

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Surrey County Council

**Report to the Secretary of State for the  
Environment, Transport and the Regions**

*August 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)

© 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.

Report no: 181



# CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>vii</i>
SUMMARY	<i>ix</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>13</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>17</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>51</i>
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Surrey: Detailed Mapping	<i>53</i>
B Draft Recommendations for Surrey (February 2000)	<i>67</i>





## Local Government Commission for England

22 August 2000

Dear Secretary of State

On 24 August 1999 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Surrey County Council under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in February 2000 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraphs 186-189) in the light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to the electoral arrangements of Surrey County Council.

We recommend that Surrey County Council should be served by 80 councillors representing 80 divisions, and that changes should be made to division boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

The Local Government Bill, containing legislative proposals for a number of changes to local authority electoral arrangements is currently being considered by Parliament. However, until such time as that new legislation is in place we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

I would like to thank members and officers of the County Council and other local people who have contributed to the review. Their co-operation and assistance have been very much appreciated by Commissioners and staff.

Yours sincerely

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT

Chairman



# 1 SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Surrey County Council on 24 August 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 22 February 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Secretary of State.**

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

- **in 34 of the 76 divisions, each of which are 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 inequality 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 186-189) 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 12 divisions will be subject to change.**

These 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 56 of the proposed 80 divisions the number of electors would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the county average, with only three divisions varying by more than 20 per cent.**
- **This improved electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors in 57 divisions expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the county in 2004, and only one division expected to vary by more than 20 per cent.**

Recommendations are also made for change to parish council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **new warding arrangements for the parishes of Godalming and Windlesham.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 3 October 2000:

**The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU**

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH</b>	
1 Cobham	Cobham & Downside ward; Cobham Fairmile ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward (part)
2 Hersham	<i>Unchanged</i> (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 Park ward; Walton Central ward (part); Walton South ward
9 Weybridge	St George's Hill ward; Weybridge North ward; Weybridge South ward
<b>EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH</b>	
10 Epsom & Ewell North	<i>Unchanged</i> (Auriol ward; Cuddington ward; Ewell Court ward)
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	<i>Unchanged</i> (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
<b>GUILDFORD BOROUGH</b>	
15 Ash	Ash Vale ward (Ash Vale parish ward of Ash parish); Ash Wharf ward (Ash Wharf parish ward of Ash parish)
16 Guildford East	Burpham ward; Merrow ward
17 Guildford North	Stoke ward; Stoughton ward
18 Guildford South East	Christchurch ward; Holy Trinity ward
19 Guildford South West	Friary & St Nicolas ward; Onslow ward (part)
20 Guildford West	Onslow ward (part); Westborough ward
21 Horsleys	<i>Unchanged</i> (Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Horsley and West Horsley); Effingham ward (Effingham parish); Lovelace ward (the parishes of Ockham, Ripley and Wisley))

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
22 Shalford	Ash South & Tongham ward (Ash South parish ward of Ash parish and Tongham parish); Pilgrims ward (the parishes of Puttenham, Seale & Sands, Shackleford and Wanborough); Shalford ward (part – the parishes of Artington, Compton and Shalford (part – the parish wards of Peasmarsh and Shalford ))
23 Shere	Clandon & Horsley ward (part – parishes of East Clandon and West Clandon); Send ward (Send parish); Shalford ward (part – Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish); Tillingbourne ward (the parishes of Albury, St Martha and Shere)
24 Worplesdon	<i>Unchanged</i> (Normandy ward (Normandy parish); Pirbright ward (Pirbright parish); Worplesdon ward (Worplesdon parish))
<b>MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT</b>	
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 Hills	Box Hill & Headley ward (Headley parish); Dorking North ward; Leith Hill ward (Wotton parish and the Northern parish ward of Abinger parish and Coldharbour parish ward of Capel parish); Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward (Mickleham parish); Westcott ward
28 Dorking Rural	Beare Green ward (Beare Green parish ward of Capel parish); Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward (the parishes of Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland); Charlwood ward (Charlwood parish); Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward (the parishes of Leigh and Newdigate and Capel parish ward of Capel parish); Okewood ward (Ockley parish and Southern parish ward of Abinger parish)
29 Dorking & the Holmwoods	Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward (Holmwood parish)
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward
<b>REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH</b>	
31 Banstead East	<i>Unchanged</i> (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 Earlswood & Reigate South	Earlswood & Whitebushes ward (No.3 parish ward of Salfords & Sidlow parish ); South Park & Woodhatch ward
35 Horley East	Horley Central ward (the parish wards of Horley North Central and Horley South Central of Horley parish); Horley East ward (the parish wards of Horley North East and Horley South East of Horley parish)
36 Horley West	Horley West ward (the parish wards of Horley North and Horley North West of Horley parish); Salfords & Sidlow ward (No.1 and No.2 parish wards of Salfords & Sidlow parish)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
37 Merstham & Reigate Hill	Merstham ward; Reigate Hill ward
38 Redhill	Redhill East ward; Redhill West ward
39 Reigate Central	Meadvale & St Johns ward; Reigate Central ward
<b>RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</b>	
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)
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
<b>SPELTHORNE BOROUGH</b>	
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 Town ward (part); Ashford Town 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
<b>SURREY HEATH BOROUGH</b>	
53 Bisley, Chobham & West End	Bisley ward (Bisley parish); Chobham ward (Chobham parish); West End ward (West End parish); Lightwater ward (part – the proposed Lightwater West parish ward of Windlesham parish)
54 Camberley East	<i>Unchanged</i> (Old Dean ward; St Pauls ward; Town ward)
55 Camberley West	Frimley ward; St Michaels ward; Watchetts ward
56 Frimley Green & Mytchett	<i>Unchanged</i> (Frimley Green ward; Mytchett & Deepcut ward)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
57 Heatherside & Parkside	Heatherside ward; Parkside ward
58 Windlesham	Bagshot ward (Bagshot parish ward of Windlesham parish); Windlesham ward (Windlesham parish ward of Windlesham parish); Lightwater ward (part – the proposed Lightwater East parish ward of Windlesham parish)
<b>TANDRIDGE DISTRICT</b>	
59 Caterham Hill	<i>Unchanged</i> (Chaldon ward; Portley ward; Queens Park ward; Westway ward)
60 Caterham Valley	Harestone ward; Valley ward; Whyteleafe ward; Woldingham ward
61 Godstone	<i>Unchanged</i> (Bletchingley & Nutfield ward (the parishes of Bletchingley and Nutfield); Godstone ward (Godstone parish))
62 Lingfield	<i>Unchanged</i> (Burstow & Horne ward (the parishes of Burstow and Horne); Dormansland & Felcourt ward (the parish wards of Dormansland, Dormans Park, Felcourt and Haxted of Lingfield & Dormansland parish); Felbridge ward (Felbridge parish); Lingfield & Crowhurst ward (Crowhurst parish and Lingfield parish ward of Lingfield & Dormansland parish))
63 Oxted	<i>Unchanged</i> (Limpsfield ward (Limpsfield parish); Oxted North & Tandridge ward (Tandridge parish and North parish ward of Oxted parish); Oxted South ward (South parish ward of Oxted parish))
64 Warlingham	Tatsfield & Titsey ward (the parishes of Tatsfield and Titsey); Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh ward (Chelsham & Farleigh parish); Warlingham West ward
<b>WAVERLEY BOROUGH</b>	
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – the parish wards of Cranleigh Rural and Elmbridge of Cranleigh parish and Ellens Green parish ward of Ewhurst parish); Cranleigh East ward (Cranleigh East parish ward of Cranleigh parish); Cranleigh West ward (Cranleigh West parish ward of Cranleigh parish); Ewhurst ward (Ewhurst parish ward of Ewhurst parish); Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward (part – Cranleigh North parish ward of Cranleigh parish)
66 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward (Farnham Castle parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham College ward (Farnham College parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Monks ward (Farnham Monks parish ward of Farnham parish)
67 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward (Farnham Hale & Heath End parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Upper Hale ward (Farnham Upper Hale parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward (Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea parish ward of Farnham parish)
68 Farnham South	Farnham Bourne ward (Farnham Bourne parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward (Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward (Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge parish ward of Farnham parish)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
69 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward (Godalming Binscombe parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part – the proposed Godalming Central parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Charterhouse ward (Godalming Charterhouse ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Farncome & Catteshall ward (Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall parish ward of Godalming parish)
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part – the proposed Ockford parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Holloway ward (Godalming Holloway parish ward of Godalming parish); Milford ward (Milford parish ward of Witley parish); Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Witley East parish ward of Witley parish)
71 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward (the parish wards of Critchmere and Shottermill of Haslemere parish); Haslemere North & Grayswood ward (the parish wards of Haslemere North & Grayswood and Haslemere South of Haslemere parish)
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – Alfold parish); Blackheath & Wonersh ward (the parish wards of Blackheath and Wonersh of Wonersh parish); Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward (the parishes of Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe); Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward (the parishes of Chiddingfold and Dunsfold); Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward (part – Shamley Green parish ward of Wonersh parish); Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Hambledon parish)
73 Waverley Western Villages	Elstead & Thursley ward (the parishes of Elstead, Peper Harow and Thursley and Witley West parish ward of Witley parish); Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward (the parishes of Dockenfield, Frensham and Tilford); Haslemere Hindhead ward (Hindhead parish ward of Haslemere parish)
<b>WOKING BOROUGH</b>	
74 Byfleet	Byfleet ward (Byfleet parish); West Byfleet ward
75 Horsell	Horsell East & Woodham ward; Horsell West ward
76 Knaphill	Goldsworth West ward; Knaphill ward
77 Pyrford	Hermon East ward; Old Woking ward; Pyrford ward
78 St Johns & Brookwood	Brookwood ward; Hermitage & Knaphill South ward; St John's & Hook Heath ward
79 Woking Central	Goldsworth East ward; Maybury & Sheerwater ward
80 Woking South	Kingfield & Westfield ward; Mayford & Sutton Green ward; Mount Hermon West 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. The maps in Appendix A illustrate some of the proposed boundaries in more detail.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Surrey

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH</b>					
1 Cobham	1	10,700	6	10,768	5
2 Hersham	1	9,143	-10	8,888	-14
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	9,321	-8	9,615	-7
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	10,718	6	10,829	5
8 Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,800	7	10,930	6
9 Weybridge	1	10,360	2	10,459	1
<b>EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>GUILDFORD BOROUGH</b>					
15 Ash	1	8,153	-19	8,997	-13
16 Guildford East	1	10,065	-1	10,154	-1
17 Guildford North	1	10,651	5	11,068	7
18 Guildford South East	1	9,829	-5	9,678	-6
19 Guildford South West	1	9,738	-3	9,912	-4
20 Guildford West	1	9,720	-4	9,796	-5
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

