

# Surrey

## Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Proposed Boundary Changes

Commentary:

1. Why have alternative proposals from the Liberal Democrats been given special preference (para 39/44). This preference “taints” the validity of the whole proposal and would suggest the proposed changes are being made to give Liberal Democrats an advantage at the ballot box.
2. “Electoral Equality” is repeatedly mentioned in the proposals. While the reasoning behind this is understood and is “nice to have” it is far more important that towns/villages be grouped together that naturally go together. Thus, the proposal to group half of Oxshott with Cobham and half with Esher makes no sense. It would make more sense to group the whole of Oxshott with Cobham.
3. With regards to point 2 above the splitting of Oxshott means as Oxshott will be a small part of both Cobham and Esher the interests of Oxshott residents will never be properly represented but instead will always be subordinate to the interests of Cobham and Esher.

Alternate Proposal:

1. The area south of the A3 should be designated as “Cobham/Oxshott” as the A3 makes a natural boundary.
2. There is good internal access between settlements (para.42) that would comprise the Cobham/Oxshott area whereas accessing the area north of the A3 is not easily done with the heavy congestion on the A244.
3. Areas north of the A3 should be designated either Hersham or Esher & Claygate.

Conclusion:

I submit that the splitting of Oxshott between Cobham and Esher/Claygate is to the detriment of Oxshott residents and the democratic process in general and should not proceed.

## **Attached Documents:**

*None attached*