Councillor,

A meeting of the Council of the Borough of Reigate and Banstead will be held in the Council Chamber on **THURSDAY, 12 APRIL 2018 at 7.30 pm** in the New Council Chamber.to which you are summoned to attend. The Agenda for the meeting is attached.

John Jory
Chief Executive

(Prior to commencement of the meeting, prayers will said by the Mayor’s Chaplain, the Reverend Doug Ross).

If you need this agenda in an alternative format, please refer to the information on the final page.

**To: All Members of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council**
1. **MINUTES**

   To sign the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8\textsuperscript{th} February 2018.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

   To receive any apologies for absence.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

   To receive any declarations of interest.

4. **URGENT BUSINESS**

   To consider any urgent business.

5. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

   To consider any questions received from members of the public under Council Procedure Rule 13.

6. **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

   To consider any questions received from Members of the Council under Council Procedure Rule 14.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

   To receive and consider the recommendations of the Council’s Executive.

8. **STATEMENTS**

   To receive any statement from the Leader of the Council, Members of the Executive, Chairmen of Committees or the Head of Paid Service.

9. **RETIRING COUNCILLOR**

   The Council is informed that Councillor D. Jackson (Horley West ward) resigned from the Council on 16 March 2018.

   Councillor Jackson’s period of office was due to expire in May 2019 so an election will be held at the forthcoming local elections on 3 May 2018 and the outcome reported to the Annual Council Meeting on 24 May 2018.
10. REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL:  (Pages 13 - 58)
BOUNDARY REVIEW SUBMISSION (WARD BOUNDARIES)

To receive and consider a report on the boundary review proposal regarding ward boundary patterns, as set out in Annex 1 of the report and recommended by the Member Working Group.

11. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive any announcements by the Leader of the Council.

12. MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive any announcements from the Mayor.
WEBCASTING OF MEETINGS

The Council webcasts some of its public meetings.

Meetings are broadcast live and available to view online for six months. A copy is retained for six years after the meeting.

In attending any meeting you are recognising that you may be filmed and consenting to the webcast being broadcast online and available for others to view.

If you have any queries or concerns please contact democratic@reigate-banstead.gov.uk.

The Council’s agenda and minutes are provided in English. However the Council also embraces its duty under equalities legislation to anticipate the need to provide documents in different formats such as audio, large print or other languages. The Council will only provide such formats where a need is identified prior to publication or on request.

Customers requiring either the translation facility or an alternative format should contact Customer Services: Telephone 01737 276000
BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held at the Town Hall, Reigate on Thursday, 8th February 2018 at 7.30 p.m.


Before the start of the meeting the Mayor reminded all present that this meeting of the Council would be webcast live on the Council’s website.

50. **MINUTES**

   **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 14th December 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed.

51. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**


52. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

   None.

53. **URGENT BUSINESS**

   None.

54. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

   None.

55. **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

   None.

56. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

   The Council received one Recommendation arising from the meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee on 16 January 2018 and five Recommendations arising from the Executive meeting on 25 January 2018.

   Before inviting Members to consider these Recommendations the Mayor asked the Council to note that, in relation to the Horley Business Park items, the reference to Councillor Mrs N.J. Bramhall, as the Executive Member for Property and Acquisitions leading on this project had been inadvertently
omitted. This omission had been corrected for the minutes to be presented to
the next meeting of the Executive and did not affect the decisions that the
Council was being asked to consider.

Consideration of Minute 55 (Budget 2018/19) and Minute 56 (Council Tax
Setting 2018/19) were dealt with in accordance with a procedure note that had
been prepared and circulated to all Members (prior to the meeting) in
accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.8.4.

For Recommendation (i) to Minute 55 (Budget 2018/19) voting was recorded
in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.21.3 as follows:

For (35): Councillors Mrs R.H. Absalom, D. Allcard, R. Ashford, M. Blacker,
Mrs N.J. Bramhall, Mrs J.S. Bray, V.W. Broad, M.A. Brunt, R.W. Coad, G.P.
Crome, G. Curry, J. Durrant, J.S. Godden, Dr Z. Grant-Duff, Dr L.R. Hack, R.
Harper, N.D. Harrison, A.C.J. Horwood, E. Humphreys, J. King, S.A. Kulka,
A.M. Lynch, R.S. Mantle, S. Parnall, J. Paul, D.J. Pay, D.T. Powell, Mrs R.
Renton, T. Schofield, M.J. Selby, B.A. Stead, J.M. Stephenson, Mrs A.
Tarrant, Ms B.J. Thomson and Mrs R.S. Turner.

Against (1): Councillor J.C.S. Essex.

Abstained (2): Councillor R.C. Newstead (Mayor) and J. White.

For Recommendations (i) to (vii) to Minute 56 (Council Tax Setting 2018/19)
voting was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.21.3 as
follows:

For (37): Councillors Mrs R.H. Absalom, D. Allcard, R. Ashford, M. Blacker,
Mrs N.J. Bramhall, Mrs J.S. Bray, V.W. Broad, M.A. Brunt, R.W. Coad, G.P.
Crome, G. Curry, J. Durrant, J.C.S. Essex, J.S. Godden, Dr Z. Grant-Duff, Dr
L.R. Hack, R. Harper, N.D. Harrison, A.C.J. Horwood, E. Humphreys, J. King,
S.A. Kulka, A.M. Lynch, R.S. Mantle, S. Parnall, J. Paul, D.J. Pay, D.T. Powell,
Mrs R. Renton, T. Schofield, M.J. Selby, B.A. Stead, J.M. Stephenson, Mrs A.
Tarrant, Ms B.J. Thomson, Mrs R.S. Turner and J. White.


RESOLVED that:

(i) the Recommendations of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee
under Minute 8 (Adoption of a Surrey wide Criminal Convictions Policy and the
introduction of Safeguarding Training for Licensed Drivers and Applicants)
from its meeting on 16 January 2018 be adopted;

(ii) the Recommendations of the Executive, from its meeting on 25 January
2018, under:

(a) Minute 55 (Budget 2018/19) be adopted;

(b) Minute 56 (Council Tax Setting 2018/19) be adopted;
(c) Minute 60 (Horley Business Park update and request for additional working Capital) be adopted;

(d) Minute 61 (Horley Business Park: Acquisition of Land in Horley) be adopted;

(e) Minute 62 (Schedule of Meetings 2018/19) be adopted.