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT</b>					
25 Ashtead	1	10,583	5	10,527	2
26 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,845	17	11,582	12
27 Dorking Hills	1	9,165	-9	9,086	-12
28 Dorking Rural	1	11,022	9	10,766	4
29 Dorking & the Holmwoods	1	9,574	-5	9,614	-7
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	10,445	3	10,606	3
<b>REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH</b>					
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 Earlswood & Reigate South	1	11,225	11	11,782	14
35 Horley East	1	9,663	-4	10,602	3
36 Horley West	1	7,966	-21	8,534	-17
37 Merstham & Reigate Hill	1	9,672	-4	9,796	-5
38 Redhill	1	10,601	5	10,786	5
39 Reigate Central	1	10,601	5	10,786	5
<b>RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</b>					
40 Addlestone	1	11,276	11	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
<b>SPELTHORNE BOROUGH</b>					
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	-1	10,714	4
50 Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	1	8,997	-11	9,385	-9

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
51 Sunbury	1	10,656	5	10,226	-1
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	9,896	-2	10,114	-2
<b>SURREY HEATH BOROUGH</b>					
53 Bisley, Chobham & West End	1	10,645	5	10,610	3
54 Camberley East	1	10,332	2	10,573	3
55 Camberley West	1	11,421	13	11,307	10
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
<b>TANDRIDGE DISTRICT</b>					
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
<b>WAVERLEY BOROUGH</b>					
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	1	10,884	8	10,718	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
71 Haslemere	1	8,931	-12	9,021	-12
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	1	9,851	4	10,486	2
73 Waverley Western Villages	1	9,152	-10	9,190	-11
<b>WOKING BOROUGH</b>					
74 Byfleet	1	9,562	-5	9,598	-7
75 Horsell	1	8,764	-13	8,921	-13

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (1999)</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2004)</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
76 Knaphill	1	9,690	-4	11,327	10
77 Pyrford	1	9,620	-5	9,695	-6
78 St Johns & Brookwood	1	9,464	-6	9,398	-9
79 Woking Central	1	11,679	15	11,813	15
80 Woking South	1	9,564	-5	9,751	-5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>808,599</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>823,851</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,107</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,298</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Note: 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 county differ marginally from the totals in Figures 3 and B2; however, we would expect this to have a minimal impact on variances.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council. 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 1996/97, in autumn 1998.

## **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.

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 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 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the county as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We 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 requires strong justification.

9 Similarly, we 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 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 we are unlikely to achieve optimum electoral equality and complete coterminosity throughout a county area. Our objective is to achieve the best balance between the two, taking into account our 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 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 A further area of difference between county and district reviews is that we recognise it will not always 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 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 were 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 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 changes 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 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 August 1980 (Report No. 394).

19 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, the Surrey Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Surrey Association of Local Councils, parish and town councils in the county, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the county and the 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. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 14 December 1999. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

20 Stage Three began on 22 February 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council*, and ended on 17 April 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

21 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 1,060,500 (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.

22 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'.

23 The electorate of the county is 809,444 (February 1999). The Council presently has 76 members, with one member elected from each division (Figure 3).

24 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 Guildford East and Woking West divisions.

25 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.

26 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 are 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.

27 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>GUILDFORD BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT</b>					
24 Ashtead	1	10,582	-1	10,527	-3
25 Bookham & Fetcham West	1	11,373	7	11,214	3
26 Dorking North	1	9,696	-9	9,504	-12

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
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
<b>REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>SPELTHORNE BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>SURREY HEATH BOROUGH</b>					
51 Camberley East	1	10,318	-3	10,573	-3

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
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
<b>TANDRIDGE DISTRICT</b>					
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
<b>WAVERLEY BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>WOKING BOROUGH</b>					
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

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

*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 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.*



### 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

28 During Stage One we received 40 representations, from the County Council, Surrey County Labour Party (the Labour Party), three district councils, 12 parish councils, 14 political groups, with a further nine representations from a Member of Parliament, local groups, county councillors and a local resident. The County Council and the Labour Party both submitted county-wide schemes. In the light of these representations and the evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council*.

29 Our draft recommendations were based on an 80-member scheme, as proposed by the Labour Party, but reflected elements of the County Council's, the Labour Party's and Surrey Liberal Democrats' proposals. We considered that our recommendations achieved the best possible balance between electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity. We proposed that:

- Surrey County Council should be served by 80 councillors;
- there should be 80 electoral divisions, involving changes to the boundaries of all but 12 of the existing divisions.

**Draft Recommendation**

Surrey County Council should comprise 80 councillors serving the same number of divisions.

30 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 58 of the 80 electoral divisions varying by no more than 10 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, with 69 of the divisions expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the county average in 2004.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

31 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, we received 66 representations, including representations from the County Council, the Labour Party, from eight district councils, 13 parish and town councils, nine political groups, five local groups, as well as nine representations from county councillors, three from borough councillors and 17 from local residents. All representations 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**

32 Surrey County Council accepted our proposals for the majority of the county. However, it put forward alternative proposals for divisions in Guildford, Mole Valley, Waverley and Woking, and for the whole of Spelthorne.

33 Surrey County Labour Party raised concerns regarding the County Council's consultation process. It argued that the task group that was set up at Stage One was not reconvened to address the County Council's response to our draft recommendations and the Labour Party was concerned that the Council's Stage Three proposals were "put together solely by members of the majority political group". However, the Council's proposals were put to a meeting of the whole council during Stage Three.

### **Surrey County Labour Party**

34 Surrey County Labour Party welcomed our draft recommendations in general, but proposed modifications to our recommendations in Guildford, and put forward alternative proposals for Spelthorne and Waverley districts. It also supported Mole Valley Labour Party's proposals for Mole Valley.

### **District and Borough Councils**

35 We received eight representations from district and borough councils. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council said it had "no representations" to make on our draft recommendations. Mole Valley District Council did not express a view on our recommendations, but passed on the comments of some of its members. Reigate & Banstead Borough Council opposed our recommendations and put forward its Stage One proposals for Redhill and Reigate. Runnymede Borough Council supported our draft recommendations for the district subject to minor amendments to our proposals. Spelthorne Borough Council opposed our draft recommendations and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the borough with a minor amendment. Surrey Heath Borough Council opposed our proposal to divide Lightwater ward between divisions and supported the County Council's Stage One proposal for the rural part of Surrey Heath. Waverley Borough Council did not comment on our proposals but clarified the conclusions of a recent review of Witley Parish Council. Woking Borough Council supported our proposal to increase the level of representation of Woking borough on the County Council from six to seven councillors.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

36 We received 13 representations direct from parish and town councils. Betchworth Parish Council opposed our proposal to include Betchworth parish in Dorking North division and supported the County Council's proposal that it should be included in Dorking Rural division. Brockham Parish Council supported our draft recommendations for Brockham parish. Buckland Parish Council opposed our proposal to include Buckland parish in Dorking North division and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposal for Dorking Rural division. Charlwood Parish Council argued that Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland parishes should be included in Dorking Rural division, as proposed by the County Council. Chobham Parish Council supported retaining the existing electoral arrangements for the parish, but accepted our recommendation to combine Chobham with Bisley and West End wards and part of Lightwater ward should it be "inevitable", in preference to the parish being linked with Bagshot. Cranleigh Parish Council opposed our proposals for the parish and proposed including the whole of Cranleigh in Waverley Eastern Villages division.

37 Haslemere Town Council opposed our draft recommendations, arguing that Hindhead should not be separated from the rest of Haslemere. Leigh Parish Council supported the County Council's proposal to include the rural villages of Mole Valley in Dorking Rural division. St Martha Parish Council opposed our proposal to include part of Shalford parish in Shere division. Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council opposed our proposal for Horley West division. Shalford Parish Council proposed that Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish should be included in Shalford division. West End Parish Council accepted our draft recommendations but argued that the name of West End should be included in the title of Chobham and Bisley division. Windlesham Parish Council opposed our proposal for Lightwater and supported the County Council's Stage One proposal for the area.

## **Political Groups**

38 We received nine representations from local political groups. Epsom & Ewell Conservative Association agreed with our proposals for Epsom and Ewell. Guildford Constituency Labour Party and Guildford Liberal Democrats supported the proposals subject to an amendment in Guildford. Guildford Constituency Labour Party also supported our proposal to increase the number of County Council members. Guildford Conservative Association proposed that the boundary of Cranleigh & Ewhurst and Waverley Eastern Villages divisions should be coterminous with the boundaries of Cranleigh parish. Mole Valley Labour Party proposed a new scheme of divisions for Mole Valley, with a further possible wholly coterminous scheme. Mole Valley Liberal Democrats supported our proposals for Mole Valley and offered alternative proposals for the south of the district should it be recommended that Dorking town be combined in a single division. Spelthorne Liberal Democrats supported our proposals for the district, objecting to proposals to link Sunbury Common and Sunbury East and supporting the linking of Sunbury and Ashford Commons. Woking Constituency Conservative Association supported our proposal to increase the district's level of representation on the County Council. However, it opposed our proposals for Woking North and Woking North East divisions and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for this area.

## Other Representations

39 We received a further 34 representations from local groups, county councillors, borough councillors and local residents. Claygate Village Residents' Association opposed our proposals for the parish and proposed that Claygate, Hinchley Wood and Esher should be combined in a single division. Egham Residents' Association objected to our proposal to divide the town of Egham between divisions, while supporting the proposed increase in the representation of Runnymede on the County Council. The Grove Group objected to our proposal to divide Horsell between divisions. The Reigate Society supported our recommendations for Redhill Central and Reigate North divisions and put forward its own recommendations for the south of Reigate. Woodcote Residents Society supported our proposals for Epsom & Ewell.

40 A county councillor supported our proposals for Epsom & Ewell while another supported our recommendations for Mole Valley. Another county councillor responded on behalf of himself and two further county councillors with regard to Mole Valley. They opposed our recommendations for the district and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals. A further county councillor supported our proposals for Ashted, Leatherhead, Bookham and Fetcham, but supported the County Council's Stage Three option for the remainder of Mole Valley. A county councillor opposed our proposals for Spelthorne and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the district, with the Borough Council's proposed amendment. We received a further representation from two county councillors arguing that Ockford should be included in Godalming North division. A county councillor supported the County Council's proposals for Horsell and Woking Central divisions, while supporting our recommendations for Woking West division. Two further county councillor opposed our proposal to divide the two Horsell wards and supported the County Council's proposal for Woking. Two borough councillors opposed our proposal to combine Claygate and Oxshott. Another borough councillor opposed our proposal to divide Horsell between divisions, supporting the County Council's Stage One proposal to divide Maybury & Sheerwater ward between divisions.

