

Stage One Consultation Responses by Area



Please click the area below to go to that section

Abinger

Ashtead

Beare Green

Betchworth

Bookham

Box Hill

Brockham

Buckland

Capel

Charlwood

Dorking

Fetcham

Headley

Holmwoods

Hookwood

Leatherhead

Leigh

Mickleham

Newdigate

Ockley

Pixham

Westcott

Westhumble

Wotton

Responses for ABINGER



Total responses: 10

Resident responses: 9

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Abinger is already an established parished area.

Abinger

- No. responses – 10
- Mole Valley Residents- 9

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Abinger	30.00% 3	70.00% 7	0.00% 0	10

Effective delivery of community services in Abinger

Support change	DO not support change	Generic observations
We should build on what we have already. To that extent, some merging of existing parishes might be helpful	Enlarging parish councils would, I believe, reduce accountability to residents. Abinger is already a disparate parish.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
The Abinger Parish Council does not represent Forest Green well. They are trustees of the Abinger Recreation Grounds Charity and their purpose as trustees is to promote recreational opportunities for residents. In 2024, a group of Forest Green residents requested a playground for the village. A task force was formed to assess the request. When it became evident that the idea had support, the APC set up a vote within the village for/against the proposal and mandated two highly-undemocratic mechanisms to ensure that it wouldn't succeed: 1. they stipulated that only one person from each dwelling could vote (which disenfranchised a number of pro-playground residents); and 2. decided that for the proposal to go ahead, that 60% of those voting would have to say yes. In the end, despite the high hurdles, the proposal received 56% support but was turned down by the APC. This is just one of several instances where the APC have not acted in good faith. [REDACTED]	Abinger seems to work well though would, I assume, need more powers	Parish council are the part of mole valley that work

Try to get fresh representation from the community	Abinger Parish Council: The work of the council is impeded by its having to spend a lot of time as trustee of the Abinger Village Greens charity. It should devote its energies to its statutory functions	I know nothing about any other parishes.
		The Parish Council supports 5 villages and has representatives from the North and South parts of the Parish. It plays an important part in managing greens and playgrounds. Greens in four villages are held in a trust where the Parish Councillors and the trustees. Trustees are responsible for the management of the greens; grass cutting, streams, risk assessments, boundary protection for example. Playgrounds on the greens are maintained and developed using grant funding and income from donations from a number of activities. The PC also supports community activities on the greens, fairs and social activities for example.

Proposed Changes to Abinger

Proposed Change	Generic Responses
A refresh of the APC would benefit the community and help to restore faith in local government.	Profile is low, as is awareness of current piwets. Much more needs to be done to inform and engage residents
	Abinger Parish Council: the area is too big for a council with limited assets. Its boundaries especially on the east and west sides are whimsical and do not represent what exists on the ground; on the west side this is made more complicated because the boundary abuts Guildford and Waverly Councils. Holmbury St Mary in particular suffers by most of it being in Shere Parish (Guildford) with a significant minority of the village being in Abinger. The council should also publish its activities. There should be a monthly report in the local Parish Magazine - the Abinger & Coldharbour Parish Magazine. Very few people have any idea that the Parish Council, let alone what it does.

Observations on unparished areas

Other comments for all MVDC areas

Already work, changing is a cost the over taxed MV residence don't need
The Parish Council supports 5 villages and has representatives from the North and South parts of the Parish. It plays an important part in managing greens and playgrounds. Greens in four villages are held in a trust where the Parish Councillors and the trustees. Trustees are responsible for the management of the greens; grass cutting, streams, risk assessments, boundary protection for example. Playgrounds on the greens are maintained and developed using grant funding and income from donations from a number of activities. The PC also supports community activities on the greens, fairs and social activities for example.
Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.
Without a parish council and its formavoice, residents are likely to be disadvantaged by the necessarily more remote unitary authority and its councillors
Democratic deficit
Yes it should be addressing the problem in MV, that is MVDC, it has a culture of being unhelpful, uncooperative, anti the communities it supposed to support. All at a huge cost
There is clearly a need for a Parish Council or other group to manage the areas described above for the community. There is not enough support from the community as a whole and there is always a shortage of Parish Councillors coming forward to provide voluntary support. The motive for getting involved is also a very significant issue. The motive should be a desire to support the community and it's interests.
Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment.
As things stand, the Unitary Councils proposed for Surrey would be the only ones of their size in non-Metropolitan England without complete coverage of Town/Parish Councils. For example, Somerset & Cornwall both created Town Councils to fill the gaps in their coverage when they were created as Unitary Councils. Both they and Wiltshire have devolved significant delivery of non-statutory services to the Parish Council sector. It would amount to an unacceptable (and undemocratic) experiment for Surrey to be denied this tier of Government and would pose significant risks to services such as libraries, leisure facilities, public conveniences, allotments, the employment hub, Day Centres, etc. These services can only be effectively provided by Councils which can raise money and meet the Nolan principles and governance standards required of Parish Councils.
For this reason we believe that Surrey should have complete coverage of Town/Parish Councils before the District/Borough Councils cease operating.
In areas such as West Sussex, it has long been the practice that larger Town Councils can offer services such as grounds management to smaller Parish Councils who may not employ staff. So a failure to create Town Councils in the more urban areas would put at risk the ability of smaller Parish Councils to meet their community's demand for some services.
The exact configuration of third-tier Councils should be primarily driven by views from the communities affected. This may involve a degree of negotiation to resolve differences of perspective.
To avoid distraction we believe changes to existing Parish Councils should be kept to a minimum in this review. However there may be requests from non-parished areas to become part of an existing Parish.
We are not in principle opposed to merging of existing parishes if the local communities wish this and we recognise that this may help areas who have struggled to find their quota of Parish Councillors. However we envisage potential future problems if two communities share a Parish Council where one could be seen as the dominant partner, leaving the smaller community destined to a minority role for the foreseeable future. We are aware of examples where such 2-community Parish Councils have been unsuccessful. So we believe merged parishes should aim to represent three or more communities.
We have considered 2 neighbouring non-parished areas which might propose merging with Headley PC. It is not our role to speak for such areas, but we have considered our response if such proposals are made:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tyrrells Wood (Polling District XC) – in view of the small population size of Tyrrells Wood and its position adjacent to properties already in Headley and close to the Headley Court developments, we would be comfortable with such a proposal which we think could be accommodated without the need to ward the Council. We also note that if Tyrrells Wood were to form part of a Leatherhead Town Council it would trigger the recommendation in Local government structure and elections - GOV.UK that parishes that straddle a County Division boundary should be warded.• Box Hill (Polling District GA) – we would be opposed to forming a joint Council covering Headley and Box Hill for the reasons given earlier in our "Final Thoughts"

Responses for ASHTEAD



Total responses: 98

Resident responses: 94

Feedback: Responses were mixed, with some clear appetite for a parish to be created and others stating that no change required at this time.

Ashtead

- Number responses – 98
- Mole Valley Residents- 94 (out of the 98)

Do you feel there is a need to establish a parish councils in Ashtead?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Ashtead	38.78% 38	45.92% 45	15.31% 15	98

Observations on parished areas

Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone - I don't trust the government and their new 2 tier system? For larger areas will have less localised knowledge, meaning poor fit for specific community needs. The savings you plan will be overstated or take years to materialise. Mergers come with high upfront costs (redundancies, rebranding, IT system changes, etc.)
Many of the above are surely too small to merit separate parish councils, and perhaps look at making groupings similar in size to Ashtead or Leatherhead.
Changing these parishes would lead to higher Council tax bills and is less democratic.
The current system appears to work well
Seems to work so why waste money changing. Never known a 'change' imposed by 'government' to save money. They just employ more people to 'organise' the change and the others to monitor the old system
I think even holding this consultation at this time is wasteful and self indulgent. At a time when we do not even know if there will be 2 or 3 areas in Surrey and boundaries throughout unclear any change now is pointless and may well not suit future needs.
The status quo is satisfactory - no change is necessary
My belief is the long term residents and new don't want this change bring the majority so I back their wishes for each parish village
Any of the above should not be changed until the unitary authority has been established.
In view of the fact that MVDC is to be replaced, and sweeping changes to boundaries and allocation of responsibilities are indicated, I agree with the view of the ARA that it is too early to express and opinion on changes to local governance at parish level. The time to do so will be when the wider picture is clear and it's possible to give informed consideration as to whether another layer of administration will provide an efficient, beneficial, and economic use of residents' money, or merely be an expensive piece of window dressing.
I believe the public's exposure to this survey has been so quick, so hidden and in the public domain for such a short time the results of this survey will not be representative of the overall general wishes of the public. A Referendum should be undertaken with all options and every household told to read and vote.
Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
I do not think change is necessary
I think it is import at to keep the governance local to people who know and care about what goes in in mv.
Using existing UK government guidance, a village in England is a community with a population of less than 10,000 persons.
Therefore, in Surrey, the existing Parish Councils should all be renamed as one of the following, depending upon the 2021 Census population within the community boundary, either:

(1) xxx Community Council, only if the population is less than 10,000, within the community boundary; or
(2) xxx Town Council, only if the population is 10,000 or more, within the community boundary.

Elections should be by in person voting at polling stations, held at the same time as other elections to minimise costs.

The reasons for these proposed changes are to better represent local communities compared to the existing arrangements, in order to ensure:

- (a) improvements or changes to a community better reflect the views of the community; and
- (b) improvements or changes to a community are implemented more rapidly in the community area.

My belief is the long term residents and new don't want this change bring the majority so I back their wishes for each parish village

Added cost and increased barriers to decision making.

NO CHANGE TO ANY - THEY WORK WELL AS THEY ARE.

I have suggested 'no change' for all. The timing of this review is poor. There is no time for residents to be informed or carefully consider the ramifications of any changes. I now have 3 days to make my mind up as a resident. Expecting people to watch a video lasting 1hr 34mins does not constitute a fair, reasonable or democratic consultation process. Such changes need communities to engage with proposals and engage with each other to discern what is for the good of all.

It is too soon to make such changes. Wait until we know more about how the new Unitary Councils will be set up and perform.

With the possible establishment of 2 new Unitary Councils making any changes to existing parishes makes absolutely no sense unless there are political reasons which you are failing to disclose.

Why waste money changing what works

I am not a resident of a parish and it is not for me to comment or have my preferences imposed on fellow residents of Mole Valley against their will.

Seems to work so why waste money changing.

Again what isn't broken shouldn't be fixed - please stop this nonsense - Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone -

Keep same approach

Seems to work so why waste money changing.

I do not see any benefit gained from making changes

To the best of my knowledge these parishes support and deliver efficient services to the community.

It is unnecessary

The changes, paperwork., rebranding all costs money which SCC does not have

They can continue for the time being until more is known about the new authority and we can make a more informed decision on what is required at the local level.

No need to change . Change always costs a lot of money which is scarce.

Support delivery of community services in Ashtead

Support Change	Don't Support Change	Generic Observations
<p>Services more effectively delivered with local interests in mind. A parish council represented by the local residents.</p> <p>Ashtead is large enough to be a parish in its own right.</p> <p>Ashtead Parish Council which should replace the Residents Association.</p> <p>There should be a maximum of 6 Councillors with elections every 4 years.</p> <p>Voting should be on Paper not on Line.</p> <p>I would not object to Parish being deleted in favour of word Village,</p>	<p>It's the same answer to all your questions -this Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone If you think changing the boundaries for more votes please stop this</p> <p>the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.</p>	<p>I think that those areas could form a larger parish council with the town or village next to them dependent on the number of residents</p> <p>Ashtead Park needs to be changed to move the area around Grange road and the schools into Leatherhead</p> <p>The names listed seem fine and unambiguous I know nothing of council workings, so have no opinion on the number of people required. I don't believe elections should be more often than every two years – allow some stability and time for plans to mature.</p> <p>The existing town boundaries seem fine, and again - unambiguous.</p> <p>I have no opinion about the council "style".</p>
<p>East Surrey would be far too remote without a more local council of some sort.</p> <p>Need local democracy</p> <p>Ashtead is a well established community that has over the years developed its own atmosphere and coherence. This has not always been served by Mole Valley and often issues highlighted as important by our Independent Councillors have been ignored. Creating a community council could give this important population centre a stronger voice when it comes to local issues.</p> <p>Matters of delivery of services is all dependent on budgets and the decisions being made about the shape and powers of any new Unitary Authority.</p> <p>I am not thrilled about creating another level of local government but if we have no choice as I want representation for Ashtead and not to be hidden in the larger East Surrey authority. To be fair this devolution in my opinion is a complete waste of time and money. I want someone to explain how this will ensure services</p>	<p>They are unnecessary .. More red tape . More cost . They are all about Councillor egos</p> <p>THE EXISTING ARRANGEMENT SEEMS TO WORK SATISFACTORILY.</p> <p>Some areas are too large to combine with others, they would overwhelm the smaller villages</p> <p>Having lived in Mole Valley for 26 years we have found it to be effective, generally efficiently run, responsive and probably more cost effective than the other parishes /district councils that are being proposed to 'group with'. Enlargement rarely increases efficiency and so cannot see that grouping into such a large area could possibly reflect and support each community or help deliver services as effectively as is done at present.</p> <p>In our view It is likely to end up like the NHS, top heavy, inefficient, expensive bleeding money and out of control.</p> <p>Resident's Association Exists. Do not need another 'local' body.</p> <p>Maybe beef up the responsibilities of the Residents Association of align</p>	<p>Residents Associations should have more consultation recognition and power</p> <p>Should Surrey district councils merge into 2 or 3 councils there will be a need for more local representation especially if the urban sprawl is going to be controlled, and local expenditure on infrastructure projects need local input. We do not want to see more cycle paths built, that are not maintained properly (overgrowing vegetation) and not being used, with cyclists preferring the road to the cycle path.</p>

<p>are delivered more efficiently. Its going to be the same local government employees and same service providers delivering the services, all we will now get is instead of one management team running a county council, multiple authorities which will duplicate cost and create jobs for local authority fat cats.</p>	<p>duties to satisfy the requirements placed on Parish Councils. Less admin etc etc</p> <p>Local bodies may be better placed to deal with 'local' issues - especially when there are only two main admin bodies in Surrey which will not want to be delving into the detail of local issues after policies have been established</p>	
<p>Local issues can be dealt with – in my case, the Ashtead Pond; APMH- adjacent public toilets; road/path repairs; car-parking problems, etc. Local councillors with intimate knowledge of the area are, of course, far better able to deliver services than some big anonymous authority that could be on the other side of the world!</p>	<p>Why? Spending more money on things that don't need to be charged</p> <p>The system currently works well why change it?</p> <p>It works well at the moment. No need to change things if nothing is wrong.</p>	
<p>In view of forthcoming legislation a parish council seems the only way forward for the Ashtead locality.</p>	<p>The motivation behind these changes is not based on any desire to improve the quality of life for residents. It's driven by interest and this interest is based on short term financial gain and reducing the sanctity of regulations designed to preserve the countryside and the environment. It represents the desire to exploit Surrey for private gain. Nowhere is this amount of effort used to improve infrastructure, provision of health services, care for the elderly or support of emergency services. It's dressed up as a root and branch initiative but is really a collection of measures designed to exploit the County of Surrey and reduce public rights.</p>	
<p>I have no further current comments.</p> <p>Reason: Ashtead has a village ethos with a prominent residents assocn. The residents assocn tends to be against a lot of things rather than constructively seeking a great future for ashtead. I feel that with a larger unitary authority that a parish council would be good for local community cohesion and identity. It may offer a broader church for local views than the residents association.</p>	<p>Our recently reshuffled Residents' Association is well-qualified to represent the residents of Ashtead</p>	
<p>Essential to enable residents to have a voice in decision-making.</p>	<p>Our recently reshuffled Residents' Association is well-qualified to represent the residents of Ashtead</p>	
<p>Provide a forum to inform and for discussions with the Unitary Councillors</p>	<p>I think even holding this consultation at this time is wasteful and self indulgent. At</p>	
<p>Better than Residents' Associations as members</p>		

<p>would be elected by all residents.</p> <p>Best placed to decide how CIL funds are allocated to projects in their parish, and in a timely manner.</p>	<p>a time when we do not even know if there will be 2 or 3 areas in Surrey and boundaries throughout unclear any change now is pointless and may well not suit future needs.</p>	
<p>Will be able to respond more rapidly to issues requiring decision or comments.</p>	<p>The imposition of a Parish Council will impact upon residents with an increase in council tax at a time when many households are struggling to survive.</p>	
<p>Parish councils should cover the whole area known, such as Ashtead Parish would cover the whole area known as Ashtead, but also include the roads on the Ashtead side of the M25 as everyone assumes that they are in Ashtead.</p>	<p>Furthermore I could see outsiders coming to dictate local matters with their own political agendas from main stream politics. Currently I do not have confidence in central and local government and to have another layer would be too much.</p>	
<p>Another option is a new 'parish council' called Mole Valley</p>	<p>It appears that the current process is being rushed through for convenience. Any changes must be by way of a referendum/vote after the new boundaries have been decided to reflect the majority of residents</p>	
<p>They reflect and support the community and bring a more realistic representation</p> <p>It would have to be closely allied to the wider area for funding and social services, but might be a stronger voice for our corner of Surrey. MVDC covers an enormous and mainly rural area - it is too big.</p>	<p>I believe everyone In Molevalley is happy with the current authority s for each village each area ,the majority of residents I think are confident that no change is for any benefit to locals in each area ,this will only push up costs</p>	
<p>It would help local empowerment and identity. By being closer to the community in every sense, the efficiency and effectiveness of the local services should increase.</p>	<p>I think things are ok the way they are.</p>	
<p>It would be good for Ashtead and its residents</p>	<p>Ashtead Residents' Association is a well established organisation to represent views of local community</p>	
<p>Ashtead and Leatherhead are wonderful local communities. It would be a shame to risk the local feel of both towns. I have lived in this area for over 50 years.</p>	<p>They won't achieve anything better than currently and will simply add cost. See comments above.</p>	
<p>Local services require local knowledge. AS MVDC will no longer exist, we risk being swallowed up/ignored by the larger conurbations,</p>	<p>Inappropriate (and probably a waste of time effort and money) to consider changes at this level until the future of Mole Valley and any Unitary Authority is settled.</p>	

<p>who may well absorb all funds available, leaving us behind.</p>	<p>Don't fix what's not broken. Ashtead Residents Association represents the community well.</p>	
<p>It is unnecessary to change The changes, paperwork., rebranding all costs money which SCC does not have</p>	<p>Current system seems to be working well. I do not see any benefit from change</p>	
<p>An elected village council sounds a good idea as long as the community is represented by it on a non-party-political basis. Whether it would deliver services effectively is another matter.....</p>	<p>I think any decision on establishing a parish council for Ashtead should be deferred until after the potential changes to Surrey County Council and MVDC have been fully resolved and implemented. I am not necessarily opposed to a parish council for Ashtead but I think a decision now would be premature until we understand how the new unitary authorities will govern / operate.</p>	
<p>To ensure Ashtead has access to all services and doesn't get side lined by areas with a council.</p>	<p>Could be very beneficial for Ashtead PROVIDED it retains the current boundaries and has a sufficient number of councillors.</p>	
<p>Ashtead should become a Parish Council</p>	<p>I believe that there should be not changes to local governance until after the Unitary Authorities have been formed and are up and running. Any changes to local governance, put in place after the UAs are in place, will reflect the new county governance structure.</p>	
<p>It feels like places like Ashtead and Bookham are forgotten when the whole area is discussed. The residents of Ashtead do not seem to be heard or listened to with their opinions not considered and overruled by people who do not know the area. It would then make residents more proud of their local area.</p>	<p>I certainly am very happy with the service and support I obtain from Ashtead. Likewise I believe residents are equally content with their areas.</p>	
<p>Providing the PC with authority and resources is critical.</p>	<p>Ashtead is already well represented by our local Councillors and Residents Association</p>	
	<p>The existing residents associations in these areas are well established, have a long term & in depth knowledge of their areas & are in the best position to represent their local areas particularly in light of the other pending changes to local government areas.</p> <p>Adequately dealt with as existing provisions.</p>	

	<p>I feel this is not necessary as we have a fairly representative body in the Ashtead Residents Association. The addition of a Parish Council on top would entail additional expense.</p> <hr/> <p>The structure and boundaries of the proposed new unitary authorities (to replace Surrey County Council) are not yet finalised.</p> <p>Premature creation of new Parish Councils, or Community Councils, or Town Councils, will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) potential additional costs to residents through precepts to their Council Tax; and (2) a potentially significant increase in Surrey councils' current combined debt of £5.5 billion, which may impact future service delivery. <p>I request that all of the following are implemented, to ensure that decisions reflect the majority view of residents, not a small number of online responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A vote or referendum shall be carried out, by "in person voting" at polling stations, on any proposed new local democratic structures; and (2) That such an "in person vote", or "in person referendum", shall be carried out before the new authorities and boundaries are in operation. <hr/> <p>Ashtead would incur increased costs for no service.</p> <hr/> <p>We have good representatives in these areas.</p> <p>overly bureaucratic and will hinder regional decision making</p> <p>No need for change</p> <p>The legislation to petition for the creation of new parishes has been on the books since 2007 for sure and as far back as 1977; shortly after Mole Valley District Council was established in 1974 and yet</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>there has been no thrust towards parishing in the meantime. It is understood that Bookham had a full ballot on parishing in 2017 and it was thoroughly defeated. The northern towns, then at least, still had trust in the District Council but that trust has waned in the meantime</p> <p>There has been no petition for this review and it would appear that this Community Governance Review is a political creation from within Pippbrook; the sinister implication of recent capital expenditures, and the sudden release of Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy funds, is that Mole Valley's coffers are being emptied into creating asset value on, or from, its property holdings in Dorking fattening them up for transfer to Dorking Town Council.</p> <p>HM Government using its democratic mandate from last year, rightly or wrongly, has decided to change the structure of government in Surrey to a two-tier system. Early in the process HMG advised that is had no interest in the creation of further parish councils.</p> <p>The Government will shortly announce its decision and it should be allowed to be hoisted by its own petard. Creating parish councils now will complicate what was meant to be a simplification of the process.</p> <p>This horse must be allowed to run its course. The relevant Unitary Authority will be able to call for requests for petition in due course or, indeed, local areas, which do not have to be as large as towns, and certainly not groups of towns, such as Ashtead, Leatherhead, Fetcham and the Bookhams.</p> <p>Ashtead has few MVDC assets, it even has one MVDC doesn't acknowledge, and some of those it does are in a pitiable state. The Recreation Ground including the children's playground are a disgrace, but that is common right across the district; Ashtead Park is in</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>need of a great deal of care and maintenance, Woodfield has not had its ditches cleared in donkey's years. The single plot of allotments are sufficiently looked after by the users and the two main car parks are in a good state of repair. They also earn MVDC £1000 a year per parking bay; a considerable sum of money but if that were to go in to parish funds where would the money come from to pay for the common services.</p> <p>In terms of structures the parish would own three homes, a youth club, two pavilions/sports clubhouses and a listed memorial. All are probably long on the wrong side of needing major attention. But that is Ashtead under Mole Valley District Council!</p> <p>Mole Valley District Council has longed pushed for and achieved common services. Joint Waste Solutions with three other boroughs, Southern Building and Planning Services with Tandridge, the co-sharing of financial services with Spelthorne itself only introduced earlier this year or late last year. It is understood that JWS are now negotiating a new road sweeping contract to become effective in June 2027 and that is unlikely to run for a short period. Other contracts, such as SCC's for street lighting is already very long-dated.</p> <p>To replace these with single contracts for small areas runs in the opposite direction of what has happened before and is counter intuitive; changes of this significance should not take place without a District-wide ballot so all the facts can be considered.</p> <p>And those facts must include those to be submitted by the Unitary Authority's first elected Councillors in May, 2026 when they will gain some element of supervision of the existing principle authorities.</p> <p>In Ashtead it would be difficult to find even a small convenient office to house a</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Parish Clerk and at least one assistant and suitable for holding meetings.</p> <p>The average Band D parish precept across England is understood to be £98 p.a.; at Ashtead's assumed average Band E home this would equate to £119.56 per annum. Even at Windlesham, the largest parish in Surrey with a population similar to Ashtead, the band D precept is £68 per annum which would come out at ££83 for a Band E in Ashtead.</p> <p>In the depths of the present financial crisis it is not appropriate for newly created, and at present unnecessary, levels of government to be plunging their hands into residents' pockets.</p> <p>It has never been the Government's intention to make local government more democratic; it is not for a local authority, which by and large, has a notorious reputation for ignoring its residents wishes and "doing its own thing" to try to reverse the Government's path. It is for the electorate to do that.</p> <p>It is unnecessary. No change is needed.</p> <p>The changes, paperwork., rebranding all costs money which SCC does not have</p>	
	<p>It's not a good idea the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.</p>	<p>Some of the villages are trampled over by councillors of the bigger towns. I do not believe anyone in my village believes their interests are being looked after by the district council. People who live over 15 miles away are always going to have limited knowledge of, and interest in, the smaller villages. The beauty of Surrey is its villages and scenery but these are being eroded by vast housing estates on current green belt, unused cycle lanes on what were pretty roads but have become treeless soulless tarmacked streets</p> <p>- similar to the London suburbs. Why can't the councillors in charge of Surrey try to keep it as a county, not another suburb of London.</p>
	<p>It is NOT a good idea.</p> <p>Ashtead has a residents association as does Bookham I am happy as a resident that we are all supporting our local area</p>	<p>I mentioned caterham....and although I found the two parish councils overly political, there are some fantastic things that happen there that would never happen in ashtead!</p> <p>They have a beacon (from 2000), volunteers from the community light it to celebrate events... and the community come (they also turn up the next morning to tidy the field up!) Local groups</p>

	<p>It is unnecessary to change The changes, paperwork., rebranding all costs money which SCC does not have</p> <p>Not a good idea</p>	<p>turn up, to sing, to cater, to marshal they bring chairs, offer gazebos, sound systems etc. for free!</p> <p>The community took over and run the local community centre</p> <p>They have a carnival, a month of culture, a street party, fireworks night... because there is a culture of "everyone welcome to help " and with support from the parish Council interesting things happen. Eg the community centre hosts Christmas lunch on Christmas day, the churches pay for the food, local shops provide veg, the school provides gifts, the food bank provides food parcels for families at home and a disparate bunch of volunteers turn up and cook, serve, deliver ... even Dial a Ride bus give lifts, with the parish paying the fuel bill.</p> <p>Notably, this open, non political way of working meant, in caterham, over 350 volunteers operated locally throughout covid and ran a local vaccination centre (led by an engaged and proactive GP - because he knew he just had to ask and get help)</p>
		Without experience and sufficient information, this is impossible to answer. I have expressed no opinion at this stage but may change my mind with more information.
		We should have one system of governance consistent across the council
		<p>It wold be difficult to find someone less capable of delivering services that MVDC. "Our roads are swept to a schedule; When is my road next scheduled to be swept. We don't know the schedule is subject to change."</p> <p>The parish council must be able to raise money in its own name, even if the amounts are small.</p> <p>Ashtead has strong ARA</p>
		<p>It is difficult to have an opinion because, in Ashtead, we have so little experience of this kind of council. One must ask whether it would enhance the democratic process, but my feeling is that although it might seem to do so, it probably would not. The candidates should be carefully chosen and represent a range of views. One must ask who would be pay for the election process.</p> <p>Would the elected parish/town councillors have any meaningful powers, or would they form just another talking shop and be completely controlled by the Unitary Council? How would the behaviour of councillors be monitored and controlled? My experience is that MVDC Standards Committee is rather ineffectual.</p> <p>Because you need postcodes and email addresses, this is cannot be considered to be an anonymous survey.</p>
		<p>I am shocked at the few responses that you have had and suggests that few people, including me, understand exactly what is going on.</p> <p>This questionnaire is balanced in favour of parishes, which people do not understand and is not a good one.</p>

		<p>The whole governmental exercise (not just this questionnaire) seems to me a waste of time and money which councils do not have and is a recipe for chaos in local services.</p> <p>In Ashtead we have a Residents Association. Would that be turned into a Village/Community Council? As far as I am aware, the Association does not have any premises. If it were to be turned into a Village Council, from where would it operate? Councillors should be elected on a non party-political basis.</p>
		<p>There are already Residents Associations, which are active in Ashtead, Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead.</p> <p>The two key aims of the new Town Councils, or new Community Councils, should be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) avoid duplication of effort; and (2) minimise future increases in Council Tax. <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/rural-urban-classification "Urban areas are determined as settlements with populations of 10,000 or more, based on the 2021 Census. Rural areas are everywhere else and will include rural towns, villages, hamlets, isolated dwellings and open countryside."</p> <p>Using the UK government definition, Ashtead, Surrey, is not a "village", it is an "urban area". Therefore, the proposed authority for Ashtead, Surrey, should be called "Ashtead Town Council".</p>

What might a Parish look like in Ashtead

There should be a maximum of 6 Councillors with elections every 4 years.
Ashtead Parish Council should cover all of Ashtead, but initially its scope, precept and number of councillors should be kept small, only increasing once results have been demonstrated. Elections should be every three years.
The Ashtead Parish council should consist of 11 councillors (including one chairperson) and all seats to be elected every two years. The parish council should cover the present Ashtead parish but be extended to include areas up to the M25 that are currently classed as being in Leatherhead despite being closer to Ashtead (eg, the areas occupied by Downsend and St Andrew's school) and being separated from Leatherhead by the M25. The council should take the form of a village council.
Ashtead - 3 clrs - 4 years - 2026 Maybe community council ? Could leave alone as strong Residents Assoc.
Called after the village/parish. There should be at most, 6 councillors who should be from that particular village. <u>Elections should take place every 3 years, giving the council time to actually get things done</u>
Logically the boundaries should be geographical - am not sure how else they could be done Village council - make it part of the actual community Make it so that only the people who live in the village full time can become councillors , and that they have been there for at least five years.
Ashtead Parish; 10 Councillors; 5 for each of the two 'new' wards. Elections at the same time as Council Elections, whatever the future Surrey structure looks like. Broadly speaking, the natural boundaries of Ashtead are clear and sensible, though a few houses on the border with Epsom & Ewell should be Ashtead, and similarly houses and schools along the border with Leatherhead would more sensibly be part of Ashtead. The M25 makes a natural division between the two here. It doesn't matter what it is called. Ashtead has a 'Residents Association' at present, which does not represent Ashtead as a whole; you may know that in 2024, the majority of the then committee resigned, when its proposal was defeated by a constitutional technicality. Since that time the new people running it only consider the views of those who pay a subscription to be 'full' members. Another area where democracy is being eroded.

