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# Introduction

## In May 2022, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (“LGBCE” or “the Commission”) announced that it would be conducting an electoral review of Surrey County Council. The review was triggered by the fact that it had been 12 years since our last electoral review in 2010.

## The Review began in May 2022 with an initial consultation on the overall council size. Surrey County Council submitted a detailed response to this consultation, considering each of the Commission’s criteria in turn, and recommended that the current council size of 81 Members be retained. In commencing phase two of the Review, the Commission has confirmed that, in line with the Council’s own view, it is minded to recommend retaining the Council’s current size of 81 Members and therefore the County Council’s response to this phase begins at this point.

# Guidance on proposing a pattern of divisions

## In phase two, all interested parties (including the County Council) are invited to put forward proposals on the detailed electoral arrangements given the suggested council size.

## In terms of evidence, the Commission has three statutory criteria:

* **Electoral equality.** Each Councillor should represent as near as possible to the same number of electors.
* **Community identity and interests**. Division boundaries should recognise and support strong community links, such as parishes, shared facilities and transport links.
* **Effective and convenient local government.** Divisions should be coherent with good internal communication links. For example, ensuring the Member can effectively travel to all parts of his/her division.

## In addition, no division can cross a district or borough boundary and therefore must be contained entirely within one of the 11 districts and boroughs within Surrey.

## The Commission also makes it clear that they cannot consider any of the following as evidence:

* Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries
* Current County divisions
* Local political implications of recommendations
* School catchment areas
* Postcodes or addresses

# The Council’s Approach

## In May 2022, the Council set up a cross-party working group to lead on its response to the Electoral Review. This working group co-ordinated the Council’s response on Council Size, endorsed formally by the County Council on 13 December 2023, and has continued in this co-ordination role for phase two of the Review.

## As each division must be contained wholly within a district/borough area, the working group felt that it was appropriate to focus on each district and borough area discretely in the first instance. To ensure that any proposals put forward were fully informed by local knowledge, meetings were held with each local grouping of county councillors to gather their views on how best to arrange divisions within their district or borough area given the Commission’s criteria.

## In putting forward proposals, local Members were asked to give consideration to the Commission’s criteria and to work within a 10% variance from the average electorate per division. Working within these boundaries, Members were asked to put forward a pattern of divisions that would best support strong community identity and used easily identifiable boundaries – such as parishes, major roads/railways and rivers. However, it is recognised that each local area is different and both the geography and pattern of communities can, in exceptional circumstances, make this 10% variance difficult to achieve. In such instances, local Members have provided additional evidence to explain the detrimental impact of altering any proposed divisions to bring them within the tolerance range for electoral equality.

## Where there was unanimous local agreement for a pattern of divisions that met the criteria, this has been automatically adopted as the Council’s response as it was felt that local Members are best placed to advise on this. Where local agreement did not prove possible, the task group looked at all the views put forward and recommended the pattern it felt best met the Commission’s criteria. If there wasn’t a unanimous agreement on one option, the task group agreed to present multiple options.

## Using this bottom-up approach, the proposals put forward by the County Council have been locally drafted and moderated for consistency by the cross-party working group.

# Recommended Pattern of Divisions

**Electorate Forecasts**

## When making their recommendations, the Commission must have regard to the likely increase, decrease or movement in electorate over a 5-year period and, therefore, the Council has used forecasted electorate numbers for 2029 in putting forward its proposals.

## The LGBCE methodology for generating the polling district electoral forecasts was:

## **Council Size**

## As stated in the introduction, the Commission confirmed in February 2023 that it was minded to recommend that Surrey County Council retains the current size of 81 Members and advised that the Council begin its work by looking at how this would be distributed across the 11 District and Borough areas to ensure the greatest level of electoral equality.

## Based on forecasts for 2029, Surrey will have an electorate of 964,825. With a Council size of 81, this equates to an average electorate of 11,911 per division. Using the 2029 forecasts, the position can be summarised as follows:

## 

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electorate 2022 total** | **Electorate 2029 total** | **Increase** | **Increase %** | **Current number of members** | **Councillors required to meet average electorate per councillor\*** |
| **Elmbridge** | **100,820** | **108,173** | **7,353** | **7%** | **9** | **9.1** |
| **Epsom & Ewell** | **58,567** | **63,309** | **4,742** | **8%** | **5** | **5.3** |
| **Mole Valley** | **67,674** | **76,015** | **8,341** | **12%** | **6** | **6.4** |
| **Reigate & Banstead** | **107,561** | **118,944** | **11,383** | **11%** | **10** | **10.0** |
| **Runnymede** | **61,125** | **66,756** | **5,631** | **9%** | **6** | **5.6** |
| **Spelthorne** | **76,527** | **82,143** | **5,616** | **7%** | **7** | **6.9** |
| **Surrey Heath** | **67,873** | **73,830** | **5,957** | **9%** | **6** | **6.2** |
| **Tandridge** | **65,461** | **70,760** | **5,299** | **8%** | **6** | **5.9** |
| **Waverley** | **95,373** | **100,246** | **4,873** | **5%** | **9** | **8.4** |
| **Woking** | **74,031** | **80,691** | **6,660** | **9%** | **7** | **6.8** |
| **Guildford** | **101,982** | **123,958** | **21,976** | **22%** | **10** | **10.4** |
| **Totals** | **876,994** | **964,825** | **87,831** | **10%\*\*** | **81** | **81** |

**\*** (overall electorate 2029/Avg electorate per councillor (11,911).

\*\* Average % increase across all D&Bs.

## As stated above, ideally each division would represent an electorate of 11,911. However, given that divisions cannot cross district and borough boundaries, this is not possible. Therefore, the proposal is to aim for as close as possible to electoral equality within each district and borough area (i.e. divide the total electorate for the district/borough area by the number of divisions proposed). If this were achieved, all 81 divisions would then fall within the 10% tolerance level the Commission is looking for.

## **Pattern of Divisions**

## The Council’s proposed pattern of divisions includes 81 single Member divisions distributed across the district and borough areas in line with the above table. It should be recognised that no solution will be perfect nor will it be unanimously accepted as the criteria, in some cases, compete with each other and a solution which provides good electoral equality may not always best support the local communities. This proposal seeks to provide the best balance against all three of the Commission’s key criteria.

## The tables on the following pages provide the detail for each division. As stated above, in some areas the task group has presented a number of options to the Comission, rather than one final scheme. Maps for each area are included as an Appendix.

## The Council asks the Commission to strongly consider these in their deliberations during phase two of the review and is happy to provide further evidence to support these proposals if required.

**Additional Comments**

## The review of Surrey County Council has taken place at a time where a number of Surrey’s District and Borough Councils are at different stages of their own reviews. This has made the review more difficult, for example through data being provided to us based upon old polling districts that no longer exist. Although the Commission states that the polling districts are only small blocks of data and old/new polling districts work equally as well, this has not been our experience in practice. For example, old polling districts often tie in with old wards and we were provided maps in some areas with both, making it harder to achieve co-terminosity between borough/district wards and county divisions. In future we suggest that upper-tier councils should be reviewed at a time where all district and borough reviews in the area have been completed.

## The timing of the phase two submission has also proved difficult with the deadline falling at the same time as local elections. The Council has relied heavily on the co-operation and support of Election Services Managers throughout this process and, quite understandably, in the run up to local elections this has placed additional pressure on Election Services managers at a very busy time. In some instances, it has simply not been possible to engage with local Election Services team at this busy time and therefore some of our proposals include estimated rather than exact electorate figures.