57. **STATEMENTS**

None.

58. **PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2018/19**

The Chief Executive introduced a report on the need for the Council to adopt a pay policy statement for 2018/19 in accordance with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011. The report set out relevant statutory powers, issues for the Council to consider and legal and financial implications. The report had appended to it a proposed pay policy statement for 2018/19. The recommendation set out in the report was moved by Councillor V.W. Broad and seconded by Councillor Mrs R. Renton, whereupon it was

**RESOLVED** that the Pay Policy Statement for the year 2018/19 be confirmed.

59. **MEMBERSHIP OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

The Council noted that following the resignation of Councillor S. Rickman in December 2017 a vacancy had arisen on the Licensing and Regulatory Committee. Following consultation with the Party Group Leaders Councillor R. Ashford had been appointed as a member of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 Municipal Year by the Head of Policy and Performance utilising the delegation introduced by Council in November 2016.

**RESOLVED** that the appointment of Councillor R. Ashford as a Member of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year be noted.

60. **LEADER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

61. **MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor reported on the following:

- The success of the Holocaust Memorial Service held at Reigate School on 23 January 2018.
Upcoming events for Members diaries:

- Ladies Lunch on 14 February 2018;
- Fly a Flag for the Commonwealth on 12 March 2018;
- The Mayor’s Military Band Concert with the Band of the Grenadier Guards playing at the Harlequin on Sunday 18 March;
- The 100th anniversary of the RAF Flag Raising Ceremony on 26 March 2018 being organised by the World War I Team; and
- St. George’s Day Dinner on 20 April at the Reigate Manor Hotel.

That the Mayor’s Volunteer Awards nominations process for 2018 was live and Councillors were invited to encourage nominations for these awards that would culminate with a ceremony in July 2018.

The Mayor closed the meeting by inviting Members and guests to join him for light refreshments in the Parlour after the meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.
COUNCIL – 12th APRIL 2018

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

REVISED CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES

The Executive Member for Finance, Councillor T. Schofield, explained Contract Procedure Rules formed an important part of the Council’s governance framework. It was noted that they helped to ensure best value, efficiency, transparency, accountability and protected the Council from allegations of impropriety.

Councillor Schofield informed the Executive the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules had last been updated in 2016. As a result, it had been necessary to consider revisions due to both an internal review and legislative changes. The following points were noted:

- An internal review of the practical implementation of the rules had highlighted the need to introduce amendments in order to simplify the process.
- In view of rising costs, lower thresholds had become impractical to maintain and had created a cumbersome procurement process.
- Recent legislative amendments to the financial limits in respect of UK and European Union regulations governing procurement.

During the discussion, a number of issues were considered in relation to the procedural rules for procurement, including:

- The process for both seeking a ‘waiver”, including roles and responsibilities for Heads of Service.
- The process for nominating subcontractors and suppliers.
- The procedural steps of a procurement.
- The use of performance bonds.

In response to questions, Councillor Schofield advised that the report recommended authorisation for any minor administrative and legislative amendments to be undertaken as required in future. The Executive was informed any minor changes would only be introduced in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance, the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer. It was noted that this authorisation was required in order to ensure compliance and effective operational business management of the Contract Procedure Rules.
RECOMMENDED that:

(i) The revised Contract Procedure Rules be approved;

(ii) The Monitoring Officer be authorised to amend the Constitution to include the revised Contract Procedure Rules;

(iii) The Monitoring Officer be authorised, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and the Chief Finance Officer, to undertake any minor amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules as may be necessary to comply with any future legislative requirements;

(iv) The Monitoring Officer be authorised, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and the Chief Finance Officer, to undertake any minor and administrative amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules as may be necessary to achieve internal practical implementation and compliance.

Reasons for decision: To ensure legal and administrative compliance.

Alternative options: To reject or request amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2018/19

Councillor T. Schofield, Executive Member for Finance, reported on the current position in relation to the adoption of the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19.

The report set out relevant statutory powers, issues (objectives, the current treasury position, matters for consideration and prudential indicators) legal, financial and equalities implications, risk management and other considerations, consultation undertaken and policy framework factors. The report had five Annexes:

- An Investment Strategy
- A Borrowing Strategy
- A Cash Management Strategy
- Risk Management Assessment
- Minutes from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 15 February 2018

It was noted that the draft Strategy had been considered by the Executive in January 2018 and reviewed as part of the consultation by the Treasury Management Portfolio Holder Panel and by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
It was emphasised that the 2018/19 Strategy had been prepared at a time of significant changes to the guidance frameworks for Local Authorities, arising in response to the increase in commercial approaches across the sector. The Executive noted that changes to the Prudential Code and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice had been published in December 2017. Councillor Schofield went on to explain that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government had published guidance on Investment and Minimum Revenue Provision in January 2018 and there would be a significant accounting standard change to IFRS 9 Financial Instruments in April 2019.

The Executive noted that these changes reflected the increasingly complex business models that were being adopted by Local Authorities in response to reductions in other funding streams. Councillor Schofield informed the Executive that the effective date for implementation of the Prudential Code and the guidance from Government was April 2018. It was recognised that these late publication dates had created practical difficulties and as a result implementation by 2019/20 was considered acceptable. The following points were noted:

- The Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 was based on the 2011 guidance and only had a few changes from the 2017/18 document.
- The strategy would be comprehensively reassessed in 2018 in accordance with updates contained within the Prudential Code and the Treasury Management Code produced by CIPFA.

Councillor Schofield concluded by informing the Executive that the Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19 provided a framework for treasury operations in 2018/19 and that this would ensure the Council delivered value for money for residents whilst protecting reserves.

During the discussion, a number of issues were considered in relation to link asset services and the role of asset managers. In addition, the differences between returns on property investments and yields obtained in relation to managed funds were highlighted.