<p>Ashtead 8 to 10 Councillors Elections every 2 years. Half to stand down for reelection so election is for a four year term. Election same time as District/County Council in early May. Boundary is KT21 and possibly the area to the east of M25 currently not KT21. Community Council.</p> <p>'d prefer a village council. My experience of parish councils (caterham) is that they are all about blocking planning (because those are the people who stand for election), or giving small amounts of cash to existing favourite charities! Most members are also district or county councillors with a political party focus. The council should be open and accessible.</p> <p>It should have people involved from a whole range of backgrounds. It should have an elected core with a range of unelected open / public sub committees for different topics with a co-design approach. The theme should be on "doing" not talking.... encouraging public participation and pride in the area. I look around at those already working hard for community cohesion in our area ... these are the people willing to use their free time / talents to support/ entertain / bring the community together. A village council should bring these people together.... offer / broker insurance deals, assist with risk assessments and grant applications, broker cheap fuel deals, purchase items to get best possible price etc etc. They should look to open up any resources they own (or can influence) for free .. removing barriers.... eg. If I want to do a road litter pick with my neighbours (a small act) I'd love to see a village council saying "here are high vis jackets, litter pickers and bags, let's give you a risk assessment to help you plan etc and would you like us to facilitate a road closure so kids can ride bikes up and down safely?</p> <p>Ashtead Parish Council I dont know how many concillors Elections in line with othr PCs in MV Boundary - village of Ashtead Style - village council</p>
<p>Ashtead Parish, as Ashtead is too large to be part of a broader one (with more residents than, for example Leatherhead).</p> <p>Eight; we used to have seven but with all the new developments in the new Local Plan there will be many more residents to cope with. The two unitary authority councillors will not be able also to deal with residents very local issues.</p> <p>Same time as the unitary elections (May 2027).</p> <p>As at present.</p> <p>I would prefer "Town/Village Council" and to avoid "parish because of its religious connotations. Parish councils should cover the whole area known, such as Ashtead Parish would cover the whole area known as Ashtead, but also include the roads on the Ashtead side of the M25 as everyone assumes that they are in Ashtead.</p> <p>Another option is a new 'parish council' called Mole Valley</p>
<p>Ashtead Community Council. The word "parish" makes it sound like a church based organisation. Ashtead Village Council suggests upper Ashtead only and is perhaps a misnomer for such a large community. The border should surround Ashtead only. I don't know how many councillors there should be.</p> <p>Called as above (Ashtead) should reflect arrangements in other existing parishes</p> <p>Parish of Ashtead, 10 Councillors with 1/3 annually standing for election to serve a three year term. Use the existing town boundaries Ashtead regards itself as a village - but its size makes it more like a small town, but the term " community council" sounds way to woke!</p> <p>It should be called Ashtead Parish At least 6 but preferably more councillors - at least the same number as we currently have. Ashtead should remain with the same boundary as we have at the moment. Elections should take place at the normal time in May</p> <p>Ashtead Parish Leatherhead Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ashtead Village Council 2. A suitable number for the population 3. Within the changeover times 4. The present electoral boundaries 5. I don't understand why they must be parishes. Surely a parish is an area surrounding a church? Village or Community Council would be better 6. To be quite honest, I have no idea about timescales or boundaries, let alone the answers above being proposals. <p>For the Ashtead area, there should be a new Town Council created for the Ashtead area, called Ashtead Town Council.</p>

The 2021 Census outputs apparently state that the population of Ashtead is 14,837.

Using UK government guidance, a village in England is a community with a population of less than 10,000 persons.

Therefore, under no circumstances should the proposed new authority for Ashtead be referenced as a "Ashtead Village Council", or "Ashtead Community Council", or "Ashtead Parish Council", due to the current population of Ashtead being far in excess of 10,000 persons.

I request that the term "Parish Council" be abolished for the Surrey area and be replaced by two appropriate terms "Town Council" and "Community Council", for the community area according to the 2021 Census population of the community area.

Ashtead Village Council

3 councillors

Rolling 3 terms so election every year.term of office 3 years run by a specialist outside body.

Geographically between the M25 and Stane Street.

Council should have specific duties and be bound by democratic rules.

There must be a strict set of rules so it's not the friends of councillors who flourish at the expense of the rest of the village.

Need an umbrella organisation of professionals to ensure the council is carrying out its expected duties always within the law.

Ashtead should remain unchanged retaining existing boundaries and not merged with any other community.

The number of councillors should be based on a ratio of 1 councillor per 1500 residents.

The name has to be retained as Ashtead.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

1. Loss of Local Accountability

Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.

2. Overstated Financial Benefits

The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.

3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance

Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.

4. Undermining Democratic Representation

Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.

5. Timing and Prioritisation

Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.

I have suggested 'no change' for all. The timing of this review is poor. There is no time for residents to be informed or carefully consider the ramifications of any changes. I now have 3 days to make my mind up as a resident. Expecting people to watch a video lasting 1hr 34mins does not constitute a fair, reasonable or democratic consultation process. Such changes need communities to engage with proposals and engage with each other to discern what is for the good of all.

I prefer any changes be delayed until the situation is clearer.

Locals need local views to be voiced and understood, not be overruled without consideration.

<p>I think even holding this consultation at this time is wasteful and self indulgent. At a time when we do not even know if there will be 2 or 3 areas in Surrey and boundaries throughout unclear any change now is pointless and may well not suit future needs.</p>
<p>I believe that there should be not changes to local governance until after the Unitary Authorities have been formed and are up and running. Any changes to local governance, put in place after the UAs are in place, will reflect the new county governance structure.</p>
<p>Not changing the existing parish councils is correct whilst we are in flux over the new Unitary Authority</p>
<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p>Why are you even considering this when MVDC is unlikely to exist in the near future.</p>
<p>At the moment I have no idea. I answered "Yes" above merely to draw attention to the need to address this issue - but now is not the time. If the current local government reorganisation proposals go through then MVDC will cease to exist. When (and only when) this reorganisation is finalised then the needs of communities to be represented at a more local level can be addressed.</p>
<p>I believe the public's exposure to this survey has been so quick, so hidden and in the public domain for such a short time the results of this survey will not be representative of the overall general wishes of the public. A Referendum should be undertaken with all options and every household told to read and vote.</p>
<p>I can't answer these points specifically. These decisions need to be taken when we know more about how the new Unitary Councils will work, and in consultation with our active Residents Association. All areas should have local representation.</p>
<p>I believe the public's exposure to this survey has been so quick, so hidden and in the public domain for such a short time the results of this survey will not be representative of the overall general wishes of the public. A Referendum should be undertaken with all options and every household told to read and vote.</p>
<p>I object to the proposed creation of a single unitary authority or any two-tier restructuring in Surrey on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of Local Accountability Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance. 2. Overstated Financial Benefits The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels. 3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions. 4. Undermining Democratic Representation Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents. 5. Timing and Prioritisation Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.

In conclusion, the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.

I feel there is a lack of connection between planning decisions, healthcare provision, local amenities, and transport congestion. Development often seems to proceed without sufficient consideration for the wider impact on essential services and infrastructure. There needs to be better coordination to ensure that new housing or other developments are supported by appropriate investment in healthcare, public transport, roads, and community facilities. This would help maintain quality of life for existing residents and ensure that new developments are sustainable.

This is one of the most pathetic surveys I have seen . Complete waste of time - a bit like MVDC !

I honestly think this review is a waste of time. Local people put forward their thoughts and are totally ignored by those running the show. What councillors say before they are voted in is not what they do and say afterwards. Politics has always been murky, but these days the wants and needs of the local small villages are totally overridden by bigger, flashier and more newsworthy projects. As you may see - I am totally disillusioned by how little the local villages needs are catered for by the bigger - remote - councils.

I believe this Review is badly timed, and should be postponed until the nature of future local government at 'County' level is known. Then it will have a clearer focus.

Take notice of all the objections being voiced and try not to ignore them.

I dont think the problem is how we are structured we need whatever level of government it is to deliver, and I am afraid I dont think any level of Government has delivered for a long time. People blame politicians and they are part of the problem, the bigger problem is the civil service which is the constant regardless of which party is in power, which leader is leading. Fix them and much of the problems are fixed, I am sick of paying more and more taxes to fund inefficiency, if this was a private business, people would be sacked for not performing.

I would like to participate and support my community but I neither have the time or stupid enough to hold the unaccountable to account, which is a sad state of democracy and capitalism.

I have previously responded more fully, but forgot to mention how to pay for a new village/parish council: the Council Tax is currently split between Mole Valley and Surrey, so I would presume that would be the same, with the UA getting a chunk, and the parishes ditto. For the new UA to swallow ALL the tax while giving us less representation would be totally unacceptable.

I would be disappointed if this leads to an extra level of burocratic political governance.

The motivation behind these changes is not based on any desire to improve the quality of life for residents. It's driven by interest and this interest is based on short term financial gain and reducing the sanctity of regulations designed to preserve the countryside and the environment. It represents the desire to exploit Surrey for private gain. Nowhere is this amount of effort used to improve infrastructure, provision of health services, care for the elderly or support of emergency services. It's dressed up as a root and branch initiative but is really a collection of measures designed to exploit the County of Surrey and reduce public rights.

Since when has an enforced government change saved money or reduced bureaucracy or even the numbers of staff employed. Government is going 'online' and self service everything but last figures I saw should the numbers of civil servants increasing.

I think even holding this consultation at this time is wasteful and self indulgent. At a time when we do not even know if there will be 2 or 3 areas in Surrey and boundaries throughout unclear any change now is pointless and may well not suit future needs.

This whole process seems to be a matter of expediency hoisted upon residents with little background information. I have concerns as to how debt will be consolidated. I have in mid local council such as Woking and Spelthorne who through greed and incompetence have accumulated liabilities following the creation of speculative property portfolios with what appeared to be low interest funding from central government. In addition Surrey CC has debt of £5.5 billion and there is no information to indicate the impact this will have upon the residents of Surrey. At some time these liabilities must be be reduced/repaid but how? The likelihood is that it will be covered by the

residents of Surrey with no responsibility placed upon the perpetrators.
In Ashtead do we need the additional costs and bureaucracy of a Parish Council.

there should not be any changes made before the Government has decided on the final make up of the County into 2 or 3 units.

Local housing associations have their own support groups to support residents also in all areas of mole valley

This survey seems to be a complete waste of time and money, especially as there is a large overspend by local councils and that they will not be in existence soon.

I disagree with the dissolution of the local councils in preference of a super council, with worse representation and higher costs

Should probably wait until after the change in council arrangements. Too many changes at once is not good

I do not see the point in making changes to local governance structures until after the new UAs are in place. Any premature changes may result in additional costs as the changes may not suit the new UAs geographical boundaries or governance structures.

I agree with the combined Residents Associations view that it would be premature to propose changes until the results of the District Governance changes are known. I refer to the combined RAs email to members dated 9th October, of which I am sure you're will have seen a copy.

Why has this not been more publicly advertised?

Thank goodness we have active local resident associations who working closely with local councillors are keeping us up to date.

Shame on central government for trying to 'sneak' this through the electorate.

The need, if any, for a parish council or alternative should be put to a transparent local vote and not decided by a committee somewhere. This should only be done when the electoral arrangements for the new unitary authority are finalised.

It is inappropriate for MVDC to be conducting this study at the present time.

I do not agree with the devolution concept proposed. I believe the merging into three large bodies removes choice from residents and dilutes our input. We already see the future problems as the current proposal to increase housing in the Ermyn Way area with a total disregard for the lack of infrastructure, particularly to address traffic congestion but also necessary improvements in capacity of GP's, schooling and local parking. I believe Dorking and its environs would be better placed to absorb increased housing but the authorities there were happy to push it off to an inappropriate location in Ashtead.

Unless there is a valid reason plus a substantial cost saving I believe we should accept the status quo.

Change is not always for the better. In this case change is not needed. If carried through would lead to higher charges for residents and lose more immediate contact for governing bodies.

The Review is utterly misconceived. I support the concerns voiced by the Ashtead Residents' Association. How can we express a view without knowing the exact powers, identity and proposals of the new unitary authorities? I would not feel the need to create a local sphere of influence if the unitary authority proposal delivers an efficient and cost-saving service. However, if it doesn't, (and there is a real concern that bureaucracy may simply increase and the deficits of some existing authorities are to be shared by all council taxpayers in the new unitary authority), reserving at least some powers to a new Ashtead parish council, could mitigate the negative outcome.

We should not do anything until we have seen how the local govt reorganisation turns out - and then we will need to have a wider vote of all those living in Ashtead.

No further changes should be made.

How Surrey communities are to be represented in the future

Firstly, I am very concerned that the process of creating Unitary Authorities across Surrey will create bigger areas of local Government while reducing any control that local residents and elected Councilors have in local matters. More power will be concentrated in fewer hands with much less accountability – BAD.

Second, we all know the financial mess that is Woking. A disastrous property development and then ultra vires financial dealings caused huge losses to that local authority. Those responsible must be prosecuted but of course that will not pay off the debt in itself. The Unitary proposals will spread the Woking debt amongst more properly-run councils and authorities whose financial strength will be subsumed into the Woking mess. Unfair and undemocratic.

The effect of servicing that huge debt, let alone repaying it, will affect what services can be provided to Surrey residents by local government.

I say there should be a referendum or vote on any local democratic structures after the new boundaries and authorities are in operation. Subsequent decisions must reflect the majority will of all residents and not just the few who gave an on-line answer.

There should be a public referendum so a representative sample can be achieved. This survey has too short a duration, limited visibility and publicity and inadequate to form an accurate view on public opinion.

The main point I wanted to raise is that given the uncertainty which is created by the ongoing local government reorganisation in Surrey, where we do not even know whether the county is likely to end up with 2 or 3 unitary authorities, it seems like a very bad time to be carrying out a review of community governance.

Would it not make more sense to wait until there is some clarity from the local government reorganisation?

All areas should have a Parish witting in the new two or three Surrey council

I think all MV residents should have the same level of local representation as should any future unitary authority arrangement.

I am concerned that some decision making at county/district level is purely motivated by cost and the needs and wishes of local residents are ignored or not given sufficient weight. An example would be selling allotment sites to plug gaps in finances without consideration of the plot holders views.

I do not see the benefits of having a Mayor unless they have statutory powers to make decisions for there area (as many European countries do e.g. France).

Generally I think there is too much 'big government' in the UK which results in compromise decision making that actually benefits nobody and consequently wastes money. Putting decision making at local level allows spending and services to be targeted in a way that best benefits the local area and makes local 'councillors' directly accountable.

I'm think that more resident opinion should be sought and that any proposed changes should be voted on.

I agree with the views of Ashtead, Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead Residents' Associations that with the intended creation of a new Unitary Authority covering our district, it is not appropriate at present to impose change on residents at this time, the process is premature, potentially undemocratic, and may possibly lead to increased Council Tax payments for residents.

Don't use this as a reason to increase Council Tax.

I am very disappointed to see that my council leaders do not have the discernment to see that the timing of this review is very poor. There is no time for residents to be informed or carefully consider the ramifications of any changes. Expecting people to watch a video lasting 1hr 34mins does not constitute a fair, reasonable or democratic consultation process. Such changes need communities to engage with proposals and engage with each other to discern what is for the good of all. I suggest you all attend some training to learn about community engagement and participatory decision making.

We are very concerned about the urban sprawl and loss of local identity. Any changes to parishes need careful consideration, local support and time to be established professionally and not rushed into and regretted later. The

large debts owned by some councils should not be off-loaded onto more prudent areas, and the people responsible for those excessive debts should not be allowed to continue in office.

Listen to the views of local residents

Why are you spending money and Human Resources on this when the decisions will be taken well above DC level?

we need better local representation on regional bodies
Proportional Representation would solve the problem far more effectively

Unnecessary expense at a time when the country is already struggling financially.

There could not have been a more inopportune time for MVDC to consider a Community Governance Review. It has not been petitioned for and is not needed.

Nothing must be done without a proper democratic vote of those entitled to vote and that ballot should be for the whole district not bits and pieces of it.

Thank you.

Responses for BEARE GREEN



Total responses: 15

Resident responses: 13

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Beare Green is already an established parished area.

Beare Green

- Number of responses: 15
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 13

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Beare Green (part of Capel Parish Council)	26.67% 4	60.00% 9	13.33% 2	15

Effective delivery of community services in the Parish

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
They should be abolished as neither separately or together do they do any good for the residents	I do not believe change is necessary as it's very well run and engages well with the community	We will be losing all the small villages You are trying to make places bigger and some will lose the status
Capel should be run from pipbrook. The parish councils do nothing for it's residents only add to the council tax bills and we have had enough of rising bills.	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up	It's rare to see a councillor in this village now, it is even rarer to see anything useful being achieved. Moving control to an already overstaffed and largely ineffective authority is hardly likely to improve matters. My very long experience is that centralisation, ultimately, creates more problems than it cures. Local people have local knowledge and there is at least some connection between the now very politicised and ideologically entrapped system, than there would be if it were all moved to one much larger area. The bottom line here is, that not everyone one in government either local or national wants to truly improve matters (with some exceptions). The imagined cost savings would soon disappear under the weight of increased responsibility with in reality fewer resources.
	NO CHANGE OTHER THAN MAKE PEOPLE DO THEY JOB THEY'RE PAID TO DO.	
	No changes are required	
	It is difficult to get people to volunteer here is beare green and feel changing the current setup will lead to a collapse. We currently have no engagement from the current district Cllr's	

	No change means doing ok! Parishes are important links between locals and mostly reflect church boundaries. They are best when not political - and local people like non-political!	
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.	
	Existing parishes appear to work well locally but are dependent on the voluntary efforts of the elected councillors and the very meagre budget they have to work within.	

Proposed Changes to Beare Green (Capel Parish)

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
<p>Capel Parish Council covers three distinct villages: Capel, Beare Green, Coldharbour. These villages are quite different in character, totally geographically separate, and the combined population is too big to be adequately represented by one parish council.</p> <p>I used to be Capel Parish Council clerk and am aware of the way the parish council operates and the concerns of the separate villages it serves. Capel village area has a very large population and deserves its own parish council. It is a busy and active community and as such it takes up much of the parish council's time and expenditure.</p> <p>Beare Green village area also has a very large population. But it is quite different in character to Capel Village. Beare Green is quieter with many retirees and economically inactive residents. It has few community activities compared to Capel. It has the benefit of a mainline train service to central London and a junior school. Beare Green also deserves its own parish council.</p> <p>Coldharbour has a tiny population and is geographically separate from Beare Green. Coldharbour village should be amalgamated with Wotton Parish Council, which already includes much of Coldharbour, including Leith Hill, within its parish boundary. If you look at the boundary map you will see that Wotton's boundary runs alongside the main residential area of Coldharbour village. It would make more sense to extend Wotton's boundary to take in the Coldharbour houses.</p> <p>Wotton Parish Council has a tiny population spread over a very large rural area and Coldharbour's rural character fits more logically into the Wotton parish council area</p>	<p>Of course parish councils reflect the needs of the local community - even with unelected members they all do a good job, led by a paid parish clerk who has to Have full training to do the work!</p>

than the present situation where it is tacked on as an afterthought Beare Green.	
I would like to see them done away with as they are a financial burden on the residents of the parishes in times when there is financial hardship. All should be run from pipbrook	
The parish names already reflect the villages which they represent - although Capel has a larger area its parish hall is within Capel so it makes sense to retain that name.	

Observations on unparished areas

All parishes work on the historic boundaries which MVDC has no ability to change. The work well utilising revenues from their assets and residents payments collected by whoever collects and returns as a stipend. However Holmwood used to run dorking and only when Govt changed stole it did North Holmwood come out of The South and Mid holmwood parish. This should never have happened so if it's possible I'd put Noth Holmwood back in the Holmwoods	
North Holmwood may be best suited to be in with Mid and South Holmwood. If it is to stay outside the existing Holmwood PC then it needs to be placed within Dorking and given a voice through new body that will create a greater voice for the residents of the town.	
Is Boxhill a parish or is it already part of Headley? If Boxhill is not already in a Parish, it may be best suited to merge with Headley, as despite there being a lot of park homes in Boxhill and Headley having "posher" houses, the majority of their problems are to do with the countryside and poor access into and out of the area - so they will have many shared interests.	
Within the proposed Unitary concept, Dorking and leatherhead may need to recreate their town councils -which are basically a parish - as without parish status their residents will not have any councillors to help them when things go wrong. as the district level will be abolished.	
Towns need strong representation, which a parish can provide, or the wishes of their population could be overlooked within a large unitary council.	
The current Parish Councils have the same boundaries for a long time and with the exception of Holmwood (who originally ran Dorking and N Holmwood) the boundaries are acceptable.	
The ability for local councillors to serve the residents is not effected by boundaries of parishes as they are so well established and parish councillors do tend to support the local community around them plus have special voluntary tasks within the parish that reflect their own skills and abilities. The boundary commission decides where Parliamentary boundaries, County and District Members constituencies lie tweeting them to suite numbers of constituents. Parishes run far more like a real community group with historic boundaries and very local ward councillors living in one section of the parish looking after their local neighbours, so with the exception of North Holmwood is not relevant for the boundary commission to change parish boundaries.	
Boxhill was not mentioned on the Parishes list - if it is not already with Headley, it could easily merge with them as it is somewhat left out as it stands.	
Town/parish councils need money to run - questionable whether 51% of residents will pay £100 a yr when now getting it all free or the Res Assn does it apparently for free! In 70s when MVDC subsumed town councils -people saw benefit in not paying parish tax to run their assets. A parish or town council needs assets to justify paying to run things. 10 yrs ago Dorking rejected a Town Council as benefit of it was slim. Now Mvdc towns don't own anything themselves so what would they manage? Northern villages have strong residents Assns to run their assets (some also stolen in mvdc merger. They can represent residents without extra payment! North Holmwood is different - logically and historically Holmwood Parish did include it and now you ask them to pay and they will say - for what?	
Headley PC already assists those on Boxhill - don't they? So Boxhill needs no Parish Council. Hard to say when parish councils are just as anonymous most of the time. They cost too much to run and is another stealth tax on the public	
I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.	

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Until recently MVDC Cllrs covered Boxhill & Headley in one seat.

It is an area that has similar problems and has few roads in and out - so it makes sense to add Boxhill to Headley. Creating a new parish for Boxhill on its own makes less sense than merging it to another that already exists if residents agree.

Boxhill doesn't need to be a separate Parish.

North Holmwood area includes housing off Spook Hill and those between Chart Lane and the A24. It shares many of the same problems as "Holmwood" Parish Council and even shares the same name. Therefore, if residents approved, rather than attempt to set up a new parish joining with Mid and South Holmwood would be a better idea as all areas are linked by the A24, with similar housing, countryside and problems.

All the areas selected above need a local council to represent them now the district council is to be wound up. The number of councillors should be a minimum of 7 maximum of 10. Elections for existing parish councils occur every 4 years. There is no need to change this timeframe for new parish or town councils.

The small communities of Box Hill and Westhumble are geographically close and should form a new Parish Council.

There should be a Dorking Town Council.

Leatherhead should have a Town Council.

Westcott should have a parish council. It already has an active residents group.

Pixham should be included in Dorking Town Council's area.

Ashtead should have a parish council. It already has an active residents group.

Bookham and Fetcham could combine as one parish council as they are similar in character. Or they could have two separate parish councils. They are both large residential areas which seem to have few facilities for residents.

Parish names led by town or village work.

All need parish councils to replace genuinely local representation if Surrey reorganisation goes ahead. That is very likely to be detrimental to local governance

Parish Councils provide some form of representation for local residents, largely free from party politics, one hopes, and as such are valuable if the local District council is to be dissolved, which I think is to be regretted. Consideration should be given to the creation of some form of local district forum to allow new and existing parish councils to have some opportunities to resolve local issues in the most satisfactory manner achievable under the (locally) undemocratic reorganisation imposed by HM Government with little or no representation in Surrey.

