the best interests of the communities involved.

Epsom & Ewell borough

86 Under the current arrangements Epsom & Ewell borough is represented by five county councillors serving five divisions: Epsom & Ewell North; Epsom & Ewell North East; Epsom & Ewell South East; Epsom & Ewell South West and Epsom & Ewell West. There is a degree of electoral imbalance in these divisions, with the number of electors represented by each councillor varying in one division by more than 10 per cent from the county average. Overall,

relative to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, under a 76-member council the Epsom & Ewell area has the correct level of representation on the County Council.

87 The County Council proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Epsom & Ewell North division. It proposed that the wards of Ewell and Stoneleigh and the northern part of Nonsuch ward should be combined to form a revised Epsom & Ewell North East division so as to retain the existing boundary between Epsom & Ewell North East and Epsom & Ewell South East divisions. It put forward a revised Epsom & Ewell South East division comprising College ward, Woodcote ward and the remainder of Nonsuch ward, and proposed that Stamford and Town wards should be combined with the southern part of Court ward to form Epsom & Ewell South West division. Epsom & Ewell West division would comprise Ruxley ward, West Ewell ward and the remainder of Court ward.

88 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in only one division. This level of electoral equality would remain relatively stable over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in one division by 2004.

89 The Labour Party supported the County Council's proposals for Epsom & Ewell borough. Under the 80-member council proposed by the Labour Party, the County Council's proposed divisions would also result in the number of electors per councillor varying by more than 10 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would deteriorate over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004.

90 Woodcote Residents' Society supported the County Council's proposals for Epsom & Ewell borough, arguing that the proposals would ensure that "established natural communities" are not divided. A local county councillor also expressed support for the County Council's proposals and emphasised that the level of electoral equality in the proposed Epsom & Ewell South East would improve further as a result of future planned development in the area.

91 We recognise that the County Council's proposals have received unanimous support and we are content to put forward these suggestions as our draft recommendations. These proposals would result in poor coterminosity, with only one of the five divisions being coterminous; however, we acknowledge that the district ward patterns do not lend themselves to the creation of divisions which would be both coterminous and result in reasonable levels of electoral equality. We consider that these proposals offer the best available balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

Guildford borough

92 At present the borough of Guildford is represented by nine county councillors, serving the nine divisions of Ash, Guildford East, Guildford North, Guildford South, Guildford West, Horsleys, Shalford, Shere and Worplesdon. There are significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in three of the nine divisions varying by more than 20 per cent from the average for the county. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the

county, Guildford borough is slightly under-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

93 The County Council proposed that Guildford should continue to be represented by nine divisions, with minimal change to the existing boundaries in order to “reflect the strong differences between the communities in the urban area of Guildford town ... and the communities in the more rural parts of the borough”. It proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Ash division in order that it should comprise the whole of the parish of Ash which it argued has “a very strong sense of community”. It proposed that Guildford East division should comprise Burpham and Merrow wards together with the part of Christchurch ward that lies to the south of the railway line, with Stoke and Stoughton wards being combined with the remainder of Christchurch ward to form Guildford North division. It proposed that the wards of Friary & St Nicolas and Holy Trinity should form Guildford South division, while Onslow and Westborough wards should be combined to form Guildford West division. It also recommended that Horsleys, Shalford, Shere and Worplesdon divisions should retain their existing boundaries. Under the County Council’s proposals Shere, Shalford and Guildford West divisions would have high electoral variances; however, the County Council argued that this is necessary to protect community interests, particularly in the rural divisions, and that the electoral equality of the divisions could only be addressed by combining urban and rural areas under a nine-member scheme.

94 Under the County Council’s proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in eight of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in three divisions. This level of electoral equality would marginally deteriorate over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in eight divisions by 2004 with four divisions varying by more than 20 per cent. Only three of the nine divisions would be coterminous with district wards.

95 The Labour Party proposed that, under an 80-member scheme, Guildford should be represented by 10 councillors, an increase of one, arguing that this would keep “natural communities” together because the borough is divided “almost exactly” in half between the urban and rural parts. It argued that a nine-member scheme would result either in a combination of rural and urban areas or in poor electoral equality.

96 The Labour Party recommended that Ash division should comprise Ash Vale and Ash Wharf wards. This would result in a division with a relatively high electoral variance; however, it argued that this was “the best solution available without splitting a ward of Ash parish”. As an alternative, it suggested that the area of Ash South ward to the north of Aldershot Road, Ash Street, Grange Road and Foreman Road might be included in Ash division, to create better electoral equality, but this would involve dividing the parish further.

97 The Labour Party also proposed that Guildford Central division should include Christchurch and Holy Trinity wards, which it claimed share “similar problems”. It argued that the “natural unit” of Burpham and Merrow wards should be retained in Guildford East division, while the “similar communities” of Stoke and Stoughton wards should form Guildford North division. It proposed that Friary & St Nicolas ward should be combined with the part of Onslow ward which

is “of a like composition” to form Guildford South ward, and that Guildford West division should comprise Westborough ward and the remainder of Onslow ward, arguing that this area is separate from the rest of Onslow ward and that residents of this proposed division share concerns regarding the A3 and the university. It supported the County Council’s proposal that Horsleys and Worplesdon divisions should retain their existing boundaries. It argued that St Martha parish, in Tillingbourne ward, should remain linked to Chilworth ward of Shalford parish in order that the whole of Chilworth village could be included in a single division. As a result, it proposed that Shalford division should comprise Ash South & Tongham and Pilgrims wards with Shalford ward, less Chilworth ward of Shalford parish, and that Shere division should combine Send ward, Tillingbourne ward, the parishes of East and West Clandon of Clandon & Horsley ward and Chilworth ward of Shalford parish.

98 Under the Labour Party’s proposals for a 10-member division, under an 80-member council the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to continue to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004. Under these proposals five of the 10 divisions would be coterminous with borough wards.

99 The Labour Party also recommended a “contingency proposal” for a nine-division arrangement for Guildford, as an alternative, should a 75-member council be preferred. Under this scheme it proposed that Ash, Guildford East, Guildford North, Guildford West, Shalford and Worplesdon divisions should be the same as under its 10-division proposal. However, it proposed that Guildford Central ward should combine Christchurch and Friary & St Nicolas wards, with part of Onslow ward, while Horsleys division would comprise Effingham, Lovelace and Send wards and the parishes of East and West Horsley of Clandon & Horsley ward. Finally, it proposed that Shere division should comprise the wards of Send and Tillingbourne together with the parishes of East and West Clandon of Clandon & Horsley ward.

100 Under the Labour Party’s proposals for a nine-member borough under a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in four divisions, with one division varying by more than 20 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in four divisions by 2004, with no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent.

101 Guildford Liberal Democrats noted their support for the County Council’s proposals for Guildford if the area were to be represented by nine councillors. However, they argued that the borough should ideally be represented by 10 councillors and put forward an identical scheme to the Labour Party’s proposal for a 10-division borough. They argued that this scheme respects “the importance of reflecting the differences between communities in the urban and rural areas of Guildford borough and the need to respect fully natural communities in both areas”. They argued that this scheme could be integrated into a 76-member council or an 80-member council; however, as they pointed out, under a 76-member council Guildford merits only nine councillors and not 10.

102 The Labour Party's proposals, under a 76-member council, would result in three of the 10 divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average, while one division would vary by more than 20 per cent. This level of electoral equality would remain relatively stable over the next five years, with four divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average by 2004, and no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent.

103 Nick Hawkins MP supported the County Council's proposals for the borough, arguing that the proposed high electoral variances in Ash and Shalford divisions were justified because the proposed boundaries were "the only sensible solution" in order to "fit community links". Mole Valley Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposals for Guildford, arguing that Horsleys and Shere divisions should retain their semi-rural and rural characters. Surrey Heath Conservative Association argued that the boundaries of Ash division should be retained, as proposed by the County Council. It expressed concern that dividing the existing division, as the Labour Party proposed, might cause "confusion" among the electorate, and that including the area in Shalford division would involve a "conflict of interests" between rural and more urban areas.

104 Ash Parish Council opposed any change to the existing Shalford division boundaries, particularly if this involved linking rural and urban areas. Pirbright Parish Council supported being linked with Normandy and Worplesdon parishes, as proposed by both the County Council and the Labour Party, but suggested that Worplesdon division should be renamed Worplesdon, Normandy & Pirbright. West Clandon and Worplesdon parish councils recommended that the existing arrangements for Guildford should be retained, and West Clandon Parish Council raised particular concerns about linking urban and rural areas in the district. A local councillor supported retaining the existing boundaries of Ash division, arguing that it would cause confusion to divide Ash parish between divisions.

105 Having carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One, we consider that the Labour Party's recommendations for Guildford would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and propose adopting these as our draft recommendations for Guildford. The Labour Party's 10-member proposal would secure improved electoral equality and coterminosity and would ensure better community representation, with an equal allocation of councillors for the urban and rural areas of the borough. In contrast, the County Council's proposals would offer extremely poor electoral equality and worse coterminosity. However, we note that there is some similarity between the County Council's and the Labour Party's schemes, given that they have both proposed that Horsleys and Worplesdon divisions should retain their existing boundaries.

106 The Labour Party's proposal would involve the division of Ash parish, which has encountered opposition at Stage One; however, having considered the options we note that it is not possible to include the whole parish in a division without having a detrimental effect on electoral equality. The Labour Party has proposed that the boundary of Ash division should be drawn along the existing parish and district ward boundaries, and we consider that this offers the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We have considered the Labour Party's proposal to ward Ash parish yet further, but we are not persuaded that it would be in the interests of the community to divide this area to a greater extent.