41 A local resident opposed our proposals for Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott division in Elmbridge and proposed retaining the existing boundary of Claygate & Hinchley Wood division. We received a representation from two local residents who proposed that those parts of Orpin Road and Nutfield Road that are in South Merstham parish, but in Redhill ward, should be placed in a division with the remainder of Merstham. We received 12 representations from local residents opposing our proposal to divide the village of Horsell between divisions in Woking. A further local resident supported the increased council size of 80 members.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

42 As with our reviews of districts, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Surrey is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

43 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.

44 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. In addition, our approach is 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.

45 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.

46 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.

47 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. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to the statutory criteria. We 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 require strong justification.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

48 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. Advice from the County Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to division boundaries has been obtained.

49 At Stage One, 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 electorate forecasts that 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". In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the forecast electorates provided by the County Council, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could be made at the time.

50 At Stage Three a county councillor raised concerns regarding the predicted decline in the electorate in the light of recent Government announcements about proposed housing figures. However, given that these proposals have yet to be confirmed we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates presently available.

## **Council Size**

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

52 Surrey County Council presently has 76 members. At Stage One, the County Council proposed a council of 75 members while the Labour Party proposed that Surrey should have an 80-member council. Mole Valley Labour Party supported the proposal that Surrey should be represented by 80 councillors.

53 In our draft recommendations report we considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received. We concluded that the achievement of electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity would best be met by a council size of 80 members. Under an 80-member council each district would be more accurately represented, with the number of councillors per district being more evenly balanced. Under our proposals Guildford, Runnymede, Waverley and Woking would each be represented by an extra councillor with no districts having fewer councillors than at present.

54 At Stage Three, Surrey County Council accepted, the Labour Party and Mole Valley Labour Party supported our proposal to increase the size of the County Council by four to 80 members. Woking Borough Council and a local resident supported the increased level of representation of Woking on the County Council. And Guildford Constituency Labour Party supported our recommendation to increase the size of the council to 80 members, with 10 members representing Guildford. Epsom & Ewell Conservative Association argued that Epsom & Ewell has the correct

level of representation under a 76 member council asserting that the existing arrangements “fit well”. We received two representations from county councillors in which they expressed concern at the proposal to increase the size of the County Council, arguing that this seemed to go against the Commission’s guidance to “safeguard against an upward drift in the number of councillors”.

55 At Stage Three, we did not receive any schemes proposing alternative council sizes, and we have not received evidence during Stage Three to persuade us to move away from an 80-member council. Our proposed council size of 80 members has received support and we are content to retain the proposed council size. While we do generally wish to safeguard against an upward drift in council size, we consider that the increase in council size best meets electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity and results in each district being more accurately represented than under the current council size. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for a council size of 80 as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

56 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the county-wide scheme from the County Council. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.

57 In our draft recommendations, we sought to build on the county-wide schemes put forward and other submissions received in order to propose electoral arrangements which would achieve further improvements in equality of representation throughout the county, better reflect the interests and identities of communities, and result in a greater level of coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards. We recommended an 80-member council for Surrey, as proposed by the Labour Party, and combined elements of the County Council’s, the Labour Party’s and Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals in our draft recommendations, together with our own recommendations for Surrey Heath district. Our recommendations improved electoral equality, compared to the current arrangements, and we considered that our draft proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

58 In drawing up our draft and our final recommendations, we have acknowledged 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 final 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.

59 At Stage Three, we received considerable support for our proposals. Minor amendments were proposed by respondents, including the County Council, the Labour Party, district councils, parish and town councils, political groups, local groups, councillors and local residents. The County Council supported our proposals for the majority of the county. However, it put forward alternative proposals for divisions in Guildford, Mole Valley, Waverley and Woking, and for the whole of Spelthorne. The Labour Party also generally supported our recommendations but proposed changes to Spelthorne and Waverley districts and supported Mole Valley Labour

Party's proposals for Mole Valley. The majority of submissions received were regarding the south of Mole Valley and the north of Woking.

60 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. Many of these submissions highlighted specific local issues, particularly in terms of local community identities and interests and we have concluded that by making a number of modifications to the draft recommendations, we would better reflect community identities and interests. We propose changes to the boundaries of eight divisions: Cranleigh & Ewhurst, Dorking North, Dorking Rural, Guildford South, Guildford West, Waverley Eastern Villages, Woking North and Woking North East. We also propose changes to the titles of 14 divisions: Chobham & Bisley, Guildford Central, Guildford South, Dorking North, Dorking South, Redhill Central, Reigate Hill & Merstham, Reigate South, Woking East, Woking North, Woking North East, Woking North West, Woking South East and Woking West.

61 The County Council, the Labour Party, Guildford Labour Party and Guildford Liberal Democrats submitted clarification regarding our recommendations in Guildford. We recognise that there was a discrepancy between the map, the figures and the text in our draft recommendations with regard to the boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions and have amended our final recommendations accordingly. Also, the County Council has made a minor amendment to its original proposals for Englefield Green and Egham Hythe & Thorpe divisions, upon which our draft recommendations were based. We have adopted this amendment and modified our maps accordingly. This change would not affect any electors.

62 Our final recommendations offer marginally worse levels of electoral equality than our draft recommendations. However, we have been persuaded to modify our proposals in the interests of improved community representation. Under our final recommendations 24 divisions would have an electoral imbalance greater than 10 per cent, and three divisions greater than 20 per cent. Over the next five years this level of electoral equality is forecast to improve, with the number of electors per councillor varying by more than 10 per cent in 23 divisions, and by more than 20 per cent in only one division by 2004. Under our final recommendations, the level of coterminosity between division and ward boundaries would remain at 64 per cent, with 51 out of 80 coterminous divisions.

63 Our proposals would involve the re-warding of two parishes, Godalming and Windlesham, in order to meet the requirements of Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. These parishing proposals are detailed later in this chapter. For the purposes of county electoral divisions, the eleven district areas in Surrey 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.

64 Details of our final 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**

65 Under 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 by more than 10 per cent from the county average in four divisions. 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.

66 At Stage One, the County Council proposed that the number of county councillors representing Elmbridge should be reduced from nine to eight 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. It proposed that Molesey division should comprise Molesey East and Molesey North wards and part of Molesey South ward and that Walton Central division should 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 a new Walton East division and that St George's Hill, Weybridge North and Weybridge South wards should form an amended Weybridge ward.

67 The Labour Party argued that the River Mole forms a "significant natural barrier for electoral purposes" in Elmbridge, which should be reflected in the warding arrangements. 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".

68 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 division comprising Walton Ambleside and Walton North wards with part of Walton Central

ward, and Walton South & Oatlands division comprising Oatlands ward, Walton South ward and the remainder of Walton Central ward. Finally, it proposed that Weybridge division should comprise St George's Hill, Weybridge North and Weybridge South wards.

69 We received no further representations regarding this area at Stage One and having carefully considered the representations received, we adopted the Labour Party's proposals for Elmbridge as our draft recommendations. We noted that the County Council's and the Labour Party's schemes were very similar in terms of electoral equality and coterminosity. However, the County Council's scheme would have involved reducing the level of representation in the borough to eight members, while the borough would be entitled to 8.9 members under an 80-member council.

70 While we recognised that the Labour Party's proposal would divide Walton Central and Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon wards, we considered that the division of wards was necessary in the interests of electoral equality. We were content that these non-coterminous divisions would reflect an element of community identity given that those areas which the Labour Party proposed combining share transport and community links.

71 Under our draft recommendations 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.

72 At Stage Three, the County Council and the Labour Party supported our recommendations for Elmbridge. Claygate Village Residents' Association opposed our proposals for the parish and proposed that the wards of Claygate, Hinchley Wood and Esher should be combined within a single division. It argued that Claygate and Oxshott are "separate communities" with different identities, with affinities elsewhere, and with a geographical distance between them. A borough councillor also opposed our proposal to combine Claygate and Oxshott, arguing that they have "separate village identities". He argued that it would "make considerably more sense" to link Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Esher with part of the Dittons area because "there is no obvious boundary between these three areas". A further borough councillor also opposed this recommendation, arguing that Claygate and Hinchley Wood would be better linked with Esher, or Long Ditton due to community links. A local resident opposed our proposals for Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott division and proposed retaining the existing composition of Claygate & Hinchley Wood division, to combine Claygate and Hinchley Wood wards, with Oxshott being transferred to a division with Cobham & Downside and Cobham Fairmile. He argued that there is geographical distance between the communities of Claygate and Oxshott, that the two areas are not connected by road and are considered to be "separate communities".

73 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have not been persuaded to move away from our draft recommendations. We note that we have received opposition to our proposal to link Claygate with Oxshott. However, we have considered alternative arrangements for Claygate and Oxshott, and they would result in either worse electoral equality, reduced levels of coterminosity or the loss of a division, when the district merits nine. Given that we consider our draft recommendations provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and coterminosity, and in the light of the support from the

County Council and the Labour Party, we are content to endorse our draft recommendations as final.

## **Epsom & Ewell borough**

74 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 small degree of electoral imbalance in these divisions, with the number of electors represented by each councillor varying by more than 10 per cent from the county average in only one division. Overall, relative to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, under the current 76-member council, the Epsom & Ewell area has the correct level of representation on the County Council.

75 At Stage One, 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 thereby retaining 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.

76 The Labour Party supported the County Council's Stage One proposals for Epsom & Ewell borough, as did Woodcote Residents' Society, 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.

77 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we recognised that the County Council's proposals had received unanimous support and we put forward these suggestions as our draft recommendations, although these proposals would result in poor coterminosity, with only one of the five divisions being coterminous. However, 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 therefore considered that these proposals offered the best available balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

78 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council, these proposals would also result in the number of electors per councillor varying by more than 10 per cent in only one division. This level of electoral equality would 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.

79 At Stage Three, the County Council, the Labour Party, Epsom & Ewell Conservative Association, Woodcote Residents Society and a county councillor supported our proposals for Epsom & Ewell. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council said it had "no representations" to make on our recommendations.

80 Our draft recommendations received general support at Stage Three, and we remain of the view that they represent the best possible balance between electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity. We therefore propose confirming them as final.

## **Guildford borough**

81 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.

82 At Stage One, the County Council proposed that Guildford should continue to be represented by nine divisions, with minimal change to the existing boundaries. It proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Ash division in order that it should comprise the whole of the parish of Ash, while 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. It argued that Stoke and Stoughton wards should be combined with the remainder of Christchurch ward to form Guildford North division and 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.