Parish Councils should always reflect the village name, if two villages are merged - perhaps little and great Bookham, then Bookham PC might be appropriate - otherwise a merged parish is best called the name of the town or all villages within the parish.

Councillors would depend upon the size of the parish and difficulty to travel around the wards. In general the current number of district Councillors would be a good guide to the number of Councillors in a parish. As far as I am aware the number of Councillors is controlled in all MVDC parishes by the governance already in place. If a new one was created the current district Councillor numbers for the wards within the District, might be a guide for any new parish - so Dorking PC might have 6 Cllrs, a Chair and a Parish Clerk.

Elections are controlled by governmental legislation - although elections of Parish Councillor every 4 years, and a need to stand down every x years seems to be normal in Councils run by Volunteers.

Geographic Boundaries - previously discussed - but for Dorking it could be Dorking as Dorking nUrban, or Dorking and surrounding villages (Westcott, Westhumble and Pixham)

Or for Leatherhead - Could include Fetcham, and Ashtead to be all 3 MVDC wards!

Parish Councils are a known and historic commodity, covered by legislation. To make it a community council or village council will have less relevance and probably hold less clout in their ability to represent their constituents.

Areas with existing parish councils are well served. All areas should have similar representation.

The new unitary authorities will need input from residents in every area within Surrey in order to run services effectively.

If Residents Assns are treated as Parishes without stipend - you only need Parishes are in Towns - where existing representation will drop from over 7 to 1 formal representative plus an MP!

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I don't support centralisation, this would make it much harder for the community to have meaningful contact with councils. An example of decentralisation that doesn't do us much good is Housing Associations and I won't get into that because it would upset the delicate souls amongst us.

Having just new county councillors responsible for large areas without much local council involvement very likely to lead to much reduced attention to parochial ie local, issues.

I don't think this is the right time to consider this.

With the abolition of Mole Valley, which in 1972 subsumed Leatherhead and Dorking Urban, the original town councils which had considerable status and voice will prevent to having no voice if nothing is at base level. In the rural villages Parishes have remained with people paying to have such bodies by legislation. Most parishes do a good job.

In MVDC's town and larger villages - sometimes there is a Residents Assn, but they are not as good as having a voice than a parish.

However, there is a problem in those now without a parish wanting to be if the residents association or town has no assets. On creating MVDC the previous councils land and property was subsumed into the District Council and as most was original bequeathed to the communities ie Dorking Halls given in 1946 to Dorking Town following it being left in a disastrous state post war use, and then passed to MVDC in 1974, it would be right to return all assets currently sitting in MVDC that are given to the local community back to the local community for the parish to look after and help justify stipends that residents will pay.

All Current Parish Councils within Mole Valley are superb, Parish Councillors discussing Planning are as highly trained as District Councillors, and apart from the paid and highly trained parish clerks, they organisations are run cheaply and efficiently by volunteers who care. IN some counties like rural Kent there they Parish's find it difficult to get Parish Councillors and that has led to mergers of villages, but they still run their assets and local areas excellently.

Do not force this on communities as not everyone has the money to pay for parish councils

Towns need more representation but the unparished residents are unlikely to

Pay to look after assets now "owned by the unitary" and the new unitary cannot fund unparished areas with money as that is unfair to their residents who pay money to parishes!

If it aint broke don't fix it.

Many hands may make light work but too many cooks spoil the broth.

KEEP IT SIMPLE!!!

Much prefer we had a vote on the proposed reorganisation; not just an imposition for ideological reasons and ill-judged investment decisions in Woking for which the rest of us now have to pay even when MVDC is well run

I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

I would like to see a local referendum for each of the existing District Council areas to determine whether there is much support for this dictatorial approach and the abolition of a District Council which appears to be doing as good a job as possible within the (financial) constraints imposed by the Government

I am really concerned that Dorking and Holmwood may lose its ability to be heard loudly in respect of things that will seriously impact its residents.

Losing a third of councillors (currently 6) and just having 2 Unitary Councillors is a worrying loss of democracy, where the elected representatives could really draw the attention of the Council, press and public to problems in the ward.

If a parish is created for Dorking, what will it run?

Dorking Wanderers and Dorking Town Football, gave up their ground to MVDC and what a mess MVDC made of "improving" the site. The remaining Club now pays a huge amount to rent for using their ground part-time from the head lease holder who pays a pittance a year.

Dorking Halls and Old Pippbrook House were both given to the citizens of Dorking, and if the sites continued to be passed on to a Unity for £0 as has happened before, how will those gifts benefit the town, and if they go to Surrey or the Unitary, will they choose to sell for financial gain?

What happens to the parks and land that has been looked after for the benefit of Dorking and MVDC residents. Who will own it and pay for its upkeep?

Every Parish has a parish hall and land, would Old Pippbrook House become Dorking's Parish Hall? Who would own Dorking's Car Parks and Parks?

If every resident in Dorking say 8000, units of housing, agree to pay say £50 - that is £400,000 a year. Would that be sufficient for a Parish Council to run what will be required of it with or without assets?

There are so many unanswered questions relating to what a Parish will have to do or might be asked to do with what funds?

Clarity is needed and needed fast - or Dorking in particular will be left with no strong voice, no assets to call its own and no real ability to stop or request anything to be done in the Unitary. With just 2 Unitary Councillors representing the town, and an elected Surrey Mayor probably with their self-appointed executive, the town gets 2 voices amongst many, so a very important town with major roads and rail links, and could easily become a "nobody". with no strong voice.

Responses for Betchworth



Total responses: 16

Resident responses: 15

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Betchworth is already an established parished area

Betchworth

- Number of responses: 16
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 15

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Betchworth	37.50% 6	56.25% 9	6.25% 1	16

Effective delivery of community services in Betchworth

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
Merge Betchworth Brockham and Buckland into a single parish: v similar areas, and a single parish council would be a more effective use of the Councillor's time. Having a renamed , larger parish council would also help to distinguish the parish council which is a tier of local government from the various Anglican Church parish councils - a current source of confusion. Would encourage non Anglicans, or non Church goers, to take part.	Betchworth Parish Council works extremely well with residents in the Parish, keeping us informed of what is going on, and providing a link to many Local events. They also arrange many events for the benefit of the local community and are very easy to contact when needed.	Keep all parishes as is
See above: a merger of the three parishes would create a stronger body to represent the local communities. .	No change is needed for Betchworth; we have an effective, hardworking, approachable Parish Council who serve the community extremely well. As I am not a resident in any of the other Parishes, I would not presume to suggest that any are changed; that it up to the residents, community groups and businesses in those Parishes.	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.
	No changes are required	They should be abolished.
	Because they are very active and accessible when problems occur.	Existing boundaries are oddly shaped, but no reason to see anything could improve through adjustments
	Betchworth is a small community with a unique identity. The Parish Council is an essential part of the community and serves the needs of the village very well. By amending/merging the Parish Council with another community would risk diluting the service currently provided and would risk making it less relevant to the residents.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want

	Betchworth has an effective, hardworking, approachable Parish Council who serve the community extremely well. They deliver all the services within their remit and could do even better if they were supported more effectively by Mole Valley (Planning) and Surrey (Highways).	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.
	Parish Councils are the first tier of Government and the most grassroots. People in communities with effective Parish Councils like Betchworth have their issues listened to; they are open and approachable.	Existing boundaries are oddly shaped, but no reason to see anything could improve through adjustments
		They should be abolished
		Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.
		Parish Councils are the first tier of Government and the most grassroots. People in communities with effective Parish Councils like Betchworth have their issues listened to; they are open and approachable.
		Parish councils do create local community spirit and accountability - worth putting in place if an area doesn't have one
		Parish Councils are well placed to serve the needs of the residents in their community. Small villages, even neighbouring villages, have unique needs which could become 'lost' if their parish council is merged with another parish council.
		No community should lose its Parish Council unless that is the express wish of the clear majority of the people. This should be done by using a democratic vote, not by a District Council subjectively interpreting a questionnaire that is seen by a minority of people.

Proposed Changes to BETCHWORTH

Proposed Changes	Generic responses

Observations on unparished areas

These parishes have no relevance to me.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.</p>
<p>I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.</p>
<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p>I don't think this is the right time to consider this.</p>
<p>Democratic deficit</p>
<p>I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.</p>
<p>We're going through a massively expensive devolution process. Why replace one elected authority with one which is unelected</p>

Responses for BOOKHAM



Total responses: 97

Resident responses: 93

Feedback: The majority of responses from Bookham residents indicate there is currently no appetite to establish a parish council; therefore, no changes are proposed for Bookham.

Bookham

- Number of responses: 97
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 93

Do you feel there is a need to establish a Parish Council in Bookham ?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Bookham	21.88% 21	65.63% 63	12.50% 12	96

Observations on parished areas

I oppose Parish Councils on principle
- they are a layer of bureaucracy that means we pay more tax for a service that could be delivered with better economy of scale if centralised
- local "representation" is meaningless when decisions on important matters (especially planning) are overridden by higher tier bodies anyway
- they are a busybody's charter for the self important to exercise "power" over other people's lives
There is absolutely no legitimate reason to change these parishes — unless, of course, it's to satisfy the egos of certain individuals in power and a government increasingly out of touch, obsessed with centralising control.
There would be no financial benefit only more bureaucracy , it would also remove decision making on local levels
Have marked no opinion to all, so N/A
Bookham does not have a parish and in my opinion they add an extra layer of admin and extra cost for very little benefit.
No changes for any parish, all working, locals involved, avoid autonomy and central bureaucratic agencies that don't get things done on the ground.
I have never lived in the parishes areas of Mole Valley. I would think it would be logical to ensure the Parishes represent a similar number of residents, but that is the only observation I can make.
I don't live in those parishes and have no experience of their effectiveness
It would be a terrible time to make more changes and it would cost residents a LOT of money. There is so much structural change going on with the county/district, that making parish changes as well would be completely wrong. Making changes without resident referendum is also wrong.
No need to change any
I have no opion on changes to places where I beither live or work.
All existing parishes are just fine as they are, so why does anything need to change? It would simply involved considerable cost and inconvenience to everybody. It's also better to have a more local.y community based parish rather than a more central function.
I do not live in any of the above parishes and therefore do not know the wishes of those who do live there
They are already working really hard.
No comment
Not applicable. We do not want the changes.
The current parishes reflect historic boundaries but are frankly ridiculous in shape and the communities they represent.
Currently the parishes reflect local needs , by changing then you remove that
BOOKHAM RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION Should be retained cost effective and INFLUENTIAL
None. Leave all alone. Parish councils are an anachronism hanging around from yesteryear and not even vaguely relevant to the 21st century, with its vast network of e-communications.
I think all areas of Mole Valley should be represented by local, village/community democratically elected councils. Call them community councils or parish councils, bringing democracy down to local level is a good thing and helps people understand how democracy works.
Not applicable - there should not be any change at the moment, and none without resident referendum. It would not deliver better services because it would be hugely expensive and would mean existing services had to be cut.
Need to preserve subsidiarity - local people for local decisions. Do NOT introduce 20mph zones in any areas - these are unnecessary, limiting freedom, personal judgement and detrimental to productivity. Every responsible driver adjusts speed to circumstances - stop interfering and incurring additional taxpayer costs for no reason - ditto 'traffic calming' measures - a complete waste of time and money.

We are happy with no changes. Mole Valley Council does a great job and never had any complaints that could all change!!We
Consolidate to reflect existing communities and geographies.
No change required, the communities and names reflect the current sense of place amongst residents.
We are happy with no changes. Mole Valley Council does a great job and never had any complaints that could all change!!We
I do not live in a parish therefore cannot comment on this
Don't change them there's no benefit
I do not feel well informed on areas where I am not residing
Parish councils should have a larger role and take on more responsibility once the unitary authority is created. Having an influence at local level with help the larger authorities gauge public opinion and provide a structured feedback method.
It is unwise to make any changes to local representation till the 2027 reorganisation has settled in - so not before 2030. Any changes before this are likely to be ineffective and costly.
Not applicable - there should not be any change at the moment, and none without resident referendum. It would not deliver better services because it would be hugely expensive and would mean existing services had to be cut.
It is not the right time to be making such changes given the major changes that are going to happen to Surrey local government due to the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2024–25.
As I said before we do not need to pay extra local taxes for a Parish when the BRA are doing such a fantastic job.
Having a local parish better serves the needs of the community better than any more central function.
This question is loaded and I will not answer it. I would suspect your motive in including it!
My husband and I are not getting any younger and even though some changes are for the good we are very apprehensive about this.
We do not envisage any of these changes working for the people.
Cost - this is an extra layer of governance which is unaffordable and a waste of taxpayers money
To make it plain, changing to current situation would only add unnecessary confusion and change to residents who already are settled in the current system, and who are generally dissatisfied with the current political climate in the country at the moment. Why make changes when there is no need to do so. The current associations of residents are not welcoming such changes, and these are people who genuinely care about the environments in which we live in.
The smaller scale representation greatly enhances political involvement, as people are much more likely to interact with someone who is directly responsible for their localized community, rather than some overarching system.

Support delivery of community services in Bookham

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
We need to replace the unelected and unrepresentative Residents Association that seems to have some kind of official standing with MVDC without having any democratic mandate. I voted for the establishment of a Parish Council in the referendum of 2016 after the campaign by BEAM for Bookham	Bookham have a very good organised hardworking Residents Association (BRA). We do need to pay extra taxes associated with a parish council as a Parish was voted down by a large referendum majority. The BRA have successfully looked after the interests of the village.	Am unsure of the specific benefits that might be obtained by creating a new parish. However if doing so enables more for more locally based control of decisions then it might be worthwhile.
Areas with PC's are much better run and give residents greater say in community affairs. Businesses are better supported. Services such as parks management, litter collection, verge maintenance etc can be managed more effectively at local level.	Bookham has a Resident's Association which very clearly reflects the views of the area and therefore does not require any change to the existing arrangements.	It would add to taxes
A localised council would represent the views of local people better than a larger Surrey one and deliver local services such as planning, local community affairs and amenities.	I do not want a parish council in Bookham and wish to retain the Bookham Residents Association - some years ago a referendum was held on this very subject and it was completely rejected by Bookham residents.	a new parish council may placate those who want a busy body parish councillor running their life for them, but in reality when the going gets tough they cannot support the community as they will be overruled for the wider good.
As stated above I think Bookham will need a village or community council following the local government reorganisation. In my view this	we had a referendum on a parish for Bookham within the last decade. It was comprehensively rejected (80% + opposed?)	It's about effective consultation. Delivery is still the responsibility of statutory local government.

<p>change will mean fewer opportunities for the newly elected councillors to be really 'in touch' with grassroots communities. Each councillor will be responsible for a much larger geographical area and the sheer volume of the workload will preclude closer liaison with the local community they are meant to represent.</p> <p>Bookham is a large village with a slightly different feel to each of the 3 areas I have proposed and each has very area-specific concerns. Having a ward councillor for each area would ensure that the slight variances in views from those areas could be well represented.</p> <p>In other areas where I am aware of Parish activity, it seems that they have a history of helping to deliver services locally - particularly in relation to playgrounds which I think might be a service under threat in the new structure. The village council could have a key role in protecting other non-statutory services such as libraries and youth provision.</p>	<p>It would result in increased tax take to fund a layer of bureaucracy that adds no value to what we already have</p> <p>I firmly support the creation of a unitary authority and reject the idea that as a result we "need" a lowest level tier for "local democratic" purposes.</p> <p>The bins will be collected whether we had a parish or not, services are delivered most effectively by bodies with economies of scale when procuring them, not tin pot entities paying through the nose for small contracts that then need to be monitored by parish council employees instead of an efficient centralised monitoring service</p> <p>Planning applications will still be referred to the Secretary of State no matter whether a parish supported or rejected them</p>	
<p>Recognisable local community, able to have control over minor local services such as recreation grounds and bus shelters.</p>	<p>We don't need it, it would not have any benefit only to pander to an already bloated system and add more local bureaucracy</p>	<p>If there is to be a campaign for a Parish Council there needs to be a fair presentation of the benefits and downsides - the last time this was discussed in Bookham the BRA used all its resources to fight against it thus making it an unfair fight</p>
<p>Establishing new parish councils now risks saddling residents with higher costs through the precept with potentially no benefit. They can continue to be represented through their RA's until it is a more appropriate time for putting this structure to a democratic vote.</p>	<p>No need to add another layer of costs</p>	
<p>It would lose its character without local governance</p>	<p>What's broken? It is the responsibility of Mole Valley District Council to be delivering services effectively. If you don't think you are then it is surely the Council's responsibility to improve. Creating another layer of bureaucracy with Parish Councils doesn't guarantee improvement and may in fact decrease service quality with a lack of action.</p>	
<p>To provide a joined up voice re planning and local needs being met, to have standing with other local authorities providing a balanced view for the citizens of Bookham rather than relying on groups of individuals each with potentially different agendas, to be accountable</p>	<p>Our Bookham Residents Association already exists and does a brilliant job</p>	
<p>Localism, ensure that local services are adequately provided and take over community assets that</p>	<p>They add an extra layer of political control and add costs for each resident for very little benefit. With the likely increase in rates and</p>	

otherwise might be neglected under a remote unitary model.	property taxes the last thing we need is even more costs.	
Would be useful if they help to provide more control of local services.	I think it would kill each village as we know them. It would seem as though changing who we are would be changing the identities of the respective villages. It seems as though for no good reason the council wants to change our boundaries and merge villages that have been in existence for hundreds of years. I don't feel that services and support for the communities should make any difference whether we are parished or not. We all pay our council tax, so should be equal.	
I just feel that we need active parish or town councils covering all of Mole Valley once West Surrey unitary is established	I feel they function well at present	
Something truly local ensures residents and businesses can have a voice on local issues. Delivering services - much would depend on access to county / unitary funds. Difficult to comment currently on this	THERE IS NO NEED FOR A CHANGE, DOING THIS WTLL BE A WASTE OF MONEY!	
I do not believe that local matters should be managed by volunteers (even though they do work hard), and that the associated costs should be borne only by those prepared to pay a subscription. I feel that Residents Associations all too often are ignored by the Council, and a local Parish Council would be taken more seriously.	The residents are supported by an RA rather than a Parish Council levying a precept. The creation of new Parish Councils would be premature at this juncture until the structure of the Unitary Authority is known and may create an avenue for cost/ service transfer from a cash strapped new UA to a local PC, noting that the UA's may start saddled with a £5.5bn debt. It is not the role of the outgoing district council to undertake this structuring for the future, it should be the new UA.	
Local government reorganisation will create a huge democratic deficit and put local community assets and discretionary services at risk.	No changes for any parish, all working, locals involved, avoid autonomy and central bureaucratic agencies that don't get things done on the ground.	
I think they will be much better at reflecting and supporting their community, and will deliver services more effectively than a remote unitary authority where most of the councillors are unlikely to be interested in what is happening in our area.	No need for new parish councils in areas where active residents associations already exist. With Area Committees set up in the new Unitary Authorities, local views can be made known direct to the UA without the need for a parish. Parish councils are unlikely to be able to manage local services without setting a precept that could be a significant additional amount of extra cost on residents Council Tax. As a consultee to the UA a parish is unlikely to have any more impact than residents associations do. You should not be considering setting up new parishes until after the UA has established itself and	

	residents can see whether the new arrangements work or not.	
I campaigned for the creation of a community council in Bookham 10 years ago. I haven't changed my mind. Now that the District Councils are to be replaced by a unitary authority, and our MP is more remote (Horley and Dorking) the need for local representation is even greater.	What's broken? It is the responsibility of Mole Valley District Council to be delivering services effectively. If you don't think you are then it is surely the Council's responsibility to improve. Creating another layer of bureaucracy with Parish Councils doesn't guarantee improvement and may in fact decrease service quality with a lack of action.	
	Our Bookham Residents Association already exists and does a brilliant job	
	They add an extra layer of political control and add costs for each resident for very little benefit. With the likely increase in rates and property taxes the last thing we need is even more costs.	
	I think it would kill each village as we know them. It would seem as though changing who we are would be changing the identities of the respective villages. It seems as though for no good reason the council wants to change our boundaries and merge villages that have been in existence for hundreds of years. I don't feel that services and support for the communities should make any difference whether we are parished or not. We all pay our council tax, so should be equal.	
	I feel they function well at present	
	THERE IS NO NEED FOR A CHANGE, DOING THIS WILL BE A WASTE OF MONEY!	
	The residents are supported by an RA rather than a Parish Council levying a precept. The creation of new Parish Councils would be premature at this juncture until the structure of the Unitary Authority is known and may create an avenue for cost/ service transfer from a cash strapped new UA to a local PC, noting that the UA's may start saddled with a £5.5bn debt. It is not the role of the outgoing district council to undertake this structuring for the future, it should be the new UA.	
	No changes for any parish, all working, locals involved, avoid autonomy and central bureaucratic agencies that don't get things done on the ground.	
	No need for new parish councils in areas where active residents associations already exist. With Area Committees set up in the new Unitary Authorities, local views can be made known direct to the UA without the need for a parish. Parish councils are unlikely to be able to manage local services without setting a precept that could	

	<p>be a significant additional amount of extra cost on residents Council Tax. As a consultee to the UA a parish is unlikely to have any more impact than residents associations do. You should not be considering setting up new parishes until after the UA has established itself and residents can see whether the new arrangements work or not.</p>	
	<p>No need for new parish councils in areas where active residents associations already exist. With Area Committees set up in the new Unitary Authorities, local views can be made known direct to the UA without the need for a parish. Parish councils are unlikely to be able to manage local services without setting a precept that could be a significant additional amount of extra cost on residents Council Tax. As a consultee to the UA a parish is unlikely to have any more impact than residents associations do. You should not be considering setting up new parishes until after the UA has established itself and residents can see whether the new arrangements work or not.</p>	
	<p>Don't destroy the status quo, which the local population have so clearly and recently demonstrated at local elections is what they want and voted for and most importantly can direct their consent or frustrations to!</p>	
	<p>We have already had a referendum on this in Bookham 4 or 5 years ago and the result was a resounding NO then and it would fly in the face of democratic principles to introduce it through the back door now. Besides if the whole point of unitary authorities being created and reducing governance and red tape, where is the logic in disbanding/integrating councils only to introduce more layers?</p>	
	<p>Do not wish to incur parish council charges</p>	
	<p>Residents Association already represents the interests of Bookham. Any other suggestion is premature before we know how Surrey County Council is to be divided and what services will be decided at local level. Anything which results in higher council tax without total clarity about this should be avoided.</p>	
	<p>I'm a councillor and even I really do not understand what a parish council could do for Bookham. I don't understand the relevance of the Review. I don't believe the Local Governance Review has been devised with ordinary people in mind. The questionnaire is assuming a</p>	

	<p>level of understanding on the part of our residents.</p> <p>I looked at the FAQ page but still couldn't understand the need for a parish council.</p> <p>At the Seminar on Zoom I attended on Tuesday 30 September I learned that a parish council will be necessary for democracy. If I hadn't already understood that, I'm uncertain how we expect our residents to understand.</p> <p>I haven't a clue as to how a parish council can help deliver services effectively.</p> <p>How would residents know how many councillors there should be? What is the difference between a community council and a village council?</p>	
	<p>Bookhams Residents Assoc (BRA) represent the Bookhams well as do the other RAs for Ashtead, Fetcham & Leatherhead. It is done by volunteers and not by politicians who apply their own bias. Politicians have to follow the party line and all too often, as per the release of green belt in the local plan, have to vote with the party. What our Dist Councillors did was a disgrace. The services provided by the volunteers of the RAs are free and provide continuity. Also unfettered by costly bureaucracy associated with local government.</p> <p>The consultation and conclusions of the Bookham Plan, promulgated by MVDC and supported by our DCs, was a disgrace. My view is that it was bordering on corrupt in the way local input was ignored and manipulated to reflect the views of our DCs and not the people. BRA holds the LAs to account.</p> <p>This push for Parish Councils is led by councillors who will be too afraid to put the choices to a referendum who want to fix what isn't broken. Bookham had one in the past - "Keep BRA or have a Parish Council". The vote in a high turnout was overwhelmingly in favour of BRA.</p>	
	<p>Would be premature pending the proposed change to a unitary authority. Makes no sense to consider at this time.</p> <p>For Bookham specifically I have never been in favour of creating a parish council.</p>	
	<p>In Bookham we have a very effective residents association. There is no need for costly change.</p>	
	<p>Bookham resident's association already does an effective job at administering Bookham on behalf of the local community. Creating a</p>	

	parish council would be unnecessary and expensive.	
	MVDC currently works well and I can see no reason to change at the moment. If change was mooted then all the residents views should be sought, not just those who respond to online surveys.	
	No need to change something that already works	
	<p>There is absolutely NO NEED to create more, expensive, layers of bureaucracy which residents would have to pay for and other services would have to be cut. I am very opposed to this being imposed upon residents against their will.</p> <p>Existing services which need change are those at county/district level, not parish level. Bookham is served by the Bookham Residents Association and that is adequate. The mess and increased cost which will result from the county/district changes would be made worse if you impose unwanted expensive parish levels too.</p>	
	<p>It is not the right time to be making such changes given the major changes that are going to happen to Surrey local government due to the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2024–25.</p>	
	<p>We already have a Residents Association that does a good job for a very low cost. I am not convinced that a Parish Council (that will require funding by Bookham residents could do better).</p> <p>It would be interesting to see if the majority of residents are in favour of a Parish Council once the costs and benefits are clearly explained to them.</p>	
	Unnecessary local expenses	
	I don't believe Parish Councils are an effective way to reflect local views	
	Bookham Residents' Association fully reflects and supports the Community of Bookham. We do not require an extra level of interference from Local Government. The Association is extremely effective in helping residents and informing residents of issues that have been raised.	
	We have been there before. Why are you wasting time and money when it was overwhelmingly rejected.	
	<p>Bookham residents voted overwhelmingly against establishing our own parish council some years ago. This was seen as an unnecessary body which would add nothing to our existing representation by the residents association while increasing Council Tax for no good reason.</p> <p>While the imminent changes in local</p>	

	<p>government raise the question once again, it remains to be seen whether this will change as regards effective democratic representation and delivery of public services.</p> <p>We would like another referendum on any new local democratic structures AFTER the new authorities and boundaries are in place.</p> <p>This is the only way to ensure that decisions will genuinely reflect the majority of residents rather than a small number of online responses.</p>	
	<p>This relates only to Bookham where I live. I think it is too premature at this stage of Local Government Reform to make such decisions as we don't know even how the Unitary Authorities will be structured and what services they will choose to retain or whether certain non-statutory roles could be farmed out to a Parish Council or equivalent.</p> <p>Bookham has already rejected the idea of a PC at a referendum but things have changed since then and it may need to be reevaluated post the new Unitary Authority being in place. Setting up a PC will impose a precept on residents in addition to Council Tax and it is important that this is done with all relevant evidence in place. I am aware of how the PC in neighbouring Effingham works and they are not without challenges, not least attracting sufficient councillors.</p> <p>Having said that, it seems that Bookham will have far less representation in the new UA compared to that from our current 6 ward councillors and 1 county councillor and a PC would ensure local people are more involved in decisions about things which effect them.</p>	
	<p>Should wait until new unitary structure is complete.</p>	
	<p>Happy as things are - no need to add in further costs</p>	
	<p>The residents associations do such a good job I cannot see how paid parish councillors can do it better. When this was last raised I know that here in Bookham received overwhelming support and nothing has changed. Anyway, it is ridiculous to raise the matter now in light of the forthcoming disbanding of MVDC.</p>	
	<p>The Bookham Residents Association already carries out many of the functions that a Parish Council would do.</p> <p>Creating a Parish Council in Bookham would only add an extra unnecessary layer and no doubt result in extra costs that would need to be recovered by an increase in council tax or similar.</p> <p>No such change should occur with</p>	

	<p>out a local referendum</p> <p>The whole idea of considering any changes now is totally wrong, misplaced and a waste of resources.</p> <p>The current ongoing process of local authority reorganization should be completed first.</p> <p>The appropriate time to undertake such a review would be after the new Unitary Authorities are created and have been operating for sometime.</p>	
	Unnecessary to make these decisions now before move to unitary authority	
	<p>Bookham has voluntary bodies which represent the interests of its residents, notably the Bookham Residents Association and the Bookham Community Association. A referendum held a few years ago revealed that there was little appetite for setting up a parish council here. This was, of course, in the context of MVDC and it may be that a different view would be taken when MVDC has been abolished [cries of 'shame!']. However we need to see what life is like under the new unitary authority which is to be set up to provide local government services in this area. Given that this will cover a much wider area than Mole Valley, it is possible that a need will then be felt for a parish council which will restore, in some measure, the element of localness that will have been lost. That remains to be seen: the new unitary authority will have its own ideas about communicating with, and even in some measure devolving powers or functions to, local areas. Meanwhile we need some stability in our local representative bodies while the upheaval of LGR is going on. For this reason it is not timely for this CGR to be taking place now.</p>	
	wait until the new Surrey authorities are in place and then have a vote	
	Already have active residents association that does a good job. Neighboring parish council does not set a good example	
	<p>Bookham has a very good proactive Residents Association. I would not like to see this changed without further consultation with the residents.</p> <p>I cannot express an opinion on the future of parishes where I do not live. Many of them have active residents associations, these should be consulted before any changes are made</p>	
	We are already very well served by Bookham Residents Association. Any change should ONLY follow a democratic referendum.	