# ELMBRIDGE

For Elmbridge, the proposal is for nine divisions representing an electorate of 108,173. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 12,019.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott** | 12,660 | 6% | Ths division encompasses the three separate communities of Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott.  It is suggested that the northern boundary of this division is amended. As outlined in the attached map, the new boundary would sit where the northern part of Claygate Lane meets Manor Road North. Along Manor Road North, the East/West boundary would see Dene Gardens moved into The Dittons electoral division, alongside the few closes to its East (Greenwood Close, Orchard Avenue, Manordene Close, and Greenwood Close). The North-Western boundary would remain as is at the railway line which forms a fairly clear ‘natural’ border. This would move roughly half the electorate from polling district BC into The Dittons division. This would have a positive impact on electoral equality, with The Dittons moving to 7% from 4% and Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott to 6% from 10%.  As well as improving the electoral equality between the two divisions, this change also makes sense in relation to community identity. Both local Members have stated that residents in this area tend to identify with The Dittons and many already contact the local councillor for that division with casework.  Therefore, the eastern boundary follows the County Border with Kingston upon Thames while the northern boundary is amended as set out above. To the south, the boundary is defined by the border with Mole Valley going westwards to Chobham railway where Blundell Lane crosses before following the railway north along the eastern boundary until it meets and follows Claygate Parish boundary before following the western edge of Littleworth Common and the Golf Course back to the railway in the north. |
| **Cobham** | 11,213 | -6% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The southern and western boundaries of the division of Cobham follow the Borough borders with Mole Valley and Guildford. The northern boundary follows the River Mole in the west near to the A3 which it follows until it meets the Waterloo to Cobham railway in the east. The eastern boundary then follows the railway south to where Blundell Lane crosses the railway and then goes eastwards to the border of Elmbridge.  The village of Cobham is a focal point for this division, which is represented by a number of established civic groups and residents’ associations. |
| **Hersham** | 11,517 | -3% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division’s boundary follows the Waterloo to Woking railway line which separates Hersham from Walton to the north, from the River Mole in the east to the A317. The western boundary line follows the A317 onto the B365, Seven Hills Road, a main road which marks the dividing line between Hersham and Weybridge. When the boundary line meets the A3, it moves south-west and then follows the line of the River Mole all the way back to the north-eastern corner where it meets the railway. |
| **The Dittons** | 12,730 | 4% | The division of the Dittons consists of three distinct communities – Thames Ditton, Weston Green and Long Ditton – which each have active residents’ associations.  The eastern boundary of the division is the County Border, following the River Thames as it heads north  The western boundary follows Hampton Court Way until the junction with Ember Court Road, then follows Ember Court Road, into Ember Lane and Station Road until it reaches the London to Woking railway line. The southern boundary has been amended – as set out in the description for Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Esher above. |
| **East Molesey and Esher** | 11,821 | -1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The north of the division follows the County Border (the River Thames) before heading south between East Molesey and Thames Ditton on the A309 and then along the B3379 Ember Lane, providing good road links between the northern and southern parts of the division. The border then follows south between Esher and Claygate to the southern boundary of the division which follows the A3, the main arterial road in the area, separating Esher from Oxshott. Finally, the western boundary follows the River Mole from the south to East Molesey and then the main roads between East and West Molesey - Seymour Road, Pemberton Road, onto Vine Road and Hurst Lane – back to the County Border. |
| **West Molesey** | 10,662 | -10% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of West Molesey is defined on three sides by natural features. To the north, it follows the River Thames (which is also the County Border), to the west, the edge of Bessborough Reservoir and to the south, the Dead River. The eastern boundary marks the line between East and West Molesey, two distinct communities, using the main roads of Seymour Road, Pemberton Road, onto Vine Road and Hurst Lane. |
| **Walton** | 12,197 | 2% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Walton follows the County Border to the north from the edge of Bessborough Reservoir to Walton Bridge. It then follows the edge of Walton town, along Walton Bridge Street, Hepburn Way onto the High Street. The southern boundary continues through Walton , skirting the back of Osborne Road, Highfield Road, Esher Avenue to Sidney Road, heading south to Rodney Road and north east to Ambleside avenue, Rydens Road, Normanhurst Road and around the edge of the Rugby Ground to Molesey Road, which it follows south to the railway and then east to the River Mole. The eastern boundary follows the River Mole until it meets the Dead River and then follows the Dead River and the main roads along the reservoirs back to the County Border. |
| **Weybridge** | 13,160 | 10% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The northern boundary of the division of Weybridge follows the River Thames (which also marks the County Border) before moving south along the line of the River Wey and the border between Elmbridge and Woking. When the border meets the A3, the southern boundary follows this major arterial road before heading north along Seven Hills Road which divides Weybridge from Hersham to the West.  The division represents two distinct communities, those around Weybridge High Street and the St George’s Hill community. |
| **Walton South and Oatlands** | 12,213 | 3% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The southern boundary of the division of Walton South and Oatlands follows the railway line from the A317 in the west to Molesey Road in the east. The northern boundary follows the edge of Walton town, along Walton Bridge Street, Hepburn Way onto the High Street. It then continues through Walton, skirting the back of Osborne Road, Highfield Road, Esher Avenue to Sidney Road, heading south to Rodney Road and north east to Ambleside Avenue, Rydens Road, Normanhurst Road and around the edge of the Rugby Ground to Molesey Road, which it follows south to the railway. The north-western boundary runs along Broad Water and then skirts round the south of Oatlands until the junction with the railway. |

# EPSOM AND EWELL

For Epsom and Ewell, the proposal is for five divisions representing an electorate of 63,309. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 12,662.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington** | 12,827 | 8% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  Within the division there are three distinct and recognisable communities (Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington), each having their own Residents’ Association.  Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington has clearly defined boundaries. The north-western boundary borders the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames. The north-eastern boundary borders the London Borough of Sutton. The eastern boundary is defined by the Epsom-Waterloo railway line and the railway bridge across the A240. The western boundary is defined by the Hogsmill River and is a natural boundary. |
| **Stoneleigh, Ewell Village and Nonsuch**  ***Currently known as Ewell*** | 13,037 | 9% | There are no suggested boundary changes to this division.  It is suggested that the name of the division is changed to more accurately describe the distinct communities it represents.  The proposed division of Ewell borders the Borough of Sutton in the east and Reigate in the south, with the northern boundary for this division being the Epsom to Waterloo railway line and the western boundary the border between Ewell and Epsom. |
| **Epsom Town & Downs** | 12,810 | 8% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Epsom Town and Downs borders Reigate and Banstead in the east and Mole Valley in the south.  The northern boundary goes around the outskirts of Epsom Common and along Dorking Road and the railway line which runs parallel to Epsom High Street and through East Ewell**.**  Whilst there are some areas of crossover with Epsom West, the residential nature of this division means and convergence of services around College ward, means that there are clear community links. |
| **Epsom West** | 12,148 | 2% | Within Epsom, the clearest boundary between the Eastern and Western parts of the town is the railway line. The south-west boundary of the Division is the boundary with Mole Valley. The western boundary is the County Border with the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames (RBK).  There is a proposed change to this division, with part of polling district D (which falls within the Horton Ward and includes the Clarendon Park estate) suggested to move from West Ewell to Epsom West. Not only does improve electoral equality between the two divisions, it also improves co-terminosity with borough wards and means that residents in the Clarendon Park estate will be using a polling station closer to where they live. |
| **West Ewell** | 12,487 | 5% | The northern boundary of this division is the Hogsmill River, the western boundary is the County Border with the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames and the east of West Ewell & Epsom is defined by the Epsom-Wimbledon railway line.  As described above, there is a suggested amendment to the south-west border of this division, with the part of Polling District D which falls within the Horton Ward, suggested to move from West Ewell to Epsom West. This reasons for this move are listed above. |