**RECOMMENDED that the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 be approved.**

**RESOLVED** that the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted.

**Reasons for decision:** To adopt a Treasury Management Strategy for the 2018/19 financial period.

**Alternative options:** To not support the contents of the report or to defer it and ask Officers to provide more information and/or clarification on specific points.
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

A report was submitted with the proposed 2018/19 work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The report set out relevant statutory powers, information on the work programme and how it had been prepared, resource, legal and equalities implications and consultation undertaken. The work programme was appended to the report.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor V.W. Broad informed the Executive that he and the Chief Executive had been consulted during the preparation of the work programme and that it delivered a good range of activities that were achievable and added value to the work of the Council.

It was noted that the Committee had continued to recognise the increased pressures on the Council and had maintained a streamlined approach to its activities to ensure its work programme reflected the Council’s priorities.

Councillor Broad concluded by highlighting that Local Government continued to change and that as a result the Council would continue to monitor both its governance and scrutiny arrangements. Councillor Broad advised that any changes to these arrangements would involve input from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

RECOMMENDED that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme for 2018/19 be adopted.

Reasons for decision: To agree a work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

Alternative options: To add to or not adopt the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme for 2018/19.
SUBJECT: REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL: BOUNDARY REVIEW SUBMISSION (WARD BOUNDARIES)

RECOMMENDATIONS:
(i) That the boundary review proposal regarding Ward boundary patterns, as set out in Annex 1 and recommended by the Member Working Group, be approved for submission to the Local Authority Boundary Commission for England

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has commenced a review of the electoral arrangements at Reigate & Banstead. The first stage confirmed that the Commission is minded to set a Council size of 45 Councillors. The second stage seeks feedback on ward boundary patterns.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is undertaking a review of electoral arrangements in Reigate & Banstead. The review has been triggered due to the population variances between wards across the borough, which exceed LGBCE criteria and the length of time since the last review. The results of the boundary review will be implemented for elections in May 2019.

The Council established a cross-party, politically balanced, Member Working Group to support this work. The Working Group has recommended the proposal attached as Annex 1, be submitted to the LGBCE. The proposal recommends ward boundary patterns.

Cllr Harrison, a member of the Member Working Group, objected to the proposal in relation to the Nork, Tattenhams and Preston areas and presented an alternative proposal to the Group that he considered better suited the local community. This alternative proposal was not supported by the Group.

Individual Councillors and Political Groups also have the option to submit separate proposals by the deadline of 9 April 2018.
STATUTORY POWERS
1. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body established by Parliament and is responsible for conducting reviews of local authority electoral arrangements and making recommendations to Parliament for any changes.

BACKGROUND
2. The LGBCE is undertaking a review of electoral arrangements in Reigate & Banstead. The most recent review at Reigate & Banstead was undertaken in 1998.
3. The results of the current boundary review will be implemented for elections in May 2019.

Local Government Boundary Reviews
4. A cross-party, politically balanced, Member Working Group has been established to support this work. This group has met regularly to inform the review.
5. There are 4 key aspects that must be considered within the review:
   a. **Determine size of the Council**: The Council submitted a proposal on Council size in December 2017. In January 2018 the LGBCE announced it was proposing that Reigate & Banstead have a council size of 45 Councillors.
   b. **Population forecasts**: These were provided in accordance with LGBCE guidance, drawing on the planned housing delivery in accordance with our local planning policies.
   c. **Electoral cycle**: The Council submitted a proposal on electoral cycle in December 2017. In January 2018 the LGBCE announced it was minded to retain the election by thirds system at Reigate & Banstead.
   d. **Boundary pattern**: As set out in the timetable below, the boundary pattern is subject to public consultation. The first stage of consultation has been undertaken. The Member Working Group has recommended the warding pattern set out in the proposal at Annex 1. The LGBCE will consider all submissions before making a recommendation on ward boundary patterns, which will then be subject to further public consultation.

Timescales
6. The outline timetable for the review is shown below:
   - Submission of Council proposals regarding council size and electoral arrangements (December 2017)
   - LGBCE determined Council size (January 2018)
   - LGBCE undertake public consultation regarding warding patterns (30 January – 9 April 2018):
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- LGBCE publish draft recommendations on warding patterns and names and undertake further public consultation (5 June – 13 August 2018)
- LGBCE publish final recommendations and place order before Parliament (November 2018)
- Elections held for all Councillors to new ward boundaries (2 May 2019)

OPTIONS

7. Approve the recommendation to submit the proposal to LGBCE. This is the recommended option. The proposal has been developed with input from Councillors across all parties through the Member Working Group. The proposal has been developed in accordance with the LGBCE guidance and criteria.

8. Reject the recommendation and not submit a proposal to LGBCE. This is not recommended as the LGBCE will develop a ward boundary pattern without any input from the Council.

9. Individual Councillors and Political Groups within the Council are able to submit a proposal directly to LGBCE if they wish to recommend different boundaries to the ones set out in the attached proposal.

LEGAL AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. There are no legal or financial implications arising from the report.

EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

11. As set out earlier in the report, one of the criteria for undertaking the boundary review in Reigate & Banstead is to reduce the significant electorate variances that currently exist between different Wards. The boundary pattern review will seek to minimise the variances between Wards.

12. As the review has recommended retaining elections by thirds, there is a requirement for all wards to have 3 Councillors. This will ensure that all residents have an equal opportunity to have a say in the running of the Council (at present some residents only elect a Reigate & Banstead Borough Councillor once every 4 years, compared to some that elect a councillor for 3 out of 4 years).

CONSULTATION

13. The public consultations are managed by LGBCE. The Council has prepared a communications plan to raise awareness so that residents, stakeholders and groups have an opportunity to input to the review.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

14. There are no policy framework considerations arising from this report.
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Annex1: Reigate & Banstead – Proposed Ward Boundaries
Introduction

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) has initiated a review of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council’s electoral arrangements, with a view to addressing the electoral variance across the Borough within the existing warding pattern.

The last review was undertaken in 1997/1998, since when there have been significant developments and changes in population.