	<p>No changes should be made based on a small internet survey</p> <p>NO Parish Council needed in Bookham.</p> <p>A Parish Council should NOT be imposed without a democratic vote</p>	
	<p>The current setup and governance works fine</p>	
	<p>I think the need for an extra tier of government is unnecessary and will lead to more bureaucracy and additional cost, which seems completely irrelevant and would strongly recommend we do not go down this route.</p>	
	<p>BRA do a very good job for Bookham residents. I cannot comment on the other parishes.</p>	
	<p>Cost of additional council tax that will be applied to most households if a Parish Council is established.</p> <p>Residents Association are non profit making and are supported by voluntary donations</p> <p>Residents' Associations that exist carry out a significant role in their communities without unnecessary levels of bureaucracy</p> <p>Residents Associations are not affiliated to any political party</p> <p>Communication through Newsletters/email/ noticeboards etc works well</p>	
	<p>We are happy with the way things are. We are not being very proactive or positive about this but that is how we feel. This has been foisted upon us all and have no confidence in anything this Government is planning.</p>	
	<p>My experience of parish councils is they have little meaningful authority and are just an exercise in spending taxpayer money on a few busybody schemes. They are also a method by which certain services are palmed off by the bigger organisations as a cost cutting measure for that organisation resulting in fragmented services at much greater cost, whose tab is still picked up the taxpayer at the end of the day.</p> <p>I am very happy with the Govt's drive to scrap district and county councils in Surrey and I welcome the advent of a unitary authority.</p> <p>Frankly I do not regard current "representation" at either district or county level to be meaningful. It is dominated by party politics and therefore reflects the "national mood" in terms of either reflecting whether it's a Tory Govt or it's a protest vote against Tory and thus</p>	

	<p>orange flavoured (Labour being irrelevant in Surrey).</p> <p>I accept that party politics are not a feature of parish council, but that in itself is because parishes were irrelevant in terms of stepping stones to "power" for aspirant politician. In the context of a unitary authority, and thus the only thing below that thence being a parish, I do not hold out much hope that party politics will not take over parishes and therefore become the same as we have now, a bunch of busybodies standing for election with a eye to moving up the "power" ranks within their party and the only time they listen to the electorate is if their seat is no longer safe.</p>	
	<p>Many reasons not to have a parish council:</p> <p>More bureaucracy</p> <p>Unaccountability, I don't believe parish councillors can be held to account should they not do their job satisfactorily</p> <p>The council should be the one stop shop for serving local needs, residents may be confused about who is responsible for what</p> <p>Local people are not always the best representatives, may lack necessary skills, be self serving and limited in vision</p> <p>Community will not appreciate another 'tax' (precept) to pay for a parish council</p> <p>There would be opportunities for things not to get done due to slow, poor decision making because of the added bureaucracy</p> <p>It's difficult enough to find people willing to be councillors or to be members of a community group committee without finding good skilled parish council candidates</p> <p>Even if a decision on an issue is made by a parish council the authorities can override it</p>	
	<p>A parish council is an unnecessary body. It increases the household bills and what do they actually achieve and deliver !</p>	
	<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do</p>	

	<p>(manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>	
	<p>The Residents' Association for Bookham has always given excellent service to the community and I can see no reason to change this for a Parish Council, with its added costs.</p> <p>Its members work tirelessly and very successfully for the Community and they are easily contactable. They are represented at many local events, volunteering in every possible way. They are highly respected and they, themselves, receive satisfaction from doing a job a for others without financial reward. They have a large range of skills and expertise and spend hours considering planning applications</p>	
	<p>Cost - this is an extra layer of governance which is unaffordable and a waste of taxpayers money</p>	
	<p>Our residents association does a good job we don't need yet another level of bureaucracy</p> <p>I am against the proposed changes at district council level as I believe that will cost money to implement and see no evidence that it will actually generate savings.</p> <p>Just make what we have work and stop wasting money on Consultants</p>	
	<p>The Bookham Residents Association (BRA) has been highly effective in consulting with local residents and businesses and representing our views for decades at minimal cost.</p> <p>Past cost comparisons with neighbouring Parish councils have demonstrated an substantial value for money in favour of the BRA.</p> <p>Moreover, the BRA have frequently</p>	

	<p>galvanised both residents and the MVDC into taking action on serious issues, needing attention, far more rapidly, often resolving the matters in question while other organisations were still discussing the issues.</p> <p>It is therefore unsurprising that residents voted by an overwhelming majority in favour of retaining a Residents Association rather than converting to a Parish council a few years ago.</p>	
	<p>Currently the Community Association deals with matters very efficiently.</p> <p>Until the division of Surrey is finalised it is pointless making decisions</p>	
	<p>The current situation creates a direct link between residents and those who represent them in positions of authority. Considering this logically, there is absolutely no connection between a resident of Westhumble and their lived experiences, when compared to a resident of another region of 'a north surrey unitary authority', in which the demographics, culture and day to day life are nothing alike.</p>	
	Bad idea	
	<p>No changes for any parish, all working, locals involved, avoid autonomy and central bureaucratic agencies that don't get things done on the ground.</p>	
	<p>Creating new parishes before the new UA has established itself, and residents can see whether the new arrangements work or not, is a BAD IDEA</p> <p>No need for new parish councils in areas where active residents associations already exist.</p> <p>With Area Committees set up in the new Unitary Authorities, local views can be made known direct to the UA without the need for a parish.</p> <p>Parish councils are unlikely to be able to manage local services without setting a precept that could be a significant additional amount of extra cost on residents Council Tax.</p> <p>As a consultee to the UA a parish is unlikely to have any more impact than residents associations do.</p>	
	<p>No, no, no. Very divisive and no doubt costly .Ill advised and unwanted proposal for local government . Who thought up this concept and what were their motives?</p>	
	I don't. Pointless exercise	
	<p>It is a TERRIBLE idea. Complete waste of money and undemocratic.</p> <p>There is absolutely NO NEED to create more, expensive, layers of</p>	

	<p>bureaucracy which residents would have to pay for and other services would have to be cut. I am very opposed to this being imposed upon residents against their will.</p> <p>Existing services which need change are those at county/district level, not parish level. Bookham is served by the Bookham Residents Association and that is adequate. The mess and increased cost which will result from the county/district changes would be made worse if you impose unwanted expensive parish levels too.</p>	
	Not a good idea	
	It is not a good idea.	
	Judging by the responses to membership collections in Bookham its residents are very happy with the status quo, i.e. Bookham Residents Association.	
	It's not a good idea	
	I do not agree with establishing Parish Councils	
	<p>I appreciate you are desperate to retain an opening for the political classes to cling to their power but I fundamentally do not agree with the notion that a parish would reflect anything more than party.</p> <p>It is bad enough at the moment with the district councillor as she turns up the the apocryphal opening of an envelope just so she can get a photo op and present herself as a driving force behind an initiative that was thought of, and implemented by, volunteers, not politician.</p>	
	Not in the current state.	
	<p>One of the reasons we moved to Bookham and the wider area was because of its special and unique rural atmosphere away from London.. These proposed reorganisation ideas will destroy that uniqueness and make Bookham and locality just another sprawling, un-unique suburb of Greater London offering nothing special or countrified to Bookham, etc. Leave things as they are. This proposed reorganisation is proposed by local political forces to an unwelcome response from the local electors because those same recently rejected political forces in the area now no longer have the support and trust of the residents who value the special nature of living in the Mole Valley area.</p>	
	For me Bookham functions very well without a parish council and I think we decided against one sometime ago.	

What might a Parish look like in Bookham?

<p>The Bookhams Parish Council No more than 9 councillors Local election every 3 years To include little and great Bookham As MVDC is to be wound up then a local Parish Council would be effective in local governance matters</p>
<p>I think Bookham will need a village or community council following the local government reorganisation. In my view this change will mean fewer opportunities for the newly elected councillors to be really 'in touch' with grassroots communities. Each councillor will be responsible for a much larger geographical area and the sheer volume of the workload will preclude closer liaison with the local community they are meant to represent.</p>
<p>A community or village council could bridge that gap in representation.</p>
<p>Bookham would need 1 council with 3 wards: Little Bookham - all roads West of & including Middlemead Road and Merrylands Road to the boundary with Effingham Bookham South - all roads South of the A246 Bookham North - all roads North of the A246 and East of & excluding Middlemead Road & Merrylands Road to the boundary with Fetcham.</p>
<p>I think 1 councillor per ward should be enough and elections should take place at the same time as county elections to maximise efficiencies of resources.</p>
<p>I think Parish Council is a misnomer - many people associate this word with the Church and think this level of local government is somehow linked to the church and that a religious view is somehow brought to bear in this context. I would prefer Community or Village Council.</p>
<p>Bookham parish, taking in Little and Great Bookham. Adopt the pre-1974 boundary with Fetcham.</p>
<p>The benefit of the different styles requires exploration and any decision must be through a democratic vote of all residents with a clear majority. It must not be based on an online survey with potentially few respondents and no set minimum.</p>
<p>Bookham parish council Leatherhead town council Both are significant and separate communities At least 2 councillors each</p>
<p>Called Bookham 7 councillors Elections at the same time as other parish council elections to include Bookham Common to the north, end at Kennel Lane to the west and Rectory Lane to the east, up to Polesdon Lacey</p>
<p>There should be a local referendum to decide whether or not to create new parishes - anything less would be undemocratic</p>
<p>They should be called community councils. The number of councillors should reflect the level of population. Elections should take place every 3/4 years in the same cycle as current district elections. Geographical boundaries should reflect the geo boundaries of the villages to ensure local cohesion and a sense of belonging. How the community councils are financed should be a matter of consultation. A proportion of savings made during the move to a unitary authority should be dedicated to this. Community councils should have more responsibilities than current parish councils.</p>
<p>Bookham parish council Same as MVDC numbers At next scheduled local or general election to minimise additional costs Stick to historical boundaries A community council sounds fully inclusive</p>
<p>Bookham Community Council 10 Concurrently with the local authority election Great and Little Bookham The word Community is important to encourage involvement of those who are not involved with churches</p>
<p>I would like a 'Bookham Parish Council' encompassing both Great Bookham and Little Bookham. I do not have an opinion on the other aspects listed above.</p>

Other comments for all MVDC areas

We need stability in local government and governance to avoid constant disruption, additional cost of changes and loss of intimate contact between local government and operational councils and other local government bodies. Need clear lines of communication and contact arrangements with closely provided and not remote local government who lack intimate knowledge of local matters and needs. This reorganisation is proposed because the long-standing political powers have lost control of local decision in making and managing local affairs. This is solely directed to negate the will of the local people in Mole Valley (as manifest by the overturning of the previously ruling party) for a major change in the running of local government in this well defined District Authority. Leave MV as it is and how the people of MV have so recently and so clearly decided that they want the status quo, with no artificial, unnecessary and unwanted reorganisation forced upon their District upon them and their so clearly demonstrated wishes at the most recent local government elections. Change would inevitably involve additional cost (to the local ratepayers).

Town Councils should be formed to replace the loss of local accountability brought about by LGR. The surrounding villages can decide whether to be included as part of a wider town council, or remain separate either as a Parish Council or Residents Association.

I would like two town councils:

Leatherhead Town Council

Dorking Town Council

I would suggest two parish councillors per ward as per the previous district council electoral boundaries.

Elections to take place every four years, and spaced two years from the Unitary Elections

There should be a Leatherhead town council potentially representing Ashtead, Bookham and Fetcham as well as Leatherhead.

Could call it Leatherhead town or community council depending which other areas are included

For geography, could initially use the existing district council wards.

With either the existing 21 councillors or perhaps better 14 ie 2 from each ward.

Elected every 4 years if using STV, otherwise every 2 years if 14 councillors to ensure more balanced and regular entry and representation.

If time, you could merge or tweak the existing wards slightly to put right the errors in the most recent LGBCE review.

So for example, you could end up with 16 councillors, split into 5 Ashtead councillors, 4 Leatherhead councillors, 3 Fetcham councillors (expanding the existing Fetcham ward to mirror the KT22/KT23 split between BRA and FRA), and 4 Bookham councillors.

No particular views about the Dorking area.

I think it would be worth considering a Leatherhead Town Council covering Leatherhead, Ashtead, Bookham and Fetcham, based largely on the existing district council wards.

I see little point in pursuing individual parish councils for each of the villages as this duplicates the roles of the Residents Associations who will oppose them.

It will be important to devolve community assets to the new parish/town council, including income-producing assets which can support the new parish/town council's activities. Otherwise residents will be concerned about having to pay higher council tax.

With the advent of the internet it's possibly the greatest positive growth in information sharing ever. The residents and council should embrace this to keep both parties well informed and to facilitate the better understanding of local needs and solutions on offer. Something of a digital forum for the good of the local community. I'm convinced we should all become more involved in local community matters.

A community council would have to have at least one full time, paid, member of an executive body, employed by the executive to handle administrative and legal/finance requirements. Other members to be executives, Chair, Finance Officer, Secretary, legally supported, all other volunteer members to be elected in regular elections. Those retiring would trigger further election/s at the appropriate, next election, time. Interaction with the community should be a priority with the council handling communication with the community as a group with all decision making reported openly, not behind closed doors. Executive Meetings to be recorded online. The council's main priority should be information flow between the residents and the unitary authority, explaining/commenting on plans and decisions, inputting the opinions of residents and local businesses, and carrying out agreed local community council duties and responsibilities.

Having lived in Surrey for over 40 years, I have always felt that the County Council is remote and local representation sparse. Losing democratic representation at District level will be a huge blow to many. Instigating cheaper, local Community Councils is a way to mitigate this, providing the budget and volunteers can be found to run them.

Leave it alone there is absolutely no need to create any parishes or merge others

With creation of unitary councils , the existence of well run and resourced parish and town councils becomes more important.
You do not mention anywhere in the background information about local referendums for any new parish councils. Making changes and potentially increasing Council Tax with Parish Council precepts without asking residents to vote on the proposal is undemocratic. If you are planning to hold referendums based on this initial review then there is a benchmark that needs to be passed before going any further. I.e. if a population of a village/town is 5000 then 25% - 1250 need to have requested a change in this review before going any further.
Nobody on Government listens to us anyway. Consultations are a waste of time as decisions have already been made and it's just paying lip service to local democracy. So why make it more complicated? Plus, our voluntary local RA is the only grip that actually tries to protect and promote our area.
I think Fetcham and Leatherhead would also benefit from a community council but I am not a resident of those areas so cannot comment in any further detail.
It might be feasible to have a North Mole Valley Community Council with 3 ward councillors for Bookham, 2 for Fetcham and 3 for Leatherhead. Not sure of the number weighting as I don't have population statistics to hand. But it could be argued that a Community council representing a larger area could have more influence on decision making at County level.
My understanding is that the structuring of the second stage is yet to be determined but may not include a vote. If it does not, I fear that a structure will be imposed based on a minority of respondents who have been encouraged to participate by some councillors who may have a self-interest in the process and for whom a PC is an avenue to continue their role as local representative.
We need local representation and not a centralised system where local issues are less likely to be understood or recognised
This whole exercise is being undertaken at least five years before it should be. Creating new parishes before the new UA has established itself, and residents can see whether the new arrangements work or not, is a BAD IDEA.
I only hope that the next stage spells out in simple terms what the community governance review is all about.
The Q " what describes you" sums up the political nature of this survey. Why do you need to know anything other than if representing a resident or business ?
 The Q " what describes you" sums up the political nature of this survey. Why do you need to know anything other than if representing a resident or business ?
This is too early to be contemplating such changes - speaks volumes for the thirst for political power of those soon to be de-throned!
 You should do nothing now pending the larger reorganisation. Seems like unnecessary expense to be doing this now.
It comes at the wrong time.
This is all very theoretical. Residents need to know much more about any proposal for change in order to make a meaningful response.
This survey will not be undertaken by the majority of residents, so a referendum/vote would probably be better
There is absolutely NO NEED to create more, expensive, layers of bureaucracy which residents would have to pay for and other services would have to be cut. I am very opposed to this being imposed upon residents against their will.
Existing services which need change are those at county/district level, not parish level. The mess and increased cost which will result from the county/district changes would be made worse if you impose unwanted expensive parish levels too.
As previously stated, it is not the right time to be making such changes given the major changes that are going to happen to Surrey local government due to the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2024–25; making such changes now seems to be a complete waste of resource and money.
I think a vote on any new Parish Council could be held after the new authorities (and boundaries) are up and running. However, whatever the decision, it should reflect the majority of residents, not a small number of online responses.
Things are fine as they are. I don't want increased costs - cost of living is tough enough as it is
Surely changes should take place after the proposed County changes
I am not sure why it has been necessary to suggest a Parish Council for Bookham. This matter has been discussed and rejected because of the level of interference by Councils.
The LGR is removing power from residents by reducing the number of councillors, and removing second tier local government.
The unitary councillors will be busier and have less time to help residents on local issues as there will be fewer of them.
Money diverted to 'traffic calming' and potential 20mph should be directed to improving road quality/maintenance/ potholes. Councils should not be wasting money on net zero or DEI initiatives - these are purely ideological spends and do not serve local residents. Councils exist to provide efficient services for taxpayers, not promote ideologically driven, unwanted policies.
Requests/other comments: Please expedite the building of the new youth centre in Bookham. This has been kicked into the long grass for too long. Please review levels of street lighting if possible; the street lights are so dim at night, they are barely fit for purpose in

<p>terms of road safety or personal safety when walking outside at night. Strongly object to the proposed traffic calming measures down Church Road in Bookham.</p>
<p>Acknowledgements: Grateful for resurfacing to some small road areas around Bookham and in front of the Howard of Effingham school. Grateful for efficient bin collection services weekly/fortnightly and availability of local recycling centres.</p>
<p>We are concerned whether the changes in local government eventually introduced will actually reduce rather than increase the level and quality of democratic representation. We have no problem with the replacement of Surrey County Council which we feel has poorly represented local interests in Bookham. However the disappearance of Mole Valley as well has the potential for a real diminution of genuine representation after a period of improvement. We feel there is a danger of the return of single party domination in Surrey unless local government changes include appropriate electoral reform as well.</p>
<p>Very early days yet and it is hard to know what will eventually happen. Shouldn't be making key decisions on PCs at this early stage.</p>
<p>I am not in favour of the new unitary structure being created - there was no consultation and it is being imposed on residents.</p>
<p>Please do not add further parish councils or additional costs to residents</p>
<p>Yes, leave well alone. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!</p>
<p>Cancel the Review with immediate effect.</p>
<p>We should have a vote or referendum on any new local democratic structures. It should be held after the new authorities and boundaries are in operation.</p>
<p>Go away and stop pestering residents who are very satisfied with the service provided by the volunteers who work tirelessly for Bookham Residents Association - its services are provided for £5 per year not the £100+ you are likely to require as a precept.</p>
<p>Parish councils only add a layer of people who think only their opinions is what's best for their community. No more parish councils should be established</p>
<p>I feel there should be local consultation in all local parishes or residents associations before any changes are made to ensure <u>adequate review of not only local requirements but also additional costs that may be involved</u></p>
<p>No decisions should be made on local democratic structures until the new authorities and boundaries are settled and in operation. When these authorities and boundary reforms have taken effect then there should be a vote to decide what local democratic structures are needed.</p>
<p>Gordon Elsey KT234BX5</p>
<p><u>The proposed new area would be far too large & focus would be lost</u></p>
<p>I am concerned that this survey is being carried out by MVDC when it will no longer exist under the Unitary Authority.</p>
<p>I am concerned that there is no communication of the cost to households of the introduction of a Parish Council via their Council Tax. How can residents make an informed decision if they are unaware of the cost. Given the amount of Council Tax already paid why should residents have to pay more</p>
<p>Residents are not being given a full cost benefit of the establishment of a PC, just vague comments on the funds that they will have to distribute in the area.</p>
<p>I am concerned that this survey shows bias towards the establishment of Parish Councils in its format and that so much of the survey is taken up with this.</p>
<p>In areas that already have an existing Residents Association there should be a referendum to decide if residents support the creation of a Parish Council (as happened in Bookham in 2016). This will truly represent the views of the local community rather than an online survey such as this.</p>
<p>We have never felt so upset and pessimistic in our 70+ years. Our fears for all our family, friends and patriots to this once great county grow more every day as this government is not "for us" and now we feel like second class citizens. Very political I know but feeling very depressed about everything that is happening. And these planned changes just add to our worries.</p>
<p>It seems a very odd decision to carry out this survey now given the wider Surrey council changes. I don't see how I can have an informed opinion on local governance structures (given that where I live doesn't have one at present) until it's clear how the new one-tier council system will operate.</p>
<p>Consideration should NOT be given to further change at this stage or until the new UAs are working satisfactorily. Then there should be full and proper consultation with a proper physical election - not on line.,.</p>
<p>As stated above, until the division of Surrey is finalised, it is pointless making decisions about all the options listed.</p>
<p>I'm very disappointed with the way this survey was put together. It actively discourages residents in Bookham, Fetcham and Ashtead from suggesting that their areas participate in a wider Leatherhead Town Council because it requires them to respond yes to an individual parish council for each area. Which is not a sensible idea (except perhaps for Leatherhead) given the existence of residents associations for each area, and which the residents associations not surprisingly are campaigning against. The only sensible response is to have a parish council for the whole of the North of Mole Valley, but this option was not available in the survey.</p>

It's a shame the survey didn't offer the option of a Leatherhead Town Council for all of the 4 communities in the North. Sadly I do not think many respondents will see past the table where they have to ask for a parish council for individual areas. So the responses will not reflect support for this option.

Having studied politics and governance at university and school, a common theme emerges when such 'reviews' take place. Change occurs at expense and confusion for little to no gain or benefit and everyone wonders what was wrong before. A referendum may potentially be an option.

I implore those considering these changes look at themselves and consider if confusing changes will actually positively impact people who live in Mole Valley.

I don't know think the issue about parish councils have been explained to the average resident who doesn't live in a perished area, if we have to make decisions then we need more one-to-one meetings to explain things.

Responses for BOX HILL



Total responses: 64

Resident responses: 62

Feedback: Responses from residents indicate strong support for establishing a parish council in the area.