# GUILDFORD

For Guildford the proposal is for ten divisions representing an electorate of 123,958. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 12,396.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Ash** | 10,845 | 10% | The boundary of Ash is defined by the County Border to the west and the border with Surrey Heath to the north. The eastern boundary is co-terminus with the boundary of Normandy Parish, which has a strong, distinct community.  It is suggested that the southern boundary of Ash is amended, so that the new division incorporates polling district R1, part of the new Ash South ward. This area has clear community links with the rest of Ash and the move will help address electoral equality. Unfortunately, the whole of Ash South ward cannot be moved as this area is heavily populated and it would make Ash division too large. Hence the suggestion to move part of the ward. |
| **Guildford East** | 11,785 | -1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Guildford East encompasses the two district wards of Burpham and Merrow.  These are two separate communities, with their own identities and represented by Merrow Residents’ Association and Burpham Community Association.  The eastern border follows the parish boundaries of West Clandon, Albury and St Martha Parishes, with the western border following Borough ward lines of Burpham and Merrow. The northern border follows the A3 and the River Wey, a natural barrier dividing the community from the northerly parts of Guildford, which are included in the division of Guildford North. |
| **Guildford North** | 12,025 | 1% | The division of Guildford North borders Worplesdon Parish to the north until it meets and follows the River Wey, down to the A3, a major arterial road through Guildford that intersects the community. It follows the A3 until the junction for the A322, another arterial road, which the division boundary follows north.  It is suggested that Poling District J2 moves from Guildford North into Guildford West. This would address the electoral inequality between the two divisions, moving Guildford North to 1% and Guildford West to 5% (when combined with another change, detailed in the description for Guildford West). |
| **Guildford South-East** | TBC | TBC | There is currently a large electoral inequality between Guildford South-East and Guildford South-West. The task group has decided to put forward three different options to address this inequality to the Commission, having felt that all three met the Commission’s criteria in different ways. Maps for each option are provided within the appendix.  Option A: Move part of polling district C4 from Guildford South-West into Guildford South-East, with York Road acting as the boundary between the two. The task group has not been able to gather the exact figures for this option but are aware that it would bring both divisions within tolerance.  Option B: The following roads from polling district C1 remain in Guildford South-West with the remaining roads moving into Guildford South-East**.** These roads encompass a compact residential area near to the Guildford Borough’s new divisional boundary of Onslow Ward.  Farnham Road (both sides)  Wherwell Road  Testard Road  Wodeland Avenue  Nethermount  Annandale Road  Mareschal Road  Mountside  The Mount, including Henley Fort  and  Mount Pleasant  Again, the task group does not have the exact figures for this option but are aware that the move would bring both divisions within tolerance.  Option C: Suggests more of a complete re-draw of both divisions, so that Guildford-South East becomes Guildford Central and Guildford South-West becomes Guildford South. This option improves co-terminosity with the new borough council wards and also addresses electoral inequality with the new divisions at 4% and 8% respectively. |
| **Guildford South-West** | TBC | TBC | See options for Guildford South-East above. |
| **Guildford West** | 12,802 | 7% | The division of Guildford West includes the ward of Westborough, a natural community, and then the area south of Westborough which includes the University campus as well as the area of Manor Park, which is predominantly university residences. Also included in this southern section are the Hospital, the Cathedral, large Tesco store and the Ashenden Estate. There are a number of shared issues between the University, Hospital, Tesco and the residential areas round the Egerton Road area and therefore it is beneficial to have them all within the same division.  There are two suggested changes to this division. Firstly, it is suggested that polling district J2 moves from Guildford North into Guildford West. This would address the electoral inequality between the two divisions.  It also suggested that part of polling district L1 (south of and including Broad Street), moves from Worplesdon into Guildford. This change has been proposed by both local Members as making sense from a community identity perspective. |
| **Horsleys** | 12,921 | 8% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of the Horsleys includes the parishes of East Clandon, Ripley, Ockham, West Horsley, East Horsley and Effingham.  The division is situated in the north-west section of Guildford Borough and is bounded by the Boroughs/Districts of Woking, Elmbridge, and Mole Valley. The M25 runs along this northerly edge which forms a natural break with the Boroughs and Districts mentioned above.  The longest border of the Horsley division is that which adjoins Shere, and this division covers the southern and western flanks of Horsley and precludes drawing electorate from any of the Guildford Borough Town divisions/wards.    East Clandon is a village on Ripley Road, which is an extension of the road which serves HM Prison Send, situated in the division of Horsley. The A246 to the south makes a natural boundary and thereafter the boundary of the division of Shere resumes. |
| **Shalford** | 13,141 | 10% | The division of Shalford currently encompasses the seven parishes of Seale and Sands, Tongham, Wanborough, Puttenham, Shackleford, Compton, Artington and parts of Shalford and Ash Parishes.  A number of housing developments are planned for Shalford and as a result the division now has the biggest projected electoral variance in the county at 32%.  In order to address this variance, it is suggested that the northern boundary is amended, so that polling district R1, part of the new Ash South ward, moves into the Ash division. This area has clear community links with the rest of Ash.  It is also suggested that the Parish of Wansborough is moved into Worplesdon division. The combination of these two moves would bring Shalford’s electoral variance into tolerance at 10%. The rest of the northern boundary remains unchanged.  The southern boundary of Shalford Division is defined by the border with Waverley, with the western boundary following the County Border.  To the east, the boundary follows the Normandy Parish line until it meets the railway, following the railway northwest to the A323, then west (Church Road into Ash Street onto Aldershot Road) until it meets the A331 and the County Border again. |
| **Shere** | 12,198 | 2% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Shere includes the parishes of St Martha, Albury, Shere, West Clandon and Send.  In the far west corner, the division borders the division of Shalford, with Chilworth included in this division, as it is a distinct community in its own right. |
| **Worplesdon** | 11,826 | -7% | The division of Worplesdon currently includes the three parishes of Pirbright, Normandy and Worplesdon, with its border following the parish boundary lines.  All three Parish Councils are active with strong individual identities.  There are two suggested changes to this division. Firstly, it is suggested that the Parish of Wansborough (polling district G5) be moved from Shalford into Worplesdon. This would help address the large electoral variance in the current Shalford Division.  Secondly, it is also suggested that the boundary of the division at the eastern side of Worplesden Parish is amended, so that part of Polling District L1 (from including and south of Broad Street), moves from Worplesdon into Guildford. This change has been proposed by both local Members as making sense from a community identity perspective.  The combination of both the changes listed above would move Worplesdon to -7% electoral variance. |

# Mole Valley

For Mole Valley, the proposal is for six divisions representing an electorate of 76,015. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 12,669.

Two options have been put forward for Mole Valley. Both options agree on the proposals for Ashtead and Dorking Town. However, there are differences of opinion on the make-up of the other divisions within the district. The task group felt that both options met the Commission’s criteria and therefore agreed to propose both to the Commission. Detailed maps for both options are included in the appendix.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Ashtead** | 12,250 | 3% | There was cross-party agreement from local Members that there should be no suggested changed to this division.  The division of Ashtead lies in the north-east corner of Mole Valley. The boundary to the east follows the border with Epsom and Ewell while the north is the County Border. The western boundary is defined by the main roads, firstly the A243 in the north, and then the M25 which divides Ashtead from the rest of the District. The final section of the boundary in the southern corner follows the border with Headley Parish.  Ashtead is a discrete community to the north of the M25 with its own Residents' Association and railway Station. It is appropriate on community grounds for Ashtead to be a single division. |
| **Bookham and Fetcham West** | 13,281 | 12% | The division of Bookham and Fetcham West includes the town of Bookham and western parts of Fetcham. These villages are surrounded by rural countryside protected from development by Metropolitan greenbelt policy with nearby areas of outstanding natural beauty.  There is a strong sense of community in the Bookham area with a very active Residents’ Association and strong voluntary participation.  It is recognised that this division remains slightly above electoral variance. However, there are a number of factors influencing this. Firstly, the northern and western boundaries are restricted by the borders with Elmbridge and Guildford respectively. The majority of the easterly boundary follows the main roads through Fetcham as Fetcham is too large to be in one division. Option A suggests that the boundary could be adjusted slightly to equalise both divisions at 11%. However, as there are 26,324 voters within Bookham, Fetcham and Leatheread, it will be impossible to bring both of these divisions into electoral tolerance without amending the southern boundary. However, just south of the division lie the Surrey Hills, which make a clear natural divide between the three northern divisions and the more southerly ones. |
| **Leatherhead and Fetcham East** | A: 13,158  B: 12,648 | A: 10%  B: 6% | Leatherhead and Fetcham East is projected to have a electoral variance outside of tolerance at 19% in 2029. However, this is a difficult variance to address, given that Ashtead to the East is very much a distinct community and Bookham and Fetcham West to the west is also large. Therefore the only real option for reducing the electoral variance in Leatherhead and Fetcham East is to change the boundary to the south.  This will result in the southern part of the town just north of the bypass being linked with the Leatherhead area south of the bypass in a villages based division – the boundary commission having recognised that this was the most appropriate area to move south in the last boundary review and it does share similar issues with the villages of Headley and Mickleham (and certainly has greater links with these village communities than with the estates and business parks of North Leatherhead). |
| **Option A: Western and Southern Villages**  **Option B: Dorking Hills**  ***Currently known as Dorking Hills*** | A: 11,616  B: 11,663 | A: -2%  B: -2% | Option A: In the south of the district, Option A draws a fairly distinct line down the centre of the Mole Valley, creating two divisions to either side of Dorking Town. The proposer states that the population across Ranmore Common is very sparce and there are no real road links and no community links across this area. This makes for a clear divisional boundary between the east and the west north of Dorking with Wotton Parish (which cannot be warded) in the west and Westhumble / Mickleham [FB and FA polling districts] in the east. Mickleham also links with the Givons Grove part of Leatherhead. In the south there is a clear boundary east of Holmwoods / Beare Green and then between the Parishes of Capel and Newdigate. This will result in all the historic parishes being in a single county division which has not been the case in the past: in particular, with the villages of Capel, Beare Green and Coldharbour being in the same county division.  Option B: Also creates two divisions in the south of the district around Dorking Town but draws them slightly differently, so that the look more like two L-shapes fitted together. The proposer states that this option better supports community identity as the Dorking Rural division brings together parishes that represent the rural south of Mole Valley and will not be dominated by a town or urban area outweighing the needs of rural communities. |
| **Option A: Eastern Villages**  **Option B: Dorking Rural**  ***Currently known as Dorking Rural*** | A: 12,714  B: 13,177 | A: 7%  B: 11% |
| **Dorking Town**  ***Currently known as Dorking South and the Holmwoods*** | 13,111 | 10% | There was cross-party agreement from local Members regarding a new Dorking Town division being created in Mole Valley. This would bring together all of Dorking in one division (rather than the previous North/South split) which would better meet match local community identity than the current arrangements).  The new division incorporates the following polling districts: FC; AB; AA; BA; BB; BC; DA |