107 We recognise that a wholly coterminous scheme in Guildford would result in very poor electoral equality and therefore some division of district wards is necessary. Under the Labour Party's 10-member proposal Clandon & Horsley ward would be divided between divisions; however, this would retain the existing division boundary, utilising easily identifiable parish boundaries. It also proposed the division of Onslow ward, but this would involve dividing urban areas that appear to be well connected with the adjoining wards with which we propose to combine them. We are also content that Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish should be combined in a division with the adjoining St Martha parish, which is similar in character and contains parts of the village of Chilworth.

108 We note that Pirbright Parish Council proposed renaming the division of Worplesdon as Worplesdon, Normandy & Pirbright; however, given that it did not provide argumentation in support of this change we are not persuaded that renaming the division would receive local support.

Mole Valley district

109 At present, Mole Valley district is represented by six county councillors, serving six divisions: Ashtead, Bookham & Fetcham West, Dorking North, Dorking Rural, Dorking South and Leatherhead & Fetcham East. There is a degree of electoral imbalance within the district, with the number of electors in one division varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, the district of Mole Valley is slightly over-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

110 The County Council based its proposals on "the natural communities" in the area, arguing that the southern areas can be grouped in their relation to Dorking. It proposed that Ashtead, Bookham & Fetcham West and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions should retain their existing boundaries. It argued that Dorking & the Holmwoods division should comprise Dorking South and Holmwoods wards, while Box Hill & Headley, Dorking North, Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham, Leith Hill and Westcott wards should be combined in a Dorking North & Rural division. It proposed that Beare Green, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Okewood wards should form Dorking Rural division, and that Dorking North & Rural division might also be named Mole Valley Gap or Dorking Hills.

111 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004. All six divisions would be coterminous with the district wards.

112 The Labour Party's proposals for Ashtead and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions were identical to those of the County Council. In the interests of electoral equality, it proposed that Bookham South ward should be divided, and that one polling district of Bookham South ward should be combined with Bookham North and Fetcham West wards to form Bookham & Fetcham West division while the remainder should be included in Mole Valley Hills ward with the wards of Box Hill & Headley, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Leith Hill, Mickleham, Westhumble

& Pixham and Westcott. It argued that this would be acceptable, given the similarly rural nature of Bookham South and adjoining areas. It also proposed combining the Chart Downs and Goodwyns estates of Holmwoods ward with Dorking North and Dorking South wards in a Dorking division, arguing that Holmwoods ward comprises distinct areas and that the northern parts “identify closely” with the town of Dorking. It further proposed that Mole Valley South division should comprise the remainder of Holmwoods ward together with Beare Green, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Okewood wards. It opposed the current “uneasy mixture of town and country” by which Dorking is divided and the urban wards are combined with rural areas, and argued that its proposals would create divisions with “consistency of character” which would improve the “electors’ identification” with divisions.

113 Under the Labour Party’s proposals for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would not vary by more than 10 per cent in any division. This level of electoral equality would continue over the next five years. Only two of the proposed six divisions would be coterminous with district wards.

114 Surrey Liberal Democrats put forward an alternative option for Mole Valley under which Ashted, Bookham & Fetcham West, Dorking & the Holmwoods and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions would be the same as those put forward by the County Council. However, they suggested that Dorking & the Holmwoods division should be renamed Dorking South. They also proposed that Dorking North division should comprise Box Hill & Headley, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Dorking North and Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham wards, and that the wards of Beare Green, Capel Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood, Leith Hill, Okewood and Westcott should be combined to form Dorking Rural division.

115 Surrey Liberal Democrats argued that their proposals would avoid large electoral variances and the division of parishes and would respect the links between areas in the district. They opposed the proposals of the County Council and the Labour Party to link Leith Hill and Westcott wards with areas between Dorking and Leatherhead on the grounds that they have no “affinity, geographical connection nor community ties”. They argued that there is an “affinity” between Box Hill & Headley and Brockham and that Beare Green, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood, Leith Hill and Okewood should be combined due to their shared concerns regarding Gatwick airport.

116 Under Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals two divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average under a 75-member council; this level of electoral equality would deteriorate marginally over the next five years to continue to vary by more than 10 per cent in two divisions. Under an 80-member council only one division would have an electoral variance greater than 10 per cent, and this would improve marginally over the next five years, with one division continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 2004. All of the proposed divisions would be coterminous with district wards.

117 Mole Valley Labour Party put forward an identical scheme to the Labour Party’s proposals for six divisions in Mole Valley under an 80-member council. It supported the proposed division of district wards, arguing that Bookham South ward could easily be linked with other rural areas within Mole Valley Hills division and that the Chart Downs and Goodwyns estate area of

Holmwoods ward should be included in the urban division of Dorking, given that these estates “identify closely” with the town, while the remainder of the ward is more rural in character. It raised concerns regarding the County Council’s proposal to divide Dorking town between divisions and to continue to combine rural and urban areas.

118 While it argued that a six-division scheme would be preferable in the interests of electoral equality and community identity, in the event of a 66-member scheme being favoured, Mole Valley Labour Party put forward a proposal for five divisions in Mole Valley. Under Mole Valley Labour Party’s five-division scheme Ashtead, Box Hill & Headley division would comprise Ashtead Common, Ashtead Park, Ashtead Village and Box Hill & Headley wards, while the wards of Bookham North, Fetcham West and Leatherhead North would form Bookham, Fetcham & Leatherhead North division. It suggested that Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Dorking North, Dorking South and Westcott wards should be combined to form Dorking division and that Mid Mole Valley division should include Bookham South, Fetcham East, Leatherhead South, Leith Hill and Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham wards. Finally, it proposed that Mole Valley South division should comprise the wards of Beare Green, Capel Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood, Holmwoods and Okewood.

119 Under Mole Valley Labour Party’s alternative proposal for a five-member district scheme under a 66-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary from the county average by less than 10 per cent in all five divisions, this level of electoral equality is projected to continue over the next five years. All of the proposed divisions would be coterminous with the district wards.

120 Mole Valley Conservative Association supported the County Council’s proposal for Mole Valley, arguing that any lack of electoral equality was caused by the “geographical limitations” of the area. It argued that the County Council’s scheme offered “the best internal links” for Dorking Rural division, particularly because Leith Hill and Westcott wards are only accessible via Dorking town.

121 Mole Valley Liberal Democrats supported Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals, arguing that this scheme would combine communities which share interests or identities and would ensure that rural and urban areas would be retained in different divisions as much as possible, while parishes would not be divided between divisions.

122 Brockham Parish Council proposed that the parishes of Brockham, Betchworth and Buckland should be combined in a division with areas of Dorking in a Dorking North division, as proposed by Surrey Liberal Democrats, instead of with surrounding areas, because “the three villages have more in common with each other and with Dorking than with the string of other villages that make up the heterogenous grouping of the present Dorking Rural division”. Wotton Parish Council proposed that if the County Council’s Dorking North & Rural division was recommended it should be renamed with a title more “appropriate” to the division’s position to the north and west of Dorking town. Ashtead Residents’ Association supported the proposal to retain the existing electoral arrangements in the area.

123 A county councillor supported the scheme that was put forward by the County Council during consultation and by Surrey Liberal Democrats at Stage One. She argued that this would address electoral equality and would ensure that suburban and rural areas remain separate. She also supported the fact that this scheme would not divide parishes. She expressed concern regarding proposals, such as that of the County Council, to include Leith Hill and Westcott wards in Dorking North division, which would include areas with which these villages have “hardly any geographical connection” and “absolutely no communal ties”. She also argued that Brockham should retain its links with Box Hill and Headley with which it has “close community ties”, and that Beare Green, Charlwood, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Leith Hill and Okewood wards should be combined in the same division because they share the “very significant common issue” of being on the flight-path to Gatwick airport. She noted that Capel Parish Council opposed the County Council’s proposal to divided the parish between divisions.

124 Having carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One, we recognise that there is merit in all the schemes; however, we are persuaded that Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and propose adopting these as our draft recommendations for Mole Valley. This scheme would offer good electoral equality, would secure 100 per cent coterminosity, and would retain links between areas to the north-east of Dorking. The County Council’s scheme offered worse levels of electoral equality and the Labour Party’s proposals resulted in poorer levels of coterminosity. Similarly, we were not persuaded by Mole Valley Labour Party’s proposals for an alternative five-member scheme, given that the district merits six members under an 80-member council.

125 We recognise that there was some opposition to the proposal to divide the town of Dorking between divisions. However, we have also noted the support received regarding proposals to link Dorking North with areas to the north-east of Dorking and Dorking South with Holmwoods ward, and the proposed divisions would be wholly coterminous, with good electoral equality.

Reigate and Banstead borough

126 At present the borough of Reigate & Banstead is represented by nine county councillors serving nine divisions: Banstead East, Banstead South, Banstead West, Horley East & Salfords, Horley West, Reigate Central, Reigate East, Reigate North and Reigate South. There are significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in two of the nine divisions varying by more than 20 per cent or more from the average for the county. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, the Reigate & Banstead area has the correct level of representation on the County Council under a 76-member council.

127 The County Council proposed that Banstead East division should retain its existing boundaries while Banstead South division should comprise Kingswood with Burgh Heath, Preston and Tadworth & Walton wards and Banstead West division should include Nork and Tattenhams wards. It put forward a Horley East division which would comprise Horley Central and Horley East wards and a Horley West division which would contain Horley West and Salfords & Sidlow wards. It proposed that Merstham and Redhill East wards should form Redhill East division, and that Reigate Central and Meadvale & St Johns wards should be combined in Reigate Central division. It recommended that the remainder of Reigate should be divided into

Reigate North division, comprising Redhill West and Reigate Hill wards, and Reigate South division, comprising Earlswood & Whitebushes and South Park & Woodhatch wards. It also suggested that, as an alternative, Banstead West division could be named Nork & the Tattenhams.

128 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in four of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, but the number of electors per councillor is expected to continue to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in three divisions by 2004 with one division varying by more than 20 per cent.