Council Size

In January 2018 the LGBCE announced that it is minded to recommend that Reigate & Banstead Borough Council should have 45 councillors in the future and launched the first period of consultation for a pattern of wards on this basis.

Ward Pattern Criteria

In drawing up a pattern of electoral wards, the LGBCE seeks to balance three statutory criteria:

- Delivering electoral equality for local voters: ensuring that each local councillor represents roughly the same number of people so that the value of a vote is the same regardless of where an elector lives in the local authority area.
- Reflecting the interests and identities of local communities: establishing electoral arrangements which, as far as possible, maintain local ties and where boundaries are easily identifiable.
- Promoting effective and convenient local government: ensuring that the new wards can be represented effectively by their elected representative(s) and that the new electoral arrangements as a whole allow the local authority to conduct its business effectively.

Where it is not possible to produce a ward pattern that meets all the criteria, the LGBCE has discretion based on the quality of evidence provided to it.

The Council will continue to be elected by thirds. As a result, the LGBCE seek to produce a consistent ward boundary pattern of three Councillors per ward, to support the electoral equality criteria and ensure that residents have an equal opportunity to vote. Therefore, proposals should seek to deliver 15 wards across the borough.

Seeking Electoral Equality

In support of the boundary review, the Council provided electorate forecasts in accordance with the LGBCE technical guidance. The electorate is forecast to increase to 116,820 by 2023.

This creates a target of 7,799 electors per ward.

Whilst also meeting the other criteria, this proposal seeks to minimise the variance between wards.
Developing a Boundary Proposal

The Council established a cross-party Member Working Group to support the boundary review. To support the Working Group in developing and testing potential boundary patterns, the Council worked with a software supplier to develop an online mapping system. This system plotted electorate numbers across the borough and enabled the working group to move boundaries and consider the impact on elector numbers.

Reigate & Banstead Borough Characteristics

Reigate & Banstead is a great place to live and work. The borough is accessible, with good transport links to central London and the wider South East.

The M23 / A23 and the A217 are strong transport corridors running north-south through the borough, with communities developed along these routes. The M25 and A25 create a strong east-west transport corridor in the centre of the borough.

The borough has a variety of natural landscapes, from the North Downs on the edge of outer London (largely included within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) to the Low Weald in the south bordering West Sussex. Within this varied landscape sit the borough’s four main settlements – Reigate, Redhill (in the centre of the borough), Banstead (to the north) and Horley (to the south), and a range of smaller settlements. Each has very different characters and histories.

The map below shows the borough context, setting out the key urban areas, transport links, shopping centres, employment areas and countryside designations

In seeking to establish new ward boundaries, this proposal has used major roads and railway lines as ‘hard boundaries’ wherever possible, unless there has been historic ribbon development around a road. Individual communities have been retained within single wards. In the more urban area in the centre of the borough, where separation between areas is not as clear, boundary patterns have been proposed that seek to maintain neighbourhood areas within a single ward.
Map: Borough Context
1. Summary of Ward Proposals

It is proposed that 15 three-Member Wards be created as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ward Name</th>
<th>Area of the Borough</th>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>Variation from Target Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banstead Village &amp; Burgh Heath</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipstead, Kingswood &amp; Woodmansterne</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>+2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlswood &amp; Whitebushes</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley Central</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley East &amp; Salfords</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,817</td>
<td>+0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley West</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham, Netherne &amp; Hooley</td>
<td>North (Central)</td>
<td>7,991</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nork</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,902</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Park &amp; Tattenham Corner</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill East</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,439</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill West &amp; Wray Common</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,668</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,536</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park, Woodhatch &amp; Sidlow</td>
<td>Central (South)</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s &amp; St John’s</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadworth, Walton &amp; Lower Kingswood</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>+2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map showing the proposed ward boundary pattern across the borough is set out in Annex 1.

The following section provides more detail on the proposed boundaries, on a ward by ward basis, together with the rationale used to reach the proposal. In order to assist the reader understand the boundaries between neighbouring wards, the proposals are split into sections within the borough, to assist: North, Central, South (as set out in the table above).
2. Boundary Proposals: Northern Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ward Name</th>
<th>Area of the Borough</th>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>Variation from Target Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banstead Village &amp; Burgh Heath</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipstead, Kingswood &amp; Woodmansterne</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>+2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nork</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,902</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Park &amp; Tattenham Corner</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadworth, Walton &amp; Lower Kingswood</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>+2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham, Netherne &amp; Hooley</td>
<td>North (Central)</td>
<td>7,991</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward proposal: Banstead Village & Burgh Heath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,903</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Banstead Village is the largest community in the north of the borough. It is the largest shopping centre in this part of the borough, with residents from nearby villages travelling to Banstead for retail and community facilities. Banstead is centred around a traditional high street, with supermarkets and independent stores. To the west there are community facilities including schools, library and youth centre. To the south and east, there are large areas of green space separating the village from other areas. There are a number of community groups centred around Banstead Village, including a residents association and church groups.

Banstead Village alone does not provide sufficient electors to meet the target population. In order to support the criteria for electorate equality, it is proposed that the nearby community of Burgh Heath be included within this ward. Burgh Heath is an historic development on all three sides of the junction of the A217 and A240. Although it is also difficult to cross the A217 at this location, the houses on the Western side which are few in number are part of the community based around the local shopping parade.

The A217 acts as the connector from Burgh Heath to Banstead Village.

It is proposed that the western boundary of this ward follow the A217, incorporating Burgh Heath in its entirety. This is a major, dual carriageway road, running north-south. It is not an easy road to cross and acts as a key boundary.

The Eastern Boundary is proposed to follow the historical Banstead Village boundary. The three small communities off Croydon Road, Woodmansterne Lane and Park Road have an affinity with Banstead Village which is their main social and commercial hub, with the highway connections leading into the village. In particular, the residents of Park Road, when they were removed from Banstead Village (in the last Boundary Review), felt so strongly that they were part of Banstead that they set up their own Residents Association to retain links with Banstead and separation from Chipstead.