# Reigate & Banstead

For Reigate & Banstead, the proposal is for ten divisions representing an electorate of 118,944. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,894. Two options have been presented for the Horley divisions, as the task group felt they both met the Commission’s criteria.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead** | 11,607 | -3% | There are no proposed changes to this division.  The division of Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead is located in the north-east of Reigate and Banstead, with the eastern boundary following the County Border. The north-western boundary follows the A217, a main arterial road dividing Banstead from Nork to the west. The boundary then moves to the east, following the edge of Banstead, and then south along the edge of Banstead Wood before skirting round Kingswood to the intersection with Chipstead Lane. Chipstead Lane/Hogcross Lane is the main road joining the east and west of the borough in this area and therefore makes a good natural boundary for the southern edge of the division, before turning north at the end of Hogcross Lane, skirting the western edge of Hooley and the recreation ground before joining the A23 back to the borough boundary. |
| **Earlswood and Reigate South** | A: 11,989  B: 11, 526 | A: 1%  B: -3% | The division of Earlswood and Reigate South lies to the south of Reigate and Redhill and includes a number of distinct communities, Woodhatch and South Park, South Earlswood and Royal Earlswood.  The southern boundary of the division follows the border of Salfords and Sidlow Parish while the east and west are defined by the boundaries with Tandridge and Mole Valley respectively. In both options, it is suggested that the northern boundary of the division is amended slightly to include polling district SPW2, as this would better align communities and improve c0-terminosity with the Borough Ward Boundary.  A further move is suggested in option B, so that HRE1 (Copsleigh Avenue part of Salfords and Sidlow PC) moves from Earlswood and Reigate South into the proposed Horley East, Salfords and Sidlow division. This would mean that all of the Parish Council area is in one division, not spread over two as is currently the case. |
| **Option A: Horley East**  **Option B: Horley West**  ***Currently known as Horley East*** | A: 12,177  B: | A: 2%  B: | There are two suggested options for how the Horley divisions could be drawn going forwards.  Option A: This option would move the county division boundary to align with the A23 Road as opposed to its existing barrier of the railway line; meaning polling district HRE4would be moved from Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow into Horley East division. This would mean that Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow would move to a +3% variance (from +9%) and Horley East to +2% variance (from -4%).  Option B: This option is more of a re-draw which looks to improve co-terminosity between Parish, Borough and County Councils. Currently residents of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council have been allocated to different places for different things, which does not support community cohesion. This means that the parish council has had to reach out for support from two different borough councillors and two different county councillors based on two different splits of their geography across an area represented by nine different borough councillors and three different county councillors!  Option B would:     * Move HRE4 (as above) * Move Salfords (HRE2) and Sidlow (HRW1) to Horley East so that borough and county wards and divisions are more consistent and the parish (who’s population is mostly Salfords/ along the A23) is part of Horley East. * Move HRE1 (Copsleigh Avenue part of Salfords and Sidlow PC) from Earlswood and Reigate South so all of the parish council area is in one division, not spread over two as is currently the case. This means the majority of the parish council is represented in an area that is the same for borough and county councils. * Move HRC2 to Horley East as this sits close to HRE4 and aligns to it.   Overall, this better aligns Horley East and West county divisions with the borough council wards and improves community cohesion. This creates the boundary between the two divisions down the centre of Horley such that responsibility for the central area is shared but communities are more clearly defined beyond the centre. |
| **Option A: Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow**  **Option B: Horley East, Salfords and Sidlow**  ***Currently known as Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow*** | A: 12,325 | A: 3% | See suggested changes described above. |
| **Redhill West and Meadvale** | 11,193 | -6% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The central part of Reigate and Banstead is significantly more urban than the north and south, with the towns of Reigate and Redhill dominating. The southern boundary of this division generally follows that of the Ward with the same name, with the A23 and A242 largely acting as natural boundaries to the north and east. |
| **Merstham & Banstead South** | 11,392 | -4% | A number of small changes are suggested for this division.  Move polling district KTW3 from Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood division into Merstham and Banstead South division. This border better suits community identity and also helps to address some of the imbalance in numbers between Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood (presently with a +4% variance) and Merstham and Banstead South (currently with a -6% variance).  It is also suggested that polling districts RDW1 and RGT1 move from  Merstham and Banstead South to Reigate division, with the aim of better aligning communities and ensuring co-terminosity with borough Wards. |
| **Nork & Tattenhams** | 12,648 | 6% | The division of Nork & Tattenhams follows the border with the London Borough of Sutton and Epsom & Ewell to the north and west, and the A217 (the main arterial road) to the east. To the south, the border is the common land at Burgh Heath, Chetwode Road (the main east/west axis road in the Preston Hawe estate), the ancient woodland of Pit Wood, and the Tattenham Corner railway line.  Nork & Tattenhams, includes the whole of the Borough’s Nork Ward and the larger part of the Borough’s Tattenham Corner & Preston Ward (the Tattenham Corner part). Taken together are part of a homogenous suburban community. They are each served by their own Residents’ Association and church (St Paul’s in Nork, and The United Church of St Mark in Tattenhams), and other community groups. At the centre of the Division is the parkland of Nork Park and the adjacent Tattenhams Recreation Ground. There is no single shopping centre, rather four small shopping parades, with Tattenham Corner being somewhat the largest, and which also includes a health centre and library. Most of the Division looks across Epsom Downs to Epsom town centre in the neighbouring borough as its focus (main shopping centre, hospital, main railway line, theatre, cinema etc), to which there are good bus services, rather than the smaller Banstead Village centre, across the A217 dual carriageway.  In the interest of electoral equality, part of Tattenham~~s~~ Corner & Preston Ward (304 electors) is proposed as part of the Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood Division. These are:   1. The whole of Chetwode Road (262 electors) and the following small changes involving 42 electors: 2. The adjacent flats (Nos. 87–99 odds) in Merland Rise, and 3. Part of Whitegate Way (Nos. 33-63 odds and No. 30 evens).   This will move 2.6% of electors between the two divisions, providing an element of future proofing to the review. The rationale for the changes is set out below.   1. This change will ensure that Chetwode Road remains the visible boundary between the two divisions, albeit reallocated to the neighbouring division. 2. This minor change will ensure that all the properties south of Chetwode Road are in the same division. 3. This change will ensure that all properties in this road are in the same division.   These changes are the same as those proposed by the County Council in the 2011 Boundary Review. They were rejected by the Boundary Commission in that review, stating “the existing boundary should be retained, as it achieves co-terminosity with the district ward boundary and does not split the community in Tattenhams” (paragraph 74, July 2011 report).  This recommendation is resubmitted because the Boundary Commission’s review of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, in the intervening period, has changed the borough ward boundaries. The single-member Preston ward has been combined with the Tattenhams ward to form the three-member Tattenham Corner & Preston ward. The argument for co-terminosity has fallen away. The change now re-proposed will not impact the ward boundary, with all the electors being moved between County divisions remaining in the Tattenham Corner & Preston Borough ward, and part of the same community. |
| **Redhill East and North Earlswood**  ***Currently known as Redhill East*** | 11,672 | -2%% | Redhill is a large town to the east of the borough, within the more urban central area.  The eastern boundary of the division is the border with Tandridge while the north-west follows the edge of Gatton Park along the A23/A242, taking in St Bede’s School before heading west on Carlton Road. A slight amendment is suggested to the northern boundary so that the division no longer includes polling district HMN7 from Mersham and Banstead. It is felt that the people who live in this area identify as being more part of Merstham than they do Redhill. The move also improves co-terminosity with the borough wards.  The boundary follows the south side of the A25 (Station Road) and the western side of the High Street to the railway. Where the railways merge heading into Redhill, the boundary heads south-east on the railway to Kingswood Business Centre and follows the edge of Rural Way, Redstone Hollow and Woodside Way down to the railway again and out to the borough boundary.  It is suggested that the division name is amended from ‘Redhill East’ to Redhill East and North Earlswood’, to better reflect the communities which it represents, with around 1/3 of the division in an area that identifies as being in North Earlswood. |
| **Reigate** | 11,335 | -5% | Alongside Redhill, the town of Reigate completes the urban centre just south of the M25. . Reigate functions as a single integrated community, it therefore makes a sensible division.  There are two suggested changes to the Reigate division.  Firstly, as has already been mentioned above, move both polling districts RDW1 and RGT1 from Merstham and Banstead South to Reigate division. This would better align communities and ensure co-terminosity with borough Wards.  Secondly, move Polling District SPW2 from Reigate division into Merstham and Banstead divisio. Again, this would better align communities and ensure co-terminosity with the borough wards.  The combination of these changes would move Reigate division from -4% to -5% electoral variance. |
| **Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood** | 12,606 | 6% | The Division of Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood includes the three villages as named along with the estate of Preston in the north-east corner.  The southern and western boundaries of the Division follow the border with Mole Valley and therefore cannot be moved. There are two suggested changes to the northern and southern boundaries, already mentioned above, but included again below for clarity.  A slight amendment is suggested to the northern border of the division, so that  part of Tattenham~~s~~ Corner & Preston Ward (304 electors) is proposed as part of the Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood Division. These are:   1. The whole of Chetwode Road (262 electors) and the following small changes involving 42 electors: 2. The adjacent flats (Nos. 87–99 odds) in Merland Rise, and 3. Part of Whitegate Way (Nos. 33-63 odds and No. 30 evens).   It is also suggested that polling district KTW3 moves from Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood division into Merstham and Banstead South division. This border better meets community identity and also helps to address some of the imbalance in numbers between Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood (presently with a +4% variance) and Merstham and Banstead South (currently with a -6% variance). |