129 The Labour Party supported the County Council's proposals for seven of the nine divisions in Reigate & Banstead borough, but proposed alternative arrangements for the Redhill area. It accepted the County Council's proposals for Banstead East, Banstead South, Banstead West, Horley East, Horley West, Reigate Central and Reigate South divisions. However, it proposed that Redhill Central division should comprise Redhill East and Redhill West wards, while Reigate North division should comprise Merstham and Reigate Hill wards. It argued that the centre of Redhill is a "natural community" with shared interests, which should be represented as a whole. It added that Reigate Hill and Merstham wards cover similar areas which also form "a clear natural community".

130 Under the Labour Party's proposals for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in three of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, but the number of electors per councillor would still vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in four divisions by 2004 with one division varying by more than 20 per cent.

131 The Reigate Society proposed that the Reigate area should be represented by four divisions, each comprising two adjacent wards. It proposed that Merstham and Reigate Hill wards should form Reigate Hill & Merstham division; that Redhill East and Redhill West wards should form Redhill division; that Reigate Central and South Park & Woodhatch wards should be combined in Reigate Central & Woodhatch division; and that Earlswood & Whitebushes and Meadvale & St Johns wards should form an Earlswood & Meadvale division.

132 Under the Reigate Society's proposals, combined with the County Council's proposals for the remainder of the district under an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in five of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, but the number of electors per councillor would vary still by more than 10 per cent from the average in four divisions by 2004 with one division varying by more than 20 per cent.

133 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council put forward identical proposals to those proposed by the County Council. Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council opposed any proposals under which the parish would be divided between divisions.

134 Having carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One, we propose adopting the County Council's proposals for seven of the divisions, and the Labour Party's proposals for Redhill Central and Reigate North divisions, which also reflect elements of the Reigate Society's proposals, as our draft recommendations for Reigate & Banstead. We consider that the Labour Party's proposals for Redhill are preferable because they would retain the whole of Redhill town community within a single division and would avoid dividing areas of Merstham from the parts of Reigate with which they are connected. Combined with the County Council's proposals, these proposals would offer 100 per cent coterminosity and reasonable levels of electoral equality. We have not been persuaded that the Reigate Society's proposed Reigate Central & Woodhatch and Earlswood & Meadvale divisions would offer a better representation of communities, given that they would combine areas that are separated by open land, which share few transport links.

135 Under our draft recommendations for Guildford, under an 80-member council the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in four of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years; however, the number of electors per councillor would continue to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in four divisions by 2004, with one division varying by more than 20 per cent.

Runnymede borough

136 At present Runnymede borough is represented by five county councillors serving five divisions: Addlestone, Chertsey, Egham North, Egham South and New Haw. There are very significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in all five divisions varying from the county average by more than 10 per cent. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Runnymede borough is under-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

137 The County Council proposed that the number of councillors representing Runnymede should be increased by one to six. It proposed that Addlestone Bourneside ward should be combined with parts of Addlestone North and Chertsey South & Row Town wards to form Addlestone division, and that Chertsey Meads and Chertsey St Ann's wards should be combined with the remaining parts of Addlestone North and Chertsey South & Row Town wards to form Chertsey division. It proposed that Egham Hythe & Thorpe division should comprise Egham Hythe and Thorpe wards and part of Egham Town ward, while the remainder of Egham Town ward would be combined with Englefield Green East and Englefield Green West wards to form Englefield Green division. It put forward a Foxhills & Virginia Water division which would include Foxhills and Virginia Water wards, and a Woodham & New Haw division which would contain New Haw and Woodham wards. The Council recognised that its proposals would result in relatively high levels of electoral inequality; however, it argued that this could be justified given that the proposed Virginia Water & Foxhills division reflects the distinct rural character of this area, in comparison to the rest of the borough, while the proposed Woodham & New Haw division combines areas with a "strong sense of community".

138 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality

would improve marginally over the next five years so that the number of electors per councillor is expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004 with one division continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. Only two of the proposed six divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

139 The Labour Party and Englefield Green Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposals for Runnymede.

140 Runnymede Borough Council also supported the County Council's proposals for the borough. It agreed that the number of councillors representing Runnymede should be increased in order to address the current under-representation of the area on the County Council. It commented that electoral variances in Woodham & New Haw and Foxhills & Virginia Water divisions were "justified" given that no other options would provide "a better balance" of electoral variance, and that "these communities do have a reasonable geographical community identity".

141 The five county councillors who represent Runnymede put forward identical proposals to those proposed by the County Council. They argued that these proposals respect the borough ward boundaries, the natural communities in the area and the need to create "sensible polling districts" within divisions while retaining good electoral equality. They supported increasing the number of councillors representing the area on grounds of electoral equality; however, they recognised that this would result in a necessary loss of coterminosity between district wards and county divisions within the borough. They argued that the resultant high level of electoral variance within Foxhills & Virginia Water division was justified because there was likely to be development in this area after 2004, and that inequalities in Woodham & New Haw division were necessary in order to protect community links in the area given that surrounding communities are not "suitable for inclusion in this division". Addlestone Branch of Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association, Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association, and Woodham & New Haw Branch of Runnymede & Weybridge Conservative Association also supported these proposals.

142 Runnymede Labour Group recognised that some division of borough wards would be necessary, and argued that any non-coterminous divisions should be drawn along the lines of polling districts, where possible, for ease of administration and to maximise turnout.

143 We have noted that the County Council's proposals for Runnymede have received general support and we are content to adopt their proposals as our draft recommendations at this stage, although in an 80-member council. The borough merits six councillors, therefore we are content that the representation of the borough should be increased. We recognise that these proposals would secure poor coterminosity between borough wards and county divisions; however, the size and distribution of borough wards does not allow for the creation of coterminous divisions without very poor levels of electoral equality. Nevertheless, we consider that the County Council's proposals would utilise clearly identifiable boundaries to divide borough wards and would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

144 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in four divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004.

Spelthorne borough

145 At present, the borough of Spelthorne is represented by seven county councillors serving the seven divisions of Ashford East, Ashford West, Laleham & Shepperton Green, Shepperton, Staines, Stanwell and Sunbury. There is a degree of electoral imbalance within the borough, with the number of electors in two of the divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Spelthorne is over-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

146 The County Council proposed that Spelthorne borough should be represented by six county councillors rather than seven, as at present, in order to address the current over-representation of the borough. It argued that Ashford East and Ashford Town wards should be combined with part of Staines South ward to form Ashford division, and that Ashford Common and Sunbury Common wards should be linked with part of Laleham & Shepperton Green ward to form Ashford & Sunbury Commons division. It proposed that Shepperton & Laleham division should comprise Shepperton Town ward and parts of Laleham & Shepperton Green and Riverside wards, while the remainder of Riverside ward would be combined with Staines ward and part of Staines South ward to form Staines division. It put forward a Stanwell division which would include Ashford North & Stanwell South and Stanwell North wards, and a Sunbury division which would contain Sunbury East and Halliford & Sunbury West wards together with the remainder of Laleham & Shepperton Green ward.

147 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in three of the six divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to continue to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in three divisions by 2004. Under these proposals only one of the six divisions would be coterminous with the borough ward boundaries.

148 The Labour Party proposed that Spelthorne borough should continue to be represented by seven county councillors, which it would merit under an 80-member scheme. It argued that its proposals for the borough were compiled in recognition of the "natural communities" demarcated by the A30, which divides Ashford from Stanwell, and the M3 motorway, which divides the Sunbury area. It proposed that Ashford division should comprise the ward of Ashford East and parts of Ashford Common and Ashford Town wards, and that Laleham & Shepperton division should contain Shepperton Town ward and parts of Laleham & Shepperton Green and Riverside wards. It proposed that Staines division should comprise Staines ward and parts of Riverside and Staines South wards. It recommended that part of Ashford North & Stanwell South, Ashford Town and Staines South wards should be combined to form Staines South & Ashford West division, while the remainder of Ashford North & Stanwell South ward and Stanwell North ward would form Stanwell & Stanwell Moor division. It proposed that Sunbury division should

comprise Halliford & Sunbury West and Sunbury East wards, which it argued respects the importance of the M3 motorway as a strong boundary in this area. Finally, it proposed that Sunbury Common & Ashford Common division should comprise the remainder of Ashford Common and Laleham & Shepperton Green wards and Sunbury Common ward.

149 Under the Labour Party's proposals for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in only one of the seven divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years to vary by less than 10 per cent from the average in all seven divisions by 2004. Only one of the proposed seven divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

150 We received no further representations with regard to Spelthorne borough at Stage One.

151 We consider that the Labour Party's scheme for Spelthorne would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, given that it would secure good levels of electoral equality and would combine areas that share community ties and links and are adopting it as our draft recommendation for the Spelthorne area. Under an 80-member council the borough would merit seven councillors, therefore the County Council's six-member scheme would offer inaccurate representation. We recognise that the Labour Party's scheme would secure poor coterminosity; however, given the number and size of the district wards, the natural boundaries of the M3 and the A30, and the topography of the local reservoirs, we consider that it would not be possible to create more coterminous divisions without having a detrimental effect on electoral equality.

Surrey Heath borough

152 At present Surrey Heath borough is represented by six county councillors serving the six divisions of Camberley East, Camberley West, Chobham & Bisley, Frimley Green & Mytchett, Heatherside & Parkside and Windlesham. There are fairly significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in three of the divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Surrey Heath is slightly over-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

153 The County Council proposed that Surrey Heath should continue to be represented by six county councillors and that Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham division should comprise the wards of Bagshot, Chobham and Windlesham, while Bisley, West End & Lightwater division would contain Bisley, Lightwater and West End wards. It proposed that Camberley East and Frimley Green & Mytchett divisions would retain their existing boundaries. It proposed that the wards of Frimley, St Michaels and Watchetts should be combined to form Camberley West division, and that Heatherside and Parkside wards should form Heatherside & Parkside division. The County Council noted that Frimley Green & Mytchett division would have a high level of electoral variance under its proposals, but it argued that the proposed division would ensure that the "strong community coherence" of the area would be respected.