The Southern Boundary is proposed to extend southwards to include the residential conversion of the Queen Elizabeth hospital, which only has an access drive leading to Banstead, and is considered an anomaly in the existing ward boundaries.

It is proposed that the ward extend to the northern borough boundary.

The proposed boundary follows the polling district boundaries, incorporating Burgh Heath as well.
Ward proposal: Chipstead, Kingswood & Woodmansterne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of Chipstead, Kingswood & Woodmansterne]

Chipstead, Kingswood and Woodmansterne are three distinct communities in the more rural surrounds to the south and east of Banstead. Each has community facilities, such as community halls, pubs and small shopping parades. Each community has its own residents association and other community groups.

It is proposed that the eastern boundary follow the Borough boundary, until it reaches the A23, which is a major trunk road leading into London. The proposed boundary then follows the A23 southwards, until it reaches the historic settlement of Hooley.

Hooley is a small village straddling a major road. In order to support the electoral equality criteria it is proposed that the residential areas south of Star Lane, east of the A23, and along Church Lane Avenue are excluded from this ward.

The Boundary then continues down the A23, which becomes dual carriageway again, until it reaches the historic settlement of Merstham, which is also excluded from this ward.

The M25 forms the Southern Boundary.

Whilst this ward is more rural and covers a larger geographical area, there are many connecting roads that run across the ward, connecting the communities within it: Rectory Lane, High Road, White Hill, Hogscross Lane, How Lane, and Waterhouse Lane.
Ward proposal: Nork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Nork Ward Map](image)
In the north west of the Borough, there are two main transport corridors. The A217 runs north to south. The A240 branches west from the A217 and connects with Epsom.

This part of the borough sits between Banstead and Epsom, and there are strong connections to both. A number of addresses in this area have a KT postcode, which does create a different local identity to other areas with an SM or RH postcode.

The existing Nork and Tattenham wards combine to form a single county council division (“Nork and Tattenham”), and are in the Epsom & Ewell parliamentary constituency, unlike the other wards in the north of the borough which are part of the Reigate constituency.

There are two shopping parades, Drift Bridge and Nork Way, with the local church providing community facilities and activities. Nork Park is a key local amenity, popular with local residents. It also hosts a number of community events.

In this area of the borough, the public transport links travel east – west, connecting Nork and Epsom Downs with Banstead and Epsom.

There are strong boundaries in this part of the Borough. The A217 is a large dual carriageway road which is difficult to cross. For this reason, it is the clear boundary between wards. It is proposed that the boundary run along the A217, with properties to the west included within the Nork ward.

The western boundary is the Borough boundary.

In terms of a southern boundary, the community around Tattenham Way / Great Tattenhams, which leads off the A217 and crosses the A240 to Tattenham Corner railway station, relate more to the community and retail facilities around Tattenham Corner than Nork. As a result, the proposed boundary is drawn just north of Tattenham Way and Great Tattenhams.

In order to support electoral equality, Shawley Crescent, Home Farm Close and Claremont Gardens / Claremont Close have been excluded from Nork. These roads have been selected as they have direct access onto the A240 or Great Tattenhams, which links it to the Tattenham Corner ward below.
Ward proposal: Preston Park & Tattenham Corner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preston Park & Tattenham Corner
Development in Tattenhams started later than Nork in the 1930’s, and the houses are generally built more densely in smaller plots. As a consequence, only 3 cul-de-sac developments have been created in the last 15 years.

The Preston Estate is a former London Council estate built in the 1950’s and 60’s. It retains a higher than average level of social housing compared to neighbouring areas. Preston has two major housing developments in progress – 229 homes being built on the playing fields of the former de Burgh secondary school and 69 on recreation land released by the Council. When complete there will be no significant vacant plots of land.

As a result, there are clear differences between the two communities. However, their proximity means that residents in this area travel to similar community, retail and transport facilities.

Tattenham Corner village centre at the western Borough boundary provides the largest shopping parade in the area, with post office, medical centre, library and railway station. This station provides services to London, via East Croydon.

The modern Leisure Centre in Preston Park with swimming pool, gym and both indoor and outdoor sports facilities, community hall and youth centre lies at the centre of Preston.

Both communities are within the Parish of the United Church of St Mark, located in Great Tattenhams. Merland Rise Church is a strong evangelical church in the heart of Preston. Both churches have extensive community facilities and activities.

The area benefits from bus routes that run north to Epsom and Sutton, and south to Reigate and Redhill.

The Borough boundary forms the western boundary of this proposed ward.

To the east, it is proposed that the ward boundary continue south down the A217, which is a duel carriageway and difficult to cross, only moving from this key boundary to avoid splitting the community of Burgh Heath at the junction of the A217 / A240 (which is included in the Banstead & Burgh Heath ward proposal).

The southern boundary is drawn just north of Shelvers Way. Shelvers Way is predominantly larger houses in a similar style to those in Tadworth to the south. Properties along Shelvers Way have therefore been included in the Tadworth ward rather than this ward proposal. Corrections are also proposed to incorporate infill development at Copley Way and Vernon Walk that has occurred since the last boundary review.

This also recognises the identity of the shopping parade at Shelvers Hill as a key junction between communities.
Ward proposal: Tadworth, Walton & Lower Kingswood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECTORATE FORECAST IN 2023</th>
<th>7,973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VARIATION FROM TARGET ELECTORATE</td>
<td>+2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tadworth, Walton and Lower Kingswood are three distinct communities along and to the west of the A217, in the north of the Borough. The A217 is the main transport corridor at this point, with regular bus services operating between Reigate and Banstead / Epsom / Sutton.

They are relatively close to each other but have their own unique community identity. Each has a local shopping parade. There are distinct greenbelt divisions between each community, helping to retain their separate identities.

Lower Kingswood is located along the A217, which runs through the centre of it and is a strong barrier due to difficulties crossing the road here. However, the residential areas either side of the road both recognise themselves as Lower Kingswood and use the Kingswood Village Hall for community groups and events.

Tadworth and Walton are located to the north of Lower Kingswood. Each has a thriving local shopping centre, with small independent retailers and services. Business groups are established to support and represent the retailers in Tadworth and Walton.

