

Runnymede Civic Centre
Station Road
Addlestone
Surrey
KT15 2AH

Tel: 01932 838383

DX 46350 ADDLESTONE
www.runnymede.gov.uk



Paul Turrell, BSc (Hons), MBA
Electoral Registration Officer

When calling please contact:

Mr M Leo
Direct Line: 01932 425640
Fax: 01932 838384
Mario.leo@runnymede.gov.uk

Date: 9 July 2018

Review Officer (Runnymede)
The Local Government Boundary
Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir/Madam

Runnymede Borough Boundary Review Consultation – Response to Initial Proposals

This document sets out the formal response of Runnymede Borough Council (the Council) to the initial proposals on the Borough ward boundaries, published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) on 8 May 2018.

The Council is pleased to note that the LGBCE has based its recommendations substantially on the Council's original submission; however the Council does have some concerns about some of the proposed ward boundaries which are set out below.

1) Boundary between proposed Woodham & Rowtown and Ottershaw wards

There are two areas of concern in with the boundary between these two wards. The first concerns the area north of the Liberty Rise properties and bounded by Ongar Hill and the M25, which is identified in Area A (map attached). This area is predicted to contain 93 electors in 2023.

The proposed Ward boundary would require the area immediately to the north, between the LGBCE proposed boundary and the existing County division boundary, to be a polling district of its own. We feel that this would not be appropriate because:

- This does not lead to effective and convenient local government as there is only one residential property in this area.
- As there is only one property in this area, any anonymous electors registering in this area would not have the appropriate degree of anonymity as there is only one property they could be living in. The proposed boundary does not protect these people appropriately.

The Council would urge the LGBCE to reconsider the Council's original submission of a boundary the other side of Liberty Rise, moving those properties into Ottershaw from Woodham & Rowtown.

This move could be accomplished by a similar sized move of properties from Ottershaw into Woodham & Rowtown (Area B – map attached).

Our proposal is for the new Borough Ward boundary to follow the existing County division boundary along Hare Hill and back south, including the properties on The Ridings in the proposed Woodham & Rowtown ward. This proposal is in alignment with our original proposal for this area and would require moving a predicted 81 electors in 2023.

This would have the following benefits:

- Effective and convenient local government – the LGBCE's proposed ward boundary would force a very small polling district of 30 properties. The Council's proposal would remove this problem and allow for better links between the two levels of local government.
- Identifiable boundaries – the LGBCE has previously decided that the county boundary would be an easily identifiable boundary, so we would urge the LGBCE to make the same decision again. Ongar Hill is an easily identifiable boundary.
- Reflect community identities – again the LGBCE has decided in the Surrey County Council electoral review that The Ridings would identify with the other properties south of Hare Hill, so we would urge the LGBCE to make a similar finding on this occasion.

The Council believes that these two proposals taken together would improve effective and convenient local governance, better reflect community identities and have more identifiable boundaries. There is no appreciable difference in electoral variance with the Council's revised proposals. The net change for each area in 2023 would be +/- 12 electors.

2) **Boundary between proposed Addlestone South and New Haw wards**

The Council believes that the boundary between the proposed Addlestone South and New Haw wards should follow the existing County Division boundary in two areas between the M25 and A318 New Haw Road rather than along the River Bourne as proposed by LGBCE. The two areas are around Sayes Court Farm Kennels (Area C – map attached) and Crockford Park Open Space (Area D – map attached).

The Council does not believe that this will affect any electors.

The attached maps of Areas C and D illustrate the areas affected. The Council believes that this alteration to the proposed boundaries is appropriate as there would be improvements to:

- Identifiable boundaries – as with the Ottershaw proposals above, the LGBCE has previously taken the northern sides of both areas to be appropriately identifiable boundaries for County Divisions.
- Effective and convenient local governance – it is more convenient for boundaries to be coterminous where possible as this allows certainty to electors and elected members. Whilst this area does not have any existing residential properties, any building in this area would require a new polling district that would be unfeasibly small.

3) **Boundary between proposed Egham Hythe and Thorpe wards**

Given the proposed electoral variances in the wards as proposed by the LGBCE, the Council would like to propose a modification to its original proposal at the north-east end of the boundary (Area E – map attached).

The Council now proposes that the properties on Coopers Close be included in the Egham Hythe ward as opposed to the Thorpe ward, so the boundary would follow the existing County division and Borough ward boundary from the A320 to the River Thames. It is predicted that this will affect 52 electors in 2023.

This proposal would have the following advantages:

- Identifiable boundaries – people are used to the boundary here as it stands, and the Council's new proposed boundary was supported by the LGBCE at the previous Borough boundary review and the more recent County boundary review.
- Better electoral equality – whilst the change will increase the variance for Thorpe ward, the proposed change will improve the variance for Egham Hythe ward, which is currently the worse of the two wards.
- Effective and convenient local governance – the Thorpe ward as currently proposed would require a polling district to be comprised of properties on Coopers Close and some on the A320. The Council believes that such small polling districts do not lead to effective and convenient local governance and should be avoided where possible. Our proposed change also means that electors have the convenience of having the same County councillor as the rest of their ward. This would also provide better links between two levels of local government.

For similar reasons to those relating to the Crockford Park open space (Area D) on the boundary of Addlestone South and New Haw, the Council would propose that the ward boundary follows the County division boundary round the south of the Devils Lane pumping station rather than the north as proposed (Area F – map attached). No electors are predicted to be affected by this change.

4) **Boundary between proposed Egham Hill and Egham Town wards**

Having seen the LGBCE proposals, the Council would amend its original proposals for the boundaries between these two wards to that shown in Area G on the attached map

The Council proposes that the boundary between Egham Hill and Egham Town follows the County division boundary down the railway, rather than the back of the properties on Manor Way as proposed by LGBCE. We predict 11 electors would be in Egham Town rather than Egham Hill ward in 2023.

- Electoral equality – there are few residential properties in this area so there would be limited impact on elector numbers.
- Identifiable boundaries – the railway line is a well-recognised boundary, currently forming a County division boundary and (for much of its length) a ward boundary.
- Effective and convenient local governance – the small number of residential properties would form an unviable small polling district. Similar to the boundary between Thorpe and Egham Hythe, it would be more convenient for all electors in Egham Town south of the railway to be represented by the same County Councillor and for all electors in Egham Hill to have the same County Councillor as this would provide better links between two levels of local government.

Summary table of changes

Ward	LGBCE Figures		With RBC Revisions	
	2023 Electorate	Variance (%)	2023 Electorate	Variance (%)
Addlestone South	4778	3	4778	3
Egham Hill	4304	-7	4293	-8
Egham Hythe	4273	-8	4325	-7
Egham Town	4651	0	4662	0
New Haw	4965	7	4965	7
Ottershaw	5071	9	5083	9
Thorpe	4444	-4	4392	-6
Woodham & Rowtown	4880	5	4868	5

In respect of the other items in the LGBCE proposal, the Council accepts them in full.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Turrell
Chief Executive