154 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in two divisions and by more than 20 per cent

in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to continue to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004, with no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent. All six divisions would be coterminous with the borough ward boundaries.

155 The Labour Party supported the County Council's proposals for Surrey Heath borough. Under an 80-member council the County Council's scheme would result in three of the six divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average, with one division varying by more than 20 per cent. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, with no divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 2004.

156 Surrey Heath Borough Council put forward identical divisions to the County Council for Bagshot, Chobham and Windlesham and Bisley, Lightwater and West End. It argued that there was "no suitable alternative" to the proposed division of Frimley Green & Mytchett "without significant detriment to community identity". Nick Hawkins MP supported the County Council's proposals, expressing particular support for the proposal to name Bisley, Lightwater & West End and Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham divisions after their constituent villages.

157 Bisley Parish Council opposed any enlargement of Chobham & Bisley division, but agreed that West End should be included in the division title. West End Parish Council also supported the retention of a Chobham & Bisley division; however, if change were required it supported the combination of West End with Bisley and Lightwater wards, in a Lightwater, West End & Bisley division. It also proposed that Bagshot, Chobham and Windlesham wards should be combined.

158 While we have noted that under an 80-member council the County Council's proposals would provide good electoral equality and 100 per cent coterminosity, we are concerned about the proposed detached division of Bisley, West End & Lightwater. This division was proposed by the County Council to be coterminous with the detached ward and parish of Bisley, which combines areas divided by the borough boundary. The Commission considers that detached divisions may create areas which lack community identity. Therefore, in order to avoid creating a detached division, the Commission is putting forward alternative proposals which were put to the County Council during its consultation period as part of its draft recommendations for Surrey Heath. This would involve combining Bisley, Chobham and West End wards with part of Lightwater ward to form Chobham & Bisley division, with the remainder of Lightwater ward being linked with Bagshot and Windlesham wards to form a Windlesham division. In order to avoid creating a detached division without having an adverse effect on electoral equality a loss of coterminosity is necessary, and we consider that the division of Lightwater ward would create a clear boundary between areas that are connected to adjoining wards with which they will be combined. While these proposals were not supported by Bisley and West End parishes, the Commission considers that they are the most appropriate in the interests of creating coherent divisions with reasonable electoral equality.

159 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council, the electoral variance of the proposed divisions will vary by more than 10 per cent in three divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, to vary by no more than 10 per cent

in all divisions by 2004. Four of the six divisions would be coterminous with the borough ward boundaries.

Tandridge district

160 At present the district of Tandridge is represented by six county councillors serving six divisions: Caterham Hill, Caterham Valley, Godstone, Lingfield, Oxted and Warlingham. There are fairly significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in three of the divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Tandridge district is over-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

161 The County Council proposed that the district should continue to be represented by six councillors and recommended that the boundaries of Caterham Hill, Godstone, Lingfield and Oxted divisions should be retained. It also proposed that Caterham Valley should comprise Harestone, Valley, Whyteleafe and Woldingham wards, while the wards of Tatsfield & Titsey, Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh and Warlingham West should be combined to form Warlingham division.

162 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in three divisions and by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004 with one division continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. All six divisions would be coterminous with the district ward boundaries.

163 The Labour Party supported the County Council's proposals for the district.

164 Horne and Lingfield & Dormansland parish councils opposed any change to the existing arrangements in Tandridge. Horne Parish Council expressed particular concern that the existing composition of Lingfield division should be retained.

165 The County Council's proposals offer 100 per cent coterminosity, reasonable electoral equality and respect community links and we therefore consider that they should form our draft recommendations for Tandridge. The retention of six councillors to represent the district would also ensure that the district had the correct level of representation in relation to the rest of the county under an 80-member council. We note that Lingfield & Dormansland Parish Council opposed these proposals where they diverge from the existing arrangements, however, given the changes which have been made to the district ward boundaries this is inevitable and we consider that our draft recommendations would offer the best balance available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

166 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in four divisions and by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve marginally over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in four divisions by 2004 with no divisions varying by more than 20 per cent.

Waverley borough

167 At present Waverley borough is represented by eight county councillors serving the eight divisions of Farnham Central, Farnham North, Farnham South, Godalming North, Godalming South & Rural, Haslemere, Waverley East and Waverley West. There are significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in four of the eight divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average, and two by more than 20 per cent. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Waverley is under-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

168 The County Council proposed that Waverley should continue to be represented by eight councillors. It proposed that Farnham should be divided into three divisions: Farnham Central, Farnham North and Farnham South, comprising Farnham Castle, Farnham College and Farnham Monks wards; Farnham Hale & Heath End, Farnham Upper Hale and Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea wards; and Farnham Bourne, Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone and Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge wards, respectively. It also proposed that the wards of Godalming Binscome, Godalming Charterhouse and Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall should be combined with part of Godalming Central & Ockford ward to form Godalming North division, while the remainder of Godalming Central & Ockford ward would be included in Godalming South & Rural division with Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green, Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe, Chiddingfold & Dunsfold and Godalming Holloway wards. It proposed that Haslemere, Waverley East and Waverley West divisions should retain their existing boundaries.

169 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in five of the eight divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in three divisions by 2004. Six of the eight divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

170 The Labour Party proposed that the representation of Waverley borough should be increased from eight county councillors to nine in the interests of convenient local government and electoral equality. It supported the County Council's proposals for Farnham Central, Farnham North, Farnham South and Godalming North divisions. It argued that in its proposals it had aimed to reflect the "natural affinities" between rural communities. It proposed that Cranleigh & Ewhurst division should combine Cranleigh East, Cranleigh West and Ewhurst wards together with Ellens Green parish of Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward, which it argued forms a "natural community". It proposed that Godalming South, Milford & Witley division should comprise Godalming Holloway and Milford wards with part of Godalming Central & Ockford ward and Witley parish of Witley & Hambledon ward. It argued that this is a "compact" division which "reflects natural communities in the area". It argued that Haslemere division should draw together those areas which were represented by the former urban district council by combining the wards of Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill and Haslemere North & Grayswood. It proposed that the remainder of Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green and Witley & Hambledon wards should be combined with Blackheath & Wonersh, Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe, Chiddingfold & Dunsfold and Cranleigh North & Shamley Green wards to form Waverley

Eastern Villages division, while Elstead & Thursley, Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford and Haslemere Hindhead wards would form Waverley Western Villages division. It argued that these divisions would best represent their constituent rural communities.

171 Under the Labour Party's proposals for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in five of the nine divisions and by more than 20 per cent in two divisions. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in only two divisions by 2004. Five of the nine divisions would be coterminous with the district wards.

172 South West Surrey Liberal Democrats proposed an alternative scheme for Waverley which would retain eight councillors to represent the borough. They put forward identical boundaries to those proposed by the County Council and the Labour Party for Farnham Central, Farnham North and Godalming North divisions, and by the County Council only for Haslemere division. They also proposed that Cranleigh division should comprise the wards of Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green, Cranleigh East, Cranleigh West and Ewhurst, arguing that Alfold and Ellens Green should retain their relations to their "parent villages" of Cranleigh and Ellens Green, respectively. They recommended that Farnham South & Rural division should comprise Farnham Bourne, Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone, Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge and Frensham, Dockenfield and Tilford wards, and that Godalming South & Rural division should combine Blackheath & Wonersh, Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe, Cranleigh North & Shamley Green and Godalming Holloway wards with the Ockford area of Godalming Central & Ockford ward. They argued that dividing Godalming Central & Ockford ward along the railway line would ensure that the two distinct parts of this ward would each be included in a division to which they would relate strongly. Finally, they proposed that the wards of Chiddingfold & Dunsfold, Elstead & Thursley, Milford and Witley & Hambledon should form Waverley Central division.

173 Under South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals three divisions would have an electoral variance greater than 10 per cent under a 75-member council, which would improve over the next five years to vary by more than 10 per cent in only one division by 2004. If an 80-member scheme were adopted elsewhere in the county, under the resultant 79-member council five of the eight divisions would have an electoral variance greater than 10 per cent, with one division varying by more than 20 per cent from the county average by 2004; this level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years so that only three divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent by 2004, with one ward continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. Six of the proposed eight divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

174 South West Surrey Conservative Association supported the County Council's proposals for the borough. Cranleigh Parish Council commented that, should the parish be divided between divisions, it would prefer that the majority of the parish should be contained in a Waverley East division, as proposed by the County Council. It argued that any further division of the parish would aggravate the current "very unsatisfactory and most confusing" arrangement under which the parish is divided for borough warding purposes.

175 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One with regard to Waverley borough, and we note that the three schemes put forward share a number of proposed boundaries. However, we consider that the Labour Party's proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria under an 80-member council and propose adopting them as our draft recommendations for Waverley. The County Council and South West Surrey Liberal Democrats proposed eight-member schemes, while the borough merits nine members under an 80-member council. The Labour Party's nine-member scheme provides reasonable levels of coterminosity and electoral equality and we consider that it reflects community identity. We recognise that the division of borough wards is necessary in the interests of electoral equality and consider that the Labour Party's proposals offer sensible division boundaries. Under all three schemes the ward of Godalming Central & Ockford would be divided between divisions along the strong boundary of the railway line and we are content that this would form a clearly identifiable boundary between distinct communities. The other areas where the Labour Party has proposed dividing borough wards they would be bisected along existing parish boundaries and we are content that these would form strong division boundaries. We note that the Labour Party scheme and South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' scheme would keep the urban area of Godalming together in one division, and we consider that this area would be best represented as a whole.