83 The Labour Party proposed that, under an 80-member scheme, Guildford should be represented by 10 councillors in order to keep "natural communities" together because the borough is divided "almost exactly" in half between the urban and rural parts. It recommended that Ash division should comprise Ash Vale and Ash Wharf wards, although 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, even though this would involve dividing the parish further.

84 At Stage One, 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 parish 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, Pilgrims and

Shalford wards, 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. The Labour Party also recommended a “contingency proposal” for a nine-division arrangement for Guildford, should a 75-member council be preferred.

85 At Stage One, 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 a scheme almost identical to the Labour Party’s proposal for a 10-division borough, with a slightly different boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions.

86 Nick Hawkins MP and Mole Valley Conservative Association supported the County Council’s Stage One proposals for the borough. Surrey Heath Conservative Association and a local councillor argued that the boundaries of Ash division should be retained, as proposed by the County Council. Ash Parish Council opposed any change to the existing Shalford division boundaries. 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.

87 We carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One in drawing up our draft recommendations. We considered that the Labour Party’s recommendations for Guildford offered the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and proposed adopting these as our draft recommendations. 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 offered poor electoral equality, worse coterminosity and would not provide the borough with the number of councillors that it merits. There was some similarity between the County Council’s and the Labour Party’s schemes, given that they both proposed that Horsleys and Worplesdon divisions should retain their existing boundaries.

88 The Labour Party’s proposal involved the division of Ash parish, which encountered opposition at Stage One. However, having considered the options available we noted that it was not possible to include the whole parish in a division without having a detrimental effect on electoral equality. The Labour Party proposed that the boundary of Ash division should be drawn along the existing parish and district ward boundaries, and we considered that this offered the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We considered the Labour Party’s proposal to ward Ash parish yet further, but we were not persuaded that it would be in the interests of the community to divide this area to a greater extent.

89 In our draft recommendations, we noted that a wholly coterminous scheme in Guildford would result in very poor electoral equality and that some division of district wards is necessary. Under the Labour Party’s Stage One proposal allocating the district ten divisions, Clandon & Horsley ward would be divided between divisions, although this would retain the existing division boundary, utilising easily identifiable parish boundaries. Onslow ward would also be separated between divisions, but this would only involve dividing urban areas that appear to be

well connected with the adjoining wards with which we propose to combine them. We also considered 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. We were not persuaded to adopt the title change proposed by Pirbright Parish Council, given that no supporting argumentation was provided and we received no evidence of local support for this change.

90 Our draft recommendations for Guildford, under an 80-member council would result in the number of electors per councillor varying by more than 10 per cent in two of the ten 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 two divisions by 2004. Four of the ten divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

91 At Stage Three, the County Council, the Labour Party, Guildford Constituency Labour Party and Guildford Liberal Democrats supported our proposals for Guildford; however, they drew attention to a discrepancy between the figures and boundaries we quoted for the proposed Guildford South and Guildford West divisions in our draft report and those that the Labour Party proposed at Stage One, which we adopted as our draft recommendations. The County Council proposed that the boundary dividing Onslow ward should be the same as our draft recommendation in the west of the ward, while following the polling district boundary in the east of the ward. This proposal would offer better levels of electoral equality. The Labour Party and Guildford Constituency Labour Party put forward the Labour Party's Stage One proposal for the area, with the amendment that Stag Hill should be transferred from Guildford West to Guildford South division, which would provide for improved levels of electoral equality. Guildford Liberal Democrats reiterated their Stage One proposals for the area, which were similar to the Labour Party's and offered similar levels of electoral equality. Guildford Liberal Democrats also suggested that the division names of Guildford Central and Guildford South were "misleading" and that South East and South West or East Central and West Central would be "slightly better possibilities" as regards the positioning of the areas.

92 St Martha and Shalford parish councils opposed our proposal to include Chilworth ward of Shalford parish in Shere division. St Martha Parish Council argued that the two parts of Chilworth village that are divided by the ward boundary are "significantly different in their nature and principal concerns" and that this is respected at parish, district and county level. Shalford Parish Council argued that our recommendation to divide the parish would cause an "unnecessary complication" in the representation of Shalford parish at county level.

93 Having carefully considered the representations made at Stage Three, we are proposing to endorse our draft recommendations as final, subject to modifying the boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions, and renaming two of the divisions. We note that our proposals have received considerable support, subject to the amendment of the boundary within Onslow ward. We recommend adopting the boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions, as proposed by the County Council, which would be similar to the Labour Party's proposal, but would offer slightly better electoral equality and a clear boundary. We consider that Guildford Liberal Democrats' proposal to rename Guildford Central and Guildford South divisions Guildford South East and Guildford South West would better reflect these areas, given that they are both in the south of the town.

94 We note that there was opposition to our proposal to include Chilworth parish ward in Shere division. However, retaining it in Shalford division would have a significant adverse effect on electoral equality and we have not been convinced that the inclusion of this area in Shere division would have an adverse effect on community representation. If Chilworth parish ward were transferred to Shalford division, Shalford division would have an electoral variance of 20 per cent from the county average, while Shere division would vary by 17 per cent in 1999 and 2004. Also, we have noted St Martha Parish Council argued that Shalford and St Martha parish councils enjoy “a strong collaborative relationship”, therefore, we do not consider that our proposals would have an adverse effect on the representation of this area. We note that Chilworth is already warded separately to the rest of Shalford parish, and that half of the village of Chilworth is in St Martha parish. Our proposal would involve the whole of the existing parish ward of Chilworth being transferred to Shere ward, where it would be combined with the remainder of Chilworth village in a single division.

95 Under our final recommendations for an 80-member council, the number of electors per councillor in Guildford would vary by more than 10 per cent in two of the ten divisions. This level of electoral equality would remain relatively stable over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions by 2004. Under our final recommendations for Guildford, four divisions would be coterminous, as under our draft recommendations.

### **Mole Valley district**

96 At present, Mole Valley district is represented by six county councillors, serving the six divisions of Ashted, 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 the existing 76-member council.

97 At Stage One, the County Council based its proposals on “the natural communities” in the area, arguing that the southern areas in the district can be grouped in their relation to Dorking. It proposed that Ashted, 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 new 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 re-named Mole Valley Gap or Dorking Hills.

98 The Labour Party’s Stage One proposals for Ashted and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions were identical to those of the County Council. It also 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 division with the wards of Box Hill & Headley, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Leith Hill, Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham and Westcott. It proposed combining the Chart Downs and Goodwyns estates of Holmwoods ward with Dorking North and Dorking South wards in a new Dorking division and

argued that Mole Valley South division should comprise the remainder of Holmwoods ward together with Beare Green, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Okewood wards.

99 At Stage One, Surrey Liberal Democrats put forward an alternative option for Mole Valley under which Ashtead, 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. They 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 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.

100 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 also put forward an alternative five-division proposal for the district. Under this 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.

101 Mole Valley Conservative Association supported the County Council’s Stage One proposal for Mole Valley. Mole Valley Liberal Democrats and a county councillor supported Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals. 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. 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 retaining the existing electoral arrangements.

102 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One. We recognised that there was merit in all the schemes; however, we were persuaded that Surrey Liberal Democrats’ proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and adopted them as our draft recommendations. This scheme offered good electoral equality, secured 100 per cent coterminosity, and retained links between areas to the north-east of Dorking, which had received support at Stage One. While the County Council’s scheme received considerable support, it offered worse levels of electoral equality and we did not receive the supporting evidence necessary to persuade us that its proposals offered better community representation than our draft recommendations, which would result in better levels of electoral equality. The Labour Party’s proposals resulted in poorer levels of coterminosity and 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. We recognised that there was some opposition at Stage One to the proposal to divide the town of Dorking between divisions. However, we also received representations in support of proposals linking Dorking North with areas to the north of Dorking and linking Dorking South ward with Holmwoods ward, and we note that these proposed divisions would be wholly coterminous, with good electoral equality.

103 Under our draft recommendations one of the proposed six divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent. This level of electoral equality would improve over the next five years, with only one division continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent by 2004. Under our draft recommendations all divisions would be coterminous with the boundaries of district wards.

104 At Stage Three, the County Council supported our proposals for Ashtead, Bookham & Fetcham West, Dorking South and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions. However, it proposed that Dorking South division should be renamed Dorking & the Holmwoods, in order to better reflect its composition. It proposed that Dorking North ward should be combined with the rural areas to the north and west of the town in a Dorking Hills division, to comprise the wards of Box Hill & Headley, Dorking North, Leith Hill, Mickleham Westhumble & Pixham and Westcott. Under its proposals the south-east rural area of the district would be combined in a Dorking Rural division to comprise Beare Green, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Capel Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Okewood wards. It argued that its scheme “better reflects the groupings of the communities in the rural area in their natural routing to Dorking” while also reducing the geographical size of the proposed Dorking Rural division.

105 Under its Stage Three proposals one division would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent in 1999. The levels of electoral equality in the district would generally improve over the next five years; however, by 2004 two divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

106 The Labour Party supported Mole Valley Labour Party’s Stage Three proposals for the south of the district, arguing that the whole of Dorking should be contained in a single division. Mole Valley Labour Party proposed a new scheme for the whole of the district. It proposed retaining our draft recommendations for Ashtead and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions. It suggested that Bookham & Fetcham West division should combine Bookham North and Fetcham West wards and the north-west part of Bookham South ward. It proposed that Mole Valley Hills division should comprise the wards of Box Hill & Headley, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland, Leith Hill, Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham and Okewood, with the remainder of Bookham South ward. It recommended that Mole Valley South East division should comprise the wards of Beare Green, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Holmwoods, while Dorking division should comprise Dorking North, Dorking South and Westcott wards. It also put forward modifications to this scheme in order to offer an alternative, wholly coterminous scheme under which Bookham & Fetcham West division would comprise the wards of Bookham North, Bookham South and Fetcham West, while Mole Valley Hills division would comprise Box Hill & Headley, Brockham Betchworth & Buckland, Leith Hill, Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham and Okewood wards. It argued that its proposals would “better reflect the identities and interests of local communities” by establishing a single division for Dorking town.

107 Under Mole Valley Labour Party's proposals no divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent in either 1999 or 2004; however, two divisions would be non-coterminous with ward boundaries. Under their proposals for a wholly coterminous scheme one division would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent in 1999 and by 2004 two divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average.