Each community has a separate residents association, which is particularly active in Tadworth and Walton. There are also a number of churches in each community, with a network of community groups operating from their facilities.

Tadworth is also home to the nearest railway station, providing regular services to London. The shopping parade is built around the station and includes a local post office.

It is proposed that the western boundary for this ward is the borough boundary. The eastern boundary follows the existing ward boundary along the A217 until the junction with Chipstead Lane, as this is a hard boundary with different communities either side at this point.

At this point, the proposed ward boundary moves eastwards the area becomes more rural, with no obvious hard boundaries. Our proposal has been developed to ensure that the communities of Lower Kingswood and Mogador and surrounding smaller developments are retained within a single ward, without straying too far to the east as the natural geography at this location is north-south due to the A217.

The northern boundary is drawn just north of Shelvers Way. Shelvers Way is predominantly larger houses in a similar style to those in Tadworth to the south. Properties along Shelvers Way have therefore been included in this ward. Corrections are also proposed to incorporate infill development at Copley Way and Vernon Walk that has occurred since the last boundary review.

This also recognises the identity of the shopping parade at Shelvers Hill as a key junction between communities.

The southern boundary is predominantly the M25, which is a hard divide within the borough. However, a small number of properties to the south of the M25 have been included within this ward, as the access to them comes from the north of the M25 running under it.
Ward proposal: Merstham, Netherne & Hooley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merstham, Netherne & Hooley
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The Merstham, Netherne & Hooley ward follows the A23, which is a major road running north-south through the eastern side of the Borough. The road switches between dual carriageway and single carriageway as it travels between the communities within this ward. It is also a major route for public transport, with bus services running along the A23 and the London-Brighton main line running through the ward at this point.

Netherne and Hooley are two smaller communities in the northern part of this proposed ward. These are unique communities that have developed along the historic A23 trunk road. Each has local retail provision and community facilities. The more recent development of Netherne on the Hill, which has been developed from a former hospital site, is a ‘self-contained’ community that is also included within this proposed ward.

In this area, whilst the A23 is a major road, as it travels northwards there are large rural areas within the borough which are Green Belt designation to provide a buffer from the urban areas of outer London.

It is proposed that the western boundary follow the A23 south from the Borough boundary, until it reaches the historic settlement of Hooley. At this point the A23 stops being a dual carriageway, and the community straddles both sides of the road. The community identifies as Hooley. In order to support the electoral equality criteria it is proposed that the residential areas south of Star Lane, east of the A23, and along Church Lane Avenue are included within this ward and the proposed boundary has been drawn to reflect this.

The proposed boundary continues down the A23, which becomes dual carriageway again after Hooley, until it reaches the historic settlement of Merstham. At this point, in order to retain Merstham within a single ward, the proposed border travels south from the A23 and across the M25.

Merstham is a large village to the north of Redhill, with a railway station providing frequent service to London, Redhill and Brighton. It is made up of a mixture of different communities that form one town. There is a former London Council estate to the east, with a vibrant community centre and local shopping parade. The estate is accessed from the Bletchingley Road in Merstham Village, where the older village developed along the A23. Merstham Village also benefits from a local shopping parade. Merstham also has connections to communities to the south, which are included in this proposed ward.

Since the last boundary review, a new access road has been constructed under the railway at Battlebridge Lane. This allows access for residential development of the former Holmethorpe industrial estate and has shifted the local identify in this area close to Redhill due to the easier access.

The proposed boundary for this ward re-joins the A23 south of Merstham. At this point along the A23 you enter an area with continuous development to Redhill. The rest of the proposed southern boundary has therefore been drawn to separate the new community of Holmethorpe from Merstham, ensuring that the community of Merstham remains in a single ward.
3. Boundary Proposals: Central Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ward Name</th>
<th>Area of the Borough</th>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>Variation from Target Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earlswood &amp; Whitebushes</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill East</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,439</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill West &amp; Wray Common</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,668</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,536</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park, Woodhatch &amp; Sidlow</td>
<td>Central (South)</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s &amp; St John’s</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward proposal: Earlswood & Whitebushes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,788</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electorate Forecast in 2023

Variation from Target Electorate
Earlswood and Whitebushes are two distinct communities to the south of Redhill. 

The A23 is the main transport corridor, running north-south and connecting the communities to the major town of Redhill in the north, which provides leisure, retail and employment opportunities, and Horley/Gatwick to the south.

Earlswood is centred between the railway line and the A23, with key community groups including the YMCA and uniformed youth groups. Earlswood has a station on the London-Brighton mainline, with regular services to London. There is a small shopping parade around the station, including a local post office.

Whitebushes is further south, with the community developed around the A23, predominantly between Maple Road and Woodhatch Road. Whitebushes has expanded with the development of the Royal Earlswood housing estate to the east of the A23. Whitebushes has a small number of convenience shops within the community. East Surrey hospital is a major landmark, providing health services to the sub region.

It is proposed that the northern boundary follow the Railway line to the north, a clear barrier separating the area from Redhill town centre. The proposed border then travels south, along the A23 which separates Earlswood from St John's to the west.

The proposed border then turns west to encompass Earlswood Common with the Earlswood & Whitebushes ward. The common is a popular green space used by local residents and given the name, it is recommended that it be included with the Earlswood ward.

To the south, the Salfords stream provides a natural boundary between Whitebushes and Salfords village. Salfords is a unique village itself, with a parish council. It is therefore recommended that the ward boundary follow this natural feature and Salfords be included in a separate ward.

The Eastern Boundary is the Borough boundary.
Ward proposal: Redhill East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,439</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redhill is the largest town in the borough, and a major retail and employment site for the borough.

The town centres around the A25 and A23, which meet at Redhill. The town also benefits from the best railway service in the borough, with a major station on the London-Brighton mainline.

The town is too large to be contained within a single ward. Therefore, the major borders of the A23 and railway lines are used as boundaries for ward patterns in this area. The town is currently divided east / west into 2 wards and it is proposed to retain this distinction. The western side of Redhill has a combination of historic development and mid twentieth century housing. The eastern side of Redhill has a combination of historic development (to the south) and modern turn of the twentieth century housing estates (to the north). These differences also support an east-west split generally following the A23.