Woking borough

176 At present the borough of Woking is represented by six county councillors serving six divisions: Woking East, Woking North, Woking South, Woking South East, Woking South West and Woking West. There are significant electoral imbalances within the borough, with the number of electors in two of the divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average, with one ward varying by 44 per cent from the borough average. In relation to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, Woking is under-represented on the County Council under a 76-member council.

177 The County Council proposed that Woking should continue to be represented by six councillors. It proposed that Hermitage & Knaphill South and St John's & Hook Heath wards should be combined with parts of Brookwood and Goldsworth East wards to form St Johns division, and that Byfleet and West Byfleet wards should be combined with part of Pyrford to form Woking East division, which it argued is an area where the population "shares the same community facilities and interests". It put forward a Woking North division which would comprise Horsell East & Woodham and Horsell West wards and part of Maybury & Sheerwater ward, while the remainder of Goldsworth East ward would be combined with Kingfield & Westfield, Mayford & Sutton Green and Mount Hermon West wards to form Woking South division. It proposed that Woking South East division should contain Mount Hermon East and Old Woking wards, and the remaining parts of Maybury & Sheerwater and Pyrford wards, and that Woking West division should include Goldsworth West and Knaphill wards, together with the remainder of Brookwood ward.

178 Under the County Council's proposals for a 75-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 20 per cent in one division. This level of electoral equality would improve significantly over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor

expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average in all of the six divisions by 2004. None of the six divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

179 The Labour Party argued that the increase in population in Woking borough necessitated an increase in its representation on the County Council, and therefore it proposed that it should be represented by seven councillors, instead of six as at present. It proposed that Woking East division should comprise the “natural combination” of Byfleet and West Byfleet wards, while Woking North division should include Goldsworth East and Horsell West wards, which, it argued, share a number of road links. It opposed the County Council’s proposal to divide Maybury & Sheerwater ward, arguing that this is an area with “common community interests”; it proposed instead that it should be combined with Horsell East & Woodham ward to form Woking North East division. It recommended that the road links between Goldsworth West and Knaphill wards justified combining the two to form Woking North West division, while Kingfield & Westfield, Mayford & Sutton Green and Mount Hermon West wards should form Woking South division due to their “well established communal and geographical links”. It proposed that Woking South East division should comprise the wards of Pyrford, Hermon East and Old Woking, which share road links, while Brookwood, Hermitage & Knaphill South and St John’s & Hook Heath wards should be combined to form Woking West division, because they share road links and it argued that any alternatives would involve splitting wards between divisions.

180 Under the Labour Party’s proposals for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor would vary by less than 10 per cent in all of the seven divisions in both 1999 and 2004. All of the divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

181 Surrey Liberal Democrats opposed the County Council’s proposals for Woking borough and supported the alternative scheme proposed by Woking Liberal Democrats, as put forward by the County Council during its consultation period. They argued that these divisions would address electoral variance and would give careful regard to “affinities and community ties”. They argued that these proposals would ensure that changes to the existing division boundaries would be minimal and that they would take account of the geographical features of the canal and railway line which run through the borough and “dominate links and identity of interest” while also respecting communication routes to local amenities and to the centre of Woking.

182 Woking Liberal Democrats put forward a six-member proposal for Woking. They argued that this scheme would address electoral inequality, minimise change to the existing division boundaries, respect community ties and identities and provide “effective local government”. They proposed that Goldsworth & St Johns division should comprise parts of Brookwood and Goldsworth East wards together with Goldsworth West and St Johns & Hook Heath wards and that Knaphill & Hermitage division should comprise Hermitage & Knaphill South and Knaphill wards together with the part of Brookwood which they argued is a housing development in keeping with the urban character of the rest of this division. They proposed that Woking East division should include Byfleet and West Byfleet wards and the Sheerwater area of Maybury & Sheerwater ward while the wards of Horsell East & Woodham and Horsell West should be combined with the remaining part of Goldsworth East ward to form Woking North division. They recommended that Woking South division should comprise Kingfield & Westfield, Mayford &

Sutton Green, Mount Hermon West and Old Woking wards, and that Woking South East division should combine Mount Hermon East and Pyrford wards with the remainder of Maybury & Sheerwater ward; both these divisions would involve minimal changes to the existing arrangements.

183 Under Woking Liberal Democrats' proposals for a 75-member council, two of the six divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average, which would improve over the next five years so that no divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent by 2004. If an 80-member scheme were adopted elsewhere in the county, under the resultant 79-member council, four of the six divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent, a figure which would deteriorate over the next five years so that five of the divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 2004. Under Woking Liberal Democrats' proposals four of the six divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

184 Having carefully considered the representations received, we consider that the Labour Party's proposals should form our draft recommendations for Woking. The County Council and Surrey Liberal Democrats proposed six-member schemes, however, under an 80-member council Woking would merit seven councillors, as proposed by the Labour Party. We are persuaded that these proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, given that they would provide 100 per cent coterminosity and good electoral equality.

Conclusions

185 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- (a) there should be an increase in council size from 76 to 80, serving 80 divisions;
- (b) the boundaries of all divisions except 13 be subject to change, as the divisions are based on district wards which have themselves changed as a result of the recent district reviews.

186 Our draft recommendations are based on the County Council's, the Labour Party's and Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals. We have also formulated our own proposals in Surrey Heath where we judge that the schemes provided at Stage One would not provide the best possible balance between electoral equality, coterminosity and the statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations for Surrey are summarised below:

- (a) In Elmbridge, Spelthorne and Woking we are adopting the Labour Party's proposals without modification.
- (b) In Epsom & Ewell, Runnymede and Tandridge, we are adopting the County Council's proposals without modification.
- (c) In Guildford we are adopting the Labour Party's proposals, which also reflect elements of the County Council's proposals;

- (d) In Mole Valley we are adopting Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals without modification.
- (e) In Reigate & Banstead we are adopting the County Council's proposals for seven of the divisions, and the Labour Party's proposals for two of the divisions, which also reflect elements of the Reigate Society's proposals.
- (f) In Surrey Heath we are adopting the County Council's proposals for four of the divisions and we are putting forward our own proposals for the two divisions in the east of the district.
- (g) In Waverley we are adopting the Labour Party's proposals, which also reflect elements of the County Council's and South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals.

187 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors/divisions	76	80	76	80
Average number of electors per councillor	10,651	10,108	10,849	10,304
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	34	22	39	19
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	12	3	8	1

188 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Surrey County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average from 34 to 22. By 2004 only 19 divisions are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A to this report.

Draft Recommendation

Surrey County Council should comprise 80 councillors serving the same number of divisions, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A and the large map inserted at the back of the report.

189 Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act provides that if a parish is to be divided between different county divisions, it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division of the county. However, a number of parishes were warded as a consequence of the new district warding arrangements in Surrey and, in order to avoid proposals for unnecessary re-warding of parishes, we are not proposing any new parish wards as a consequence of this review.

190 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council and welcome comments from the County Council and others relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors and division names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

5 NEXT STEPS

191 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 18 April 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the County Council by appointment, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

192 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Surrey Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

193 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Surrey: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed division boundaries for Surrey.

Map A1 illustrates the proposed boundary between Cobham and Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott divisions.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed boundary between Walton and Walton South & Oatlands divisions.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundary between Epsom & Ewell North East and Epsom & Ewell South East divisions.

Map A4 illustrates the proposed boundary between Epsom & Ewell South West and Epsom & Ewell West divisions.

Map A5 illustrates the proposed boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions.

Map A6 illustrates the proposed boundary between Shalford and Shere divisions.

Map A7 illustrates the proposed boundary between Addlestone and Chertsey divisions.

Map A8 illustrates the proposed boundary between Egham Hythe & Thorpe and Englefield Green divisions.

Map A9 illustrates the proposed boundary between Ashford, Laleham & Shepperton and Sunbury Common & Ashford Common divisions.

Map A10 illustrates the proposed boundary between Ashford, Staines South & Ashford West and Stanwell & Stanwell Moor divisions.

Map A11 illustrates the proposed boundary between Laleham & Shepperton, Staines and Staines South & Ashford West divisions.

Map A12 illustrates the proposed boundary between Chobham & Bisley and Windlesham divisions.

Map A13 illustrates the proposed boundary between Godalming North and Godalming South, Milford & Witley divisions.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates, in outline form, the Commission's proposed divisions for Surrey, including constituent district wards and parishes.

*Map A1:
Proposed Boundary between Cobham and Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott Divisions*

*Map A2:
Proposed Boundary between Walton and Walton South & Oatlands Divisions*

*Map A3:
Proposed Boundary between Epsom & Ewell North East and Epsom & Ewell South East
Divisions*

*Map A4:
Proposed Boundary between Epsom & Ewell South West and Epsom & Ewell West Divisions*

*Map A5:
Proposed Boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West Divisions*

*Map A6:
Proposed Boundary between Shalford and Shere Divisions*

*Map A7:
Proposed Boundary between Addlestone and Chertsey Divisions*

*Map A8:
Proposed Boundary between Egham Hythe & Thorpe and Englefield Green Divisions*

*Map A9:
Proposed Boundary between Ashford, Laleham & Shepperton and Sunbury Common & Ashford
Common Divisions*

*Map A10:
Proposed Boundary between Ashford, Staines South & Ashford West and Stanwell & Stanwell
Moor Divisions*

*Map A11:
Proposed Boundary between Laleham & Shepperton, Staines and Staines South & Ashford West
Divisions*

*Map A12:
Proposed Boundary between Chobham & Bisley and Windlesham Divisions*

*Map A13:
Proposed Boundary between Godalming North and Godalming South, Milford & Witley
Divisions*

APPENDIX B

Surrey County Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B1:

