



## Consultation Responses

Question 1	<p>Do you feel that any existing parish area should be altered or abolished?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details of the proposals including a map illustrating the proposed boundary changes, the reasons for the proposal and explain how the proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and</li> <li>b be effective and convenient.</li> </ul>
Alfold	No
Bramley	<p>Yes. There is considerable scope for adjustment to move various small communities around the fringes of the current parish to parishes which are both closer and with which they potentially have more affinity – clearly a need to consult before any changes are enacted.</p> <p><b>Proposed amendment at southern extent of the parish to the south of Dunsfold Road including Lydia Park.</b></p> <p>Southern extent of Bramley Parish to the south of Dunsfold Road including Lydia Park. This area sits on the fringes of the Dunsfold aerodrome and will become a marginal area of the new Dunsfold Park estate when it is developed. The inconsistency of having the New Acres site in Alfold parish to the south and Lydia Park in Bramley to the north is clear – both logically should sit in the same parish. Lydia Park is 7.5km south of the main Bramley settlement but only 3km northwest of Alfold village, 3.5km from the centre of Cranleigh and 3km northeast of Dunsfold village.</p> <p><i>The darker blue lines on the maps below denote the current Parish boundaries. The red line represents the proposed boundary change</i></p> <p><b>Map 1:</b></p>  <p><b>Proposed amendment to the east of The Street in Hascombe</b></p> <p>The southwest part of the parish to the east of The Street in Hascombe more naturally sits with Hascombe parish. The area around Langhurst farm is less than 1km from the centre of</p>

Hascombe but nearly 5km from the centre of Bramley as the crow flies and far further by road.


## Map 2



### Proposed boundary alteration at Whitley Manor Farm

Whitley Manor Farm is part in Bramley and part in Wonersh Parish. Palmer's Cross, the associated settlement, is identified as Bramley but all the shops are in Wonersh parish, which are accessed from the A281 in Bramley. We think it could be sensible to move Whitley Manor Farm and its associated shops and businesses to Bramley Parish. Additionally, making this change will tidy up anomaly that exists around the parish boundary at Pepperbox Lane and Brooklands Farm. Pepperbox Lane and Brooklands are currently within Bramley parish, but Brooklands Farm and Brooklands Farm Cottages, which are both access from Pepperbox Lane, are within Wonersh parish.

### Map 3:




### Smithbrook.

The settlement of Smithbrook is in Bramley parish but is much closer to Cranleigh. Smithbrook Kilns is 3km from the centre of Cranleigh and 6km from the centre of Bramley. Smithbrook Kilns presents itself as "Smithbrook Kilns, Cranleigh", so it would appear that the

business estate regards itself as part of Cranleigh's orbit. No proposal for a boundary alteration is shown on the map, but we feel that consultation is warranted with residents and business owners in Smithbrook to ascertain if they feel greater affinity for Bramley or Cranleigh.


**Map 4:**




**Gosden Common**

If the review can reach across into Guildford District, there are a number of businesses and properties in Shalford parish which look much more to Bramley. The housing on the north side of Gosden Common and Gosden House School are less than 1km from the centre of Bramley and over 1.5km from the centre of Shalford. We feel consideration could be given to moving these from Shalford to Bramley.

**Map 5:**



Map 6: Map showing all proposed boundary changes (marked in red)



Chiddingfold


Yes

It is proposed that changes to the boundary of Chiddingfold Parish and its neighbours be implemented in 5 areas and these are shown in red in the maps that follow.

**Area 1: Pockford Farm (Hambledon Parish)**

The boundary is awkwardly shaped and operates to exclude one of the Pockford Estate cottages while Pockford Farm and Pockford house and 2 other estate cottages are in Chiddingfold Parish. The farm estate is historically associated with Chiddingfold and its division across two parishes is without any clear benefit. There is no logical reason that one of the estate cottages should be separated from the estate and included within Hambledon Parish. In addition, Brookside should be incorporated into Chiddingfold as property is set within a cluster Chiddingfold properties and is linked to Chiddingfold via

the adjacent public footpath. An adjustment would enable all the estate accommodation to fall within one parish, which is a sensible outcome.




#### Area 2: Durfold Hatch (Dunsfold Parish)

Durfold Hatch Cottage lies just into Dunsfold Parish, but is close to the residential properties in Chiddingfold at Fisher Lane (the nearest residential neighbouring properties). The residents at Durfold Hatch have established associations with Chiddingfold village and wish to be included within Chiddingfold Parish. The address is covered by the Chiddingfold Good Neighbours scheme.