# Runnymede

For Runnymede, the proposal is for six divisions representing an electorate of 66,756. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,126.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Addlestone** | 12,028 | 1% | The division of Addlestone has been re-drawn to improve electoral equality and co-terminosity with the borough wards. Polling district CR1 has been moved into Chertsey Division and the part of AS4 that was previously in Addlestone Division has moved into Woodham and New Haw Division. |
| **Chertsey** | 10,851 | -9% | The division of Chertsey has been re-drawn to improve electoral equality and co-terminosity with the borough wards. Polling district CR1 has moved into Chertsey division from Addlestone division. Polling District LLC2 has moved into Thorpe, Longcross and Ottershaw division. |
| **Egham** | 10,676 | -10% | The division of Egham is projected to be significantly under variance in 2029 at -28%. The division has been re-drawn to address this electoral inequality and bring all of Egham into one division. Polling districts ET1 and ET2 have moved into the division from Englefield Green division. Polling Districts TH3 and VW4 have moved out of Egham Division into the proposed Thorpe, Longcross and Ottershaw Division. |
| **Englefield Green** | 10,806 | -9% | Englefield Green division has been re-drawn so that it now includes polling district VW1 to the South. Polling districts ET1 and ET2 have moved into Egham, so that all of the Egham Town Wards are now in one division. |
| **Thorpe, Longcross and Ottershaw**  ***Was Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water*** | 11,724 | -2% | This division has been re-drawn to improve electoral equality. It now includes TH3 and VW4, polling districts that were previously in the Egham division. Polling district VW1 has moved into Englefield Green Division. Polling district LLC2 has moved from Chertsey division into this division, improving co-terminosity with the Borough Ward. |
| **Woodham & New Haw** | 10, 671 | 10% | The southern, eastern and western boundaries of the division of Woodham & New Haw follow the borough border and therefore cannot be adjusted.  There has been a slight amendment to the northern boundary of this division, with the remainder of polling district AS4 (which was previously split between two Woodham & New Haw and Addlestone divisions) moving into Woodham and New Haw. |

# Spelthorne

For Spelthorne, the proposal is for seven divisions representing an electorate of 82,143. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,735.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Ashford** | 11,991 | 1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The northern boundary for the division of Ashford follows the railway line while the southern boundary is the A308, a main arterial road through the area. Ashford as a whole is too large to be included in one division. To ensure electoral equality, Stanwell Road, a main road, is used in the west as the boundary for the division and the eastern boundary skirts Bedfont Lakes Country Park to the B377, then heads south through residential streets until it reaches the A308. |
| **Laleham & Shepperton** | 10,816 | -9% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The southern boundary follows the border of the borough with Runnymede and Elmbridge, mainly along the River Thames. The eastern boundary then follows the River Ash and the outskirts of the Queen Mary Reservoir, with the remaining north and western boundaries following the main roads of the A308 and Ashford Road, skirting the grounds of Buckland Junior School and the Sports Ground before re-joining the River Thames via Sweep’s Ditch. |
| **Lower Sunbury & Halliford** | 11,832 | -1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Lower Sunbury & Halliford has strong natural and physical boundaries defining it. The southern boundary follows the borough boundary with Elmbridge while the eastern and north-eastern corner are the County Border. The remainder of the northern boundary follows the A316 into the M3 motorway with the final western boundary following the River Ash from the M3 back south to the borough boundary. |
| **Staines** | 12,317 | 3% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The western and southern boundaries of the division follow the borough boundary, as does the northern corner around Wraysbury Reservoir. The boundary then follows the edge of Staines Moor Nature Reserve down to the A30, which it follows to the edge of Ashford Park where it drops south to the railway, heads west along the railway towards Staines town centre and then follows Kingston Road and residential roads south to Sweep’s Ditch and back to the borough boundary again. |
| **Staines South, Laleham and Ashford West**  ***Currently Staines South and Ashford West*** | 11,059 | -7% | There are no suggested changes to the boundaries of this division. It is suggested that the name of the division is amended to Staines South, Laleham and Ashford West, to be better reflect the communities which it represents.  The northern boundary of the division follows the A30, a major arterial road, from the edge of Ashford Park to Lodge Way before heading south along the boundary of Ashford High School and St David’s School to the railway. The boundary then follows the railway west to Stanwell Road with the remainder of the western boundary following main roads (Stanwell Road, Ford Bridge and Ashford Road). The southern boundary heads west along the grounds of Buckland Junior School and the Sports Ground until it reaches Laleham Road (B376), heading north west. |
| **Stanwell, Stanwell Moor and North Ashford**  ***Currently Stanwell and Stanwell Moor*** | 11,588 | -3% | There are no suggested changes to the boundaries of this division. It is suggested that the name of the division is amended to Stanwell, Stanwell Moor and North Ashford, to better reflect the communities which it represents.  The northern and eastern boundaries of the division of Stanwell and Stanwell Moor are defined by the County Border. The western boundary heads south from the County Border around Wraysbury Reservoir to the M25 and then skirts the edge of Staines Moor Nature Reserve until it meets the A30. The southern boundary follows the A30 eastbound until it passes Lodge Way where it heads south, skirting the grounds of Ashford High School and St James’ School until it reaches the railway, following this east back to the County Border. |
| **Sunbury Common & Ashford Common** | 12,540 | 5% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The northern boundary of the division of Sunbury Common & Ashford Common follows the County Border, while the southern boundary is the M3 motorway. The remaining western boundary follows the River Ash and the boundary with Queen Mary Reservoir to the A308 and then heads northeast through Ashford Common until it reaches the County Border. |