Surrey County Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH					
1 Cobham & Oxshott	1	11,980	11	12,056	10
2 Ditton Green	1	10,736	-1	11,589	5
3 Esher, Claygate & Hinchley Wood	1	12,594	26	12,928	11
4 Hersham & Oatlands	1	11,559	7	11,354	3
5 Molesey	1	11,693	8	11,612	6
6 Walton Central	1	11,247	4	11,463	4
7 Walton East	1	10,347	-4	10,356	-6
8 Weybridge	1	10,360	-4	10,459	-5
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH					
9 Epsom & Ewell North	1	11,589	7	11,418	4
10 Epsom & Ewell North East	1	11,118	3	11,049	1
11 Epsom & Ewell South East	1	9,428	-13	9,365	-15
12 Epsom & Ewell South West	1	10,193	-6	11,595	5
13 Epsom & Ewell West	1	9,886	-8	10,296	-6
GUILDFORD BOROUGH					
14 Ash	1	12,511	16	13,454	22
15 Guildford East	1	12,388	15	12,502	14
16 Guildford North	1	12,137	12	12,817	17
17 Guildford South	1	12,161	13	12,270	12
18 Guildford West	1	13,193	22	13,267	21

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
19 The Horsleys	1	9,230	-14	9,334	-15
20 Shalford	1	7,920	-27	8,024	-27
21 Shere	1	8,436	-22	8,714	-21
22 Worplesdon	1	10,566	-2	10,778	-2
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
23 Ashtead	1	10,583	-2	10,527	-4
24 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,845	10	11,582	5
25 Dorking & the Holmwoods	1	9,574	-11	9,614	-13
26 Dorking North & Rural	1	9,165	-15	9,086	-17
27 Dorking Rural	1	11,022	2	10,766	-2
28 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,445	-3	10,606	-4
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH					
29 Banstead East	1	11,430	6	12,124	10
30 Banstead South	1	12,514	16	12,667	15
31 Banstead West	1	10,833	0	11,076	1
32 Horley East	1	9,663	-10	10,602	-4
33 Horley West	1	7,966	-26	8,534	-22
34 Redhill East	1	10,738	-1	11,078	1
35 Reigate Central	1	10,659	-1	10,969	0
36 Reigate North	1	9,535	-12	9,504	-14
37 Reigate South	1	11,225	4	11,782	7
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH					
38 Addlestone	1	11,276	4	11,357	3
39 Chertsey	1	9,956	-8	9,945	-10
40 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	1	11,261	4	11,246	2
41 Englefield Green	1	10,460	-3	10,955	0
42 Foxhills & Virginia Water	1	8,440	-22	8,889	-19
43 Woodham & New Haw	1	8,621	-20	8,565	-22

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH					
44 Ashford	1	11,832	10	11,972	9
45 Ashford & Sunbury Commons	1	12,303	14	12,358	12
46 Shepperton & Laleham	1	12,356	14	12,262	12
47 Staines	1	12,169	13	12,491	14
48 Stanwell	1	10,975	2	11,320	3
49 Sunbury	1	10,638	-1	10,679	-3
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH					
50 Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham	1	10,694	-1	10,691	-3
51 Bisley, West End & Lightwater	1	11,238	4	11,248	2
52 Camberley East	1	10,332	-4	10,573	-4
53 Camberley West	1	11,421	6	11,307	3
54 Frimley Green & Mytchett	1	8,578	-21	9,364	-15
55 Heatherside & Parkside	1	9,599	-11	9,508	-14
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT					
56 Caterham Hill	1	9,619	-11	10,204	-7
57 Caterham Valley	1	9,890	-8	10,201	-7
58 Godstone	1	8,925	-17	8,948	-19
59 Lingfield	1	11,904	10	11,993	9
60 Oxted	1	11,296	5	11,530	5
61 Warlingham	1	7,987	-26	8,495	-23
WAVERLEY BOROUGH					
62 Farnham Central	1	10,148	-6	10,222	-7
63 Farnham North	1	10,018	-7	10,108	-8
64 Farnham South	1	9,538	-12	9,488	-14
65 Godalming North	1	11,434	6	11,374	3
66 Godalming South & Rural	1	12,714	18	12,675	15
67 Haslemere	1	12,048	12	12,091	10

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
68 Waverley East	1	12,910	20	12,746	16
69 Waverley West	1	12,052	12	11,983	9
WOKING BOROUGH					
70 St Johns	1	12,265	22	12,239	5
71 Woking East	1	11,574	7	11,652	6
72 Woking North	1	11,266	4	11,452	4
73 Woking South	1	11,842	10	12,055	10
74 Woking South East	1	11,361	5	11,437	4
75 Woking West	1	10,035	-7	11,668	6
Totals	76	809,444	-	824,508	-
Averages	-	10,793	-	10,993	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Surrey County Council's submission.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B2: Surrey County Council's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH	
1 Cobham & Oxshott	Cobham & Downside ward; Cobham Fairmile ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward
2 Ditton Green	Long Ditton ward; Thames Ditton ward; Weston Green ward
3 Esher, Claygate & Hinchley Wood	Claygate ward; Esher ward; Hinchley Wood ward
4 Hersham & Oatlands	Hersham North ward (part); Hersham South ward; Oatlands Park ward
5 Molesey	Molesey East ward; Molesey North ward; Molesey South ward (part)
6 Walton Central	Hersham North ward (part); Walton Central ward; Walton South ward
7 Walton East	Walton Ambleside ward; Walton North ward; Molesey South ward (part)
8 Weybridge	St George's Hill ward; Weybridge North ward; Weybridge South ward
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH	
9 Epsom & Ewell North	Auriol ward; Cuddington ward; Ewell Court ward
10 Epsom & Ewell North East	Ewell ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Stoneleigh ward
11 Epsom & Ewell South East	College ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Woodcote ward
12 Epsom & Ewell South West	Court ward (part); Stamford ward; Town ward;
13 Epsom & Ewell West	Court ward (part); Ruxley ward; West Ewell ward
GUILDFORD BOROUGH	
14 Ash	Ash South & Tongham ward (part – Ash South parish ward of Ash parish); Ash Vale ward; Ash Wharf ward
15 Guildford East	Burpham ward; Christchurch ward (part); Mellow ward
16 Guildford North	Christchurch ward (part); Stoke ward; Stoughton ward
17 Guildford South	Friary & St Nicolas ward; Holy Trinity ward
18 Guildford West	Onslow ward; Westborough ward
19 Horsleys	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Horsley and West Horsley); Effingham ward; Lovelace ward
20 Shalford	Ash South & Tongham ward (part – Tongham parish); Pilgrims ward; Shalford ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
21 Shere	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Clandon and West Clandon); Send ward; Tillingbourne ward
22 Worplesdon	Normandy ward; Pirbright ward; Worplesdon ward
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT	
23 Ashted	Ashted Common ward; Ashted Park ward; Ashted Village ward
24 Bookham & Fetcham West	Bookham North ward; Bookham South ward; Fetcham West ward
25 Dorking & the Holmwoods	Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward
26 Dorking North & Rural	Box Hill & Headley ward; Dorking North ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward; Leith Hill ward; Westcott ward
27 Dorking Rural	Beare Green ward; Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward; Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward; Charlwood ward; Okewood ward
28 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH	
39 Banstead East	Banstead Village ward; Chipstead, Hooley & Woodmansterne ward
30 Banstead South	Kingswood with Burgh Heath ward; Preston ward; Tadworth & Walton ward
31 Banstead West	Nork ward; Tattenhams ward
32 Horley East	Horley Central ward; Horley East ward
33 Horley West	Horley West ward; Salfords & Sidlow ward
34 Redhill East	Merstham ward; Redhill East ward
35 Reigate Central	Meadvale & St Johns ward; Reigate Central ward
36 Reigate North	Redhill West ward; Reigate Hill ward
37 Reigate South	Earlswood & Whitebushes ward; South Park & Woodhatch ward
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH	
38 Addlestone	Addlestone Bourneside ward; Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)
39 Chertsey	Chertsey Meads ward; Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey St Ann's ward; Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)
40 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	Egham Hythe ward; Egham Town ward (part); Thorpe ward
41 Englefield Green	Egham Town ward (part); Englefield Green East ward; Englefield Green West ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
42 Foxhills & Virginia Water	Foxhills ward; Virginia Water ward
43 Woodham & New Haw	New Haw ward; Woodham ward
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH	
44 Ashford	Ashford East ward; Ashford Town ward; Staines South ward (part)
45 Ashford & Sunbury Commons	Ashford Common ward; Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Sunbury Common ward
46 Shepperton & Laleham	Shepperton Town ward; Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Riverside ward (part)
47 Staines	Riverside ward (part); Staines ward; Staines South ward (part)
48 Stanwell	Ashford North & Stanwell South ward; Stanwell North ward
49 Sunbury	Halliford & Sunbury West ward; Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Sunbury East ward
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH	
50 Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham	Bagshot ward; Chobham ward; Windlesham ward
51 Bisley, West End & Lightwater	Bisley ward; Lightwater ward; West End ward
52 Camberley East	Old Dean ward; St Pauls ward; Town ward
53 Camberley West	Frimley ward; St Michaels ward; Watchetts ward
54 Frimley Green & Mytchett	Frimley Green ward; Mytchett & Deepcut ward
55 Heatherside & Parkside	Heatherside ward; Parkside ward
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT	
56 Caterham Hill	Chaldon ward; Portley ward; Queens Park ward; Westway ward
57 Caterham Valley	Harestone ward; Valley ward; Whyteleafe ward; Woldingham ward
58 Godstone	Bletchingley & Nutfield ward; Godstone ward
59 Lingfield	Burstow, Horne & Outwood ward; Dormansland & Felcourt ward; Felbridge ward; Lingfield & Crowhurst ward
60 Oxted	Limpsfield ward; Oxted North & Tandridge ward; Oxted South ward
61 Warlingham	Tatsfield & Titsey ward; Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh ward; Warlingham West ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
WAVERLEY BOROUGH	
62 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward; Farnham College ward; Farnham Monks ward
63 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward; Farnham Upper Hale ward; Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward
64 Farnham South	Farnham Bourne ward; Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward; Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward
65 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Charterhouse ward; Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall ward
66 Godalming South & Rural	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward; Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward; Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Holloway ward
67 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward; Haslemere North & Grayswood ward; Haslemere Hindhead ward
68 Waverley East	Blackheath & Wonersh ward; Cranleigh East ward; Cranleigh West ward; Ewhurst ward; Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward
69 Waverley West	Elstead & Thursley ward; Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward; Milford ward; Witley & Hambledon ward
WOKING BOROUGH	
70 St Johns	Brookwood ward (part); Goldsworth East ward (part); Hermitage & Knaphill South ward; St John's & Hook Heath ward
71 Woking East	Byfleet ward; Pyrford ward (part); West Byfleet ward
72 Woking North	Horsell East & Woodham ward; Horsell West ward; Maybury & Sheerwater ward (part)
73 Woking South	Goldsworth East ward (part); Kingfield & Westfield ward; Mayford & Sutton Green ward; Mount Hermon West ward
74 Woking South East	Maybury & Sheerwater ward (part); Mount Hermon East ward; Old Woking ward; Pyrford ward (part)
75 Woking West	Brookwood ward (part); Goldsworth West ward; Knaphill ward;