108 Mole Valley Liberal Democrats supported our draft recommendations for Mole Valley and offered alternative arrangements for the south of the district, should it be recommended that Dorking be combined in a single division. They opposed proposals to link Leith Hill and Westcott with rural areas north of Dorking, to divide the rural communities to the north of Dorking from those in the south of the district and to divide parishes between divisions. They argued that Brockham should retain its links with Box Hill & Headley due to the "community ties" and road links. They also argued that the areas contained in the proposed Dorking Rural division are "bound together by the significant common issue of the Gatwick flightpath". They also argued that the divisions group villages around "their natural routes to Dorking". Should the Commission be minded to alter its recommendations, they argued that it should consider including the whole of Dorking within a division, together with Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward. Should we adopt this option, they proposed that Dorking Villages division should comprise the wards of Boxhill & Headley, Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland and Holmwoods, while Dorking Rural division would comprise Beare Green, Charlwood, Capel Leigh & Newdigate, Leith Hill, Okewood and Westcott wards.

109 Under Mole Valley Liberal Democrats' alternative proposals, one division would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality would continue, with one division continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average in 2004.

110 Mole Valley District Council did not express a view on our recommendations, but passed on the comments of some of its members. One member supported the inclusion of Brockham in Dorking North division, although he noted that this would also involve including the "traditionally rural" areas of Betchworth and Buckland in this more urban division. A second member opposed the inclusion of Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward in Dorking North division, arguing that this ward should be included with areas to the south-east of the district with which the ward shares "many things in common". Another member argued that Westcott should be linked with Dorking North, due to common links. Two members opposed our proposed Dorking Rural division on the basis of its geographical size, and poor road links between the rural areas. A further councillor argued that Dorking town should be combined in a division with the ward of Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham while Brockham should be combined with Box Hill, and they supported our proposed Dorking Rural division based on the agricultural nature of the composite villages. A further councillor opposed the Labour Party's proposal to include part of Bookham South ward in Mole Valley Hills division, arguing that Polesden Lacey is "an asset to Bookham South" and that the ward should be "maintained in its entirety".

111 Betchworth Parish Council opposed our proposal to include the parish in Dorking North division and supported the County Council's proposal that it should be included in Dorking Rural division. It argued that Brockham has "very little urban character" and that it and Betchworth and Buckland should be included with the rural villages to the south, which have similar "problems and views". Brockham Parish Council supported our draft recommendations for the parish to be included in Dorking North division. Buckland Parish Council opposed our proposal to include

the parish in Dorking North division and supported the County Council's Stage Three proposal for the parish. Charlwood Parish Council argued that Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland should be retained in Dorking Rural division, as proposed by the County Council. It argued that Charlwood has "a natural affinity" with these parishes and should be combined in a division with them. Leigh Parish Council supported the County Council's proposal to include the rural villages of Mole Valley in Dorking Rural division instead of linking them with Dorking North.

112 A county councillor supported our recommendations for Mole Valley. Another county councillor supported our proposals for Ashted, Bookham & Fetcham West and Leatherhead & Fetcham East divisions, but supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the remainder of the district. He raised concerns about the large geographical size of our proposed Dorking Rural division and argued that the County Council's scheme "makes sense" by linking communities in their "natural" routing to Dorking. He argued that Brockham, Betchworth and Buckland have "close ties" with Leigh, and share interests with Beare Green, Capel, Leigh & Newdigate, Charlwood and Ockley. A further county councillor submitted a joint response with two other county councillors opposing our proposals and supporting the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the district. They argued that our recommendations would not offer significant improvements in electoral equality, compared to the County Council's proposals, and would not provide improved representation of the area. They raised concerns regarding the geographical size of our proposed Dorking Rural division. They also stated that there was "clearly deep-seated opposition" to our proposals among a "wide-range of Mole Valley councillors".

113 We have carefully considered the representations received. We are endorsing our recommendations for the north of the district, given the general support received for our proposals in this part of the district. We note that we have received some support for our recommendations in the south of the district and there is some support for the alternative arrangements proposed by Mole Valley Labour Party, Mole Valley Liberal Democrats and a member of Mole Valley District Council. However, we have not been persuaded that these alternative proposals would better meet the statutory criteria than our draft recommendations. In particular, we doubt the merit of Mole Valley Labour Party's proposal to create two non-coterminous divisions. Also, our proposed Dorking Rural division received considerable opposition at Stage Three, while the County Council's proposed Dorking Hills and Dorking Rural divisions received the majority of local support. As a result, we have been persuaded that Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward should be included in Dorking Rural division while Leith Hill and Westcott wards should be included in a new Dorking Hills division. Under these proposals Dorking Rural division would be reduced in geographical size and would comprise similar rural areas, while the parts of the rural areas to be combined with Dorking North ward share strong transport links with the town. We are also adopting the County Council's proposal to rename Dorking South division as Dorking South & the Holmwoods, in order to better reflect the composition of the division.

114 While we recognise that it has been argued that there are ties between Brockham and Boxhill, we also note that we have received assertions about the links between Betchworth and Buckland and areas to the south. We do not consider that it would be in the interests of the community to divide this ward between divisions and we note that there are good road links between this ward and those to the south. We also note that while we received a degree of opposition to our recommendations to divide Dorking between divisions we have also received argumentation in support of linking Dorking with rural areas. Mole Valley Liberal Democrats supported our draft recommendations, arguing that they would link areas which share major road

links. Our final recommendations would also link areas with strong road links to each other and to Dorking and would combine areas which share concerns regarding the Gatwick flight-path.

115 Under our final recommendations one division would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent in 1999. The levels of electoral equality in the district would generally improve over the next five years; however, by 2004 two divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent. All divisions would be coterminous with district wards.

## **Reigate & Banstead borough**

116 At present the borough of Reigate & Banstead is represented by nine county councillors serving the nine divisions of 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 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.

117 At Stage One, 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. It proposed that 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 renamed Nork & the Tattenhams.

118 The Labour Party supported the County Council's Stage One 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".

119 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.

120 At Stage One, 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.

121 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we carefully considered the proposals put forward at Stage One. We adopted as our draft recommendations for Reigate & Banstead 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 reflected elements of the Reigate Society's proposals. We considered that the Labour Party's proposals for Redhill were preferable because they retained the whole of Redhill town community within a single division and avoided dividing areas of Merstham from those parts of Reigate with which they are connected. Combined with the County Council's proposals, these proposals provided 100 per cent coterminosity and reasonable levels of electoral equality. We were not 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 and which share few transport links.

122 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council the number of electors per councillor for Reigate & Banstead 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.

123 At Stage Three, the County Council and the Labour Party supported our proposals for Reigate & Banstead. Reigate & Banstead Borough Council opposed our recommendations and reiterated its Stage One proposals for Redhill and Reigate. It proposed that one division should comprise Merstham and Redhill East wards, and the other Reigate Hill and Redhill West wards. It argued that Merstham and Reigate Hill have different "geography, population density and character".

124 The Reigate Society supported our draft recommendation to combine the Redhill wards and suggested that Redhill Central division might be renamed Redhill division. It also supported our proposal to link Reigate Hill and Merstham. However, it reiterated its Stage One proposals for the area to the south of Reigate, arguing that Reigate and Redhill "have suburbs and associated communities to the south". It argued that Reigate Central and South Park & Woodhatch wards should be combined in a Reigate South division, while Meadvale & St Johns and Earlswood & Whitebushes wards should be combined in a Redhill South division. Should we decide to endorse our draft recommendations for Reigate North division, it argued that it should be renamed Merstham & Reigate Hill or Merstham & Reigate North and that Reigate South division should be renamed Earlswood and Reigate South division, in order to best reflect the communities involved.

125 Under the Reigate Society's proposals, four divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average, with two divisions varying by more than 20 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality would remain relatively stable over the next five years, with four divisions continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average and one continuing to vary by more than 20 per cent. All the proposed divisions would be coterminous with ward boundaries.

126 Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council opposed our proposal for Horley West division, arguing that this division would have worse electoral equality than the existing division. It proposed that the boundary of Salfords and Sidlow parish should form the northern boundary of this division. We received a representation from two local residents proposing that those parts of Orpin Road and Nutfield Road that are included in South Merstham parish, but in Redhill ward, should be included in a division with the remainder of Merstham.

127 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we are content to endorse our draft recommendations for the borough as final, with changes to three of the proposed division titles. We note that Reigate & Banstead Borough Council opposed our recommendations for Reigate and Redhill. However, given that our proposals also received considerable support, particularly regarding Redhill Central division, we have not been persuaded to move away from our recommendations. We note that the Reigate Society argued for the rearrangement of divisions in the south of Reigate. However, as this would involve combining wards which share few or no transport links, we do not consider these proposals would improve upon our recommendations. Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council proposed that the whole of the parish should be included in a single division. However, they did not provide convincing argumentation in support of this proposal and we do not consider that the reduction in coterminosity that would result from adopting this proposal is warranted. Also, we are not persuaded to put forward a non-coterminous division as proposed by two local residents to address an anomaly at parish level in Reigate North division. The Reigate Society proposed alternative names for the Redhill and Reigate divisions and we have been persuaded to adopt their suggestions that Redhill Central division be renamed Redhill, Reigate North division be renamed Merstham & Reigate Hill, and Reigate South division be renamed Earlswood & Reigate South in order to better reflect the composite communities of these divisions.

## **Runnymede borough**

128 At present Runnymede borough is represented by five county councillors serving the five divisions of 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.

129 At Stage One, 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 a new Englefield Green division. It put forward a Foxhills & Virginia Water division which would comprise 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”.

130 The Labour Party, Englefield Green Conservative Association and Runnymede Borough Council supported the County Council’s Stage One proposals for Runnymede. Runnymede Borough Council also 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”.

131 The five county councillors who represent Runnymede agreed with the proposal of the County Council at Stage One. 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 the grounds of electoral equality. 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 supported these proposals. 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 existing polling districts, where possible, for ease of administration and to maximise turnout.

132 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we noted that the County Council’s Stage One proposals for Runnymede received general support and we were content to adopt their proposals as our draft recommendations. The borough merits six councillors; therefore we were content that the representation of the borough should be increased by one. We recognised 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 considered 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.

133 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. Two of the six divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

134 At Stage Three, the County Council, the Labour Party and Runnymede Borough Council supported our proposals for Runnymede subject to the clarification of the boundary between Englefield Green and Egham Hythe & Thorpe divisions. The County Council noted that there was a mistake in their Stage One proposals and put forward an amendment to the boundary between Englefield Green and Egham Hythe & Thorpe divisions at Stage Three. This amendment

does not affect the division electorates. Egham Residents Association supported increasing the representation of the district but it opposed our proposal to divide the town of Egham between divisions, arguing that there are strong community ties within the town which should be respected.