Box Hill (Currently unparished)

- Number of responses: 64
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 62

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish councils in Boxhill?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Boxhill	60	1	3	64

Observations on parished areas

Do not reflect the local community
No change. Each parish is unique and individual.
See above. Keeps each area with a voice and representation.
Local councils deliver for the local population. There should be one for every village.
I live in Box Hill, so changing existing parishes doesn't concern me
With larger district councils Parishes need to retain their individuality to serve their communities better

Support delivery of community services in Box Hill

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
Reflect and support the community in which I live	Elected to say 'no change' so they don't impinge on Box Hill.	All local parishes need a say in the running of their own communities.
To better support its residents	Very concerned that smaller villages will be overlooked and the vulnerable and disabled will be negatively impacted. Saving money? Costing jobs and adding bureaucracy seems more likely.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
To support the residents living in that area		I have no knowledge, no opinion.
In Boxhill, we want our own parish council and don't want to be linked with another area. We want to have our own parish councillors, who can make decisions for our parish. We don't want to be ruled by another parish!.		Each council should use its area name followed by the words -parish council In our village case for example BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL With at least 5 councillors electable from 2027 Our boundary should be Boxhill Village & its immediate out lying homes on Boxhill rd from the National Trust Cafe to the start of Boxhill road at its northern end intersecting Headley rd. There should be no area gaps between all parish councils Surrey so all residents can access a parish council for local matters. All the councils should be Parished ones. No alternative style needed. With local representation all Parishes can make decisions

		<p>pertinent to their own areas. More important still with the proposed devolution of existing district councils. These councils can make best quicker decisions for their own immediate areas, and more easily liaise with neighbouring parishes and where needed, liaise with the new county wide authorities. It keeps administration and decision taking immediately relevant and properly local!</p>
Box Hill needs its own Parish Council		<p>Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.</p>
To better represent the residents		<p>Each area has individual needs - each needs a voice.</p>
I don't want Box Hill to merge with nearby Headley		<p>Protecting Local Identity – With larger authorities replacing Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council, a parish council would preserve the unique character, traditions, and priorities of the local area.</p> <p>2. Stronger Community Voice – Parish councils provide a formal and recognised platform for residents to raise concerns, influence decisions, and ensure that local views are represented at higher levels of government.</p> <p>3. Control Over Local Services – A parish council can take responsibility for amenities such as parks, community centres, street lighting, and local events, ensuring these are managed in line with community needs rather than distant priorities.</p> <p>4. Access to Funding – Parish councils have the ability to raise a precept and apply for grants, bringing in additional resources for community projects, improvements, and infrastructure that might otherwise be overlooked.</p> <p>5. Responsive and Accountable Governance – Parish councillors are local residents themselves, meaning decisions are made by people who live in and understand the community, leading to quicker responses and greater accountability.</p>
Remove Box Hill Village from these two parishes and create own parish		
Box Hill Parish council		
So residents have more of a say in decisions being made in their area		
To keep local issues at grassroot level.		
Box Hill has an excellent, longstanding Neighbourhood Council		

that would benefit from being Parished now the village is growing with more houses being built.		
To best support the needs of the people living in this area		
We are a vibrant active village but many residents and I believe the village would prosper much better both financially and in terms of galvanising more events for our many residents, in our beautiful village. We need more autonomy to allow our village to thrive to its full potential. We have the residents ready to rise to the challenge.		
I believe it will ensure local representation		
To better support those living in that parish		
So each parish best supports those living in that parish		
Parish councils will better deliver local representation and speed up on occasions urgent matters which require urgent outcomes. eg In Boxhill's case we have trees often loosing branches in the wetter months or dangerous pot holes over and in Boxhill road which need urgent attention to prevent risk to life. The focus through a Boxhill Parish council councillor would hopefully produce a safe resolution to one phone call rather than many concerned individuals having to sit on the phone for hours even to get through to the right department! I would hope such an urgent request from a parish council would be dealt with immediately at the new large authority level, not several weeks during in which interim, a member of public could be seriously hurt. Shared services could be better devolved and directed. Faults and problems more quickly acted on. And communication through the village more easily enabled.		
I very strongly believe that with the wholesale changes that are being made to Local Government, it is vital that communities have a voice and representation in relevant local issues. With Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council ceasing to exist in 2027, Box Hill will lose its Mole Valley District Councillors and our Surrey County Councillor. Much of the Box Hill community's ability to raise issues of concern and lobby will be lost if these representatives are replaced by only two Unitary Authority Councillors covering a larger area.		
Box Hill must have a Parish Council to ensure some tangible local representation and the ability to lobby for and raise funds for important local matters. Box Hill has		

a high proportion of elderly and disadvantaged residents. Currently, there are grants and other funding for the bus service (essential in the isolated village), the bus shelter and developing the village hall. Furthermore, local people should have a direct influence on funding on a wider scale such as that needed to maintain the Dorking Library and Dorking Halls.		
Better representation for people living in that parish		
We must have someone representing the Box Hill community		
In Boxhill, we want a new parish council and councillors to make decisions for the residents of Boxhill. This includes the views of residents on certain topics to do with the village and the provision and availability of all required services and amenities. We don't want another parish deciding what's appropriate for the residents of Boxhill, as this could lead to conflict, negativity, aggravation and suffering. We want the support of a parish council for Boxhill residents!		
so that Box Hill does not get swallowed up in some other parish		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
Support local representation of the Box Hill Community, and monitor and deliver local services.		
I believe it will ensure better local representation.		
I want to ensure local representation!		
We are losing our own Mole Valley District Councillors and our Surrey County Councillor which means we will have no local representation on behalf of our Community in Box Hill which is very important. The only way we can be represented and recognised is we have our OWN Parish Council to act on our behalf and be heard. We do not want to be part of another PC that does not represent our needs and requirements so it essential we have our own Box Hill Parish Council that will reflect and support our community and ensure local representation on behalf of the residents (and businesses where appropriate)		

The Parish Council will support the local residents and community and will ensure local representation		
Creating a new Boxhill Parish council will give the residents of Boxhill a voice at the local level.		
We have very specific needs as a community here on Box Hill which would be best understood and served by our own parish council. We also need this to ensure our voice is heard and that we have local representation after the loss of our local councillors. We have a very good Box Hill Neighbourhood Council which would require parish council powers to ensure that local services are both appropriate to our needs and are delivered effectively, as demonstrated by the Warm Hub and the improvements to the Village Hall, both of which are bringing much needed support to the community.		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
I believe it will ensure local representation		
So that residents of that parish are better represented		
As I said, we are often forgotten, finances and grants for the village should be controlled and decided by the village.		
We believe many of the parishes have a different resident population to those in box Hill and therefore we believe we should be the people protecting our beautiful landscape and the eclectic mix of people living here.		
IT WILL REFLECT WHAT THE LOCAL BOXHILL RESIDENTS NEEDS ARE AND HOPEFULLY HAVE A VOICE TO EXPRESS THEM ON OUR BEHALF.		
I believe it will ensure local representation		
I believe it will ensure local representation		
I believe it will ensure local representation		
I BELIEVE IT WILL ENSURE LOCAL REPRESENTATION		
It will allow closer oversight of the services being offered to a largely elderly population. It will continue to allow our voices to be heard and ensure that we don't lose important local provisions. It will ensure that we remain represented locally.		
A voice for the specific needs of the village within the broader local government structure.		
To ensure identifiable representation of specific concerns to Box Hill residents		

Up to now we haven't had a voice and with the upcoming changes to the district it is very important that we should have adequate and specific representation without the dilution and distortion which would inevitably follow if we joined another new or existing parish. It is vital we have accountable and verifiable representation specific to Box Hill.		
I believe this will ensure representation		
I believe it will ensure local representation.		
We will have a direct say how our particular services are provided and I believe it will ensure local representation		
To ensure the local area is well represented for the locally unique issues that arise from living in Boxhill, due to both the rural location and the consideration of it being a National Trust destination. I believe a Parish council will be best placed to represent the village in the best way		
I believe it will be important for smaller villages such as Boxhill to be represented by local residents as they/we are best placed to say what is happening in our neighbourhood good and bad therefore local representation is imperative		
I believe that it would ensure local representation for the needs of Boxhill.		
A large meeting in the village hall showed strong support in giving the village official local representation with a Council that had proper funding that will allow better care of the village itself.		
Will ensure on going community representation and provision of services		
Will ensure continue to support and representation of the village. Provision of local services.		
Support local services. Ensure local representation.		

What might a Parish look like in Boxhill?

Boundary change allow Box Hill local representation
what the parish/es should be called - Box Hill Parish Council how many councillors there should be - 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries - Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) - No any other details about your proposal/s
Boxhill Parishcouncil
Boxhill Parish council
Each council should use its area name followed by the words -parish council In our village case for example BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL

<p>With at least 5 councillors electable from 2027 Our boundary should be Boxhill Village & its immediate out lying homes on Boxhill rd from the National Trust Cafe to the start of Boxhill road at its northern end intersecting Headley rd. There should be no area gaps between all parish councils Surrey so all residents can access a parish council for local matters. All the councils should be Parished ones. No alternative style needed. With local representation all Parishes can make decisions pertinent to their own areas. More important still with the proposed devolution of existing district councils. These councils can make best quicker decisions for their own immediate areas, and more easily liaise with neighbouring parishes and where needed, liaise with the new county wide authorities. It keeps administration and decision taking immediately relevant and properly local!</p> <p>The village of Box Hill needs its own identity. Not Tadworth as this already shows we are out on a limb and have lazy post coding and naming. Should be called Box Hill Parish Council with a number of 5 councillors. Elections should be in 2027 and the village should be given its own identity with the boundaries of Box Hill Village. Does not need to have an alternative style.</p> <p><u>Box Hill village could develop with its own name and Parish Council.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I think that the local parish should be called 'Box Hill Parish Council'. 2) I think that there should be five (5) councillors. 3) I think that the election should take place by voluntary single vote for each resident and separate business owner of Box Hill village (as designated by the village boundary) in 2027. 4) The boundary of the Box Hill Parish Council should be the Box Hill village. 5) I do not think that it should have an alternative style.
Box Hill Parish council
Box Hill Parish council 5 councillors 2027 Box Hill village No
mainly because i feel we don't have a choice.
Box Hill Parish Council reasonable number of councillors yearly elections Box Hill
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 COUNCILLORS 2027 BOX HILL VILLAGE NO
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 2027 BOX HILL VILLAGE NO
what the parish/es should be called - answer "BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL" how many councillors there should be – answer 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries – Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) – No.
BOXHILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 Councillors 2027 Boxhill Village No
Boxhill Parish Council. 5 Councillors. 2027 Boxhill Village No No
what the parish/es should be called - answer "BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL" how many councillors there should be – answer 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries – Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) – No.
what the parish/es should be called - answer "BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL" how many councillors there should be – answer 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries – Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) – No

Community council or village council sounds good. Sadly many people aren't overly interested in local councils or voting in the elections.
what the parish/es should be called - answer "BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL" how many councillors there should be – answer 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries – Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) – No.
Box Hill Parish Council 5 councillors Election in 2027, usual local election rules Box Hill Village boundaries No alternative style Essential local representation following Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council changes
It should be called BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL It should have at least 5 Councillors The election should be asap - eg 2027 its Boundaries should be those of Box Hill Village No alternative style
Box Hill Parish Council 5 2027 Box Hill Village No
It should be called: BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 COUNCILLORS TO BE ELECTED IN 2027 THE GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE : BOX HILL VILLAGE THERE SHOULD NOT BE AN ALTERNATIVE STYLE
Should be called BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL COUNCILLORS 5. Elected 2027 Geographical boundary should be BOX HILL VILLAGE It SHOULD NOT have a different name
Title Boxhill Parish, 5 councillors, Elections 4 -5 years, Boxhill Village.
BOXHILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 COUNCILLORS
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 COUNCILLORS Election should take place in our local village hall in 2027 Geographical boundaries - Box Hill Village No alternative style
what the parish/es should be called - answer "BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL" how many councillors there should be – answer 5 how and when election should take place - 2027 the suggested geographical boundaries – Box Hill Village whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council) – No.
Box Hill Parish Council
Boxhill parish council 5 councillors 2027 Boxhill village No No
Should be called Box Hill Parish Council Should have 5 Councillors Election in 2027 Box Hill Village Should NOT have an alternative style No other proposals
BOX>HILL>PARISH>COUNCIL
I propose Box Hill parish with 5 or 6 councillors. Elections should take place as soon as possible after the change removal of Mole valley as an entity. We are an often forgotten village but we have very active community that wishes to have more control of the immediate village of Box Hill I suggest elections take place in the same format as central government elections.
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 2027 BOX HILL

NO NOB]
BOXHILL PARISH COUNCIL
BOXHILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 Councillors The election should take place in 2027 Geographical boundaries- Box Hill Village NO All has been said
Box Hill Parish Council 5 councillors 2027 Boundaries Box Hill Village No No
Box Hill Parish Council 5 2027 Boundaries - Box Hill Village No No
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 COUNCILLORS 2027 BOX HILL VILLAGE NO NO
Boxhill Parish Council 5 councillors Elections should take place 2027 the geographical boundaries should incorporate Box Hill Village. No change to the style of governance
Box Hill Parish Council Five parish councillors Local Box Hill election in 2027 Box Hill village only No alternate style No other thoughts.
Box Hill Parish Council 5 ideally to get a broad spectrum of views Local Box Hill Election 2027 Box Hill Village only No No
Name: Box Hill Parish Number: 5 How/When: Local election in Box Hill, 2027 Boundary: Only the village of Box Hill Alternatives: No Other details: No
Box Hill Parish Council 5 Local election 2027 Box Hill Village No
Box Hill Parish Council 5 Councillors 2027 Box Hill Village No No
* Box Hill Parish Council * There should be 5 councillors * 2027 * Boundaries should be Box Hill Village * No * No
Box Hill Parish 5 councillors Election to take place in 2027

Geographic boundary should be Box Hill Village no no
Boxhill parish council Number of councillors 5 Suggested boundaries - Boxhill village Alternative style - No
BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 councillors election take place 2027 Geographical boundaries :- BOX HILL VILLAGE No alternative style
No other details
Parish called BOX HILL PARISH COUNCIL 5 Councillors Election in 2027 geographical boundaries — BOX HILL VILLAGE no alternative style council
No other details
Box Hill Parish Council Suggest 5 councillors Election 2027 Box Hill Village boundaries No to the alternative style
Boxhill Parish Council
Box Hill Parish Council (no alternative style) Five councillors Election in 2027 The geographical boundaries should be Box Hill Village
Box Hill Parish Council. 5 Councillors. Elections ASAP. Per existing Box Hill Village Boundary.
Box Hill parish Council. Five Councillor's elections as soon as possible. No change to boundaries existing Box Hill Village.
Box Hill Parish Council. 5 Councillors. Asap. Existing boundaries Box Hill.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

EVERY village and community should abut a neighbouring parish council so interaction and co-operation between can be forged on joint projects while individual local needs can be preserved with each council identity.
Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.
When I grew up in Leicestershire, we had a local parish council with 5 councillors and 3 admin staff . It covered Rothley and several outlying areas with several thousand residents. No problem that arose ever got overlooked or left . Roads were always in good state . Factory workers were protected with inspections of local business. Utilities were secure. Flood defences were maintained. They along with much else was all within the council's authority. Planning matters and any disputes all settled quickly and usually amicably. Rubbish was collected and much recycled in a neighbouring parish which had an appropriate facility. Our road works teams often covered their potholes etc! Any urgent local works were given to local contractors by competitive quote and we never had to wait for any kind of council assistance . Whilst I know present day parishes don't do as much administration, their very existence hopefully might speed up urgent tasks like gritting roads etc when outside Parish control because the Parish has asked for it . Individuals will no longer have to block phone lines thus making general needs more quickly taken care of! Parish councils can keep government local so everyone can have their say and be more easily involved with their local community. Only by small parish councils providing that vital link to the central administration can this new half county system possibly

work. Give every parishioner his/her say through their Parish council. It will strengthen our electorate's overall unity. Under the new large area proposals, without Parish Councils, county wide government will still be as remote as it is now! We are lucky to have a good Mole valley council under present regulation . The new proposals represent loss of immediate contact with local government causing the new system, whilst not necessarily saving money to further isolate Surrey's residents from decisions that affect us all. Parish councils will help keep local representation and provide a vital link in that chain. Thank you

Responses for BROCKHAM



Total responses: 27

Resident responses: 24

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Brockham is already an established parished area

Brockham

- Number of responses: 27
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 24

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Brockham	19.23% 5	69.23% 18	11.54% 3	26

Effective delivery of community services in Brockham

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
help deliver services and make them work more effectively	If it ain't broke don't fix it Parish Councils have the local knowledge to govern its own area and stop/fix unwanted, badly thought out and unnecessary changes, and planning by the local authorities on residents behalf. Brockham Parish Council do a marvellous job locally instead of faceless bureaucrats.	No change to parishes I have connections to. Unable to comment on areas I have not had a connection with.
A large area of Betchworth Parish which lies SW of Brockham should be added to Brockham	Why change something if it isn't broken! Far too much faffing about trying to reinvent something! Waste of time and more particularly, money because I dare say that MVDC do not have the relevant experience in house so it will have to go out to consultant by tender.	Local residents and their Parish Councillors are the best people to decide on what goes on in their Parish. Most Parish Councils are small and localised, much better than a larger overarching committee of people who are not local and do not have the local best interests at heart. I live in a village with a strong sense of community, many people give of their time (beyond the Parish Council) to volunteer around the village doing things like clearing ditches to prevent flooding, organising the local GP surgery vaccination mornings, coming together for village fetes and horticultural shows - all the things that bring people together. More of this and less distant (and some may say, disinterested) parties should be involved with running our village.
Merged for efficiency purposes	If it ain't broke, don't fix it	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up
	Don't try and fix what's not broken	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want

	The proposed changes as I understand them would remove the required and important focus on the specific needs of the local communities.	
	no change needed. We have an effective parish council in place	Only change if there are not enough volunteers to support. Implementation merger as a temporary measure to allow more time for volunteers to step forward. Funding should not be shared to keep it fair with contributions.
	works well currently, although councillors not paid	There is nothing wrong with the way things are - it's not broken so does not need fixing. Parishes have a good cohesive relationship and work well together
	No change needed.	Keep the current model if it works for existing parish councils. Let them continue to set the example. Allow them if possible to provide support and structure to others by sharing resource catalogues, assessments etc.
	Brockham Parish Council do a marvellous job of protecting the village	I've no view on changing or not changing other parishes.
	Brockham is well run and supports all	For goodness sake most residents won't have ANY idea what their local parish council does.
	I live in Brockham and our parish council is very effective and community driven as well as fiscally supportive and responsible. We are lucky. I can't speak for other parishes.	I strongly favour Parishes being based around the village they represent and no boundary changes should be made that would enlarge these or homogenise them.
	Brockham parish council is effective and represents our community. I do not believe Brockham would be better served by any changes	Local representation is important for all residents to be heard and supported, allowing for a direct link between residents and governance at all levels.
	Brokham Parish Council serves us very well. I think they do try to.	All small villages should have a Parish Council elected in accordance with the rules governing them.
		All areas will need parish or town Councils to ensure democracy is maintained in the new unitary framework Namesto suit the areas. Inoitially Councils should consist of seven Councillors but this should be increased to suit the populations of the areas
		They are made up of local people with the best interests of the Parish at the forefront of their mind, not profit and greed. They are best placed to make decisions that affect their community and regular meetings where residents can put their case.
		Gives a layer of added protection from the idiocy of a central government that has no idea of the area or village/small town life
		Bigger is not better. Unitary will not save us money.

Proposed Changes to Brockham

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
A large area of Betchworth Parish which lies SW of Brockham should be added to Brockham	

Observations on unparished areas

<p>This area is considered locally and functions as part of Brockham</p> <p>Dorking definitely needs an elected body</p> <p>Governance/representation should be fair and equal (proportionally).</p> <p>I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.</p> <p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p>A larger town such as Dorking could be divided up into say 3 parishes from the RH4 postcode - appropriate names could be given from each local parish taken from roughly the centre of each Parish eg Dorking Chalkpit or Dorking Deepdene etc.</p> <p>I am not sure how many Councillors there are normally on a Parish Council but maybe slightly more to represent a greater density of people in a town vis a vis a village Parish Council.</p> <p>The elections should be just exactly as they are done in existing Parish Councils - we already have the models for that.</p> <p>For Geographical Boundaries the relevant town postcode ie RH4 could be taken as the boundary and it can be divided into 3 or 4 parishes.</p>
<p>Residents need representation</p> <p>Dorking should have a Town Council</p> <p>Local problems need local solutions</p>

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone - I don't trust the government and their new 2 tier system? For larger areas will have less localised knowledge, meaning poor fit for specific community needs. The savings you plan will be overstated or take years to materialise. Mergers come with high upfront costs (redundancies, rebranding, IT system changes, etc.)</p>
<p>Why change something if it isn't broken! Far too much faffing about trying to reinvent something! Waste of time and more particularly, money because I dare say that MVDC do not have the relevant experience in house so it will have to go out to consultant by tender.</p>
<p>Residents need a local representative who is more aware of local concerns and area than at unitary level. A visible and local representative. However the whole area should have equal/same representation at every level of governance.</p>
<p>1. Loss of Local Accountability Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and</p>

reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.

2. Overstated Financial Benefits

The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.

3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance

Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.

4. Undermining Democratic Representation

Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.

5. Timing and Prioritisation

Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.

Again what isn't broken shouldn't tried to be fixed - please stop this nonsense - Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone -

Changes disrupt the cohesion of an existing community often to it's detriment

The current proposal seem to reflect the thinking of those that believe it more efficient to have one large super authority and that single super efficient decision making The reality is greater bureaucracy and a remote lack of knowledge on local issues.

Currently all 4 have separate but in some way joint areas and things such as thru traffic (always a issue as on the rat run to Gatwick) calming measures if done in one parish without consultation may cause worsening traffic in other parishes

The families use same primary and secondary schools either in the villages or in Dorking and Reigate
Churches are affiliated but separate

The key is for all parishes to communicate to each other

All have slightly different demographics and facilities that are communally used by all the residents

It's the same answer to all your questions -this Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone If you think changing the boundaries for more votes please stop this

the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.

This is getting rather boring now. LEAVE ALONE!!

That in my opinion is not a question for residents at this time and in this survey. In general terms, each might relating to size of community have different requirements.

Avoid overkill and ensure a compact and knowledgeable group focused on local issue but aware of wider issue and restraints imposed by government.

I do not have strong answers to the above!

I do however feel that there should be an elected body of people in place who know and understand Dorking and it's needs if Mole Valley Council is no longer in existence.

I would be content for it to cover a wider area than just Dorking, (as Mole Valley does currently), but losing focus all together on the area would be a bad situation

Just the need for similar representation across the whole area. A residents association could be transformed into a 'parish', being given the same status, name, role and any funding.

Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.

All towns and villages need to have their own committees in order to protect their own local facilities such as community halls, sports grounds, public toilets, theatres . Any facilities they provide would thereby be protected when they became part of a larger authority .Mole Valley has . more to lose than you in our excellent Dorking Halls for example.

It's not a good idea the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.

Both these statements apply. As a chairman of a local charity, dealing with Mole Valley is infinitely better than a more remote SCC. The same logic applies to smaller community focused councils

A unitary authority needs a lower level of democracy to ensure area concerns are effectively addressed

Local people should have a say in what goes on in their locality. It will hopefully engender pride and a sense of community. The process to engage people can sometimes be difficult but hopefully by listening to locals and attempting to encourage them to become involved or have a say would grow in time. One only has to look at social

media for a local area ie We Love Dorking to see how many people have opinions about things, how local information is shared etc etc so something like Facebook would be the ideal place to share local Parish Council notices and engagement, thereby garnering views from people and encouraging them to get involved.
Consistency and equal representation is essential.
I don't think this is the right time to consider this.
Democratic deficit
See above. We cannot risk losing control of Dorking Halls or any other community assets to a larger authority.
As above, faceless bureaucrats sitting in Kingston who, for the most part, have never set foot in places they are making ludicrous decisions about on the basis of croneyism and backhanders.
WHY, JUST WHY???????
Keep local governance LOCAL!
This is not a very user friendly survey I am afraid!!!
Individuals need representation, often areas where representation is needed most are less engaged in these types of surveys and this should be considered.
I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.
The main point I wanted to raise is that given the uncertainty which is created by the ongoing local government reorganisation in Surrey, where we do not even know whether the county is likely to end up with 2 or 3 unitary authorities, it seems like a very bad time to be carrying out a review of community governance.
Would it not make more sense to wait until there is some clarity from the local government reorganisation?
I feel the Council has let Dorking High Street Down. Too many barbers, and Nail bars, also vape shops. I have shopped in Dorking for 50+ years.

Responses for BUCKLAND



Total responses: 12

Resident responses: 9

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Buckland is already an established parished area.

Buckland

- Number of responses: 12
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 9

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Buckland	25.00% 3	66.67% 8	8.33% 1	12

Effective delivery of community services in Buckland

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
	Keep all parishes as is	I do not know what the advantages are of having a parish council.
	No change proposed	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.
	No changes are required	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
	<p>Buckland is a small parish of c.250 households and I consider we are best served by our own parish council. I do not feel we would be well served if we were a ward of a larger parish as our pro rata representation would be unable to carry sufficient weight to ensure the needs of our small community are heard. Our local landowner, Buckland Estate, is very supportive of community initiatives and our Parish Councillors, all of whom are unpaid volunteers work constructively with the help of our parish clerk to help deliver services effectively and ensure our voice is heard by our local authorities.</p> <p>Buckland includes houses on Buckland Hills which have postal addresses in Mogador and houses which bound Reigate Heath. Once we are governed by a Unitary Authority which includes the current areas of Reigate and Banstead and Mole Valley it may be that a Community Governance Review might result in residents living close to the current parish boundary</p>	If nothing is done all will just stay the same

	<p>requesting change.</p> <p>The scope of the pilot Dorking and Villages Neighbourhood Area Committee (NAC) includes Buckland - it may be that once a Unitary Authority is in place that Buckland might question whether this reflects the day to day activities and choices of Buckland residents. I would suggest a Unitary Authority might find many Mole Valley rural residents do not view Dorking as central to their day to day lives which would suggest the Dorking and Village NAC pilot should not assume this currently defined area will have the medium term support of its residents.</p>	
	<p>From a residents point of view, we have an excellent parish council who are both approachable and knowledgeable. so why change what works.</p>	<p>Buckland Parish Council held its first meeting on 18th December 1894 and the records (held at the Surrey History Centre) provide a trail of evidence for the volunteer effort that has consistently focused on supporting the needs of our local community over the last 130 years. The Parish Council has seven councillors, all of whom were elected at the May 2023 elections to serve for a four year term, with the support of a qualified part time Clerk.</p> <p>The Parish Council convenes Annual Parish Meetings at which it consults with its residents on potential initiatives and then works to deliver those amenity improvements for which there is support. The Parish Council provides grant funding to support a village website and over 80% households are signed up to receive parish updates via email from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Buckland's parish boundaries primarily follow geographical features and broadly correspond to the historical boundaries of the Buckland Estate with whom the Parish Council has a positive working relationship which benefits our local community. The parish is bounded by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (RBBC) to the north and east and the parish of Betchworth / Betchworth Estate to the south and west. Council notes that the geographical scope of this Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) led Community Governance Review is limited to the legislative boundary of MVDC.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes MVDC's decision to ask residents of non-parished areas of Mole Valley if they would like to be parished has been prompted by the proposed Local</p>

		<p>Government Reorganisation into Unitary Authorities and the inclusion of all the parished areas has been driven by the time lapse since a review was last undertaken.</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that any review of Buckland's parish boundary would be best undertaken by the new Unitary Authority as it would be able to consider potential changes that might be sought by residents who live close to either side of the current District Boundary between MVDC and RBBC. The Parish Council does not believe it is appropriate for the soon to be replaced MVDC to be investing its limited funding and resource undertaking a Community Governance Review of Buckland Parish at this time.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not believe merging Buckland with any other parished area would reflect and support our local community and considers such a move would undermine the effectiveness of the services currently being delivered. The Parish Council encourages its residents to engage and to propose any amenity improvements they would be happy to help deliver to our local community. Accordingly the Parish Council is keen to have sight of any feedback submitted via this consultation that it can factor into its future planning.</p>
	Better support the local community.	Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.
		I don't think this is the right time to consider this.

Proposed Changes responses to BUCKLAND

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
	It can be taken in with wider areas more cost effective and corrinated.
	I think all these should be changed. To many people who shout the loudest are heard
	Better geographic areas.

Observations on unparished areas

Other comments for all MVDC areas

Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone - I don't trust the government and their new 2 tier system? For larger areas will have less localised knowledge, meaning poor fit for specific community needs. The savings you plan will be overstated or take years to materialise. Mergers come with high upfront costs (redundancies, rebranding, IT system changes, etc.)

1. Loss of Local Accountability

Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.

2. Overstated Financial Benefits

The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.

3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance

Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.

4. Undermining Democratic Representation

Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.

5. Timing and Prioritisation

Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.

Again what isn't broken shouldn't be fixed - please stop this nonsense - Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone -

The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.

It's the same answer to all your questions -this Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone If you think changing the boundaries for more votes please stop this

the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.

I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information.

The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

It's not a good idea the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.

Democratic deficit

I feel very lucky to live in this area. My knowledge does not extend to knowing the pros and cons of restructuring. I have found the published information extremely complex and difficult to understand. I do rely on getting local knowledge from the Parish Council.

I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Responses for CAPEL



Total responses: 8

Resident responses: 8

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Capel is already an established parished area.