Note: The constituent areas reflect the new district wards resulting from electoral reviews of the 11 Surrey districts which were completed in 1998. Where whole district wards do not form the building blocks, constituent parishes and parish wards are listed for parished areas.

Surrey County Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3:

Surrey County Labour Party's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH					
1 Cobham	1	9,780	-3	9,842	-4
2 Hersham	1	9,143	-3	8,888	-5
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	10,241	1	10,607	3
4 Molesey East & Esher	1	9,160	-9	9,116	-12
5 Molesey West	1	9,578	-5	9,622	-7
6 The Dittons	1	10,736	6	11,589	12
7 Walton	1	10,713	6	10,873	6
8 Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,805	7	10,863	5
9 Weybridge	1	10,360	2	10,459	2
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH					
10 Epsom & Ewell North	1	11,589	15	11,418	11
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	1	11,118	10	11,049	7
12 Epsom & Ewell South East	1	9,428	-7	9,365	-9
13 Epsom & Ewell South West	1	10,193	1	11,595	13
14 Epsom & Ewell West	1	9,886	-2	10,296	0
GUILDFORD BOROUGH					
15 Ash	1	8,153	-19	8,997	-13
16 Guildford Central	1	9,596	-5	9,678	-6
17 Guildford East	1	10,065	0	10,154	-1
18 Guildford North	1	10,651	5	11,316	10
19 Guildford South	1	9,694	-4	9,776	-5

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
20 Guildford West	1	9,873	-2	9,932	-4
21 Horsleys	1	9,229	-9	9,334	-9
22 Shalford	1	11,408	13	11,607	13
23 Shere	1	9,307	-8	9,588	-7
24 Worplesdon	1	10,566	5	10,778	5
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
25 Ashted	1	10,583	5	10,527	2
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	10,718	6	10,462	2
27 Dorking	1	10,149	0	10,125	-2
28 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,445	3	10,606	3
29 Mole Valley Hills	1	10,628	5	10,457	1
30 Mole Valley South	1	10,111	0	10,004	-3
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH					
31 Banstead East	1	11,430	13	12,124	18
32 Banstead South	1	12,514	24	12,667	23
33 Banstead West	1	10,833	7	11,076	7
34 Horley East	1	9,663	-4	10,602	3
35 Horley West	1	7,966	-21	8,534	-17
36 Redhill Central	1	10,601	5	10,786	5
37 Reigate Central	1	10,659	5	10,969	6
38 Reigate Hill & Merstham	1	9,672	-4	9,796	-5
39 Reigate South	1	11,225	11	11,782	14
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH					
40 Addlestone	1	11,276	12	11,357	10
41 Chertsey	1	9,956	-2	9,945	-3
42 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	1	11,261	11	11,246	9
43 Englefield Green	1	10,460	3	10,955	6
44 Foxhills & Virginia Water	1	8,440	-17	8,889	-14
45 Woodham & New Haw	1	8,621	-15	8,565	-17

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH					
46 Ashford	1	10,548	4	10,527	2
47 Laleham & Shepperton	1	10,308	2	10,183	-1
48 Staines	1	9,804	-3	9,728	-6
49 Staines South & Ashford West	1	10,065	0	10,714	4
50 Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	1	8,997	-11	9,385	-9
51 Sunbury	1	10,656	5	10,226	-1
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	9,896	-2	10,114	-2
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH					
53 Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham	1	10,694	6	10,691	4
54 Bisley, West End & Lightwater	1	11,238	11	11,248	9
55 Camberley East	1	10,332	2	10,573	3
56 Camberley West	1	11,421	13	11,307	10
57 Frimley Green & Mytchett	1	8,578	-15	9,364	-9
58 Heatherside & Parkside	1	9,599	-5	9,508	-8
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT					
59 Caterham Hill	1	9,619	-5	10,204	-1
60 Caterham Valley	1	9,890	-2	10,201	-1
61 Godstone	1	8,925	-12	8,948	-13
62 Lingfield	1	11,904	18	11,993	16
63 Oxted	1	11,296	12	11,530	12
64 Warlingham	1	7,987	-21	8,495	-18
WAVERLEY BOROUGH					
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	1	10,248	1	10,677	4
66 Farnham Central	1	10,148	0	10,222	-1
67 Farnham North	1	10,018	-1	10,108	-2
68 Farnham South	1	9,538	-6	9,488	-8

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
69 Godalming North	1	11,434	13	11,374	10
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	1	10,118	0	10,060	-2
71 Haslemere	1	8,931	-12	9,021	-12
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	1	10,487	4	10,527	2
73 Waverley Western Villages	1	9,152	-9	9,190	-11
WOKING BOROUGH					
74 Woking East	1	9,562	-5	9,598	-7
75 Woking North	1	10,812	7	10,833	5
76 Woking North East	1	9,631	-5	9,901	-4
77 Woking North West	1	9,690	-4	11,327	10
78 Woking South	1	9,564	-5	9,751	-5
79 Woking South East	1	9,620	-5	9,695	-6
80 Woking West	1	9,464	-6	9,398	-9
Totals	80	808,657	-	824,325	-
Averages	-	10,108	-	10,304	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on the Labour Party's submission.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B4:
Surrey County Labour Party's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH	
1 Cobham	Cobham & Downside ward; Cobham Fairmile ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward (part)
2 Hersham	Hersham North ward; Hersham South ward
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	Claygate ward; Hinchley Wood ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon (part)
4 Molesey East & Esher	Esher ward; Molesey East ward
5 Molesey West	Molesey North ward; Molesey South ward
6 The Dittons	Long Ditton ward; Thames Ditton ward; Weston Green ward
7 Walton	Walton Ambleside ward; Walton Central ward (part); Walton North ward
8 Walton South & Oatlands	Oatlands ward; Walton Central ward (part); Walton South ward
9 Weybridge	St George's Hill ward; Weybridge North ward; Weybridge South ward
EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH	
10 Epsom & Ewell North	Auriol ward; Cuddington ward; Ewell Court ward
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	Ewell ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Stoneleigh ward
12 Epsom & Ewell South East	College ward; Nonsuch ward (part); Woodcote ward
13 Epsom & Ewell South West	Court ward (part); Stamford ward; Town ward
14 Epsom & Ewell West	Court ward (part); Ruxley ward; West Ewell ward
GUILDFORD BOROUGH	
15 Ash	Ash Vale ward; Ash Wharf ward
16 Guildford Central	Christchurch ward; Holy Trinity ward
17 Guildford East	Burpham ward; Merrow ward
18 Guildford North	Stoke ward; Stoughton ward
19 Guildford South	Friary & St Nicolas ward; Onslow ward (part)
20 Guildford West	Onslow ward (part); Westborough ward
21 Horsleys	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Horsley and West Horsley); Effingham ward; Lovelace ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
22 Shalford	Ash South & Tongham ward; Pilgrims ward; Shalford ward (part – the parishes of Artington, Compton and Shalford (part – the parish wards of Peasmarsh and Shalford))
23 Shere	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Clandon and West Clandon (part)); Send ward; Shalford ward (part – Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish); Tillingbourne ward
24 Worplesdon	Normandy ward; Pirbright ward; Worplesdon ward
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT	
25 Ashtead	Ashtead Common ward; Ashtead Park ward; Ashtead Village ward
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	Bookham North ward; Bookham South ward (part); Fetcham West ward
27 Dorking	Dorking North ward; Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward (part)
28 Mole Valley Hills	Box Hill & Headley ward; Bookham South ward (part); Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward; Leith Hill ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward; Westcott ward
29 Mole Valley South	Beare Green ward; Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward; Charlwood ward; Holmwoods ward (part); Okewood ward
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH	
31 Banstead East	Banstead Village ward; Chipstead, Hooley & Woodmansterne ward
32 Banstead South	Kingswood with Burgh Heath ward; Preston ward; Tadworth & Walton ward
33 Banstead West	Nork ward; Tattenhams ward
34 Horley East	Horley Central ward; Horley East ward
35 Horley West	Horley West ward; Salfords & Sidlow ward
36 Redhill Central	Redhill East ward; Redhill West ward
37 Reigate Central	Meadvale & St Johns ward; Reigate Central ward
38 Reigate North	Merstham ward; Reigate Hill ward
39 Reigate South	Earlswood & Whitebushes ward; South Park & Woodhatch ward
RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH	
40 Addlestone	Addlestone Bourneside ward; Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)
41 Chertsey	Addlestone North ward (part); Chertsey Meads ward; Chertsey St Ann's ward; Chertsey South & Row Town ward (part)