135 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have noted the general support received for our draft recommendations and we have not been persuaded to move away from our proposals in our final recommendations, subject to the amendments put forward by the County Council. The County Council's proposals were generally accepted at Stage One, under which the electorate figures remain correct for the amended boundary put forward at Stage Three, and given that the Borough Council also put forward this modification, we are content to amend the boundary between Englefield Green and Egham Hythe & Thorpe divisions. We consider that this would receive local support and we are content to incorporate this modification in our final recommendations. We have not been persuaded to move away from our proposal to divide the town of Egham between divisions in the face of opposition from Egham Residents' Association. We received considerable support for our proposals for Runnymede at Stage One and Stage Three and, in drawing up our draft recommendations we considered the options available and considered that our proposals offered the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

## **Spelthorne borough**

136 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.

137 At Stage One, the County Council proposed that Spelthorne borough should be represented by six county councillors rather than seven. 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.

138 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 the southern 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 acknowledge 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. We received no further representations with regard to Spelthorne borough at Stage One.

139 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we considered 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 we adopted it as our draft recommendation. Under an 80-member council the borough merits seven councillors; therefore the County Council's six-member scheme offered inaccurate representation. While we recognised that the Labour Party's scheme would secure poor coterminosity, 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 considered that it would not be possible to create more coterminous divisions without having a significantly detrimental effect on electoral equality.

140 Under our draft recommendations 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.

141 At Stage Three, the County Council proposed a new scheme of divisions for Spelthorne. It proposed that Ashford East division should comprise Ashford Common ward, the eastern part of Ashford East ward, and that part of Laleham & Shepperton Green ward comprising Charlton village and the southern part of Ashford Common. It proposed that Ashford West division should include Ashford Town ward with the remainder of Ashford East ward and the south western part of Ashford North & Stanwell South ward. Its proposed Laleham & Shepperton Green division would combine Riverside ward with the remainder of Laleham & Shepperton Green ward, while Shepperton division would combine Halliford & Sunbury West and Shepperton Town wards. It proposed that Staines division should combine Staines South ward with that part of Staines ward to the south of the A30 and that Stanwell division should comprise Stanwell North ward, and the remainder of Ashford North & Stanwell South and Staines wards. Finally, it proposed that Sunbury division should comprise Sunbury East and Sunbury Common wards. It argued that this scheme "better reflects the boundaries between Staines and Ashford", while also improving coterminosity and electoral equality.

142 Under the County Council's proposal no divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent in 1999 or 2004 and two of the proposed seven divisions would be coterminous with district wards.

143 The Labour Party supported our draft recommendations for Spelthorne in general and argued that the proposed Stanwell & Stanwell Moor division recognises the "natural community" in this area. It opposed the County Council's Stage Three proposals to include part of Staines in a Stanwell division, arguing that this part of Staines is "geographically separated from Stanwell

by substantial distance and major reservoirs” and has “entirely different socio-economic characteristics”. However, it put forward alternative arrangements for Laleham & Shepperton and Sunbury Common & Ashford Common divisions. It proposed transferring Charlton Village from Sunbury Common & Ashford Common division to Laleham & Shepperton division, arguing that it is rural in character and fits “more conveniently” with the former division. This proposal would have a minimal effect on electoral equality.

144 Spelthorne Borough Council opposed our draft recommendations and supported the County Council’s Stage Three proposals for the borough, with a minor amendment under which the small part of Staines ward, in the proposed Stanwell division, to the north of the A30, should be transferred to the proposed Staines division. It argued that this area has “no natural links” with the Stanwell community. This amendment would have a minimal effect on electoral equality.

145 Spelthorne Liberal Democrats generally supported our proposals for the district. They opposed proposals to link Sunbury Common and Sunbury East wards in a division, arguing that there are no direct transport links between the two, while there are existing community links between Sunbury and Ashford Commons and “better” transport links.

146 A county councillor objected to our proposals for Spelthorne and supported the County Council’s Stage Three proposals with the Borough Council’s proposed amendment. He raised particular concerns about our proposal to divide Charlton Village from Ashford Common ward. He argued that our proposals were “exceedingly divisive of actual communities”, while the County Council’s proposal offered better coterminosity and would put “the communities in Spelthorne back together again”. He argued that Charlton Village is “an entity in its own right” which is situated closer to Ashford Common than anywhere.

147 Having carefully considered the representations received, we propose endorsing our draft recommendations as final. We note that the County Council’s Stage Three proposals would provide improved coterminosity and electoral equality and has been supported by some argumentation regarding community representation. However, we have no evidence that the County Council’s proposals would offer better community representation than our recommendations, and we are particularly concerned about the proposal to link Sunbury Common and Sunbury East wards. These areas lack direct transport links and are divided by the significant boundary of the A316. Given the lack of consultation by the County Council at Stage Three, and given that our draft recommendations received some support, we are not persuaded that the County Council’s proposal would receive greater local support. We recognise that the Labour Party proposed that Charlton Village should be transferred to Laleham & Shepperton division, however, given that the County Council proposed the opposite on the same grounds, we are not convinced that either of these proposals would offer better community representation.

## **Surrey Heath borough**

148 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 the existing 76-member council.

149 At Stage One, 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.

150 The Labour Party supported the County Council’s Stage One proposals for the borough. Surrey Heath Borough Council put forward identical divisions to the County Council for the wards of Bagshot, Chobham and Windlesham and Bisley, Lightwater and West End. It also argued that there was “no suitable alternative” to the County Council’s 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. Bisley Parish Council opposed any enlargement of Chobham & Bisley division, and argued 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.

151 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we noted that while the County Council’s scheme provided good electoral equality and 100 per cent coterminosity, we were concerned about the proposed detached division of Bisley, West End & Lightwater. This division was proposed by the County Council in order 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 endorsed 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 the western part of Lightwater ward to form a 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 was necessary, and we considered that the division of Lightwater ward would create a clear boundary and would involve combining areas that have good community and transport links. While these proposals were not supported by Bisley and West End parishes, the Commission considered that they were the most appropriate in the interests of creating coherent divisions with acceptable levels of electoral equality.

152 Under our draft recommendations for an 80-member council, the electoral variance of three of the proposed divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent. 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.

153 At Stage Three, the County Council and the Labour Party supported our recommendations for Surrey Heath. Surrey Heath Borough Council opposed our proposals for the rural part of the borough, arguing that the division of Lightwater is unacceptable to the local communities affected. It supported the County Council’s Stage One proposal for this area, arguing that the detached division would offer better community representation than our recommendation. It also argued that division titles should include the names of local communities.

154 Chobham Parish Council supported retaining the existing electoral arrangements for the parish, but accepted our recommendations should it be “inevitable”, in preference to the parish being linked with Bagshot. It argued that the link between Chobham, Bisley and West End should be retained, while the combination of Chobham and Bagshot would be “indefensible” given the lack of links and relations between the two areas. It also argued that the name of West End should be included in the division title. West End Parish Council accepted our draft recommendations but argued that the name of West End should be included in the title of Chobham and Bisley division, in order that the residents of the area would identify with the division. Windlesham Parish Council opposed our proposal to divide Lightwater between divisions and supported the County Council’s Stage One proposal for the area. It argued that the division of Lightwater would be “divisive” and would not reflect the “discrete communities” in the area.

155 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we are endorsing our draft recommendations as final, subject to renaming one division. We recognise that our proposals for the rural part of the borough have received opposition at Stage Three, while the County Council’s Stage One proposal has received support. However, given that this proposal would involve the creation of a detached division, the Commission is not persuaded that this would offer improved community representation. We have considered alternative arrangements which would avoid separating district wards, including the existing arrangements, but these would result in extremely poor levels of electoral equality. We do not consider, therefore, that they would offer the optimum balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Also, we note that while Chobham Parish Council supported retaining the existing electoral arrangements for the parish, it accepted our recommendations in preference to the parish being linked with Bagshot, arguing that the link between Chobham, Bisley and West End should be retained. Chobham and West End parish councils argued that the name of West End should be included in the title of Chobham & Bisley division and we consider that this would offer better representation of the constituent area; therefore we propose as part of our final recommendations that Chobham & Bisley division be renamed Bisley, Chobham & West End.

## **Tandridge district**

156 At present the district of Tandridge is represented by six county councillors serving the six divisions of 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 the existing 76-member council.

157 At Stage One, 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.

158 The Labour Party supported the County Council's Stage One proposals for the district. 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. We received no other representations at Stage One.

159 In drawing up our draft recommendations, we considered the representations received at Stage One. The County Council's proposals offered 100 per cent coterminosity, reasonable electoral equality and respected community links and we therefore considered 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 diverged from the existing arrangements, however, given the changes to the district ward boundaries following the Periodic Electoral Review of Tandridge this is inevitable if coterminous divisions are to be created and we considered that our draft recommendations would offer the best balance available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

160 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.

161 At Stage Three the County Council and the Labour Party supported our proposals for Tandridge and we received no further representations. Given this level of support, we propose confirming our draft recommendations as final.

## **Waverley borough**

162 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 the existing 76-member council.

163 At Stage One, 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 (comprising Farnham Castle, Farnham College and Farnham Monks wards), Farnham North ( comprising Farnham Hale & Heath End, Farnham Upper Hale and Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea wards) and Farnham South (comprising Farnham Bourne, Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone and Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge wards). 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.

164 The Labour Party proposed that the representation of Waverley borough should be increased from eight county councillors to nine in order to give the correct level of representation under an 80-member council. It supported the County Council's proposals for Farnham Central, Farnham North, Farnham South and Godalming North divisions. It argued that its proposals reflected the "natural affinities" between rural communities and 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 would be a "compact" division which "reflects natural communities in the area". It argued that Haslemere division should comprise 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.

165 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 at Stage One 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 with 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.

166 South West Surrey Conservative Association supported the County Council's Stage One 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 be contained in a Waverley East division, as proposed by the County Council.

167 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we noted that each of the three schemes shared a number of proposed boundaries. However, we considered that the Labour Party's proposals would offer the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria under an 80-member council and adopted 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 provided reasonable levels of coterminosity and electoral equality and we considered that it reflects community identity. We recognise that the division of borough wards in the borough is necessary in the interests of electoral equality and considered that the Labour Party's proposals offered 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 were content that this would form a clearly identifiable boundary between distinct communities. In the other areas where the Labour Party proposed dividing borough wards they would utilise existing parish boundaries and we were content that these would form strong division boundaries. We noted that the Labour Party scheme and South West Surrey Liberal Democrats' scheme united the urban area of Godalming within a single division, and we were content to endorse this in our draft recommendations.

168 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent in two of the nine divisions. This level of electoral equality would continue over the next five years, varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in two divisions in 2004. Five of the nine divisions would be coterminous with the district wards.