In the case of the proposed Redhill East ward, it is recommended that the western boundary follow the A23, incorporating all areas to the east of this major trunk road, including the relatively new communities of Park 25 and Watercolour, and the Holmesdale Road industrial employment area.

To the south, it is recommended that the boundary follow the railway lines to the south of Redhill. These are hard boundaries and developments to the south of the railway line are better aligned with Earlswood and St John’s.

To the north, the urban areas between Redhill and Merstham have become harder to define following recent developments. A proposed boundary has been drawn between those communities associated with Redhill and those considered to be part of South Merstham to the north.

The ward continues to the east until the borough boundary.
Ward proposal: Redhill West & Wray Common

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,668</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redhill is the largest town in the borough, and a major retail and employment site for the borough.

The town centres around the A25 and A23, which meet at Redhill. The town also benefits from the best railway service in the borough, with a major station on the London-Brighton mainline.

The town is too large to be contained within a single ward. Therefore, the major borders of the A23 and railway lines are used as boundaries for ward patterns in this area. The town is currently divided east / west into 2 wards and it is proposed to retain this distinction.

The western side of Redhill has a combination of historic development and mid twentieth century housing. The eastern side of Redhill has a combination of historic development (to the south) and modern turn of the twentieth century housing estates (to the north). These differences also support an east-west split generally following the A23.

In the case of the proposed Redhill West & Wray Common ward, it is recommended that the North Downs railway line form the southern border of this ward. The eastern boundary is along the A23, incorporating all communities to the west of this major trunk road. Towards the north the boundary leaves the A23 to avoid dividing the village of Merstham, and continues with the A23.

The community of Gatton and the Royal Alexandra & Albert Boarding School is included within the more rural area of the ward to the north before the hard boundary of the M25.

Along the western side of the ward, it is proposed to use the A242 / Croydon Road as the boundary before heading north to the M25.
Ward proposal: Reigate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,536</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reigate is one of the 4 largest towns within the borough, with significant retail and employment space. The town is centred along a traditional high street on the A25, with a one-way system around the Town Hall and Castle grounds, a historic and protected green space. This is the heart of the town with key transport corridors of the A25 and A217 meeting at Reigate. The east-west North Downs railway line also runs through Reigate, which has frequent rail services to London, Guildford and Reading.

The historic Priory Park is a local landmark, with regular community events taking place. Reigate has a large business guild supported by locally businesses.

The north and eastern areas benefit from countryside protection including Reigate Heath and the Start of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

There is a clear boundary to the north in the form of the M25. To the west is the Borough boundary.

The Boundary between Reigate and Redhill is ill-defined, so we have used highways as a means of separating the wards whilst retaining community groups. It is proposed that the eastern boundary follow key roads which act as dividers between Reigate town and surrounding residential areas. The A242 / Croydon Road is a busy road providing a link from Reigate to the A25 north of Redhill. Chart Lane, whilst a narrow road, acts as a natural divider too, with St Mary’s church and churchyard providing a more open space between Reigate and surrounding housing.

The Southern Boundary follows the previous ward boundary, with the exception of Park Lane East, which has a stronger community identity with South Park and therefore it is proposed that this is corrected.
Ward proposal: South Park, Woodhatch & Sidlow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Park, Woodhatch and Sidlow are unique communities to the south of Reigate.

South Park and Woodhatch are centred around the junction of the A217 and Woodhatch Road. This forms the main community centre as you drive south from Reigate. The Western Parade and Woodhatch shopping centres provide local convenience retail which are used by the local community.

Woodhatch Park is a key green space which is maintained by a local community group.

To the north of South Park and Woodhatch, Priory Park and Cockshott Hill act as natural divides between these communities and Reigate. It is therefore proposed that the northern boundary follows Clayhall Lane and the southern boundary of Priory Park.

Under current boundaries the community of Woodhatch is split between two wards. The eastern boundary of the new ward has been set to include the entire community of Woodhatch, centred around the village green and local shopping parades. The Woodhatch Community Centre, which provides a range of services for the local community and groups, is located close to the Woodhatch shopping centre and would be included with this ward.

The main transport routes within the south of the borough are north-south in their geography, with no major roads running east west. The A217 is the main transport corridor, and therefore it is proposed that the ward continues south along this route, including many of the smaller communities and more isolated locations along it. This includes the community of Sidlow. Whilst this is incorporated within Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council, Sidlow has its own identity and therefore we feel it is acceptable to include it in a separate ward with the communities to the north that provide key facilities and retail.

The proposed eastern boundary therefore runs through the centre of the borough between the A217 and A23, keeping smaller communities together within single wards.

The western boundary is proposed as the borough boundary.

The southern boundary branches off at the junction between Lonesome Lane and Meath Green Lane, which is seen as a logical transition with Horley. It continues to the north of the historic hamlet of Duxhurst, and onwards to the borough boundary.
Ward proposal: St Mary’s & St John’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,507</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area between Redhill and Reigate has limited natural boundaries due to the higher density of urban development across the centre of the borough in this location. However, we can still identify individual neighbourhoods within the urban developments, and community facilities at the heart of these areas.

The proposed ward has been centred around Redhill common, a popular area of open green space accessible to all the communities around it.

There are hard boundaries to the north and east in the form of the North Downs railway line and the A25. To the south, Earlswood common provides a green buffer to other communities and acts as a natural boundary for this proposed ward.

The ward encompasses key east-west transport routes connecting Reigate and Redhill, including the A25, Lesbourne Road, Pendleton Road and Whitepost Hill / Mill Street.

The neighbourhood of Meadvale, which centres around Somerset Road, is fully contained within the proposed ward, together with the communities along the A25 around St Mary’s Church, Reigate and St John’s Church, Redhill. Both of these churches are large with strong connections within the community and large community facilities used by the wider community.