Capel

- Number of responses: 8
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 8

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Capel	25.00% 2	62.50% 5	12.50% 1	8

Effective delivery of community services in Capel

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
Capel parish has a large precept and is a very well organised. Both Holmwood and Newdigate have small precepts and do not meet frequently enough. They should be merged with Capel parish.	It wouldn't please do not change	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.	By email we receive good regular communication from our parish councillor, who keeps us regularly updated on all important / relevant parish council matters in and around Coldharbour
	Do not change	
	When I asked for more disability access on our pavements, making them more wheelchair accessible, I went to my parish council who fought for me and within a year we got that making our village safer and more inclusive. A big council that covers many parishes does not have that personal touch, nor the ability to see what's best for a village. I have come from Carshalton before living here. I saw Carshalton merge into the London borough of Sutton. London was forced onto that village and the voice of the village always lost. That council doesn't help to try to preserve historically important building or improve our environment and health needs, they simply do what London needs, more flats, more streamlining, less personal touch. I don't want to lose our uniqueness here in Capel. No to the merge.	

	Capel is able to deliver services quicker and more professionally. We have long-standing contracts with local suppliers for grass and vegetation clearance, playground maintenance, public building maintenance and many other services.	
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.	
	Capel seems reasonably well managed and, so, effective. Change could well be for the worse. So leave well alone.	

Proposed Changes to Capel

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
The communities of Holmwood and Newdigate would benefit from being part of a larger, well run parish. They could have their councillors with on the Capel executive committee. Both of these parishes are similar to Capel with primarily rural areas with a village centre.	Do not change
Capel parish has a large precept and is a very well organised. Both Holmwood and Newdigate have small precepts and do not meet frequently enough. They should be merged with Capel parish.	No changes are required
Westcott is local and could join our Chapel or more appropriately Wotton as all areas need to join parish councils for local representation	

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.
Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to

becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

I feel North holmwood is losing its identity and needs help on a more personal level.

Parishes create a personal touch for small villages. It keeps them alive instead of succumbing to the London/suburbia sprawl

All residents should have local representatives to consult who have a detailed knowledge of local affairs.

I don't think this is the right time to consider this.

We are aware that there is already a shortage of properly trained and qualified (CiICA) parish clerks in the county. With the likely devolution of services down to parish level, whilst I happily support this principle, we will all have to either increase the hours of existing personnel or employ extra personnel to manage these services, causing the inevitable rise in our precepts. It is imperative that a county wide campaign to recruit these new staff begins immediately as the qualification programme takes one year.

I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

All residents should have local representatives to consult who have a detailed knowledge of local affairs.

We are aware that there is already a shortage of properly trained and qualified (CiICA) parish clerks in the county. With the likely devolution of services down to parish level, whilst I happily support this principle, we will all have to either increase the hours of existing personnel or employ extra personnel to manage these services, causing the inevitable rise in our precepts. It is imperative that a county wide campaign to recruit these new staff begins immediately as the qualification programme takes one year.

Was this a good use of resources? I fear not:

Responses for CHARLWOOD



Total responses: 8

Resident responses: 7

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Charlwood is already an established parished area.

Charlwood

- Number of responses: 8
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 7

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Charlwood	37.50% 3	37.50% 3	25.00% 2	8

Effective delivery of community services in Charlwood

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
Charlwood parish currently consists of the two communities of Charlwood and Hookwood. Hookwood is much more aligned to Horley geographically, for travel, education, shopping and life generally. It would benefit from being a more active part of Horley whilst Charlwood would be encouraged to maintain its existence as a village parish.	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want

Proposed Changes to Charlwood

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
- the community in Hookwood identifies itself much closer to Charlwood whereas Charlwood retains a strong independent identity.	

Observations on unparished areas

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Responses for DORKING



Total responses: 110

Resident responses: 102

Feedback: Although responses were varied, a clear majority expressed that the establishment of a parish council would be advantageous for Dorking. Accordingly, it is suggested that a parish council be constituted in the area.

Dorking

- Number of responses: 110
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 102

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish council?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Dorking	70.00% 77	20.00% 22	10.00% 11	110

Observations on parished areas

Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone - I don't trust the government and their new 2 tier system? For larger areas will have less localised knowledge, meaning poor fit for specific community needs. The savings you plan will be overstated or take years to materialise. Mergers come with high upfront costs (redundancies, rebranding, IT system changes, etc.)
think that as other changes are taking place at the same time, existing parishes, unless they wish to change, should stay as they are and be reviewed later, eg 5 years after the County change and changes with Village and Town Associations have been put in place. Allow the dust to settle and then see what else may need doing. If they are working, which I believe they do, no need to "fiddle".
Abinger and Capel too large, each covers more than one 'natural' community.
selected no opinion but I'm strongly in favour of devolving as much power to local parishes as is practicable. Especially with regard to the ownership and operation of community assets.
Holmwood Parish Council where I live covers a very small area. The remainder of the Holmwoods is unparished which will mean that there will be no democratic structure in place for local governance apart from the very large unitary Council with a very small number of Councillors with big areas to cover. Extending Holmwood PC to cover the whole of the Holmwoods would give it greater weight through representing more people and increase the talent pool from which Parish Councillors could be drawn. There could also be synergies around common issues such as Holmwood Common and local sports facilities. Another option if a town Council is formed for Dorking, some or all of the Holmwoods could be included.
Buckland Mickleham Wotton are smaller parishes and could be incorporated into neighbouring larger parishes
I don't know enough about any of the parishes but trust that their Parish Councils are well established and effective. The 4 councils I selected will be impacted if Gatwick expands
Each must be in a position to contest or support any expansion as dictated by their communities
I don't know anything about their boundaries so cannot give a comment
I think local people are best placed to make decisions in their area.
Betchworth, Brockham and Bucklans should be joined to a single parish council - there is no need for three covering that area as they are so close together
I feel it works well enough as it is.
No need to change existing
Happy with the existing system
Abinger, Wootton and Capel cover more than a single natural community (eg: Capel, Coldharbour, Beare Green, Charlwood, Hookwood) artificially, and split others (eg: Forest Green). Would be better to have parishes comprising single, discrete communities.
Holmwoods needs a local parish representation

I strongly believe Parish Councils, whilst not actively malicious and occasionally well meaning are a relic of a by-gone era. For this reason they should be retired from local democratic offers with dignity.
Possibly the boundary or area of the Holmwoods (and maybe Capel) could change to include North Holmwood and their should be more clarity on what area or parish we are in.
I would like a parish council for Westcott.
No need to change existing
No changes
Holmwoods is such a beautiful area and should have parish representation
Wider boundaries may provide more opportunities for people in those areas.
There is no purpose in changing.
North Holmwood should be in with Dorking and Pixham as one built up area
Again what isn't broken shouldn't tried to be fixed - please stop this nonsense - Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone -
I think that local parish councils on the whole do a very good job. They are made up of local people who are far more likely to understand local issues than anyone from elsewhere. I think with big changes going on and no big concerns regarding Parish Councils, they should be left alone.
Not applicable, discontinue them all.
Trying to represent different natural communities is confusing.
If the parishes are working well and have good representation, why change them?
Keeping things as they are is best to reflect and support the community
I am not aware of any need to make a change.
Existing parishes are established and support their communities
Parish councils will be vital in reflecting local opinion in the new structure
One huge unitary unit is likely to mean that small areas like the Holmwoods would not be adequately represented. The creation of a Parish Council in this area may help to ameliorate this
I think the Parishes should be retained, they already support their own communities interests and it would be expensive and disruptive to change their. Dorking should also have a Parish council.
Pixham could be incorporated into neighbouring parish-
Local needs should be represented in local areas, rather than dissipated to larger, amorphous areas. All of the unparished areas could be represented by one ore more parish councils, say, Dorking North, South, East and West.

Support delivery of community services in Dorking

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
I was not aware we had a parish council for North Holmwood or Dorking I believe we should have one so we have a voice over local issues and services. Like allotments, libraries, funding for places like the swimming pool and sports facilities, parking for local residents, EV charging points, play grounds.	Creating a parish council for dorking would be a waste of (taxpayer) money, it is not needed, and just provides another excuse for greedy local representatives to get their snouts in another trough	But what about a Town Council for Dorking - such as Guildford BC are considering

However, make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation	It is difficult to administer services across the existing unparished areas and there is already a perception of disparity in different areas individually, and compared to other unparished areas - I do not see how it could help to further create new parishes for representation purposes, without further creating a wider gulf between areas, services, local economy and representation.	No = no local information to determine a response
I thinking the town of Dorking should have a parish/town council. Broadly coinciding with the 'untarnished' area. Possibly some very minor adjustments to the parishes which abut this area would be sensible but too early to say	I don't think it would add anything.	Give us some autonomy in Dorking!
As we - Dorking Town Forum - will be requesting establishment as 'Dorking Parish Council' proceeding to change that to 'Dorking Town Council', we are - at this initial stage - keen to sample the views of the historic 'Dorking & District' parishes/villages to understand their views on remaining separate or banding tog	All works well as it is	
Add Dorking Parish Council so Dorking has representation	<p>It's the same answer to all your questions -this Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone If you think changing the boundaries for more votes please stop this</p> <p>the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.</p>	
My concern is that Forking should be better represented than the parishes as it has a much larger population	Most do support the Local Community along with their Churches and local Food Banks	
Dorking should be included in a parish. I assumed it was the parish of St Martins, but it seems it isn't.	I cannot see any convincing evidence they achieve anything useful. Some individual parish councillors are undoubtedly worthy people who mean well.	
I live in Dorking and have little experience of these parishes. However, we need a Town Council for Dorking.	Don't change it for the sake of it. It works well.	
Dorking should have a town parish council as that affects all in the local area who live or work there.	I can't see the need for a change. What benefits would it bring? I've seen services close and anti-social	

	activities increase due to a lack of police activity. Councils already seem stretched as it is.	
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation	We do not need more civil servants and higher council taxes	
Add Dorking Parish Council to have representation.in Dorking	Change for the sake of change is not necessary. The current system would seem to be satisfactory	
Dorking should have representation. It seems strange that there is none.	Things are working well so no need to make changes.	
Dorking is a Town not a, Parish and needs a Town Council to represent the many households and businesses within it.	I don't think parish councils are necessarily representative of residents as a whole. A town like Dorking is too big for a parish council and I'm not sure the people who would sit on it would accurately represent the various communities accurately. Also assume there would be an additional cost to residents? Feels like it would be for an unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy.	
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation	As explained already, this is not necessary. The current arrangements for supporting the residents and businesses are sufficient and do not need to be changed for change's sake.	
Add Dorking Parish Council.to ensure Dorking has representation	I don't believe we should be establishing new parishes at this time. They will place an additional financial burden on residents and we should wait to see what LGR brings in terms of community support before making any governance related changes.	
We need representation in Dorking, I don't know about the parishes	I feel the present system works	
Despite the efforts of our SCC councillors, many decisions are made by (a majority of) those with little knowledge of Dorking. A group with local roots will help to ensure that appropriate decisions are made.	Some areas look pretty ok already.	
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation	It seems unnecessary to create another tier in local government for Dorking, particularly if it means an increase in Council Tax	
I would like to see a Town Council established. Possibly this may mean establishing a Parish Council first	Don't do any of this, please.	
Local representation is essential in order to mitigate the negative effects of centralisation.		
I recommend that Leatherhead and Dorking have town councils		

What might a Parish look like in Dorking?

North Holmwood should be in with Dorking and Pixham as one built up area
Another option if a town Council is formed for Dorking, some or all of the Holmwoods could be included.
N orth Holmwood should be in with Dorking and Pixham as one built up area
Dorking as a Town Council could work. Sureey CC are setting a Dorking / Mole Valley Neighbourhood Hub
I think that all these unparished areas are closely located to and effectively part of the two towns of Dorking and Leatherhead and in my opinion they should be merged into the town councils which I am recommending.
In the case of Pixham as would come under Dorking parish if formed
I think all areas should have the level of parish/town council particularly following abolition of Mole Valley Dustrict Council. I think Pixham, Westcott and North Holmwood would be best with Dorking. Where i have said 'no opinion"it is because I don't know those areas sufficiently to comment on boundaries.
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Name: Dorking Town (or Parish) Council,2. Depending on the boundaries which should align with the new Dorking Division of the new unitary council boundary of Dorking and assuming that North Holmwood and Pixham are included as one built up area, then about nine to eleven councillors, three for Dorking South, three for Dorking North one or two for Pixham (maybe including Westhumble) and one or two for North Holmwood depending if it includes Mid Holmwood (don't know where Westcott and Bookham fit in)3. Ideally 2026 but I understand that this will be a decision for the new unitary council so possibly 2027 as I understand they will be setting up from May 2026 to April 20274. Geography: As above - the unitary council division of Dorking5. Name: Depending on the geographic scope, if just Dorking North and South, Pixham and North Holmwood then Dorking Town Council, if including surrounding villages then Dorking Parish Council
The names could be those used in the list above - nothing should be over-complicated. The standard rules for councillor numbers should be followed - I think it is min. 5 with no maximum. I do not have a map to show you boundaries, but if you provide an app to allow this, I would be happy to make suggestions. This would probably best be done in negotiation with the existing resident association or other local representatives. There is no need to give these an alternative "style". Keep everything simple, uniform and fair. I believe it is very important that there is this level of local government and representation.
I am interested in maintaining, if not increasing/ encouraging, the potential for local representation. I look with considerable caution on any proposal to distance power from the people
Dorking Town Council link to Dorking Town Centre Forum / Dorking Business Forum - but must not be too costly in the precept No more than 10 Councillors Should NOT be political Independent / Ratepayers
Dorking Community Council. Maybe 6-8. At the same time as future county elections - bring local elections into alignment to reduce costs and improve efficiency. Boundaries should cover the town and extend to Goodwyns, Chart Downs, and Bentsbrook Park / North Holmwood village to ensure these areas retain local representation once the unitary authorities are implemented. Community council sounds like the most appropriate style. The idea is that this council would be able to make sure local issues (currently dealt with by Mole Valley DC) are still covered by local people, and help ensure our community amenities (e.g. library, allotment sites) are protected.
Dorking Parish Council, possibly combined with Pixham and/or Westcott. No opinion on when elections should take place or the number of councillors, but enough to enable the job to be done well. 5 minimum perhaps. Probably 10. However, I also think some sort of community council would be a good idea. Ideally, id love a form of local sortitician to be used to ensure many people in the community are engaged with the council's work at points, even if it was 'opt out'. Dorking Town Council. There should be 11 Councillors. Elections should take place every two years. Boundaries to be agreed, having regard to and not impacting on existing parish boundaries.
Possibly the boundary or area of the Holmwoods (and maybe Cape) could change to include North Holmwood and their should be more clarity on what area or parish we are in. This should be a 'village type council' as it will cover more than one 'village' The same could be said of Box Hill Pixham and Westhumble they could join with Mickleham. I would suggest a similar approach for the the other communities they could be incorporated in with other local parishes that make sense geographically and works beneficially for the village. Dorking should have a town parish council as that affects all in the local area who live or work there, Leatherhead should be treated in the same way.

<p>No particular care for the names. I'd suggest at least three councillors for each. Elections every 5 years. Boundaries to cover at least a large majority of those who consider themselves as living in the town/village. I'm unaware of the differing styles of councils, i believe the locals could suggest the most relevant, or current councillors if not. I would really like to protect the community assets, that's my main focus.</p>	
Dorking Parish	Three councillors
Three councillors	Elections every four years
Dorking - Dorking Town Community Council, same for Leatherhead and Ashtead. Others would be Village Community Council.	
There should be TOWN COUNCILS established for the unparished urban area.	
Need to explain much more clearly that these are the same a "Parish Councils", if that is indeed the case.	
Dorking Town Council (comprising Dorking, Holmwoods, Westcott and Pixham)	Leatherhead Town Council (comprising Leatherhead, Ashtead, Fetcham and Bookham)
Dorking	Not more than 10 councillors
<p>I think that both Dorking and Leatherhead are well established towns, the residents of which need to be represented formally by a properly elected community, or town, council, as was the case before the District Councils were set up. I have some experience of living in Cornwall both before and after the local District Councils were abolished and it was very evident that the County Councillors alone cannot give adequate representation to local residents and communities without town councils in place, closer to the ground and able to reflect and promote the views and needs of local people.</p> <p>My personal view is that these new councils should cover the urban area of the two towns, with the smaller communities represented by their local "parish" councils - by whatever name their population consider best - although I think that the population of the smaller "parish" areas should have the ability to request that their community was "merged" with a nearby town, if that is what they want.</p>	
<p>A new parish should have the name of the community they serve. I live in Dorking and would like a council called Dorking.</p> <p>There would need to be enough councillors to have a balance view so perhaps 8-10</p> <p>Elections should be biannual. That gives time for a councillor to know the system and to be effective.</p> <p>The boundaries should cover the built up area of Dorking, including North Holmwood, Pixham and Westcott Road, but not as far at Westcott or Westhumble.</p> <p>I don't know about the style as there isn't an existing urban council here</p> <p>The council would need to have autonomy in order to be able to provide for local services which it decides will benefit the local community.</p>	
<p>There is a need for a Dorking Town Council serving Dorking Town. This area is un-parished and there is a need for a local body equivalent to a parish council to work on behalf of residents. This should be an elected body of say 20 councillors elected for five years. There is a need for a body to oversee works that are too detailed for a unitary authority to manage - such as park and cemetery management litter collection etc.</p>	
<p>Dorking</p> <p>5 or 7 - small but enough to handle the likely workload</p> <p>elections taking into account other local elections</p> <p>boundary is mostly obvious with the exception of area to the south - I am not sure that the dual carriageway is an appropriate boundary with North Holmwood.</p> <p>Consider Town council once established</p>	
<p>I'd prefer a village council. My experience of parish councils (caterham) is that they are all about blocking planning (because those are the people who stand for election), or giving small amounts of cash to existing favourite charities! Most members are also district or county councillors with a political party focus.</p> <p>The council should be open and accessible.</p> <p>It should have people involved from a whole range of backgrounds. It should have an elected core with a range of unelected open / public sub committees for different topics with a co-design approach.</p> <p>The theme should be on "doing" not talking.... encouraging public participation and pride in the area.</p> <p>I look around at those already working hard for community cohesion in our area ... these are the people willing to use their free time / talents to support/ entertain / bring the community together.</p> <p>A village council should bring these people together.... offer / broker insurance deals, assist with risk assessments and grant applications, broker cheap fuel deals, purchase items to get best possible price etc etc. They should look to open up any resources they own (or can influence) for free .. removing barriers..... eg. If I want to do a road litter pick with my neighbours (a small act) I'd love to see a village council saying "here are high vis jackets, litter pickers and bags, let's give you a risk assessment to help you plan etc and would you like us to facilitate a road closure so kids can ride bikes up and down safely?</p>	
<p>Dorking and Leatherhead would benefit from town councils as long as it wasn't too bureaucratic and not too many councillors</p> <p>North Holmwood and Pixham should be with Dorking</p>	
<p>Dorking parish. Three or four councillors. Elections every four years, with ballots if required. Boundary would be as currently Dorking North and South Wards.</p>	
<p>make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation</p>	
<p>Dorking Town council.</p> <p>6-8 but would need more details on how parish council works</p> <p>Think it would make sense to co-ordinate with other council elections</p> <p>Geographical boundaries - ?? To be discussed</p>	
<p>The abolition of MVDC will necessarily remove an important local tier and services such as parks, allotments, leisure input to planning, need local input and as far as possible some control. I think the two of Dorking, including Pixham and North Holmwood should definitely be one area.</p>	

I would like a Dorking Town Council and this would make sense to a lot of people. What were the old Dorking Urban District boundaries? Elections on 3 year cycle, preferably not all representatives at the same time. How many councillors? Look at successful examples for towns of 16,000+.
Dorking Town 9 councillors elections every three years by proportional representation Current Dorking North, Dorking South wards and Pixham as geographic boundary Dorking Town Council
The aim should be effective and meaningful local democracy for the maintenance development and improvement of local community facilities and resources; and the effective holding to account of any unitary or government authority. The duties of the latter to be strengthened, broadened and made into funded expectations.
I think there should be a town/parish council to represent all the unparished areas so they have representation. Dorking town council/parish could include the areas of Pixham, North Holmwood, Westcott and Box Hill. It could be called Dorking Town Council (Dorking being the largest town of the group) There could be one councillor for each of the major centres of population represented ie Wescott, Pixham etc. The boundaries can be as they are on the map showing unparished areas. Election should take place when the unitary boundaries are changed .
Parish areas should be small enough to represent the local community not the general area. My suggestion would be to have parishes aligned to residential or commercial areas ie Goodwyns, Chart Downs, Ashcombe Road, Deepdene, The Nower, Horsham Road, Town Centre.
A "Dorking Area Council", including the "Yes" areas above.
A local body is needed to look after important assets e.g. Dorking Halls, Meadowbank, Leisure Centre. Leaving these to a unitary authority covering half of Surrey is too remote.
I think that the number of councillors should reflect the population size of the parishes . So those that cover towns would have more councillors than say Box Hill or Pixham . The boundaries seem reasonable. Elections every 4 years I would strongly suggest that a move is made from the 'parish' name which would be confusing in areas with a number of Parish Churches and is rather old fashioned . A Community Council is far more inclusive with no religious connotation.
Dorking Town Council Maximum appropriate number in relation to the population Parishes generally have a 4 year cycle, with elections in May I would propose Dorking is based on the new SCC/Unitary seat but taking into account the views of Pixham who may want to go alone, and Goodwins/Rough Rew who may wish to stay with Dorking or may wish to join North Holmwood In the case of Dorking "Town Council"
Divine Dorking Parish Council There will be at least 7 councillors on each local Parish council Elections will take place biannually as national elections do Geographical boundaries to be decided by Parish Council if not existing ones Parish style to be decided by parishioners Need to keep local representation in Divine Dorking and other localities like Westcott, Westhumble and Boxhill etc.
At least 3 councillors for Dorking and 3 for Leatherhead. Any less would give them too much workload
I prefer community forums as a title and not sure that the title councillors is the right title. 6-8 people per forum seems about right . It would need a tight constitution / remit with formal reporting procedures into the integrated Council . The election needs to take place within 6 months of the establishment of the integrated Council .
Dorking - 6 council members Need a stand alone town council It's very difficult to answer this without more information. I imagine that along with Dorking, the other main towns should have representatives and appropriate funds.
I just want more, smaller parish councils to ensure proper representation
Local representation is important as unitary authority is too far removed from residents. Having moved to Surrey from a two tier authority in Northumberland (and previously in a three tier system in North Yorkshire) a two tier system appears to be the best compromise. Local people are in the best position to make the best decisions about local issues, then more global issues can be discussed at a higher level.
Dorking town would be a sensible size with perhaps 4 councillors able to put an input in say planning matters, traffic etc. Parish authority would be more cost and time effective (so you are not wasting time discussing issues outside the local area) Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.
Dorking Town Council
Dorking parish council and should probably include Pixham and North Holmwood to create a cohesive town representation Numbers of councillors would presumably reflect the number of residents - minimum 5 As the parish (or town council) would be non political it would better to have elections separate from the Surrey and whatever unitary bodies are created. It would also be fair if the business rate payers could also be given a vote.

Following the bullets above:

Dorking.

Councillors equivalent to the "councillor per capita basis" as adopted by the existing parishes in MVDC.

Noted that first past the post is the current proposal for local elections.

When - at the same time as proposed elections for new unitary authority (money saving).

Parish to enclose the two existing Dorking wards.

Dorking Town Council.

What the parish/es should be called?

- Dorking

How many councillors there should be?

- I propose that an average of the councillors per number of residents be taken across existing parishes in the MVDC area and this be applied to the new council. Appropriate wards would need to be drawn up within the suggested geographical boundaries set out below to ensure that the population was appropriately distributed.

How and when election should take place?

- the elections should be conducted in the usual manner (first past the post) at the same time as the new elections for the proposed unitary authority for the area of Surrey in which Dorking is situated. This would save money.

The suggested geographical boundaries

- the geographical area covered by the existing Dorking wards for the MVDC (Dorking South and North) should be used in the first instance. If there are any subsequent developments, such as expansion of Dorking or outlying areas seeking to be incorporated, this could be considered.

Whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council)?

- As Dorking is a town, it would make sense to call it the Dorking Town Council.

Any other details about your proposal/s.

The Parish should be named after the area it represents as simply as possible.

Elections should be in line with elections for other parish councils.

With the demise of MVDC and SCC into a Unitary body, I do not see any other choice but to form Dorking parish/town council.

As the first tier of local governance it is a recognised statutory body. Without it Dorking residents will not be democratically represented at community level. Which is contrary to the Devolution White Paper's desire for robust community engagement.

The population of Dorking is one of the larger populations and economic areas in Mole Valley and as such needs to have a strong community voice.

The Localism Act 2011 further enables parish/town councils to potentially take on more activities to benefit their communities and allows for greater flexibility, such as setting up a local trading company or investing in local infrastructure.

A Dorking parish town council will be recognised as a stakeholder and have its own budget.

A Town council can bid for funding independently from a variety of sources.

The suggested Neighbourhood Committees will only be advisory and if there is no Dorking Parish Council, Dorking residents will not be represented in the same way as Parishes which would put the community at a disadvantage.

Questions above

1. I believe under the regulations governing the formation of a Parish Council it has to be Dorking Parish Council. At a later date it would be sensible to name it Dorking Town Council.

2. The number of councillors is usually determined by the population and would conform to guidelines so this is a bit of a 'Chicken and Egg'.

3. Given the timeline to move to unitary, the sooner the better, so there is not a democratic vacuum with Dorking residents not being fairly represented. The process I believe usually takes 12-18 months. Last time Dorking voted for a town council (2017) the voting took place as a separate Yes/No ballot paper during the May Council Election. The MVDC timeline is slow and might scupper the process this needs to be fast-tracked.

4. The boundary should be that of the proposed Dorking Division which also takes in Pixham. Parts of Holmwood are unparished as part of the Dorking Rural Division it would perhaps be sensible to merge to form a larger Holmwood Parish but that is for residents of Holmwood to decide.

5. The style and operation would be again be something for the newly formed parish councillors to decide. Again 'Chicken and Egg'.

6. It would be suggested that any newly formed Parish/Town Council works closely with Dorking Town Partnership BID and investigates best practice locally (Farnham and Horley,) regionally and nationally for ideas and innovation and should also a member of SALC. However again this is a bit 'Chicken and Egg'

The name could simply reflect the location: Dorking Parish (or Town) Council. I have included N Holmwood, as effectively it is part of Dorking.

The principal objective is to have sufficient councillors to ensure adequate representation for the whole of Dorking. Keeping more or less the existing wards, at least for the main part of the town and immediate environs would be a good start. I don't have a definite number, but the councillors should be very familiar with their local areas, and any concerns of the locals.

A Dorking Town Council might be more appropriate.