# Surrey Heath

For Surrey Heath, the proposal is for six divisions representing an electorate of 73,830. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 12,305.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Lightwater, West End & Bilsey** | 13,145 | 10% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The villages of Lightwater, West End and Bisley have a good amount of commonality within their communities. They are situated within a rural setting and are surrounded by natural heathland, grassland and woodland. The villages are notable for their Sites of Specific Scientific Interest and local nature reserves with Brentmoor Heath, Bisley and West End Common along with Turfhill being of specific note. All three communities consider their greenspaces to be valuable community assets and are proud of their rural heritage which sets them apart from the more urbanised areas of Camberley and Woking.  Each of the villages has their own distinct characteristics and all are supported by strong, vital community groups, organisations and Parish Councils which form the backbone of their communities. |
| **Camberley East** | 12,852 | 8% | To address some anomalies in the existing boundaries, it is suggested that polling district EB moves from Heatherside & Parkside division to Camberley East division to join communities up along natural borders separated by the M3, and the Maltway. This change will also be co-terminus with existing Borough Council wards St Pauls. Additionally, polling district BB and the remainder of BA will be brought into this division, for co-terminosity and the dividing line boundary of the A30, where most of the residents to the north of the road form a community linked to the miltary and the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst.  The final change on existing boundaries would be for polling district DC to be moved from Camberley East to Camberley. This would make the county division more co-terminous with the borough council boundary of Watchetts Ward. |
| **Camberley West** | 12,611 | 6% | A number of changes to the existing boundaries of this division have been proposed to better align communities and improve co-terminosity with Borough Wards. Firstly it is proposed that polling district DC moves from Camberley East to Camberley West, as those who live within this area have a strong community with others in neighbouring polling district DB. This move would also make the area co-terminus with the boundary of Watchetts Ward.  Secondly it is suggested that the entirety of polling district BB and outlier of BA should be moved from Camberley West into Camberley East for co-terminosity.  Finally, part of polling district F should be moved from Camberley West to Heatherside & Parkside with the revised boundary drawn along either the industrial estate or including the entirety of sycamore drive (which will stay east) that meets the cricket club (which will stay west), down to and including Frimley Grove Gardens (which will be split between the two divisions). |
| **Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut**  ***Currently Frimley Green & Mytchett*** | 10,939 | -8% | For the most part, this division is a largely self-contained and easily defined, with external borough boundaries to the south, west (County border), and south-east. It is suggested that there should be a slight change to the existing boundaries with polling district IA (along the north border of Balmoral drive) being moved to Camberley West. This will support the communities in this area who see themselves more aligned to Frimley village, as opposed to Frimley Green.  The north-east section of the boundary meets West End Parish. Half of the northern boundary joins Heatherside & Parkside Division, following Old Bisley Road along to the Tomlinscote School junction. The community of Deepcut is separate to that of Heatherside and this is a suitable place to have the boundary. |
| **Heatherside & Parkside** | 12,473 | 5% | Presently the division is split by the M3, which goes against the criteria of community identity and good and effective local government. Therefore, it is proposed that northern boundary be changed so that polling district EB is moved out Camberley East electoral division. This change would also be co-terminus with existing borough council ward St Pauls.  The southern boundary of the division is the Old Bisley Road leading to the Upper Chobham Road and to the A325 – Portsmouth Road. The boundary then follows north-west to join the M3 again, with the grounds of Frimley Park Hospital sitting just outside the division to the west, and Bayfield Avenue. To address some concerns around electoral equality, it is suggested that part of polling district F be moved into the division from Camberley West, with the revised boundary to be along either the industrial estate or to (and including) the entirety of sycamore drive (which will stay east) that meets the cricket club (which will stay west), down to and including Frimley Grove Gardens (which will be split between the two divisions).  The division includes the Heatherside development which is in itself a strong community centred around a shopping arcade, a junior school, a community centre/church and playing fields. Heatherside is linked by various roads and footpaths to Frimley Ridge, making it sensible to keep these areas in the same division. This community also shares schools.  The area of Parkside has good transport links with Heatherside and the two communities have well-established links and fit well together due to the M3 and B3015. |
| **Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham** | 12,035 | 1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The three villages of Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham have identities very much based upon their own perception of being communities with a rural heritage going back as far as the Doomsday Book.  Whilst being at different stages of urbanisation, this identity is based upon being surrounded by Swinley Forest in the west ,Windsor Great Park in the north and Chobham Common in the east. Open space is very important asset to them all. Each village has a vibrant centre, and a raft of strong local organisations providing social frameworks and support. |

# Tandridge

For Tandridge, the proposal is for six divisions representing an electorate of 70,760. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,793. Two different options have been put forward for Tandridge, as it was felt both largely met the Commission’s criteria.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Caterham Hill** | 12,120 | 2% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Caterham Hill includes the two parishes of Chaldon and Caterham-on-the-Hill. The western boundary of the division follows the County Border and border with Reigate & Banstead, while the south and eastern boundaries follow the parish lines.  The Surrey Hills make a distinct natural boundary along the southern escarpment, which goes along the Bletchingley Parish boundary. Catherham Hill and Catherham Valley both have strong and distinct community identities. |
| **Caterham Valley** | 10,459 | -12% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Caterham Valley includes the parishes of Caterham Valley and Whyteleafe, both located within the valley.  In terms of the boundaries, the division follows the County border to the north and parish boundaries. It is recognised that the division is small in terms of electoral equality but is not possible to resolve this without either splitting parishes and/or adversely impacting on one of the bordering divisions. |
| **Godstone** | A: 11,152  B: 10, 738 | 6%  10% | Godstone has a large geographical area with the population mostly clustered in villages along the A25 and A22. It is fully parished and the parish councils are extremely active.  There are two suggested options to address the electoral variance in Godstone.  In Option A, the Parish of Horne (Polling district BB) is moved from Lingfield into Godstone.  In Option B, Tandridge Parish is split south of Crowhurst Lane End (Polling district LB) from Oxted to Godstone and moving the whole of Crowhurst Parish (Polling district JB) from Lingfield to Godstone. |
| **Lingfield** | A: 12, 694  B: 13,208 | A: 7%  11% | The division of Lingfield encompasses the entire south of the district, following the County Border along the south and eastern boundary and the county Border and Mole Valley boundary to the west. The northern boundary currently follows the five parish borders of Burstow, Horne, Lingfield, Crowhurst and Dormansland.  There are two suggested options to address the electoral variance in Lingfield.  In Option A, the Parish of Horne (Polling District BB) is moved from Lingfield into Godstone.  In Option B, the Parish of Crowhurst (Polling District JB) is moved from Lingfield to Godstone. |
| **Oxted** | A: 13,170  B: 13,070 | A: 11%  B: 10% | The division of Oxted lies to the east of the district, encompassing the Parishes of Tandridge. Limpsfield and Oxted.  In Option A, Oxted remains as it is now.  In Option B, Tandridge Parish is split south of Crowhurst Lane End (Polling District LB) from Oxted to Godstone |
| **Warlingham** | 11,165 | -6% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Warlingham is situated in the north of the District, following the County Border to the north and east. The Division includes the parishes of Tatsfield, Titsey, Chelsham & Farleigh, Warlingham and Woldingham with the parish boundaries co-terminus with the division boundary.  Both Warlingham and Woldingham are located on the hills to the west of the Caterham and Whyteleafe Valley with extended rural aspects. There are no main A-roads serving this area, which relies on more minor roads, stemming from Croydon in the North and Titsey in the South. In addition, the London-East Grinstead railway runs through the area, stopping first in Upper Warlingham before Woldingham and onto Oxted further south. Warlingham and Woldingham are distinct natural communities, with individual community facilities and their own small local shopping parades. |