### Area 3: Coopers Place (Witley Parish)


The area is closely located to the settlement at Wormley, within Witley Parish. The Parish Council wish to retain Coopers Place, the site of historic walking stick manufacturing, for which the parish was known, and the properties Combe Lane Farm, Bungalow, Lodge and Cottage as they form part of the large and historically significant Combe Court estate further South in the parish. However, the newer residential development just to the north, does not have the historic connections to Chiddingfold and it is accepted that residents there may feel more closely aligned to the community and services in Witley and may benefit from a boundary adjustment. Although the adjustment is fairly sizeable, the residential property is all located in one small area. This northern section of the parish is isolated from Chiddingfold especially the land North of the railway line, this land is the only part of Chiddingfold Parish north of the railway and so this is a significant feature. Witley Parish have also raised the possibility of transferring some land from Chiddingfold to Witley in this area.





#### Area 4: Imbhams (Haslemere Parish)



A change is proposed here to remove the bungalows that are farm workers cottages from Chiddingfold Parish and place them within Haslemere Parish with the rest of the Imbhams Farm estate. This would be a logical adjustment.



#### Area 5: Lythe Hill (Haslemere Parish)


The Lythe Hill Hotel and the adjacent Cortium Sports sit at the far South West end of Chiddingfold Parish (with no other development between it and the parish boundary to the West). Locally, the hotel is associated in the minds of residents with Haslemere town and parish, which is its postal address. It is isolated by location from the rest of the Parish and more naturally connected to Haslemere town and Parish by geography and infrastructure. It is proposed that The Lythe Hill estate and High Barn Farm, which is only accessible through the Lythe Hill estate and extremely isolated from the rest of Chiddingfold Parish, along with

the Cortium Sports site, be included as part of Haslemere Parish. Although this is a fairly large adjustment, only 3 sites are involved. The residential properties at Ansteadbrook are felt to function well together as a defined community and should be retained within Chiddingfold Parish.



The parish Council has consulted with the relevant adjoining councils and has not received any objections to the suggested changes and some positive indications, though the no council has at this stage committed to a formal position, save Dunsfold, which has no objection.


Cranleigh	No
Godalming	See additional comments.
Hambledon	We can only comment in relation to Hambledon Parish Council. We do not feel that our existing parish boundaries require alteration, as they correctly represent our established village settlement and the rural areas that surround it. We certainly do not wish any parish area to be abolished.
Hascombe	The proposal is to include two areas in the Parish of Hascombe. These are Langhurst

	<p>Farm (Map 1) and High Hascombe (Map 2). <i>(Not supplied in submission)</i></p> <p>The logic behind this that Langhurst valley and "High Hascombe (east)" are very close to Hascombe centre and a long way from other parish centres.</p> <p>The Langhurst valley is rural, as is most of Hascombe parish, so they have more common interests.</p> <p>Vigilance over the AONB - both small additional areas are within the Surrey Hills AONB. All of Hascombe is in the AONB which the parish is keen to protect and be vigilant about. Also planning applications in these areas affect Hascombe more than other parishes.</p> <p>Topography - the Langhurst valley, Cricket's Hill, High Hascombe, etc, face Hascombe, so it makes sense for them to be within Hascombe Parish. The new boundaries pass close to the ridge line of the hills surrounding the village.</p> <p>The inhabitants of the two areas tend to see Hascombe Parish Church as "their church", if/when they engage with the church.</p>
Thursley	We feel that the existing parish area is correct and does not require alteration.
Witley	<p>Yes.</p> <p><b>Milford Road/Royal Common, Elstead</b></p> <p>WPC proposes that part of Witley parish should be removed and transferred to Peper Harow parish. The properties excluded from Witley would be all of those to the west of the A3, accessed from Elstead Road. The new boundary could follow the river/stream from the parish boundary to the west (northeast of Borough Cottage) and travel northeast to Elstead Road, then along Elstead Road, to just north of the roundabouts. It is felt that these properties would identify more closely with the remaining properties on Elstead Road and the village of Elstead. They are somewhat segregated from the village of Milford.</p> <p>Having consulted with the Clerk to Peper Harow, they have confirmed that in principle Peper Harow have no objection to the proposed boundary change and agree that it could be sensible to match the parish boundaries to the route of Elstead Road. They stressed that they have not held full discussions with all of their residents, but in summary they are open to a boundary change.</p> <p><b>Map 1: Milford Road/Royal Common, Elstead - potential boundary shown in green</b></p> 