<p>They should be called by a name that identifies the place No idea how many councillors Community council or local council without old-fashioned “parish” My only proposal is for LOCAL DEMOCRACY</p>
<p>As with other existing Parish Councils but Dorking needs a Town Council and Councillors to represent its households and businesses.</p>
<p>One parish to cover the whole of Dorking which could in time be changed to a town council as these cannot be created directly. Around 10 councillors to allow a breadth of representation. Elections to be in line with any other local government elections to encourage as many people to vote as possible. Geographical boundaries to include what is generally understood as Dorking ie not including areas such as North Holmwood, Westcott. Possibly not including Pixham as they have a strong community identity and may wish to have their own parish council.</p>
<p>How on earth should I know? Dorking Parish Council?</p>
<p>Dorking North, South, East and West. There should be the minimum number of councillors (75) for each parish. Suggest the elections should take place at the beginning of the financial year, whenever that may be. <u>The function of the parish seems to be the same, whether it's called community or village council, so no views on the style.</u></p>
<p>Dorking needs local community representation (I think this is a principle for all unparished areas as we move to the larger unitary authority but can only comment on my own town). I understand that to have a Town Council, Dorking will need to first become a Parish. To 'ward' or not to 'ward' within this parish is a moot point. Both times canvassing to be a Dorking North Councillor, residents of Dorking rarely saw issues on a ward basis but on a Dorking Town basis.</p>
<p>I don't have enough knowledge to comment on what parishes should be called or where boundaries should be (I only found out about this survey very recently) but feel strongly that all areas in Mole Valley should have local representation.</p>

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>No changes should be made by MVDC until after new Unitary Authorities have been created. Once established UA's should be required to carry out a consultation process and referendum with the community to determine future local governance.</p>
<p>I consider that it is vital that we continue with and expand the parishes/ local town council be continued in light of the move to Unitary Authorities in Surrey</p>
<p>I believe the current arrangements for representing the residents is more than sufficient. We do not need to waste time or money on making unnecessary changes to the political boundaries. All areas should be represented I am concerned about unparished areas of Mole valley</p>
<p>I don't think the proposed changes are a good thing</p>
<p>Most local people have no idea the balance of powers of parishes/town councils/county councils & the proportion of money which follows to each now & when the upcoming changes with Surrey . Also how that would be changed when Surrey is split into 2 or 3 & the powers and cash that would follow each layer. How much power have parishes now? I suspect very little.</p>
<p>1. Loss of Local Accountability Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.</p>
<p>2. Overstated Financial Benefits The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.</p>
<p>3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.</p>
<p>4. Undermining Democratic Representation Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public</p>

scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.

5. Timing and Prioritisation

Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.

I think that the local Parish Councils will need to be formally linked into the decision making process within the County Council so that they are properly consulted and their views respected.

Parishes should be set up for all the unparished areas of Mole valley . Without this a very large population will have no voice - for example there is no guarantee they will be invited to attend Neighbourhood area committees

To support and reflect the local community and make them work more efficiently and effectively which saves time and money.

As the resources are in the right place at the right time.

Someone in Guildford, or Godalming or Cranleigh or Haselmere would have no idea what is important to the residents of Dorking or North Holmwood.

Our family lives in these areas and they have their own local issues everywhere needs a local voice or the new arrangement will just be a totalitarian organisation. Which oddly goes against the Labour governments ideals and definitely does not fit with the local Liberal Democrats.

Totally waste of time and money to change. It's just a cost cutting exercise.

This is just another waste of money and effort. Changing boundaries is irrelevant when it comes to providing support and services to local residents and businesses. They need to be provided with good quality, well-managed, well resourced services. This is just a smoke screen to hide any failings or attempts to appease minority groups with their own agendas.

I believe Dorking Halls and the Leisure Centre are both funded by MVDC. This funding, as well as other local representation, needs to be formalised for the future, among no doubt many other things.

Having larger executive bodies will result in worse representation and weaken the connection between the electorate and the governing bodies. It's not a good thing for democracy. It actually comes across like an attack on democracy.

No opinion.

The Government is making a total shambles of our communities. So very disappointing that in essence, local communities are going to be wholly disenfranchised by decisions being made by people who haven't a clue, either about the area or the real world impact decisions will have, directed by even less informed Ministers who are enabling the top level changes to our democratic processes.

Newdigate for example needs more. It's pub is closed now and although it may reopen there are many elderly residents there and I think having more in a larger area for them would provide a better quality of life.

I think all areas should have the level of parish/town council particularly following abolition of Mole Valley District Council. I think Pixham, Westcott and North Holmwood would be best with Dorking. Where i have said 'no opinion"it is because I don't know those areas sufficiently to comment on boundaries.

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

I can't suggest specifics but anything that can maintain the work and well-runness of MVDC in terms of financials and output of services is supported by me.
With the unitary council, the whole area needs parishes to provide local representation
I think many of these questions should be for people who live in the areas above. Elections should be timed to tie in with other regular elections e.g. the unitary council elections. At least Dorking and Leatherhead should styled as town Councils.
I consider that the whole of Mole Valley should be represented by parishes or Town Councils to represent the view of the local residents to the new Unitary Authority. To manage on behalf of the UA local assets eg. playgrounds, open spaces, amenity buildings e.g Dorking Halls, Pippbrook House.
<u>I recommend that Leatherhead and Dorking have town councils</u>
All areas without parish councils should have parishes created prior to the new county council reorganisation. It will be really important that decisions can be made locally that reflect the individual characters of the different places. There should be an adequate number of councillors reflecting the size of the place.
I think that each area should have local governance, given that there will be no say in Mole Valley without parish councils being established.
I do not wish to loose MVDC. When it goes under the new reorganisation then these areas need a local replacement.
These locations should have their own local decision-making bodies to allow for decisions to be made by people closest and most knowledgeable
Parishes should be set up for all the unparished areas of Mole valley . Without this a very large population will have no voice - for example there is no guarantee they will be invited to attend Neighbourhood area committees. Elections to be held in May 26 . We need our voices to be heard now.
Parish councils will be vital in reflecting local opinion in the new structure and unless these Parish Councils are formed there will be no local representation in the new structure
My concern would be that there should be a Holmwoods Parish Council It would not require many individuals just as long as there were representatives from across the 'parish' to ensure the voice of the local residents are heard in planning matters, road safety matters, environmental issues, social and crime issues, events in the villages and surrounding areas etc
I think it would be worth considering a Leatherhead Town Council covering Leatherhead, Ashtead, Bookham and Fetcham, based largely on the existing district council wards.
I see little point in pursuing individual parish councils for each of the villages as this duplicates the roles of the Residents Associations who will oppose them.
It will be important to devolve community assets to the new parish/town council, including income-producing assets which can support the new parish/town council's activities. Otherwise residents will be concerned about having to pay higher council tax.
I object to the proposed creation of a single unitary authority or any two-tier restructuring in Surrey on the following grounds:
1. Loss of Local Accountability Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.
2. Overstated Financial Benefits The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.
3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.
4. Undermining Democratic Representation Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.

<p>5. Timing and Prioritisation</p> <p>Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.</p>
<p>In conclusion, the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.</p>
<p>Need to communicate to the whole of Dorking and just through Hello Dorking Use BBC Radio Surrey Use the Churches Network - Churches Together in Dorking</p>
<p>I found the Community Governance Review almost by random accident. A mediocre questionnaire is not a valid way to determine community governance and is a cheap excuse. You only need to search on 'social research in communities' to find splendid examples of valid research which can then confidently determine local public policies. As with anything, random activity produces random results. Token research is awful</p>
<p>Can I ask that you publish prominently the total number of replies you get to this questionnaire and express it as a percentage of Mole Valley households.</p>
<p>I currently do not support the unitary council idea as the current system is working very well from a residents point of view. I hope all the good running and the financials are unchanged by this system shake up.</p>
<p>We have a council with Mole Valley that works very hard for us all and we can be confident that our councillors are available to us when we need their help or support.</p>
<p>It is vital in the reorganisation of local authorities that nothing - and more importantly no one - falls through any gaps. Please make sure our voices are still heard.</p>
<p>I believe everyone should have a proper VOTE and voice locally a large town like Guildford may have some great ideas on how to manage services and customer care by having a great team who can help and possibly close the issue immediately.</p> <p>What they cannot do or understand is what would work locally for Dorking or a small village like North Holmwood we do not need a by pass or bigger Marks and Spencers or 500 local authority houses built without local consultation. The first two would be a definite No but the housing with the appropriate local help may be possible it would need to include the local schools in Dorking and Doctors services, local shops, proper parking we may require another local surgery building and better bus services which the larger authority can help with. You would need local support and help that and ensuring the local things that matter like libraries, sports and swimming facilities, allotments, children's playgroups and other amenities are looked after locally.</p> <p>As an example building the houses on an allotment site would be an definite NO this go against all the climate change issues we have and makes no sense, creating a Hub new type of allotment where less well off residents can offer an hour or two without an impact on their benefits to grow some food and get some as a reward makes sense but would require local support.</p> <p>When we work as a whole we can reap the rewards but will require locally elected small teams with a proper voice but it must be done in a holistic where everyone finds out who does what best or more efficiently. If you have local residents on your side SO MUCH MORE can be achieved.</p> <p>I for one have experienced how un integrated the local NHS services are outside of Dorking locally they work well if you are under one discipline.</p> <p>Lack of communication and sharing of resources creates patient confusion and wastes time and resources.</p> <p>I have come across the NHS Surrey heartlands integrated care board not overly sure what they do or who pays for them but not sure the integrated approach is working outside of the local areas this is what we do not want to happen or they will be anarchy.</p> <p>I for one would consider refusing to pay all my council tax for services I am not getting. This needs to work but there needs to be local support and help so we all benefit and feel we have a voice.</p>
<p>Yes I came here to have a say on improvements to Dorking. Except every question was about parishes so I've just wasted time. I don't know what parishes are.</p>
<p>The widespread disillusionment with government at all levels can only be reversed by building communities locally, so that people feel that they can actually have some affect what happens - not just electing representatives periodically.</p>
<p>Look at the admin staff - can that be stream lined? Look at contracting some jobs out.</p>
<p>It is important to re-draft the consultation to make VERY CLEAR that the potential formation of Town Councils for the urban areas is one of the options being explored. As currently presented, not many of the town based residents will recognise that this is part of the review, and that legally the only difference is the name (is this correct?)</p>
<p>Given the total lack of concern MVDC have about local residents views on what they want to happen in the Mole Valley this seems like a completely pointless exercise and yet another waste of taxpayers money by the local council.</p>
<p>Mole Valley's unparished polling districts MUST be allowed to establish new Town Councils. This is a vital balance to the disgraceful and undemocratic local government reorganisation imposed in Surrey without due process or meaningful consultation at the ballot box.</p>
<p>I think the resulting redundancies to existing staff will not be cost effective.</p>
<p>'Leave well enough alone'</p>
<p>I am pleased to see that the review is being undertaken because I consider that this is a very important issue.</p>

I think local people should have more say in what developments are planned. For instance, making the Westcott Road entrance into Dorking into a major housing estate. The builders seem to have too much power in influencing the Council.
.
I would support a Town Council for Dorking
It is unthinkable that nobody will have responsibility for the villages and outlying communities unless each area has some say in the way that funding is directed.
Localism is vital.
Şi dacă vrei poti să-mi trimiți numărul
I would be disappointed if this leads to an extra level of burocratic political governance.
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation
All new changes in council working costs a lot of money. This money would be better spent on giving it to the councils now in control. Also whatever is changed is always complicated never an easy option
As we understand you have not (yet) approached the villages/parishes to either discuss this or request their views, we shall do so - and will share their responses with you.
Whole exercise is wasteful and unnecessary.
Some of your questions above are not easily answered by the majority of the population ie. How and when should an election of councillors take place? Also the questions about the boundaries- this would require specialist knowledge surely.
The most important aspect is that the unparished areas have some form of representation and this should be the emphasis of the questionnaire.
I would like to request as Chairman of Dorking Town Forum that, whilst I support the introduction of Parish Councils in all areas to even up the fairness in representation, Dorking be allowed to move to the next stage in the CGR process in order to be able to take an informed decision with regard to having a Town Council.
Once local councils are removed will be nigh on impossible to bring them back and it is so short sighted to do away with local councils that are the hub of our communities. If we are ever to bring about a sense of pride and partnership in our communities and localities we need our local councils to remain in place and have local representation rather than centralisation which makes life more difficult for those without easy forms of transport, the poor, vulnerable and all those challenged by daily living.
Community boards are being piloted. But these seem to be talking shops- With no powers. We want town councils with some powers and mandatory consultation rights. Also community boards can't hold assets but town councils can. Town councils ought to be able to work alongside/with 3rd sector charities and CICs to improve the area.
Devolution as it is currently processed and being pushed at break neck speed by SCC leadership is all about saving money and not about improving the area and services.
The overall long term savings are small compared to the initial costs and risks of fowling it up!!! (Which seems highly likely)
A poor implementation of devolution will be worst than the 3 tier system we currently have. A lost opportunity. So do it properly. And ensure that local people have a say in their services and assets.
It seems and feels that devolution will lead to selling off a lot of assets and cutting services. This is not acceptable to the residents of Dorking and Leatherhead and villages.
As mentioned in your information on Parish Councils, one concern would be the recruitment of suitable councillors. If there is so little interest that appointments are always uncontested, there is a danger that councillors are simply not good enough, or remain on a council beyond their best before date.
As a very new resident of Dorking, I have already come across two organisations: Hello Dorking and Circular Dorking which would appear to be excellent sources of informed opinion on the CGR. I think one of the most useful roles of a Parish Council would be to encourage representation from these and many other community groups, not necessarily as councillors, but in attending council meetings in order to remain informed and to encourage community cohesion.
Thanks, please keep us well informed of progress and timetable
It's not clear what benefit the proposals will provide. It looks like a corporate restructure with the talk of "efficiency", which is usually code for layoffs and decreased quality of service.
I think the CGR is awful ending up with far less focused local representation
I think the information about this change was difficult to understand and engage with.

<p>The publicising of these changes to local communities have been poor - both in terms of basic drawing attention to changes, but also in terms of providing accessible and clear information on what the changes actually mean in practice.</p>
<p>This is a complex subject and given the seismic changes about to take place, I do not think this survey or the process of community engagement has been robust enough. There has been too much faith in social media and not enough face-to-face. People are confused and many have very little idea of what is happening. There has been no community collaboration in Dorking with Dorking Residents, although there was a desire from residents to engage. This resulted in Dorking residents having to do the research themselves and pay for a pop-up shop. Bit of a poor show from MVDC! I am sure many people will not do an online survey and it was not clear where to get printed copies, where they were in the library and where to send them back to.</p>
<p>I understand that the Government has not commissioned a proper, objective review of the possible impact of proposed changes.</p>
<p>It's the democratic deficit that worries me most.</p>
<p>You do not cover the creation of a Town Council for Dorking.</p>
<p>I agree with many others that insufficient time is being allowed to ensure the best system is being set up for the future.</p>
<p>Surrey County Council has consistently failed our area. 2 or 3 Unitary Authorities (I favour 2 strong authorities to stand up to Central Government) without a Town Council for Dorking and additional Parish Councils will result in a further reduction of true democracy in our area.</p>
<p>It's a shame the significance and importance of this review taking place now, when the governance of Surrey as a whole is under discussion, has not been made clearer.</p>
<p>The language used in this consultation is archaic, eg the concept of a 'parish'. if you asked residents of Dorking if they would like a Town Council once MVDC is abolished, I'm sure the majority would be in agreement. Once MVDC has gone we do not know where decisions for our town will be taken and how diluted the Dorking voice will be within the new unitary council.</p>
<p>Local representation seems very important; to be able to contact local councillors about an issue, who are themselves resident locally is vital. They alone can understand local issues</p>
<p>I have no further thoughts at this time.</p>
<p>It's a shame the survey didn't offer the option of a Leatherhead Town Council for all of the 4 communities in the North. Sadly I do not think many respondents will see past the table where they have to ask for a parish council for individual areas. So the responses will not reflect support for this option.</p>

Responses for Fetcham



Total responses: 30

Resident responses: 26

Feedback: There is a mixed response, with some clear support for an establishment of a parish council in the area.

Fetcham

- Number of responses: 30
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 26

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish council in Fetcham?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Fetcham	14	12	4	30

Observations on parished areas

Not qualified to comment
It would ensure the availability of candidates in the longer term if the "three B's" were to come together as a single grouped council. There are already problems filling roles in the management of Betchworth church. There is clear synergy between these villages and many people belong to groups, activities and businesses in one village while living in another. Similar proportions of residents commute out from these villages.
Balance the areas and populations
Leave things alone no need to fix things that are not broken
The system works well at the moment so why change it?
Help support the community
Parishes are an outmoded form of dividing communities based on religious control of the population. Consequently they should all be abolished and a more democratic centralised system put in place.
Why change when these have worked very effectively for the communities they serve
Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
Change definitely costs money we don't have and may not bring the benefits intended
I don't know these areas sufficiently to express an opinion.
I propose to use the existing parish boundaries and that each village would be a ward electing three councillors. The name of the council should be decided by those who live there.
No changes required.
All boundaries are unnecessary and have been arbitrarily drawn. All parishes are discriminatory, discourage local participation and should be abolished.
They work well now.
Parish Councils are an unnecessary layer of local government. They tend to be run by older reactionary residents and do not reflect the needs of the local residents.

Support delivery of community services in Fetcham

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
I believe there must be some form of local community voice.	It will create additional bureaucracy at more cost to the residents. The Residents Association provides sufficient representation for Fetcham when it is necessary.	Fetcham I don't know enough about the options. You're probably consulting too soon and before there's been an opportunity to hear about it. I'm going to such an event on the 27th.
We aren't heard when it comes to things here in Fetcham, Bookham, Leatherhead - we need our voices to be heard	I would not welcome an additional tier of local government at the time when effort is being expended on implementing national policy to rationalise the number of tiers in the form of LGR, it would seem wasteful to deliver a contradictory local policy to introduce a new one back in.	Fetcham residents haven't yet experienced under-representation and it's fair to say many have not kept up with Local Government Review proposals. They will be shocked when they become marginalised.

		Already underrepresented by the Commission's own admissions, it will be a complete failure if the Government restricts the new council to just x2 per new district.
<p>This is a problem. The existing Ward of Fetcham (for the Unitary) is being split between Bookham (Bookham East) and Leatherhead (Leatherhead North). Therefore, an area with a strong sense of place and a community built around schools, village halls, places of worship, shops, parks, clubs and societies - and the Fetcham Residents Assoc will lose its sense of identity.</p> <p>The representation (ratio of residents to councillors) is likely to be the worst in Surrey. There are physical boundaries between Leatherhead and Fetcham with the railway and river. In essence, there are just x3 roads and a by-way - but only one straight-line route through the far South East Hawks Hill/Guildford Road. This does not support and integrated community!</p> <p>A Parish Council could compensate for lack of case work from overloaded unitary councillors and provide a focus for Fetcham's community and nurture the sense of place.</p>	<p>Too many decisions affect wider areas so it is correct to manage decisions in larger areas than individual parishes.</p> <p>Shall stuff can be influenced by residents associations.</p>	
<p>A parish council would have an effective say in how local services were organised.</p> <p>The councillors would be local to the residents and more accessible.</p>	I don't know enough about how parish councils work to answer the question as I don't live in one. I don't want to pay anymore local tax.	
<p>A large unitary authority is necessarily further removed from the local community voices. Some form of local representation seems important.</p>	Rather than creating new parish councils, all should be disbanded.	
<p>Fetcham has a unique identity and community. It is not Bookham - this has its own heart. It is definitely not North Leatherhead which is a car journey away and not a 'village', but a town.</p> <p>There's no guarantee Unitary councillors will live in Fetcham. Having a Parish Council would, improve some local representation from people with their hearts within the community.</p> <p>Fetcham is not huge and has relatively few community assets. It would not require a large PC.</p>	my experience of Parish Councils is that they create an additional and mostly unnecessary layer of local government; they are made up of wannabe politicians with very parochial (no pun intended) and narrowminded views ...	
<p>As chair of a charity which has three trustees appointed by MVDC I am concerned that without something like a parish council there may not be enough support for organisations such as mine. Without the councillors to report to, I probably would have left the charity some</p>	Works brilliantly as it is.	

<p>time ago - the fact that they have been our 'non-executive directors' has been part of my motivation to stick with it. They provide advice, support when we need to negotiate something or get council help, and a independent view. I fear that with only two councillors and each of those being shared with Leatherhead or Bookham, Fetcham will be left without it's own focus and identity.</p> <p>At the same time, things like planning must not be at only local level. Otherwise we'll never address our housing shortage.</p>		
<p>A key part of what makes Fetcham good is having flourishing organisations whether charities, sports clubs and resident's association. Having councillor support and interest is a key part of these being able to flourish.</p>	<p>No changes should be made by MVDC until after new Unitary Authorities have been created. Once established UA's should be required to carry out a consultation process and referendum with the community to determine future local governance.</p> <p>New Parish Councils should not be created by MVDC.</p>	
	<p>My answers chiefly refers to Fetcham where I live. I am writing this in my role as the elected Co-Chairman of the Fetcham Residents Association (FRA).</p> <p>1) The FRA already represents the community (working effectively with elected Councillors) to larger authorities, other statutory bodies and private companies.</p> <p>2) There is a long history (since 1932) of the FRA as a non-political voluntary association in Fetcham, and no history of a Parish Council.</p> <p>3) The running costs of the FRA are very low and the Association has the freedom to act and become involved in any issue it sees fit.</p> <p>4) The non-political tradition of the FRA is highly valued, and there is a danger this could be lost if a Parish Council was created.</p> <p>5) Most residents would not welcome the introduction of an additional Council Tax precept to fund a Parish Council.</p>	
	<p>No possible useful purpose for Parish Councils will be evident until AFTER the new Unitary authorities are established and the working relationships possible with their respective Cllrs has an opportunity to be demonstrated. Otherwise an ADDITIONAL tax burden is imposed without evidence of need.</p>	
	<p>The FRA is concerned that Local Government Reorganisation (abolition of MVDC) will lead to fewer Councillors working on behalf of residents. But we also believe that rushing to create new Parish and Town Councils may not be the</p>	

	<p>answer.</p> <p>The following statement from the FRA is already in the public domain: "We recognise why MVDC has launched this process, but it seems premature. There is already a great deal of upheaval in the pipeline and we feel it would be better to see how the new system operates before making any further changes. We certainly don't exclude the possibility that new grassroots councils will eventually be needed."</p> <p>Above all, it is crucial that new authorities (Unitaries) develop a working culture of constructive engagement with community groups and Residents Associations. There is much professional expertise within communities and RAs which is too often ignored, despite the fact the time and expertise comes without charge to the authority and council tax payer. This change of 'culture' is the community governance reform that is most needed.</p>	
--	--	--

What might a Parish look like in Fetcham?

I propose that new parish councils be established with the individual names Ashtead, Bookham, Dorking Fetcham and Leatherhead. Leatherhead and Dorking parish councils would most likely then vote to rename themselves as town councils. The existing ecclesiastical parish or the electoral ward boundaries would be the appropriate new boundaries.

Town mayors for Leatherhead and Dorking would be most advantageous in the new unitary structure (for either two or three unitaries). Indeed the role should already exist. A forum would be needed in which these town mayors could meet and cooperate, and in which the leaders of the parish councils around them, in North MV and separately in South MV could do the same. In the unitary system other nearby villages might prefer to join the structure, eg Oxshott, Effingham, especially if it proves beneficial to the villages already in the structure.

The Boundary Commission has broken its own guidance in dividing Fetcham between Bookham and Leatherhead.

Fetcham is a unique entity with schools, churches and clear visible boundaries.

The new boundaries make Fetcham residents some of the least represented in Surrey. Having a Fetcham Parish would help protect its identity and representation

5 councillors

Follow existing boundaries

Should take the name of the area it represents Local people need to represent the area in which they live.

Bookham, Fetcham

6 - 3 from each village

Probably outside of the scope. However, the Boundary Review has created a nightmare with pooling districts split between different communities, physical separation, and even (Leatherhead North and Fetcham East) two different MPs! A wider Town Council for Ashtead, Leatherhead, Fetcham, and Bookham would at least create a coherent geographical area and support an integrated 'strategic' view. Parish Councils could foster caring for community assets and understand the fine detail of local needs and preferences.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

No changes should be made by MVDC until after new Unitary Authorities have been created. Once established UA's should be required to carry out a consultation process and referendum with the community to determine future local governance.

Elections need to happen on a better scale, providing them to be more publicly known

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

I answered 'Yes' to the idea of a Parish Council or Town Council to represent Dorking. I believe that Dorking is of a sufficient size, and of sufficient economic and cultural importance to warrant an elected authority of its own.

The areas I have named are each a distinct community with its own identity. There are for example varying shopping facilities in these parishes, specific social and community activities. We see very few residents of the southern MV group taking part in northern MV activities - although I have no knowledge of employment trend for resident living on one side of the north/south divide while working in the other.

North MV has a greater population density than the south, while Dorking is the largest individual town. Ashtead chooses to title itself a village, although judging by the number of councillors it currently send to MV, it must have a larger population than Leatherhead town. Some might argue that a larger Leatherhead-Fetcham-Bookham parish or town council might be better. I would argue that the make-up and employment activities of Leatherhead town make it clearly different from its two neighbouring villages. Our boundaries may seem indistinct but we know who we are here!

Each of Ashtead, Leatherhead, Bookham and Fetcham has a U3A, and these also work together to provide some minority classes. Social events of other types are supported by residents from all four communities, not only the one which gives the activity its title.

Fetcham has different characteristic to Leatherhead and Bookham. Have a PC that understands these will be better than just overstretched new unitary councillors alone trying to serve artificially blended disparate communities.

The existing ones work well and forming ones for areas without them can only be beneficial.

It is unknown how the new Unitary Authority covering Mole Valley will operate in practice i.e its relationships with towns and villages, and how it will interact with the strategic Mayor's office.

Creating a Town Council in Dorking may also act as 'test bed' to see if a new third tier authority could work in practice - or not.

Existing Community Governance needs to be streamlined and made more efficient. Additional bodies are unnecessary.

There is no need to consider trifling in the implementation of small scale limited influence parish councils at a time when public policy is towards larger more muscular and resilient local authorities. If those parished areas wish to continue with their parish councils let them continue but there is no need to add to the current count of over 200 microscopic parish councils in the county of surrey.

Stop wasting ratepayers money , paying for surveys and consultations that are not needef

By losing MVDC the voice of locals is being lost and decisions made by people outside the area who have no idea of local conditions and requirements

A well functioning RA, or local voluntary organisation, can be very effective, but it needs the same status as a PC, and MVDC, SCC and the new UA need to have a mechanism structure through which they effectively engage with residents. It is too 'ad hoc' at the moment and most of the time not properly effective - RAs and residents know their area and should be properly listened to - not ignored and patronised which often happens.

Too little engagement too late, this survey is a prime example. The timing is ridiculous considering that there is a major restructure of local and county governance - Community Boards are being trialled. As a co-chair of an RA, we would like to have proper input on what might work, and be the best way to deliver local democracy.

There was no engagement with the RAs about this survey, if it was really necessary we could have helped shape the questions at an early stage to make it meaningful, and we could then help publicise it. Instead these surveys and consultations are foisted on the local community and often do not reflect the reality of the area, are meaningless, and are ust a tick box excersize and a waste of taxpayers money.