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
42 Egham Hythe & Thorpe	Egham Hythe ward; Egham Town ward (part); Thorpe ward
43 Englefield Green	Egham Town ward (part); Englefield Green East ward; Englefield Green West ward
44 Foxhills & Virginia Water	Foxhills ward; Virginia Water ward
45 Woodham & New Haw	New Haw ward; Woodham ward
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH	
46 Ashford	Ashford Common ward (part); Ashford East ward; Ashford Town ward (part)
47 Laleham & Shepperton	Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Riverside ward (part); Shepperton Town ward
48 Staines	Riverside ward (part); Staines ward; Staines South ward (part)
49 Staines South & Ashford West	Ashford North & Stanwell South ward (part); Staines South ward (part); Ashford Town ward (part)
50 Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	Ashford North & Stanwell South ward (part); Stanwell North ward
51 Sunbury	Halliford & Sunbury West ward; Sunbury East ward
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	Ashford Common ward (part); Laleham & Shepperton Green ward (part); Sunbury Common ward
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH	
53 Bagshot, Chobham & Windlesham	Bagshot ward; Chobham ward; Windlesham ward
54 Bisley, West End & Lightwater	Bisley ward; Lightwater ward; West End ward
55 Camberley East	Old Dean ward; St Pauls ward; Town ward
56 Camberley West	Frimley ward; St Michaels ward; Watchetts ward
57 Frimley Green & Mytchett	Frimley Green ward; Mytchett & Deepcut ward
58 Heatherside & Parkside	Heatherside ward; Parkside ward
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT	
59 Caterham Hill	Chaldon ward; Portley ward; Queens Park ward; Westway ward
60 Caterham Valley	Harestone ward; Valley ward; Whyteleafe ward; Woldingham ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
61 Godstone	Bletchingley & Nutfield ward; Godstone ward
62 Lingfield	Burstow, Horne & Outwood ward; Dormansland & Felcourt ward; Felbridge ward; Lingfield & Crowhurst ward
63 Oxted	Limpsfield ward; Oxted North & Tandridge ward; Oxted South ward
64 Warlingham	Tatsfield & Titsey ward; Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh ward; Warlingham West ward
WAVERLEY BOROUGH	
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – Ellens Green parish); Cranleigh East ward; Cranleigh West ward; Ewhurst ward
66 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward; Farnham College ward; Farnham Monks ward
67 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward; Farnham Upper Hale ward; Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward
68 Farnham South	Farnham Bourne ward; Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward; Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward
69 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Charterhouse ward; Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall ward
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Holloway ward; Milford ward; Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Witley parish)
71 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward; Haslemere North & Grayswood ward
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – Alfold parish); Blackheath & Wonerish ward; Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward; Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward; Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward; Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Hambledon parish)
73 Waverley Western Villages	Elstead & Thursley ward; Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward; Haslemere Hindhead ward
WOKING BOROUGH	
74 Woking East	Byfleet ward; West Byfleet ward
75 Woking North	Goldsworth East ward; Horsell West ward
76 Woking North East	Horsell East & Woodham ward; Maybury & Sheerwater ward
77 Woking North West	Goldsworth West ward; Knaphill ward
78 Woking South	Kingfield & Westfield ward; Mayford & Sutton Green ward; Mount Hermon West ward
79 Woking South East	Mount Hermon East ward; Pyrford ward; Old Woking ward
80 Woking West	Brookwood ward; Hermitage & Knaphill South ward; St John's & Hook Heath ward

Surrey Liberal Democrat Group's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B5:

Surrey Liberal Democrat Group's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
25 Ashtead	1	10,583	5	10,527	2
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,845	17	11,582	12
27 Dorking North	1	9,538	-6	9,445	-8
28 Dorking Rural	1	10,649	5	10,407	1
29 Dorking South	1	9,574	-5	9,614	-7
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,445	3	10,606	3

Source: Electorate figures are based Surrey Liberal Democrat Group's submission under an 80-member council.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B6:

Surrey Liberal Democrat Group's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT	
25 Ashtead	Ashtead Common ward; Ashtead Park ward; Ashtead Village ward
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	Bookham North ward; Bookham South ward; Fetcham West ward
27 Dorking North	Box Hill & Headley ward; Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward; Dorking North ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward
28 Dorking Rural	Beare Green ward; Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward; Charlwood ward; Leith Hill ward; Okewood ward; Westcott ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
29 Dorking South	Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward

Mole Valley Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B7:

Mole Valley Labour Party's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT					
23 Ashtead, Box Hill & Headley	1	12,182	-1	12,100	-3
24 Bookham, Fetcham & Leatherhead North	1	11,990	-2	11,759	-6
25 Dorking	1	13,087	7	12,939	4
26 Mid Mole Valley	1	13,127	7	13,232	6
27 Mole Valley South	1	12,248	0	12,151	-3

Source: Electorate figures are based on Mole Valley Labour Party's submission under a 66-member council.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B8:

Mole Valley Labour Party's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT	
23 Ashtead, Box Hill & Headley	Ashtead Common ward; Ashtead Park ward; Ashtead Village ward; Box Hill & Headley ward
24 Bookham, Fetcham & Leatherhead North	Bookham North ward; Fetcham West ward; Leatherhead North ward
25 Dorking	Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward; Dorking North ward; Dorking South ward; Westcott ward
26 Mid Mole Valley	Bookham South ward; Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead South ward; Leith Hill ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward
27 Mole Valley South	Beare Green ward; Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward; Charlwood ward; Holmwoods ward; Okewood ward

South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B9:

South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
WAVERLEY BOROUGH					
65 Cranleigh	1	11,572	13	11,365	9
66 Farnham Central	1	10,148	-1	10,222	-2
67 Farnham North	1	10,018	-2	10,108	-3
68 Farnham South & Rural	1	12,607	23	12,559	20
69 Godalming North	1	11,123	9	11,065	6
70 Godalming South & Rural	1	11,373	11	11,366	9
71 Haslemere	1	12,048	18	12,091	16
72 Waverley Central	1	11,973	17	11,911	14

Source: Electorate figures are based on South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' submission under a 79-member council.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B10:

South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
WAVERLEY BOROUGH	
65 Cranleigh	Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward; Cranleigh East ward; Cranleigh West ward; Ewhurst ward
66 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward; Farnham College ward; Farnham Monks ward
67 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward; Farnham Upper Hale ward; Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
68 Farnham South & Rural	Farnham Bourne ward; Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward; Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward; Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward
69 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Charterhouse ward; Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall ward
70 Godalming South & Rural	Blackheath & Wonersh ward; Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward; Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part); Godalming Holloway ward; Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward
71 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward; Haslemere North & Grayswood ward; Haslemere Hindhead ward
72 Waverley Central	Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward; Elstead & Thursley ward; Milford ward; Witley & Hambledon ward

Woking Liberal Democrats' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B11:

Woking Liberal Democrats' Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
WOKING BOROUGH					
74 Goldsworth & St John's	1	12,036	17	12,009	15
75 Knaphill & Hermitage	1	10,264	0	11,898	14
76 Woking East	1	12,064	18	12,129	16
77 Woking North	1	11,042	8	11,225	8
78 Woking South	1	11,469	12	11,659	12
79 Woking South East	1	11,468	12	11,583	11

Source: Electorate figures are based on Woking Liberal Democrats' submission under a 79-member council.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B12:

Woking Liberal Democrats' Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
WOKING BOROUGH	
74 Goldsworth & St John's	Brookwood ward (part); Goldsworth East ward (part); Goldsworth West ward; St John's & Hook Heath ward
75 Knaphill & Hermitage	Brookwood ward (part); Hermitage & Knaphill South ward; Knaphill ward
76 Woking East	Byfleet ward; West Byfleet ward; Maybury & Sheerwater ward (part)
77 Woking North	Goldsworth East ward (part); Horsell East & Woodham ward; Horsell West ward
78 Woking South	Kingfield & Westfield ward; Mayford & Sutton Green ward; Mount Hermon West ward; Old Woking ward
79 Woking South East	Maybury & Sheerwater ward (part); Mount Hermon East ward; Pyrford ward

The Reigate Society's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B13:

The Reigate Society's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Division

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH					
31 Banstead East	1	11,430	13	12,124	18
32 Banstead South	1	12,514	24	12,667	23
33 Banstead West	1	10,883	8	11,076	7
34 Earlswood & Meadvale	1	11,306	12	11,876	15
35 Horley East	1	9,663	-4	10,602	3
36 Horley West	1	7,966	-21	8,534	-17
37 Redhill	1	10,601	5	10,786	5
38 Reigate Central & Woodhatch	1	10,578	5	10,875	6
39 Reigate Hill & Merstham	1	9,672	-4	9,796	-5

Source: Electorate figures are based on the County Council's submission and on an 80-member council scheme.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B14:

The Reigate Society's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH	
31 Banstead East	Banstead Village ward; Chipstead, Hooley & Woodmansterne ward
32 Banstead South	Kingswood with Burgh Heath ward; Preston ward; Tadworth & Walton ward
33 Banstead West	Nork ward; Tattenhams ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
34 Earlswood & Meadvale	Earlswood & Whitebushes ward; Meadvale & St Johns ward
35 Horley East	Horley Central ward; Horley East ward
36 Horley West	Horley West ward; Salfords & Sidlow ward
37 Redhill	Redhill East ward; Redhill West ward
38 Reigate Central & Woodhatch	Reigate Central ward; South Park & Woodhatch ward
39 Reigate Hill & Merstham	Merstham ward; Reigate Hill ward

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to counties:

Having regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the county likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the number of local government electors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral division of the county;
- (b) every electoral division shall lie wholly within a single district;
- (c) every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single electoral division; and
- (d) every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single electoral division.

- 8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a) – (d) above, regard should be had to:
- (e) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable;
 - (f) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary; and
 - (g) the boundaries of the wards of the districts in the county.