### Properties around, and including Milford Hospital

- Witley PC proposes that the area in Busbridge which lies north of Enton and east of the railway, including Tuesley/Milford Hospital should be absorbed by Witley Parish Council. Consultation with Busbridge Parish Council has been undertaken however they have objected to WPC's proposal. WPC still wishes to put this proposal forward for the following reasons:
- Most traffic generated by Milford Hospital, the Leithfield Park development and the Hall Hunter business travels towards Milford and into the parish of Witley.
- The population of this area looks to Milford for the provision of services, including education.
- There would be merit in Witley Parish Council being a statutory consultee on any development proposals on Hall Hunter land, which ultimately affect traffic around Milford.
- Geographically there is a valley between Busbridge and the area in question which has a contiguous link with Milford and its surrounds.

### Map 2: Properties around, and including Milford Hospital - potential boundary shown in green



### Properties around Coopers Yard Industrial Estate

Witley PC proposes to absorb, from Chiddingfold parish, the residential roads between the Coopers Yard industrial estate and the existing parish boundary. The area is closely located to the settlement at Wormley and has much more obvious links with Wormley than Chiddingfold. Residents there are likely to feel more closely aligned to the community and services in Witley and would likely benefit from a boundary adjustment. This area is currently extremely isolated from Chiddingfold.

Having consulted with Chiddingfold Parish Council they have advised that in principle they may support this proposal.

### Map 3: Properties around Coopers Yard Industrial Estate - potential boundary shown in red




### Properties in Grayswood

Witley PC proposes to release the area of Grayswood, from Damson Cottage to the A286, south of the stream (which is proposed to be the new parish boundary) to Haslemere Town Council, but to continue the boundary along the line of the stream to the east of the A286 and absorb the properties north of the stream, around the Toll House, from Haslemere Town Council.

WPC feels that the properties proposed for removal would likely have much closer links with the village of Grayswood. By absorbing the properties to the north of the stream the boundary line would be much simpler.

An initial consultation with Haslemere Town Council has resulted in an informal response supporting WPC's proposal.

### Map 4: Properties in Grayswood - potential boundary shown in green



Question 2	Do you feel that the name of an existing parish should be changed? If yes, please provide details of the proposal and explain your reasons for the proposal.
Alfold	No
Bramley	No
Chiddingfold	No
Cranleigh	No
Godalming	No
Hambledon	The current parish area covers Hambledon and its related rural areas that encompass it. Its name requires no change.
Hascombe	No.
Thursley	No – it should remain Thursley Parish
Witley	Yes, Witley Parish Council proposes that its name should change to Witley and Milford Parish Council. Milford is the largest settlement in the parish and is facing a substantial increase of housing and services in future years as outlined in Waverley Local Plan. WPC feels it important to recognise the village of Milford in its name to ensure its residents feel connected and represented by the Parish Council.
Question 3	Do you consider that any parish should be grouped with another parish or other parishes?
Alfold	No
Bramley	No
Chiddingfold	No
Cranleigh	No
Godalming	See additional comments.
Hambledon	We do not see any need for grouping with any other parish as Hambledon is an established area, with a distinct and individual identity. Hambledon Parish Council communicates and, when necessary, cooperates with neighbouring parishes. This works well and we see no need for change, nor has anyone suggested to the council that any sort of grouping or merger would be beneficial.
Hascombe	No
Thursley	We do not consider that Thursley parish should be grouped with another parish or other parishes.  Thursley Parish Council work collaboratively with Churt, Frensham, Tilford, Elstead and Dockenfield Parish Councils as the Western Villages. We feel that we should all remain as separate parishes.  A previous suggestion was that the Western Villages group above, excluding Elstead, should form one parish ward known as Churt & Frensham. Although we agree with the warding proposal we would like Thursley and other parish names included in the title or