169 At Stage Three, the County Council supported our proposals for Farnham Central, Farnham North and Farnham South divisions, but it proposed changes to our recommendations in the rest of the district. It argued that Cranleigh East, Cranleigh West and Ewhurst wards should be combined with Cranleigh North parish ward from Shamley Green & Cranleigh North ward, and all of Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward, less Alfold parish, in order that the whole of Cranleigh parish would be combined in a single division. It proposed that Godalming North division should comprise Godalming Binscombe, Godalming Charterhouse and Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall wards and the Ockford part of Godalming Central & Ockford ward. Its proposed Godalming South, Milford & Witley division would combine Godalming Holloway and Milford wards with the remainder of Godalming Central & Ockford ward and Witley East parish ward of Witley & Hambledon ward. Its proposed Haslemere division would include Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill and Haslemere East & Grayswood wards with Thursley parish ward of Witley parish of Elstead & Thursley ward. It proposed that Waverley Eastern Villages division should comprise the wards of Blackheath & Wonersh, Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe and Chiddingfold & Dunsfold with Shamley Green parish of Shamley Green & Cranleigh North ward, Alfold parish from Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward and Hambledon parish from Witley & Hambledon ward. It put forward a Waverley Western Villages division, combining Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford and Haslemere Hindhead wards with Elstead and Peper Harow parishes from Elstead & Thursley ward. It argued that this proposal would be preferable to our draft recommendations because it would include the whole of Cranleigh parish within a single division and would reduce the geographical size of the Western Villages division to make it more "manageable".

170 The Labour Party supported our draft recommendations for the district with the exception of the proposed Godalming North division, where it pointed out a discrepancy between the quoted figures and boundary in our draft report. It reiterated its Stage One proposal to include the

eastern part of Godalming Central & Ockford ward in Godalming North division, arguing that these areas are more closely linked.

171 Waverley Borough Council did not comment on our proposals but clarified the conclusions of a recent parish review of Witley Parish Council, which would not affect our recommendations. Guildford Conservative Association proposed that the whole of Cranleigh parish should be included in a single division. Cranleigh Parish Council also proposed uniting the whole of Cranleigh parish in a single division. It argued that, in the interests of the local community, the parish should not be fragmented between divisions. Haslemere Town Council argued that Hindhead should not be separated from the rest of Haslemere due to the historic links between these areas. We received a representation from two county councillors who argued that the Ockford part of Godalming Central & Ockford should be included in a Godalming Town division. They argued that the Waverley West ward has “nothing at all in common” with the Ockford area.

172 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we propose modifying the boundaries of our proposed Cranleigh & Ewhurst and Waverley Eastern Villages divisions, and amending the figures provided for two divisions. We recognise that we have received considerable support for the whole of Cranleigh parish to be united in Cranleigh & Ewhurst division. The modification of the boundaries of Cranleigh & Ewhurst and Waverley Eastern Villages divisions to this effect would have a minimal effect on electoral equality and appears to offer a better representation of community identity, and we are therefore content to adopt these amendments as our final recommendations. We have not been persuaded to adopt the County Council’s Stage Three proposals for the centre of the district, given that they have not received local support and these proposals would result in the creation of two further non-coterminous divisions. We note that Haslemere Town Council argued that Hindhead should be linked with the rest of Haslemere. However, the combination of these areas in a division would have a significant adverse effect on electoral equality which we do not consider warranted in the light of the alternatives that are available. We do not consider that proposals to link the western part of Godalming Central & Ockford ward with Godalming North and the eastern part with wards to the south or west of Godalming would improve on our draft recommendations, given that this would involve creating detached divisions or would have an adverse effect on electoral equality and there are significant road links between the eastern part of the ward and the rest of Godalming. Therefore, we are confirming our recommendations as final for Godalming, with the amendments to the figures put forward by the County Council.

173 Under our final recommendations the level of electoral equality in two divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality would remain relatively stable over the next five years, with two divisions continuing to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average in 2004. Of the nine divisions, five would be coterminous with the borough wards.

## **Woking borough**

174 At present the borough of Woking is represented by six county councillors serving the six divisions of 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 and 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 the existing 76-member council.

175 At Stage One, 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.

176 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 Maybury and Sheerwater ward 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. It argued that any alternatives would involve splitting wards between divisions.

177 Surrey Liberal Democrats supported the alternative scheme proposed by Woking Liberal Democrats at Stage One. Woking Liberal Democrats put forward a six-member proposal for Woking. 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. They proposed 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 also 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.

178 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we considered 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 were 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 levels of electoral equality.

179 Under our draft recommendations, 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.

180 At Stage Three, Surrey County Council supported our proposed boundaries for Woking East, Woking North West, Woking South, Woking South East and Woking West divisions. However, it suggested renaming Woking East, Woking South East, Woking West and Woking North West divisions in view of their constituent areas. It also proposed that Horsell East & Woodham and Horsell West wards should be combined to form an Horsell division, while Goldsworth East and Maybury & Sheerwater wards should form a Woking Central division. It argued that these proposals would ensure that the "distinct community" of Horsell would be combined.

181 Surrey County Labour Party supported our draft recommendations for Woking and noted the particularly positive effect of the proposed increased number of county councillors on the effective representation of the district. Woking Borough Council supported the proposed increased level of representation of the borough on the County Council. Woking Constituency Conservative Association supported our proposal to increase the level of representation on the County Council, but it opposed our proposals for Woking North and Woking North East divisions, arguing that they would "divide the historic and cultural identity of Horsell". It supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the district. The Grove Group opposed our proposal for Horsell and argued that two Horsell wards should be combined in a single division. It argued that the "unnatural combinations" we proposed for the northern Woking divisions would be "contrary to community interests".

182 A county councillor supported the County Council's proposal for Woking. A further county councillor opposed our proposal to divide the two Horsell wards between divisions and supported the County Council's proposal for Woking. He argued that its proposed Woking Central ward is "physically formed between the main railway and the Basingstoke Canal". Another county councillor supported the County Council's proposals for Horsell and Woking Central divisions, while supporting our recommendations for Woking West division. She argued that this division respected "community ties" and would combine well-connected areas, being "very conducive to effective and convenient local government". However, she supported the County Council's proposal to rename this division St John's and Brookwood, in order to reflect the two "main and distinct local communities therein". A borough councillor opposed our proposal to divide Horsell between divisions, supporting the County Council's Stage One proposal to divide Maybury & Sheerwater ward between divisions. He argued that Horsell is a community while there is "no community of interest" between Sheerwater and the parish of Woodham. He added that Sheerwater and Maybury are "physically separated" by the London to Southampton railway line.

183 We received 14 representations from local residents opposing our proposal to separate Horsell between divisions. They argued that the area has a strong community identity and should be represented by a single councillor. One of the residents argued that the residents of East Horsell have no “community connection nor interest” with Maybury and Sheerwater, looking instead to Horsell village for their community interests. One of the residents proposed that the Woodham part of East Horsell & Woodham ward should be linked with Maybury & Sheerwater ward, if necessary, but that Horsell should remain combined and separate.

184 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we are content to propose replacing the proposed Woking North and Woking North East divisions and renaming four of the other divisions. We note that our proposals received some support; however, we recognise that we received a large number of representations opposing our proposal to divide Horsell between divisions. The majority of these submissions also offered evidence in support of the County Council’s Stage Three proposals for the divisions. Therefore, we propose adopting the proposal to combine Horsell East & Woodham and Horsell West wards in a Horsell division, and Goldsworth East and Maybury & Sheerwater wards in a Woking Central division. These changes would have a minimal effect on electoral equality. We also propose adopting the County Council suggestions that Woking East division be renamed Byfleet; Woking South East division be renamed Pyrford; Woking West division be renamed St Johns & Brookwood; and Woking North West division be renamed Knaphill as we consider that these division names would offer a clearer reflection of the communities involved.

185 Under our final recommendations, two of the proposed divisions would have electoral variances of more than 10 per cent from the county average. This level of electoral equality would continue, with two divisions continuing to have electoral variances of more than 10 per cent in 2004. All seven divisions would be coterminous with the borough wards.

## Conclusions

186 Having considered all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 76 to 80, serving 80 divisions;
- changes should be made to the boundaries of 64 of the 76 existing divisions.

187 We have decided to substantially endorse our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- in Guildford borough we are amending the boundary between Guildford South and Guildford West divisions as proposed by the County Council, and we propose that Guildford Central and Guildford South divisions be renamed Guildford South East and Guildford South West respectively;
- in Mole Valley district we are adopting the County Council’s proposed Dorking Hills and Dorking Rural divisions and propose that Dorking South division be renamed Dorking & the Holmwoods;

- in Reigate & Banstead borough we propose that the divisions of Redhill Central, Reigate North and Reigate South be renamed Redhill, Merstham & Reigate Hill and Earlswood & Reigate South respectively;
- in Surrey Heath borough we propose that Chobham & Bisley division be renamed Bisley, Chobham & West End;
- in Waverley borough we are amending the boundaries of Cranleigh & Ewhurst and Waverley Eastern Villages divisions in order to include the whole of Cranleigh parish in Cranleigh & Ewhurst division;
- in Woking borough we are adopting the County Council's proposed Horsell and Woking Central divisions, and propose that Woking East, Woking North West, Woking South East and Woking West divisions be renamed Byfleet, Knaphill, Pyrford and St Johns & Brookwood respectively.

188 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

*Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors / divisions	76	80	76	80
Average number of electors per councillor	10,651	10,116	10,849	10,304
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	34	24	39	23
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	12	3	8	1

189 As shown in Figure 4, our final recommendations for Surrey County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 20 per cent from the county average from 12 to three. By 2004 only one division is forecast to vary by more than 20 per cent from the average. Our final recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

**Final Recommendation**

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

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

190 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act. The Schedule 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. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Godalming and Windlesham to reflect the proposed county divisions in those areas.

191 The parish of Godalming is currently represented by 20 councillors serving five wards, each represented by four parish councillors. As a result of our proposal to divide Godalming Central & Ockford ward between divisions, we propose warding Godalming parish further. We propose that the existing Godalming Central & Ockford parish ward should be divided into the new parish wards of Godalming Central and Ockford in line with the proposed division boundaries, while the remaining parish wards should retain their existing boundaries and number of councillors. As a result of the allocated proportion of parish electorate, both new parish wards would be entitled to two councillors.

**Final Recommendation**

Godalming Parish Council should be divided into six parish wards with Godalming Binscombe, Godalming Charterhouse, Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall, Godalming Holloway each being represented by four councillors and Godalming Central and Godalming Ockford wards each being represented by two councillors as illustrated in Appendix A and on the large map at the back of the report.