# Waverley

For Waverley, the proposal is for nine divisions representing an electorate of 100,246. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,138. However, achieving electoral equality in Waverley is difficult, given it’s large, rural nature and the fact that it has a number of established communities represented by Town and Parish councils. Although the task group has some ideas for tackling the projected electoral variance in Waverley, it has not been able to work these through in detail or discuss whether they would be workable locally (for example, through consultation with local Parish councils). In any case, the divisions of Cranleigh & Ewhurst and the Farnham divisions are proposed to remain unchanged. As a result, we have not drawn up a map for Waverley as there are a number of key boundaries where we the task group does not have an exact proposal to share.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division Name** | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria** |
| **Cranleigh & Ewhurst** | 12,026 | 1% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The northern and eastern boundaries of the division of Cranleigh & Ewhurst are the boundaries with Guildford and Mole Valley respectively while the southern boundary is the County Border.  The division includes Cranleigh Parish and Ewhurst Parish with the western boundary for the division following the Cranleigh Parish line. |
| **Farnham North** | 10,757 | -10% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Farnham North has a distinctively suburban and residential character and associations with the Aldershot area which contrast with the historic urban central part of the town.    The northern, eastern and western boundaries of the division of Farnham North are defined by the County Border. The southern boundary follows that of the Farnham Upper Hale, Farnham Hale and Heath End and Farnham Weybourne and Badshot Lea Wards, meaning that there is effective co-terminosity. |
| **Farnham Central** | 11,072 | -7% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Farnham Central contains the historic urban core of Farnham, the transport hub and the retail, cultural and service focus of the wider Farnham area.  The western boundary is defined by the County Border while the eastern border follows the boundary with Guildford. The northern and southern boundaries follow existing ward boundaries, meaning there is effective co-terminosity. |
| **Farnham South** | 10,705 | -10% | There are no suggested changes to this division.  The division of Farnham South is the third division within Farnham Parish, with the western boundary following the parish line and the County Border and the southern boundary again following the parish boundary. The final northern boundary follows the existing ward boundaries. |
| **Godalming North** | TBC | TBC | See Waverley Western Villages for potential changes to Godalming North and South. |
| **Godalming South** | TBC | TBC |
| **Haslemere** | 11,070 | -7% | There is a projected electoral variance of -14% in Haslemere. However, this is difficult to address as the division of Haslemere borders Hampshire to the south and the east, with the division of Waverley Western Villages to the north. However, Waverley Western Villages is also projected to be outside the electoral variance tolerance at -14%. This leaves Waverley Eastern Villages division to the east as the only real option to address the electoral variance in Haslemere.  The neighbouring parish is Chiddingfold, however, it is too large to move into Haslemere division in its entirety, hence the task group’s suggestion that around 800 voters are moved from Chiddingfold Parish into Haslemere division. This would leave Waverley Eastern Villages with a variance of -10% (which would likely be addressed in the future by the Dunsfold Park development) and Haslemere with a variance of -7%. However, the task group is aware that this could have a negative impact on community identity, with the parish being split between two divisions.  As it has not been possible to engage with the local electoral services team regarding where this split could sit, the task group recommends that the Commission considers this option further, potentially working with Chiddingfold Parish Council to see if there is a way to split the parish into two wards. An obvious geographical dividing line would be the A283 that runs down the centre of Chiddingfold, however, as the majority of the parish’s population appears to the west of this road, it might not work on an electoral variance basis. |
| **Waverley Eastern Villages** | 11,540 | * 10% | The Division of Waverley Eastern Villages is geographically large and rural in its nature. It covers eight parishes – Wonersh, Bramley, Busbridge, Hambledon, Hascombe, Chiddingfold, Dunsfold and Alfold – each with their own active parish councils. The communities within the Division have a rural character in common, and the boundary with Waverley Western Villages is marked, not only by a zone containing the A3, but a geological contrast along much of its length between Wealden clay in the east and sandy heathland to the west.  The Division’s boundary to the north is the border with Guildford, and then with the urban area of Godalming and the more built-up areas contained within the parish of Witley (which also contains Milford). The south boundary follows the County Border. The eastern and western boundaries are co-terminous with parish boundaries, with the majority of the western boundary running parallel to a railway line.  As set out above, it is proposed that part of the Parish of Chiddingfold is moved into Haslemere division to address the projected electoral variance in Haslemere. A move of around 800 voters would leave Waverley Eastern Villages on -10%, however, it is anticipated that this variance would be addressed in the future by the planned Dunsfold Park Development. We have not been able to engage with the Waverley Borough Council, to establish how much of this development has been included in the 2029 electorate figures but in total 2,600 homes are predicted to be built on this site. |
| **Waverley Western Villages** | 10,191 | -14% | Waverley Western Villages is a large rural division which is projected to be -14% outside electoral equality by 2029. Like Haslemere, it is a challenging variance to address, given that Waverley Western Villages borders Hampshire to the west, Farnham (which is seen as a distinct community) to the north-west, Guildford to the north and Haslemere (which is also below variance) to the south.  This means that the only real option for addressing the variance is to look east, with voters coming from either Waverley Eastern Villages or Godalming South, Milford and Witley. As it has been suggested that part of Waverley Eastern Villages moves into Haslemere, this leaves Goldaming South, Milford and Witley division as the only option from which to draw voters to address the variance in Waverley Western Villages.  The task group have not been able to explore this option in detail to understand how it would work at a Parish Ward level but suggest that it may be possible to move part of Witley Parish into Waverley Western Villages. Witley Parish is already divided across Waverley Western Villages and Godalming South divisions. A movement of a further 600 or so voters would bring Waverley Western Villages into tolerance at 10%. However, in order not to move Goldaming South outside of tolerance, voters from Goldaming North would also need to be moved into Goldaming South – for example from the GCOA polling district. The table below gives an example of the numbers:    The task group agreed to put this forward as a potential solution to the electoral variance in Waverley Western Villages but have not been able to engage with the local electoral services team, or local Members for Godalming North and South, to get a feel for whether this is a practical suggestion in relation to community identity. It should also be noted that this suggestion has been opposed by the local Member for Waverley Western Villages. |

# Woking

For Woking, the proposal is for seven divisions representing an electorate of 80,691. This would equate to an average electorate size for each division of 11,572.

Local Members in Woking have presented three different options for division boundaries in the borough. The task group felt that all three options met the Commission’s criteria and therefore agreed to present all three to the Commission. Please note the wording used to describe the divisions in Option B and Option C below are that of local Members proposing each option, rather than the task group.