	be known as Western Villages rather than naming only two of the parishes within the ward title.
Witley	No
Question 4	Should the number of councillors on an existing council be changed?  If yes, please indicate what the proposed number of councillors should be and the reasons for the proposal.
Alfold	Councillors feel that the numbers of the parish councillors needs to increase to accommodate this growth, based on the projections provided by the Consultation and the approved permissions in the parish. Furthermore, as Dunsfold Park is built out, we would anticipate that the Community Governance Review would accommodate further projections to Alfold Parish Council's size given that the projected end date for the scheme is well after the 2027 projections within the Consultation document.
Bramley	No
Chiddingfold	No
Cranleigh	No. The Parish Council is satisfied with the current representation from 12 Parish councillors.
Godalming	Yes  If the boundary of the Civic Parish of Godalming is to be retained in its existing form then Godalming Town Council proposes that the size of Godalming Town Council is reduced from 20 Councillors to 18.  Godalming Town Council believes that, in order to maintain the proportionate representation between borough and parish wards, the requirement to reduce the number of Town Councillors from 20 to 18 is consequential to the review of electoral boundaries of its principal council that reduced the representation on that principal council from 10 to 9 for the electoral area of the Civil Parish of Godalming. Additionally, Godalming Town Council believes that a reduction of Councillors from 20 to 18 would provide a greater equity of representation throughout the Council's electoral area.
Hambledon	Hambledon Parish Council represents a small, rural village. It has seven elected councillors and a Clerk/RFO. This would seem to be the correct ratio of councillors to residents. No need for change.
Hascombe	No
Thursley	No – Thursley Parish Council should remain with seven parish councillors.
Witley	No
Question 5	Do you consider the parish should be divided into parish wards?  If yes, please provide details of the proposals including a map illustrating the proposed ward boundary, the reasons for the proposal and explain how the proposal will make the election of councillors more practicable and convenient.  You should also include suggestions for proposed parish ward names and the number of councillors that should represent the electorate in each ward.
Bramley	No.

	It has proved a historical challenge to attract candidates from outside of the main settlement.					
Chiddingfold	No					
Cranleigh	<p>Cranleigh currently has 5 parish wards. In the 2019 elections, 3 of the 5 wards were uncontested. The Parish Council would like to propose reducing the number of Parish Wards from 5 to 2 utilising the same ward boundaries as the Boundary Review map. This has the benefit of being simpler for members of the public to understand their local representation at Parish and Borough Council level.</p> <p>To reduce the Parish Wards, the Parish Council recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding Elmbridge and Rural to Cranleigh West</li> <li>• Adding North to Cranleigh East</li> </ul> <p>The resulting wards would be Cranleigh East with 7 Parish Councillors and Cranleigh West with 5 Parish Councillors.</p>					
Polling District	Parish/ Town	Parish Ward	No of Cllrs	Electorate 2020	Projected Electorate 2027	No of Electors per Cllr 2027
CEA/CEB	Cranleigh	East	7	5422	6743	963
CWA	Cranleigh	West	5	3843	4618	923
Farnham						
Godalming	<p>If the boundary of the Civic Parish of Godalming is to be retained in its existing form, Godalming Town Council considers that the electoral area of Godalming should continue to be divided into five wards, although as stated below the level of representation within the existing wards should be amended.</p> <p>Godalming Town Council believes that, along with the maintenance of locality characteristics and identity in determining local representation, the number of councillors within a local council must also reflect fair representation across the parish area. Additionally, the Council also considers that the warding arrangements within the electoral area should provide for effective and convenient local government.</p> <p>Godalming Town Council believes that the strength of local councils lies in the ability of councillors to be able to support each other for the benefit of not only the electorate but also the councillors' own well-being. As such, Godalming Town Council believes that warding arrangements that support multi-member wards to be the most effective and efficient model for providing effectual and convenient local government.</p> <p>Godalming Town Council proposes a five ward model based upon the Electoral Commissions proposed Waverley Borough Council Godalming Ockford &amp; Central, Godalming Holloway and Godalming Farncombe &amp; Catteshall wards along with the retention of the pre-existing Binscombe ward and Charterhouse ward.</p> <p>Whilst Godalming Town Council acknowledges that this would mean that if the Boundary Commission's draft recommendations are enacted electors in this area would be within the Godalming Binscombe &amp; Charterhouse ward for the Borough Council and in either the Binscombe ward or Charterhouse ward for the Town Council. However, the Town Council considers that as described in the Godalming &amp; Farncombe Neighbourhood</p>					

Development Plan Charterhouse and Binscombe are clearly identified as two distinct character areas. Although the boundaries between the existing Charterhouse and Binscombe wards are slightly untidy around the area of Elizabeth Road, and the lower end of Farncombe Hill, they do delineate areas of differing characteristics. The majority of Charterhouse ward is established upon Farncombe Hill, Charterhouse Hill and Frith Hill and their approaches, whereas Binscombe is predominantly based around the area of the 1930's onwards northern expansion of Farncombe. These two distinctive areas clearly have a differing majority of housing stock and characteristics.