192 Windlesham Parish Council is currently represented by 18 parish councillors serving three wards. As a result of our proposal to divide Lightwater between divisions, we propose re-warding the parish ward of Lightwater in line with our proposed division boundaries. The boundaries of the new wards should reflect the proposed changes to the county divisions. Bagshot and Windlesham parish wards should retain their existing boundaries and number of councillors. The existing parish ward of Lightwater should be divided into Lightwater East and Lightwater West

wards, to be represented by four and two councillors respectively, in line with their share of the parish electorate.

**Final Recommendation**

Windlesham Parish Council should be divided into four parish wards: Bagshot and Windlesham wards should each be represented by six councillors, Lightwater East ward should be represented by four councillors and Lightwater West ward should be represented by two councillors. The parish ward boundaries of Lightwater East and Lightwater West should be modified to reflect the proposed division boundaries as illustrated in Appendix A and on the large map at the back of the report.

## 6 NEXT STEPS

193 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

194 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an order. Such an order will not be made earlier than six weeks from the date that our recommendations are submitted to the Secretary of State.

195 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU



## APPENDIX A

### **Final 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 West 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 Bisley, Chobham & West End 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 West 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 Bisley, Chobham & West End and Windlesham Divisions*

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

## APPENDIX B

### Draft Recommendations for Surrey (February 2000)

Figure B1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH</b>	
1 Cobham	Cobham & Downside ward; Cobham Fairmile ward; Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon ward (part)
2 Hersham	<i>Unchanged</i> (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
<b>EPSOM &amp; EWELL BOROUGH</b>	
10 Epsom & Ewell North	<i>Unchanged</i> (Auriol ward; Cuddington ward; Ewell Court ward)
11 Epsom & Ewell North East	<i>Unchanged</i> (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
<b>GUILDFORD BOROUGH</b>	
15 Ash	Ash Vale ward (Ash Vale parish ward of Ash parish); Ash Wharf ward (Ash Wharf parish ward of Ash parish)
16 Guildford Central	Christchurch ward; Holy Trinity ward
17 Guildford East	Burpham ward; Mellow 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

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
21 Horsleys	<i>Unchanged</i> (Clandon & Horsley ward (part – the parishes of East Horsley and West Horsley); Effingham ward (Effingham parish); Lovelace ward (the parishes of Ockham, Ripley and Wisley))
22 Shalford	Ash South & Tongham ward (Ash South parish ward of Ash parish and Tongham parish); Pilgrims ward (the parishes of Puttenham, Seale & Sands, Shackleford and Wanborough); 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 (Send parish); Shalford ward (part – Chilworth parish ward of Shalford parish); Tillingbourne ward (the parishes of Albury, St Martha and Shere)
24 Worplesdon	<i>Unchanged</i> (Normandy ward (Normandy parish); Pirbright ward (Pirbright parish); Worplesdon ward (Worplesdon parish))
<b>MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT</b>	
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 (Headley parish); Brockham, Betchworth & Buckland ward (the parishes of Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland); Dorking North ward; Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham ward (Mickleham parish)
28 Dorking Rural	Beare Green ward (Beare Green parish ward of Capel parish); Capel, Leigh & Newdigate ward (the parishes of Leigh and Newdigate and Capel parish ward of Capel parish); Charlwood ward (Charlwood parish); Leith Hill ward (Wotton parish and the Northern parish ward of Abinger parish and Coldharbour parish ward of Capel parish); Okewood ward (Ockley parish and Southern parish ward of Abinger parish); Westcott ward
29 Dorking South	Dorking South ward; Holmwoods ward (Holmwood parish)
30 Leatherhead & Fetcham East	Fetcham East ward; Leatherhead North ward; Leatherhead South ward
<b>REIGATE &amp; BANSTEAD BOROUGH</b>	
31 Banstead East	<i>Unchanged</i> (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 (the parish wards of Horley North Central and Horley South Central of Horley parish); Horley East ward (the parish wards of Horley North East and Horley South East of Horley parish)
35 Horley West	Horley West ward (the parish wards of Horley North and Horley North West of Horley parish); Salfords & Sidlow ward (No.1 and No.2 parish wards of Salfords & Sidlow parish)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
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 (No.3 parish ward of Salfords & Sidlow parish); South Park & Woodhatch ward
<b>RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</b>	
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)
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
<b>SPELTHORNE BOROUGH</b>	
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
<b>SURREY HEATH BOROUGH</b>	
53 Camberley East	<i>Unchanged</i> (Old Dean ward; St Pauls ward; Town ward)
54 Camberley West	Frimley ward; St Michaels ward; Watchetts ward
55 Chobham & Bisley	Bisley ward (Bisley parish); Chobham ward (Chobham parish); Lightwater ward (part – the proposed Lightwater West parish ward of Windlesham parish); West End ward (West End parish)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
56 Frimley Green & Mytchett	<i>Unchanged</i> (Frimley Green ward; Mytchett & Deepcut ward)
57 Heatherside & Parkside	Heatherside ward; Parkside ward
58 Windlesham	Bagshot ward (Bagshot parish ward of Windlesham parish); Lightwater ward (part – the proposed Lightwater East parish ward of Windlesham parish)); Windlesham ward (Windlesham parish ward of Windlesham parish)
<b>TANDRIDGE DISTRICT</b>	
59 Caterham Hill	<i>Unchanged</i> (Chaldon ward; Portley ward; Queens Park ward; Westway ward)
60 Caterham Valley	Harestone ward; Valley ward; Whyteleafe ward; Woldingham ward
61 Godstone	<i>Unchanged</i> (Bletchingley & Nutfield ward (the parishes of Bletchingley and Nutfield); Godstone ward (Godstone parish))
62 Lingfield	<i>Unchanged</i> (Burstow & Horne ward (the parishes of Burstow and Horne); Dormansland & Felcourt ward (the parish wards of Dormansland, Dormans Park, Felcourt and Haxted of Lingfield & Dormansland parish); Felbridge ward (Felbridge parish); Lingfield & Crowhurst ward (Crowhurst parish and Lingfield parish ward of Lingfield & Dormansland parish))
63 Oxted	<i>Unchanged</i> (Limpsfield ward (Limpsfield parish); Oxted North & Tandridge ward (Tandridge parish and North parish ward of Oxted parish); Oxted South ward (South parish ward of Oxted parish))
64 Warlingham	Tatsfield & Titsey ward (the parishes of Tatsfield and Titsey); Warlingham East & Chelsham & Farleigh ward (Chelsham & Farleigh parish); Warlingham West ward
<b>WAVERLEY BOROUGH</b>	
65 Cranleigh & Ewhurst	Alfold, Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – Cranleigh Rural parish ward of Cranleigh parish and Ellens Green parish ward of Ewhurst parish); Cranleigh East ward (Cranleigh East parish ward of Cranleigh parish); Cranleigh West ward (Cranleigh West parish ward of Cranleigh parish); Ewhurst ward (Ewhurst parish ward of Ewhurst parish)
66 Farnham Central	Farnham Castle ward (Farnham Castle parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham College ward (Farnham College parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Monks ward (Farnham Monks parish ward of Farnham parish)
67 Farnham North	Farnham Hale & Heath End ward (Farnham Hale & Heath End parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Upper Hale ward (Farnham Upper Hale parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward (Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward)
68 Farnham South	Farnham Bourne ward (Farnham Bourne parish ward of Farnham parish); Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone ward (Farnham Wrecclesham East & Boundstone parish ward of Farnham ward); Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge ward (Farnham Wrecclesham West & Rowledge parish ward of Farnham ward)

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
69 Godalming North	Godalming Binscome ward (Godalming Binscombe parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part – the proposed Godalming Central parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Charterhouse ward (Godalming Charterhouse parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall ward (Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall parish ward of Godalming parish)
70 Godalming South, Milford & Witley	Godalming Central & Ockford ward (part – the proposed Ockford parish ward of Godalming parish); Godalming Holloway ward (Godalming Holloway parish ward of Godalming parish); Milford ward (Milford parish ward of Witley parish); Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Witley East parish ward of Witley parish)
71 Haslemere	Haslemere, Critchmere & Shottermill ward (the parish wards of Critchmere and Shottermill of Haslemere parish); Haslemere North & Grayswood ward (the parish wards of Haslemere North & Grayswood and Haslemere South of Haslemere parish)
72 Waverley Eastern Villages	Alfold Cranleigh Rural & Ellens Green ward (part – Alfold parish and Elmbridge parish ward of Cranleigh parish); Blackheath & Wonersh ward (the parish wards of Blackheath and Wonersh of Wonersh parish); Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe ward (the parishes of Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe); Chiddingfold & Dunsfold ward (the parishes of Chiddingfold and Dunsfold); Cranleigh North & Shamley Green ward (part – Shamley Green parish ward of Wonersh parish); Witley & Hambledon ward (part – Hambledon parish)
73 Waverley Western Villages	Elstead & Thursley ward (the parishes of Elstead, Peper Harow and Thursley and Witley West parish ward of Witley parish); Frensham Dockenfield & Tilford ward (the parishes of Dockenfield, Frensham and Tilford); Haslemere Hindhead ward (Hindhead parish ward of Haslemere parish)
<b>WOKING BOROUGH</b>	
74 Woking East	Byfleet ward (Byfleet parish); 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

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

Figure B2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations Surrey

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH</b>					
1 Cobham	1	10,700	6	10,768	5
2 Hersham	1	9,143	-10	8,888	-14
3 Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	9,321	8	9,615	7
4 Molesey East & Esher	1	9,160	-9	9,116	-11
5 Molesey West	1	9,578	-5	9,622	-7
6 The Dittons	1	10,736	6	11,589	13
7 Walton	1	10,718	6	10,829	5
8 Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,800	7	10,930	6
9 Weybridge	1	10,360	2	10,459	2
<b>EPSOM AND EWELL BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>GUILDFORD BOROUGH</b>					
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	11,068	7
19 Guildford South	1	9,829	-4	8,421	-18
20 Guildford West	1	9,783	-4	11,284	10
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

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT</b>					
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
<b>REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>SPELTHORNE BOROUGH</b>					
46 Ashford	1	10,548	4	10,527	2
47 Laleham & Shepperton	1	10,305	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

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
51 Sunbury	1	10,656	5	10,226	-1
52 Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	9,896	-2	10,114	-2
<b>SURREY HEATH BOROUGH</b>					
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
<b>TANDRIDGE DISTRICT</b>					
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
<b>WAVERLEY BOROUGH</b>					
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
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
<b>WOKING BOROUGH</b>					
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

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (1999)</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2004)</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
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
<b>Totals</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>808,657</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>824,031</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,108</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,300</b>	<b>-</b>

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

*Note: 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 county differ marginally from the totals in Figures 2 and B2; however, we would expect this to have a minimal impact on variances.*