The western border has been proposed to ensure the Woodhatch community, which is split across the Woodhatch Road, is reunited into a single ward (it is currently split). It follows Croydon Road and Chart Lane, which act as a local marker separating Reigate town centre from neighbouring residential areas.
## 4. Boundary Proposals: Southern Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ward Name</th>
<th>Area of the Borough</th>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>Variation from Target Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horley Central</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley East &amp; Salfords</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,817</td>
<td>+0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley West</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward proposal: Horley Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horley is the main town in the south of the borough. At Horley, the two main trunk roads running north-south in the Borough, the A23 and A217 come together with Gatwick airport, a major international airport just to the south of the borough boundary.

Horley benefits from strong transport links, with regular rail services to Redhill and London to the north and Brighton to the south. There are regular bus services to Redhill, Crawley and Gatwick.

The town has a commercial centre, with shops, services and community facilities including library and community centre.

Horley is also represented by a strong Town Council, with offices located in Albert Road.

Horley is a growing town, with new estates developed since the last review. These large scale developments to the north east and north west of the town have resulted in significant increases in elector numbers. These developments are still under construction, with further growth in elector numbers needing to be factored into ward patterns.

The town is too large to be contained within a single ward, and is currently split into three wards: east, west and central.

It is proposed to retain a three ward pattern covering Horley, the new neighbourhoods to the north east and north west and extending north to incorporate the village of Salfords. The major boundaries of the A23 / Brighton Road, the railway line and Balcombe Road are proposed as boundaries between these wards.

Horley Central will incorporate the town centre and the residential areas between the A23 and Balcombe Road. The Chequers Roundabout to the north, which is the major gateway junction for people entering Horley via the A23, is also included within this ward, together with residential areas around the junction and the A23.
Ward proposal: Horley East & Salfords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,817</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horley is the main town in the south of the borough. At Horley, the two main trunk roads running north-south in the Borough, the A23 and A217 come together with Gatwick airport, a major international airport just to the south of the borough boundary.

Horley benefits from strong transport links, with regular rail services to Redhill and London to the north and Brighton to the south. There are regular bus services to Redhill, Crawley and Gatwick.

The town has a commercial centre, with shops, services and community facilities including library and community centre.

Horley is also represented by a strong Town Council, with offices located in Albert Road.

Horley is a growing town, with new estates developed since the last review. These large scale developments to the north east and north west of the town have resulted in significant increases in elector numbers. These developments are still under construction, with further growth in elector numbers needing to be factored into ward patterns.

The town is too large to be contained within a single ward, and is currently split into three wards: east, west and central.

It is proposed to retain a three ward pattern covering Horley, the new neighbourhoods to the north east and north west and extending north to incorporate the village of Salfords. The major boundaries of the A23 / Brighton Road, the railway line and Balcombe Road are proposed as boundaries between these wards.

In the case of Horley East and Salfords, the ward encompasses the areas to the east of the Balcombe Road and railway line. This captures the new developments to the north east of the town. These new communities have their own identify and new community facilities, including local shops and a community hall.

The eastern edges of Horley include rural areas, and it is therefore logical to extend the ward to the rural area north and north east of Horley, following the major A23 road and incorporating the village of Salfords. Salfords is a unique community with a strong local identify. It is part of Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council, which is based in Salfords. Salfords has a shopping parade along the A23, with the community straddling the road as a result despite the major trunk road.

Salfords has a community hall and social club which is a strong community asset, as well as the Christ the King Church at its centre. It is important that the village of Salfords is retained within a single ward.

The Northern Boundary is the Salfords Stream and the existing ward boundary. The Eastern and Southern boundaries are the Borough Boundary. The Western Boundary follows the Balcombe Road and the Railway line, and then veers westwards of the A23, to encompass the whole village of Salfords.
Ward proposal: Horley West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate Forecast in 2023</th>
<th>7,856</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation from Target Electorate</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horley is the main town in the south of the borough. At Horley, the two main trunk roads running north-south in the Borough, the A23 and A217 come together with Gatwick airport, a major international airport just to the south of the borough boundary.

Horley benefits from strong transport links, with regular rail services to Redhill and London to the north and Brighton to the south. There are regular bus services to Redhill, Crawley and Gatwick.

The town has a commercial centre, with shops, services and community facilities including library and community centre.

Horley is also represented by a strong Town Council, with offices located in Albert Road.

Horley is a growing town, with new estates developed since the last review. These large scale developments to the north east and north west of the town have resulted in significant increases in elector numbers. These developments are still under construction, with further growth in elector numbers needing to be factored into ward patterns.

The town is too large to be contained within a single ward, and is currently split into three wards: east, west and central.

It is proposed to retain a three ward pattern covering Horley, the new neighbourhoods to the north east and north west and extending north to incorporate the village of Sidlow. The major boundaries of the A23 / Brighton Road, the railway line and Balcombe Road are proposed as boundaries between these wards.

It is proposed that the Horley West ward captures the residential areas to the west of the A23 / Brighton Road, excluding those communities surrounding the Chequers roundabout, which is incorporated into the central ward.

With this boundary, the neighbourhood communities of Court Lodge and Meath Green are within a single ward.

This ward also incorporates the Horley Leisure Centre and football club.

Similar to the eastern part of Horley, the western edges include rural areas, and it logical to follow a similar approach and extend the ward to the rural area north west of Horley following the major north-south route of the A217. This incorporates the new housing development at Westvale Road, which will result in a significant increase in electorate and a number of isolated residential areas in the outskirts of Horley, including the historic settlement of Duxhurst.

Moving north from Horley, it is proposed that the boundary run between the A23 and Meath Green Lane. The residential areas along Meath Green Lane are more isolated and rural compared to Salfords to the east, and it is therefore recommended that they be included in the west ward. Meath Green Lane also connects with the Meath Green neighbourhood to the south, which is proposed to be included within this ward, and to the A217 to the North West. This supports a north-south geographical split as proposed here.

It is proposed that a northern boundary be drawn west from the junction between Lonesome Lane and Meath Green Lane, which is seen as a logical transition with Horley, continuing onwards to the Borough boundary.
Annex 1: Reigate & Banstead - Proposed Ward Boundaries