Additionally, Godalming Town Council considers the geographic nature of these areas to be unsuitable, as suggested by the Boundary Commission, for conjoining into a single entity for Local Council representation. Binscombe and Charterhouse localities are distinctly different, are only meaningfully connected at a very narrow point at the bottom of Farncombe Hill and have no meaningful synergy. As such Godalming Town Council considered it much more preferable to retain separate Town Council wards for the Binscombe and Charterhouse localities.

In considering the existing Binscombe ward and Charterhouse ward as single entities, distribution of electorate is in the region of 47% Charterhouse and 53% Binscombe. Godalming Town Council believes that by retaining the Binscombe & Charterhouse 'parish' wards as separate entities for Town Council elections, thus a five ward model, would allow the equitable ratio of elected representatives to electorate across the Town Council election area to be maintained.

In regards to the naming of the wards Godalming Town Council cannot see any reason to change the pre-existing names of the parish wards and would wish the wards to continue to be called:

Central & Ockford ward

Holloway ward

Farncombe & Catteshall ward

Charterhouse ward

Binscombe ward

Godalming Town Council believes the five ward model it proposes would prevent a real or perceived sense of loss of local identity as well as the extremes of ward size that would result from the recommendations of the Boundary Commission.

The table below sets out Godalming Town Council's recommendation for the warding and number of Councillors for the Civil Parish of Godalming.

Ward	2027 Electorate	18 Councillors		
		Councillors Per Ward		
		Rounded to nearest whole person	Electorate per Councillor	Percentage From Average %
Binscombe	3215 <sup>#</sup>	3	1,071	+4.8%
Charterhouse	3179 <sup>#</sup>	3	1,059	+3.7%
Farncombe & Catteshall	3932 <sup>*</sup>	4	983	-3.7%
Holloway	4028 <sup>*</sup>	4	1,007	-1.4%
Central & Ockford	4026 <sup>*</sup>	4	1,007	-1.4%

#elector numbers based on WBC Community Governance Review Consultation Paper projected electorate data 2027

\*elector numbers based on ward areas proposed by the October 2021 draft recommendations of the local Government Boundary Commission for England for the new electoral arrangements for Waverley projected electorate data 2027.

It should be noted that the total electorate for Godalming Binscombe and Charterhouse ward proposed by the Boundary Commission at 6,384 is the same as the combined total of the separate Binscombe ward and Charterhouse ward proposed by Godalming Town Council. It should also be noted that the total number of electorate indicated in the 5 ward model proposed by Godalming Town Council is 18,380, which is the same total of electorate indicated by the 6 ward model put forward by the Boundary Commission.

Hambledon	As one of the smallest and most rural parishes within the Waverley Borough Council area, the parish consists of the village settlement and a few outlying areas such as part of Hydestile, Feathercombe and Vann. These “hamlets” are small in the number of households and they relate in all regards to Hambledon village. Our current representation seems to work well, no one has suggested any need for change, and we do not see any merit in dividing our small community into parish wards.
Thursley	No, this is not necessary. We try and ensure that Councillors represent all areas within the parish. If this were not possible, we would ensure that communication channels exist so that all parishioners views were represented.
Witley	No
Question 6	Additional Comments
Alfold	Alfold Parish Council are a 7-councillor body, represented by a single borough councillor in a ward with several other local parishes. Alfold has, as a village had significant permissions granted for new housing in the last 2-3 years which has in effect doubled the size of the village in terms of dwellings, which then has a knock-on effect with regards to the parish electorate. This is reflected in the Consultation document under the 2027 projections which demonstrated that the projected electorate will increase by 331%. In order to make sense of the information within the Consultation document, Alfold Parish Council request that Waverley Borough Council provide the reasoning for the increase in Alfold's numbers. The increase shown in appendix 2 would indicate an increase of 1000+ dwellings in a 7-year period which exceeds the number of approvals within Alfold to date. We would also like to know whether this whole plan assumes that Dunsfold Park Garden Village (DPGV) is going to become a separate parish or whether it will remain as part of Alfold. Having evaluated appendix 2 within the Consultation document, it shows that Dunsfold's electorate decreases by 9 individuals between 2020 and 2027. This could indicate that Dunsfold Park Garden Village (DPGV) is likely to become a parish in its own right unless DPGV's numbers have been included in Alfold's numbers and clarification of this point.
Bramley	None
Godalming	<p>Godalming Town and Busbridge Parish are constituent members of the Godalming Joint Burial Committee with Godalming funding approx 94% of the parish contributions for the upkeep and operations of Eashing and Nightingale Cemetery.</p> <p>Apart from representation on the Joint Burial Committee, the main activity of Busbridge Parish Council is planning observations. Current members of Busbridge Parish Council are all co-opted representatives. It is believed that it is in excess of 20 years since the last contested election for the Parish, if indeed there has been one since the 1974 re-organisation of local government.</p>