**Option A**

This would largely keep the county divisions as they are now, except for moving polling district D3 from Woking South to Woking South West, improving electoral equality.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option B** | | | |
| **New division Name**​ | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Supporting evidence and rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria**​ |
| **Knaphill & Hermitage**​ | 12,366 | 4%​ | This division is mainly made up of Knaphill ward, which is one community and village.  The proposed division includes K1 from St John’s, this area used to be a ward on its own called Hermitage and Knaphill South, which delights this area’s close link to Knaphill.  Most children from Knaphill attend school at Winston Churchill School, which is in the Hermitage area.​  This division includes polling districts: G1​ G2​ K1​ G3​ G4​ |
| **Goldsworth Park & St Johns​** | 11,407 | -4%​ | This proposed division unites Goldsworth Park, one clear community that is currently divided into two divisions.  Parts of the St John’s ward is included in this division.  Much of the St John’s area was built at the same time as Goldsworth Park and it used to be linked with Goldsworth Park in the old Goldsworth East ward.  Goldsworth County Primary School is in the St John’s ward, delighting how close these two communities are.​  This division includes polling districts: C1​ C2​ C4​ C3​ K3​ K2​ |
| **Brookwood & Woking South​** | 11,411 | -4%​ | This division is made up of Hoe Valley ward and some of Heathlands ward.  Hoe Valley is one community made up of three interlinked villages of Kingfield, Old Woking and Westfield.  This ward is currently divided into two divisions.  Mayford and Sutton Green have very strong links with Hoe Valley, as Mayford and Sutton Green residents use shops in Hoe Valley and attend schools in that ward.  Brookwood has less connection, but is in the same Borough ward as Mayford and Sutton Green.  ​This division includes polling districts: D3 E1 D6 E2 E3 E5 E4 D1 D2 |
| **Horsell & Woking Town​** | 10,256 | -14%​ | Horsell is a very strong community with a very active Residents Association and many community activities. It is currently split between two divisions of Horsell and Goldsworth East and Woking North. Most of the children attend the local primary schools in Horsell and then go on to Woking High School which is also in the middle of Horsell. It is linked to the town centre borough of Canalside and it makes sense to continue this association. Local Members are concerned that some new developments and predicted voters have not been included in the numbers for central Woking. There are significant high and medium rise developments planned for the town centre so the population will increase substantially over the years to balance out the Electoral Variance.​  This division includes polling districts: F1 B6 F2 B1 B2 F3 |
| **Hook Heath & Mount Hermon​** | 12,235 | 3%​ | This division is made up of Mount Hermon ward and some of Heathlands ward.  Mount Hermon is one community, settled in between the railway line and Hoe Stream.  The Barnsbury area of Heathlands has been added to this division, it also sits between the railway line and Hoe Stream.  Some of this area used to be in a the same Borough ward as Mount Hermon.​  This division includes polling districts: D4 D5 H1 H3 H4 H2 |
| **Maybury & Pyrford & Sheerwater​** | 11,885 | 0%​ | This division is made up of parts of Canalside and Pyrford wards.​  ​  Maybury is mainly up of people from an Asian heritage, although the area is divided by the railway line with the old Maybury sitting north of the railway and the Maybury council estate south of the railway line.  Maybury and Sheerwater have a strong connection, for example MASCOT supports both areas.  The Maybury estate is currently in Pyrford ward with Pyrford village, so all three areas in the east of Woking seems to fit well together.​  This division includes polling districts: B3 B5 J1 J2 B4 J3 |
| **The Byfleets (NO CHANGE)​** | 11,131 | -7%​ | ​ This division includes polling districts: J4, A1, A2 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option C** | | | |
| **New division Name**​ | **2029 Forecast Electorate** | **2029 Forecast Electorate Variance** | **Supporting evidence and rationale that the proposals meet the statutory criteria**​ |
| **Knaphill & Hermitage​** | 11,957 | 0% | In order to mitigate the deficit in Woking South West, it is proposed to swap Goldsworth West (C1 & C4) out of the existing division and instead replace it with The Hermitage (K1). There would be no change to any other part of the current Knaphill division and Percheron Drive (G2) would remain in Woking South West as at the moment.  There is significant coherence between these two areas and Knaphill South and Hermitage was a borough ward from 2000-2016 that linked the current K1 polling district proposed to be moved. While it is true that Hermitage also associates itself with St Johns, either area has been found acceptable in the past when determining boundaries.  The change also places the new division within 400 voters of complete equity and allows some surrounding areas to be made more coterminous as a result.  This division includes polling districts: G1, G3, G4, K1 |
| **Goldsworth Park and Horsell Village** | 11,638 | -2% | On the last occasion, Horsell was split into two divisions and the decision was made on that occasion that its identity as a village was not sufficiently important to overcome the problem of it remaining significantly undersized as a county division. Those problems still remain and would require significant changes - a combination with the town centre wards would be needed in order to overcome these issues.  There is, however, an opportunity to create a coterminous and equitable Goldsworth Park division that maintains Goldsworth Park’s identity and is an evolution of the current division. The entire borough ward of Goldsworth Park combined with the village of Horsell is within 100 electors of complete equity and retains the connection between Goldsworth Park and Horsell that respects the historic links between the two.  This division includes polling districts: C1, C2, C3, C4, F1 |
| **Woking South​** | 11,059 | -7% | By moving Mayford and Sutton Green (D3 and D6) into Woking South West (combined these were a former single-member ward of Woking BC from 2000-2016), there is the opportunity to make the Woking South division coterminous with the Woking BC Hoe Valley ward. This is achieved by moving in Old Woking (E4) from the current Woking South East division.  In order to accommodate this, Woking South would lost around 66% of the old Mount Hermon West Woking BC ward; Mount Hermon is currently split between two divisions anyway and keeping the new Mount Hermon ward together within a division could not be achieved without significant changes. The result is a ward within 500 electors of complete equity.  This division includes polling districts: E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, H1, H3 (part) |
| **Woking North** | 11,449 | -4% | Woking North was created from the old Woking Central ward plus the then borough ward of Horsell East and Woodham. There is an opportunity to vary this ward slightly and make it coterminous with the new borough ward of Canalside, combined with parts of Horsell as it is at the moment. That would mean part of the current Woking North division joining another division, with which it would also be coterminous in terms of current borough ward boundaries. To compensate for this, a slightly smaller part of the current Goldsworth East and Horsell Village division moves across to join Horsell East in the division.  Bringing Canalside together would respect the natural division of the railway line while also creating a division functionally very similar to the present one but within 150 electors of complete equity.  This division includes polling districts: B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, F2, F3 |
| **Heathlands and St Johns​**  ***currently Woking South West*** | 12,033 | 1% | The current Woking South West ward is undersized and contains no complete borough wards within it. Under these proposals, the current Heathlands ward would be completely contained within it, along with the retention of the Percheron Drive area of Knaphill (G2) and St John’s Village (K2). The Goldsworth East polling district (K3), also part of the current St John’s borough ward, would join the division. This would create a division that runs along the Basingstoke Canal from the town centre to Brookwood and it is one that brings together villages already linked by borough wards.  The nature of this rural part of Woking is one of different villages, often slightly separated geographically, but the Heathlands ward has worked very well and this proposal would also be within 500 electors of complete equity.  This division includes polling districts: D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, K2, K3, G2 |
| **Pyrford and Heathside​**  ***Currently Woking South East*** | 11,424 | -4% | The reconfiguration of both Woking North and Woking South allows the South East division to become more coterminous with the Pyrford ward of Woking Borough Council. This involves the transfer of the Maybury Estate (J1) into the division along with the removal of Old Woking (E4).  While ideally the J4 polling district – or that part of it south of the Old Woking Road – would also be included in the division, such a move would impact the equity of both wards and is not possible to achieve. So the proposal is that J4 should remain in The Byfleets.  As now, Woking South East retains the former Mount Hermon East Woking BC ward, along with around 1,000 voters from the old Mount Hermon West ward from the area to the east of the Guildford Road.  This new division provides greater coterminosity and is within 150 voters of complete equity.  This division includes polling districts J1, J2, J3, H2, H4, H3 (part). |
| **The Byfleets (NO CHANGE)​** | 11,131 | -7%​ | ​  There are no changes proposed in this division, which contains within it the new Byfleet and West Byfleet ward of Woking BC along with the J4 polling district in Pyrford. A considerable part of the J4 area is in West Byfleet in any case, so the number of voters who would consider themselves in Pyrford village but in the Byfleets division is small. The borough ward alone is insufficiently large to create equity but the current ward is only 350 voters fewer than complete equity so this remains the proposal.  This division includes polling districts: A1, A2 J4 |