It is suggested that the majority of Busbridge residents consider that they are either resident in Godalming or Milford. This to some extent is due to the fact that Busbridge Village Hall, Busbridge Church and both Busbridge Infant and Junior schools are in the Godalming Holloway ward and not Busbridge Parish.

Whilst it is not for Godalming Town Council to dictate, it would, if the proposal was desirable to the Busbridge Parish Meeting, be content for Godalming Parish boundary to be adjusted to take in the existing Busbridge Parish area and for that area to become part of the existing Town Council's Holloway Ward. If this were to happen then it is suggested that the new ward is renamed as Holloway & Busbridge Ward and represented by 5 councillors. Based on the 2027 electorate of 4878 this would equate to a councillor to electorate ratio of 1:976 for this ward, with the total electorate for the new Godalming Town Council area being 19,230 represented by 19 Councillors.

The warding arrangements would be as per the table below:

Ward	2027 Electorate	19 Councillors		
		Councillors Per Ward		
		Rounded to nearest whole person	Electorate per councillor	Percentage From Average %
Binscombe	3215	3	1,071	+5.6%
Charterhouse	3179	3	1,059	+4.5%
Farncombe & Catteshall	3932	4	983	-2.9%
Holloway & Busbridge	4878	5	976	-3.6%
Central & Ockford	4026	4	1,007	-0.5%

Hambledon	<p>Hambledon Parish Council sits well with the community it represents. It does not seek any change. If, however, a neighbouring parish has recommendations that involve Hambledon and its current boundaries, it would listen to the proposal. But it is extremely unlikely that change would be desired.</p> <p>It does, however, wish that the current Waverley Ward boundaries, currently under review in a different consultation, will allow Hambledon to remain in a Borough Ward with Witley and Milford, with which it has close ties in many areas of life, and not be grouped with Alfold and Dunsfold, with which it has few.</p>
Thursley	<p>We would like to remain with two Ward Borough Councillors available to represent the views of Thursley Parish Council (either remaining with Elstead Parish Council or as part of the Western Villages.</p>

### Other responses

Responder	David Harmer
Question 1	Do you feel that any existing parish area should be altered or abolished?

	<p>If yes, please provide details of the proposals including a map illustrating the proposed boundary changes, the reasons for the proposal and explain how the proposal will:</p> <p>a) be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and</p> <p>b) be effective and convenient.</p>
	<p>Yes. Reasons in Additional Comments</p> <p>1) Propose transferring Portsmouth Road, Hindhead (A333) back into Hindhead Ward of Haslemere</p> <p>2) Create a new administrative parish of Hindhead from Hindhead Ward of Haslemere.</p> <p>3) Support Witley PC proposal to transfer 2 or 3 properties of Oxenford Estate into Peper Harow.</p>
Question 2	Do you feel that the name of an existing parish should be changed?
	No
Question 3	Do you consider that any parish should be grouped with another parish or other parishes?
	No
Question 4	Should the number of councillors on an existing council be changed?
	<p>If yes, please indicate what the proposed number of councillors should be and the reasons for the proposal.</p> <p>Reduce Haslemere TC by the 5 councillors currently representing Hindhead Ward.</p>
Question 5	Do you consider the parish should be divided into parish wards?
	<p>N/A in respect of Haslemere TC.</p> <p>For the proposed new admin parish of Hindhead, yes, into 2 wards with a dividing line approximately at St Alban's Church – to be named</p> <p>a) Hindhead North and Beacon Hill</p> <p>b) Hindhead South</p> <p>All of the above subject to strong local consultation.</p>
Question 6	Additional Comments
	<p>Waverley's 27 parishes generally have names that reflect the communities they represent. Very few, if any, inhabitants of Hindhead Ward believe they live in Haslemere, but quite a number would identify as living in Beacon Hill as a distinct part of Hindhead.</p>