Online surveys are NOT a proper way to engage with residents and get their views - MVDC should realcarise this by now, the uptake is tiny and the result does not reflect the resident's views properly

Fewer elected "representatives" will be more cost effective.

why this change? it strikes me as a bit like the EU: let's create a few more levels of government - i.e. more jobs for the boys - without any thought of whether this is actually necessary (but who cares, they say, what do our residents matter?)

I fully support the comments and position taken by the Residents Associations of Ashtead, Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead on the Community Governance Review.

My issue with the whole process is that we need to understand what is being proposed by the review and THEN we can democratically feedback what we think of it. As I understand it, the new boundaries have not been finalised so we cannot know what exactly we are voting for.

Why throw all the balls up the air from the outset?

First change to the Unitary Council format,

See how that does or doesn't work and local level,

ONLY HEN consider what else could be changed and HOW, FOR THE BETTER.

Responses for HEADLEY



Total responses: 8

Resident responses: 7

Feedback: Headley already has a well-established parish council, and responses from the community—including the parish council—have suggested a boundary adjustment to incorporate a small unparished polling district within Headley, which was created during the last boundary review.

Headley

- Number of responses: 8
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 7 (out of the 8)

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Headley	62.50% 5	25.00% 2	12.50% 1	8

Effective delivery of community services in Headley

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
The proposed change (see below) is generally supported in the community and will remove a potential divisive factor among future residents of the new development at Headley Court. It was unanimously agreed at the Parish Council's September Meeting. it would allow the Parish Council to treat a new residential development as a single entity	Unnecessary complications to a working system	I have found the Headley Parish Council to be ineffective in shaping development at Headley Court and believe it has no useful role going forward.

Proposed Changes to HEADLEY

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
Include all of the new developments at Headley Court	
Council is fine but needs to include all of the new development at Headley Court	
Extend the boundary of the Parish Council to include the entire GG Polling District; the change would affect about 20 properties (all under construction) and . It would also ensure that any additional dwellings proposed for the Audley development (and granted planning permission on 1/10/25) would be included in the Parish Area. We note that since the area remains entirely within a single County Division (both before and after the recent LGBCE Boundary Review for Surrey), it does not trigger the recommendation in Local government structure and elections - GOV.UK(https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-government-structure-and-elections) that parishes that straddle a County Division boundary should be warded. It would remove an imminent anomaly where the current boundary splits a new residential development; Without this change residents would be confused and face anomalous Council Tax rates depending on the exact location of their property, which would be divisive	

within the new development; it would also support Parish Council initiatives to integrate the new community within the village	

Observations on unparished areas

Details about boundaries, naming & number of councillors should be up to the communities affected. Our preference would be for Dorking & Leatherhead to have Town Councils and other communities to have Parish Councils.
Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want We are not aware of any specific changes being proposed relating to other Parish Council areas. We believe other proposals from existing Parish Councils should be looked at constructively.
If any Unitary wards end up covering both Parished and non-Parished areas, then there is a risk that the Ward councillors will be drawn away from the Parished areas by the need to address the democratic deficit on the non-parished areas. This would be unfair on Parishes like Headley which might find themselves in this situation.
Many residents in Headley (and other rural villages) rely on discretionary services, such as libraries & leisure facilities, based in the larger towns. Having Town Councils would reduce the risk that a Unitary Council, facing budgetary pressures and/or desiring to focus on their complicated statutory responsibilities, might reduce such services, having an adverse impact on our residents.
Town Councils with the capacity to employ staff might be able to offer services competitively to rural Parish Councils, such as Headley
With the number of Councillors for the MVDC area due to fall from 45 to 12 (or possibly 18) it will become much harder (especially for vulnerable and disadvantaged residents) to get effective support from an elected representative. This democratic deficit would be addressed by ensuring all residents can access a "third-tier" of elected representatives who follow the Nolan principles & governance standards that apply to Parish Councils.
As things stand, the Unitary Councils proposed for Surrey would be the only ones of their size in non-Metropolitan England without complete coverage of Town/Parish Councils. For example, Somerset & Cornwall both created Town Councils to fill the gaps in their coverage when they were created as Unitary Councils. Both they and Wiltshire have devolved significant delivery of non-statutory services to the Parish Council sector. It would amount to an unacceptable (and undemocratic) experiment for Surrey to be denied this tier of Government and would pose significant risks to services such as libraries, leisure facilities, public conveniences, allotments, the employment hub, Day Centres, etc. These services can only be effectively provided by Councils which can raise money and meet the Nolan principles and governance standards required of Parish Councils.
For this reason we believe that Surrey should have complete coverage of Town/Parish Councils before the District/Borough Councils cease operating.
In areas such as West Sussex, it has long been the practice that larger Town Councils can offer services such as grounds management to smaller Parish Councils who may not employ staff. So a failure to create Town Councils in the more urban areas would put at risk the ability of smaller Parish Councils to meet their community's demand for some services.
The exact configuration of third-tier Councils should be primarily driven by views from the communities affected. This may involve a degree of negotiation to resolve differences of perspective.
To avoid distraction we believe changes to existing Parish Councils should be kept to a minimum in this review. However there may be requests from non-parished areas to become part of an existing Parish.
We are not in principle opposed to merging of existing parishes if the local communities wish this and we recognise that this may help areas who have struggled to find their quota of Parish Councillors. However we envisage potential future problems if two communities share a Parish Council where one could be seen as the dominant partner, leaving the smaller community destined to a minority role for the foreseeable future. We are aware of examples where such 2-community Parish Councils have been unsuccessful. So we believe merged parishes should aim to represent three or more communities.
We have considered 2 neighbouring non-parished areas which might propose merging with Headley PC. It is not our role to speak for such areas, but we have considered our response if such proposals are made: • Tyrrells Wood (Polling District XC) – in view of the small population size of Tyrrells Wood and its position adjacent to properties already in Headley and close to the Headley Court developments, we would be comfortable with such a proposal which we think could be accommodated without the need to ward the Council. We also note that if Tyrrells Wood were to form part of a Leatherhead Town Council it would trigger the recommendation in Local government structure and elections - GOV.UK that parishes that straddle a County Division boundary should be warded.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Box Hill (Polling District GA) – we would be opposed to forming a joint Council covering Headley and Box Hill for the reasons given earlier in our “Final Thoughts”

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>

<p>Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.</p>
--

<p>With the number of Councillors for the MVDC area due to fall from 45 to 12 (or possibly 18) it will become much harder (especially for vulnerable and disadvantaged residents) to get effective support from an elected representative. This democratic deficit would be addressed by ensuring all residents can access a “third-tier” of elected representatives who follow the Nolan principles & governance standards that apply to Parish Councils.</p>
--

<p>If any Unitary wards end up covering both Parished and non-Parished areas, then there is a risk that the Ward councillors will be drawn away from the Parished areas by the need to address the democratic deficit on the non-parished areas. This would be unfair on Parishes like Headley which might find themselves in this situation.</p>

<p>Many residents in Headley (and other rural villages) rely on discretionary services, such as libraries & leisure facilities, based in the larger towns. Having Town Councils would reduce the risk that a Unitary Council, facing budgetary pressures and/or desiring to focus on their complicated statutory responsibilities, might reduce such services, having an adverse impact on our residents.</p>

<p>Town Councils with the capacity to employ staff might be able to offer services competitively to rural Parish Councils, such as Headley</p>
--

<p>Democratic deficit</p>

Responses for Holmwoods



Total responses: 36

Resident responses: 36

Feedback: Part of the Holmwoods (South Holmwood) is already parished. It is proposed that the parish boundary be extended to encompass the entire Holmwoods area, including North Holmwood and Mid-Holmwood.

Holmwoods (including North Holmwood)

- Number of responses: 36
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 36

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Holmwoods	50.00% 18	38.89% 14	11.11% 4	36
North Holmwood (unparished)	63.89% 23	19.44% 7	16.67% 6	36

Effective delivery of community services

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
North Holmwood is currently unparished. Setting up a parish in North Holmwood would provide representation for local residents which would otherwise be lost when the government's new plans are actioned and MVDC no longer exists.	Keep all parishes as is	The current Parish Council structure works very well and the councils are genuine community champions already.
	Why change something that has worked ok for a long time. Local people now about their location and what's works not big council departments .	I think it would be great to have a Holmwoods Parish Council to discuss and help implement local views and issues
I live in an unparished area near the Holmwood Parish. Extending the Holmwood Parish should be considered as an option. The reduction in the number of Councillors representing residents following the introduction of the new Unitary structure could be offset by this area being parished and having parish councillors to represent the residents in this area	No need for changes - keep it local!	The local community needs a budget, actions and decisions at a more local level
Setting up a parish in North Holmwood would provide representation for local residents which would otherwise be lost when the government's new plans are actioned and MVDC no longer exists. Parish councillors could put across the views of local people to those in the new Unitary Councils who may try to impose unwelcome changes in the area.	Leave it as it is	Residents need a local voice in this area
I'm not really sure but I do feel strongly about a Parish Council so local voices are heard. I would definitely consider putting myself forward to be elected onto a council	I believe the existing parishes already work sufficiently well.	A Parish Council can create a focal point for establishing community wishes and initiate action and communication to upper tiers of Government.

		parish Councils will have a better understanding and knowledge of the local environment and residents priorities and advocate for these at the appropriate Government level.
	If it isn't broken, why fix it.	I sometimes think the Holmwoods are ignored or just clubbed in with Dorking. They are very different from the town centre with different issues such as protecting the countryside, extremely noisy motorbikes on the A24, supporting the local elderly and vulnerable to name but a few
	Keep all parishes as is	One huge unitary unit is likely to mean that small areas like the Holmwoods would not be adequately represented. The creation of a Parish Council in this area may help to ameliorate this
	No change needed	If anything needs to be improved, the wishes of the people should be taken into account to a greater extent, rather than initiating 'consultations' with an outcome already planned
	Keep all parishes as is	New local council is needed for future. So local people can monitor area
	Services work ok	
	I do not see that any change is necessary. Any changes would no doubt result in increased administrative costs which would reduce the amount of funding to be used for the community. I also think there would be more red tape and overlap .	
	They all seem to be working well as they are.	

Proposed Changes to Holmwoods

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
Capel PC is quite large with at least one sub-committee and responsibility for land, parks and buildings in 4 distinct communities whereas Holmwood PC is very small with few responsibilities apart from playground equipment since it is almost entirely National Trust land. Mickleham is also small. Holmwood could combine with Capel or expand north to include Mid/North Holmwood (currently unparished).	More delegated local control at parish level if there won't be a Dorking Town Council with delegated powers
I was not aware we had a parish council for North Holmwood or Dorking I believe we should have one so we have a voice over local issues and services. Like allotments, libraries, funding for places like the swimming pool and sports facilities, parking for local residents, EV charging points, play grounds.	The identity, needs and requirements of the community or communities should provide the guidance on the 'Area' size/shape to inform boundaries. A governance model that requires these areas to then provide insight and requirements through ToR and purpose to service delivery / and community practitioners is efficient and proactively preventative
Holmwood Parish Council where I live covers a very small area. The remainder of the Holmwoods is unparished which will mean that there will be no democratic structure in place for local governance apart from the very large unitary Council with a very small number of Councillors with big areas to cover. Extending Holmwood PC to cover the whole of the Holmwoods would give it greater weight through representing more people and increase the talent pool from which Parish Councillors could be drawn. There	My concern would be that there should be a Holmwoods Parish Council It would not require many individuals just as long as there were representatives from across the 'parish' to ensure the voice of the local residents are heard in planning matters, road safety matters, environmental issues, social and crime issues, events in the villages and surrounding areas etc

could also be synergies around common issues such as Holmwood Common and local sports facilities. Another option if a town Council is formed for Dorking, some or all of the Holmwoods could be included.	
Holmwood PC covers a very small area with very few responsibilities. It could be combined with another PC or be subsumed in a new Dorking PC	Holmwood Parish council 2 to 4 councillors May Holmwood area
The Holmwoods encompasses several communities (North Holmwood, Mid Holmwood, South Holmwood and a significant number of scattered rural dwellings) within and surrounding Holmwood Common (NT). A larger Holmwood PC could improve cohesion and communication between the more densely populated north of the area and the more isolated rural parts. Common concerns are health, education, public transport and highways and relationship with the National Trust. Mickleham could combine with Box Hill and Westhumble to make a larger, more varied parish.	
Extending the Holmwood Parish to cover North Holmwood should be considered as an option. Having a formal and stable structure with consistent governance defined by statute is more enduring than residents associations and therefore can represent residents more consistently over time.	
North Holmwood Parish Council.	
The Holmwoods Parish Council Not sure how many councillors but it should represent all the Holmwoods Elections every 4 years but not sure if this is about right? The boundary should just be around the three Holmwoods	
"Holmwood" should probably be renamed to "South Holmwood" as Mid and North Holmwood are in Dorking unparished area rather than Holmwood parish.	
The village of "South Holmwood" was called just "Holmwood" per old OS maps at A Vision of Britain https://visionofbritain.org.uk/unit/10128237 but given the current name of this settlement and the fact Mid and North Holmwood aren't included the name suggests that it either covers all 3 Holmwoods or the current name of South Holmwood is just "Holmwood". Alternatively the boundary of the parish could be changed to take in the other 2 Holmwoods.	

Observations on unparished areas

Similarly, Headley PC could be expanded to include Box Hill, currently unparished, Wotton could be combined with Westcott and Mickleham with Westhumble.
Keep all the present parish councils , but arrange representation for the other areas in Mole Valley.
However, make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation
I would like to see parish councils introduced in Dorking/Holmwood, Leatherhead/Fetcham, Ashtead and Bookham so there is a council with representatives of each distinctive community who could represent the interests of that community to the unitary councillors, who will be representing a larger geographical area from 2027. This is more democratic than relying on Residents Associations that may represent a particular sector of the community.
It is also a good opportunity to consider whether any of the current parish councils are too small and to incorporate any currently unparished areas. Every resident of the District should have the same democratic representation.
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation
I would like to see a parish council and suitable element to council tax to be incorporated to improve local services control in Holmwood and Dorking
make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation

<p>New local council is needed for future So local people can monitor area</p>
<p>North Holmwood. Other areas could have a combined PC, eg Box Hill, Mickleham and Westhumble. Ashtead, Leatherhead, Dorking and Bookham are each large enough to have a PC and Fetcham could combine with Leatherhead or Bookham. Similarly, Pixham and Westcott could each combine with either Dorking or Box Hill and Westhumble.</p>
<p>I believe the parish councils in their current form are hindered by their historical creation and purpose, specifically the governance, ToR, accountability, capability and capacity, access and understanding of insight and its use in targeting community identified needs. A modern approach is required to deliver the most efficient and representative outputs.</p>
<p><u>Why do you need more, need less for joined up thinking</u></p>
<p><u>Why change something that work</u></p>
<p>The Residents Associations across Mole Valley do a remarkable job representing their respective communities and Parish/Town Councils in these geographies would be an unnecessary complication and cost. If no Residents Associations, Parish or Town Councils exist than by all means they should be formed to represent the relevant communities at that local level.</p>
<p><u>make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation</u></p>
<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p><u>Services already ok</u></p>
<p>It would simply create more red tape and expense for the taxpayer.</p>
<p><u>I think there are sufficient parish councils to reflect the needs of the community already.</u></p>
<p>As far as I know, they all work well.</p>
<p><u>Leatherhead and Dorking should each have a Town Council to protect their unique identities.</u></p>
<p>To be viable and effective, each PC should represent a distinct geographical area with shared features, eg densely populated or scattered housing. Each part of a parish should be represented by at least 2 councillors but overall numbers should be under 20.</p>
<p>Given Dorking will no longer be the Mole Valley hub then the people of Dorking need either a parish or a Town Council with at least 15 councillors to represent the breadth of Dorking. There could then also be a community council with representatives from each parish. Bi annual elections in a different cycle from the new unitaries.</p>
<p>Possibly the boundary or area of the Holmwoods (and maybe Cape) could change to include North Holmwood and their should be more clarity on what area or parish we are in. This should be a 'village type council' as it will cover more than one 'village' The same could be said of Box Hill Pixham and Westhumble they could join with Mickleham. I would suggest a similar approach for the the other communities they could be incorporated in with other local parishes that make sense geographically and works beneficially for the village. Dorking should have a town parish council as that affects all in the local area who live or work there, Leatherhead should be treated in the same way.</p>
<p>I think many of these questions should be for people who live in the areas above. Elections should be timed to tie in with other regular elections e.g. the unitary council elections. At least Dorking and Leatherhead should styled as town Councils.</p>
<p>Dorking, North Holmwood and Pixham could be grouped into one parish (Dorking community council). Leatherhead and Fetcham could be grouped (Leatherhead community council). Box Hill, Westcott and Westhumble could each be combined with an existing nearby PC eg Box Hill / Headley, Westhumble / Wotton, Westhumble / Mickleham.</p>
<p>Make a new parish for the Holmwoods or Holmwoods and Dorking, as once MVC goes, we will have no say and no way of protecting the services we have now. All the other places without a council also need them.</p>
<p><u>make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation</u></p>
<p>New PCs could protect and maintain community assets, represent residents' views via Unitary Councillors, and promote community cohesion and mutual support.</p>

<p>They could only deliver services if they were able to raise a precept and if the Unitary Council devolved responsibility (and possibly some funding) to them, eg to manage and maintain parks and village halls.</p>
<p>Some services are best delivered locally and it would help create a sense of belonging if parishes had more powers/ could be part of a broader community council.</p>
<p>To support and reflect the local community and make them work more efficiently and effectively which saves time and money.</p> <p>As the resources are in the right place at the right time.</p> <p>Someone in Guildford, or Godalming or Cranleigh or Haselmere would have no idea what is important to the residents of Dorking or North Holmwood.</p> <p>Our family lives in these areas and they have their own local issues everywhere needs a local voice or the new arrangement will just be a totalitarian organisation. Which oddly goes against the Labour governments ideals and definitely does not fit with the local Liberal Democrats.</p>
<p>Local democratic representation</p> <p>Local control of services best delivered locally, especially those that are discretionary for principal councils to provide.</p> <p>Protection of local discretionary services that the unitary Council might feel it cannot afford because of the financial pressure of statutory services such as social care and SEND.</p>
<p>There will be far fewer councillors in a unitary council after LGR, covering larger geographical areas. It will be harder for them to represent the interests of distinct communities. PCs representing the individual communities could be consulted about assets and services in their community and are a conduit to raise local concerns with a higher authority.</p>
<p>A parish council in North Holmwood could represent the views of residents on local issues such as planning consent.</p> <p>Once MVC goes, we will have no say and no way of protecting the services we have now.</p> <p>As above, only if no Residents Associations exists already</p> <p>make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation</p>
<p>The priority for forming Parish/ Town Councils should be focused on those areas where there is a concentration of services such as Shops, Community Buildings and Services such as Libraries, Community Buildings, Parks, Playgrounds etc These priorities are the service areas in Ashtead, Leatherhead, Bookham and Dorking. The definition of the Boundaries of these areas will define the requirements of the surrounding areas. The "fairness" of the cost of providing community services in these priority areas to rest on the residents of these areas should be considered.</p> <p>There is therefore an argument to have Town/Parish Councils in these areas extended to where the residents who use the assets and services live.</p> <p>For Example,</p> <p>Town Council for Ashtead should cover all of the Ashtead District Council Wards</p> <p>A Leatherhead Town Council should/could cover all of the Leatherhead and Fetcham District Council Wards</p> <p>Likewise Bookham could cover all the Wards.</p> <p>A Dorking Town Council could include Westcott Pixham and the urban areas on North Holmwood</p>
<p>The aim would be to act as a mouthpiece for the locality so we don't get forgotten. It could help with keeping the area vibrant, active and more prosperous while also helping to deal with some of the social & safety issues locally. There is generally a very good community spirit in this area and I would hate that to be lost as we get swallowed up in a large, impersonal organisation that does not have an eye and a feel for the local community here.</p>
<p>Local decisions made by local residents or councillors are a must</p> <p>Improves relevance of local devices and impact for residents</p> <p>Be the voice of the residents</p>

Other comments for all MVDC areas

The unitary governance model - at this level.

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/community/make-it-happen/neighbourhood-area-committees>

Neighbourhood Area Committees will aim to bring people together and create real opportunities for local collaboration and insight gathering in towns and villages.

The purpose and focus of the NACs is to:

- Understand key local issues
- Agree priorities and champion collaborative action
- Promote preventative activity
- Support thriving communities
- Act as advisory bodies (not constituted)
- Supported by a range of engagement tools

This multi agency place based & focused model provides Surrey communities with:

- Greater governance legitimacy
- Stronger service coordination
- Measurable public impact

- Alignment with devolution legislation

- Scalable, modern community empowerment infrastructure

This transition offers far more than what is possible under a legacy parish council model focused largely on local amenities and representation

Benefits of this approach

1. Integrated Multi-Agency Coordination

* Local hubs bring together SCC, NHS, VCSEs, and community services for co-designed, place-based delivery.

* Enables seamless referrals, joint service planning, and integrated care at neighbourhood levelTAC model

Background PF....

2. Preventative Focus with Clear Impact Pathways

* Moves from reactive to preventative support through early engagement intervention frameworks.

* Reduces long-term statutory demand (e.g. A&E visits, social care packages).

3. Empowered Local Democracy

* NACs embed councillors and residents in a formalised governance structure.

* Offers stronger accountability and local ownership than parish councils from wider community representation allowing place/ locality insight to be identified and communicated, which informs preventative service provision.

4. Evidence-Driven & Transparent

* Embedded Theory of Change and Logic Models to evaluate performance, promote learning, and ensure transparency (e.g. dashboards, open meetings, public voting)

5. Stronger Voice in Strategic Reform

* NACs provide the governance infrastructure needed for effective participation in the government's new Local Government Outcomes Framework (LGOF) and English Devolution Bill processes

* Parish councils have limited statutory role in these emerging governance structures.

6. Community Capacity Building

* Active facilitation of grassroots involvement via VCSE partners, community champions, and targeted outreach - COMMUNITY PRACTITIONERS

* Parish councils often lack funding and personnel for this scale of mobilisation.

Improve public transport across the southern part of the county and more joined up thinking

With the larger unitary council being installed we need more local control and influence

The representation and local control in services in Holmwood will be greatly underrepresented in comparison to the current mole valley system

To support and reflect the local community and make them work more efficiently and effectively which saves time and money.

As the resources are in the right place at the right time.

Someone in Guildford, or Godalming or Cranleigh or Haselmere would have no idea what is important to the residents of Dorking or North Holmwood.

Our family lives in these areas and they have their own local issues everywhere needs a local voice or the new arrangement will just be a totalitarian organisation. Which oddly goes against the Labour governments ideals and definitely does not fit with the local Liberal Democrats.

A Parish Council or Town can create a focal point for establishing community wishes and initiate action and communication to upper tiers of Government.

parish Councils will have a better understanding and knowledge of the local environment and residents priorities and advocate for these at the appropriate Government level.

The formation of Parish (Town) Councils is not only important to those who live or work there but also to those who live in other areas and visit and use the services in neighbouring areas.

Until the boundaries and populations of the Parish/Town Councils are defined it is premature to mention, names, numbers of Councillors style.

For economic reasons the elections to Town/Parish Councils should take place on the same day as Unitary elections.

Keen to be involved in the discussion, but in big handfuls whatever is done should maintain or improve the current local service provision and control with local representation not diminish it eg garden bins, local playground and youth facilities / health and social care

It would be useful to understand if a Dorking Town council is a real and viable option and to have some modelling of what might be delegated to such a council or the various parishes assuming there will be one very large East Surrey Unitary Council.

There needs to be clear accountability through benefit analysis, impact measures & evaluation of activity, alignment of requirements (community identified with government direction),

I do not feel informed enough about parish councils. To be honest I didn't even know what/where my local parish is until I just googled it. I'm sure I'm not the only resident in this situation, but as someone who always votes and pays an interest in local politics I'm surprised at my own ignorance and lack of awareness.

With regard traffic policy in county, it is more of a hair brained money wasting scheme than joined up thinking. Current works on A24 have nothing to do with road safety and everything to do with revenue generation. If they truly wanted to make safer they would change road layout with a roundabout at South Holmwood rather than install cameras

I believe everyone should have a proper VOTE and voice locally a large town like Guildford may have some great ideas on how to manage services and customer care by having a great team who can help and possibly close the issue immediately.

What they cannot do or understand is what would work locally for Dorking or a small village like North Holmwood we

do not need a by pass or bigger Marks and Spencers or 500 local authority houses built without local consultation. The first two would be a definite No but the housing with the appropriate local help may be possible it would need to include the local schools in Dorking and Doctors services, local shops, proper parking we may require another local surgery building and better bus services which the larger authority can help with. You would need local support and help that and ensuring the local things that matter like libraries, sports and swimming facilities, allotments, children's playgroups and other amenities are looked after locally.

As an example building the houses on an allotment site would be an definite NO this go against all the climate change issues we have and makes no sense, creating a Hub new type of allotment where less well off residents can offer an hour or two without an impact on their benefits to grow some food and get some as a reward makes sense but would require local support.

When we work as a whole we can reap the rewards but will require locally elected small teams with a proper voice but it must be done in a holistic where everyone finds out who does what best or more efficiently. If you have local residents on your side SO MUCH MORE can be achieved.

I for one have experienced how un integrated the local NHS services are outside of Dorking locally they work well if you are under one discipline.

Lack of communication and sharing of resources creates patient confusion and wastes time and resources.

I have come across the NHS Surrey heartlands integrated care board not overly sure what they do or who pays for them but not sure the integrated approach is working outside of the local areas this is what we do not want to happen or they will be anarchy.

I for one would consider refusing to pay all my council tax for services I am not getting. This needs to work but there needs to be local support and help so we all benefit and feel we have a voice.

All for Unitary but fs cost saving a key objective one Unitary for Surrey makes sense.

make Dorking a parish council because we need local representation

The formation of Town and Parish Councils are an important step to make the secure the future of cherished assets and services which are valued by local communities and are currently being provided by the District Council or financially supported by the District Council.

If new Town or Parish Councils are formed it will be important that careful consideration is given to what assets and services are transferred to them to ensure their long term ability to maintain them. Larger assets and services will be better transferred to the new Unitary Authority.

Again if new Town or Parish Councils are formed cooperation between them will be important to ensure that inefficiencies in maintaining these assets and services are not introduced.

A more remote council with wider responsibilities than the current District Council will have financial pressure and less local connections will inevitably put less essential but cherished local assets and services at risk.

This consultation has, as usual, been poorly publicised .

Not enough information from MVDC was sent or made available via post for those without internet connection and generally poorly promoted

No more councils or committees are necessary

None - apart from this survey is very difficult for your normal electorate to complete and as a result you may have very in accurate results from your activity and further quantified and simpler electorate engagement must happen before any decision is made

I honestly believe this survey is a waste of time, as I think whatever the public think, this government will do what they want anyway.

Responses for HOOKWOOD



Total responses: 6

Resident responses: 5

Feedback: Hookwood is already part of a parished area under Charlwood Parish Council, and there is no indication for any changes.

Hookwood (Charlwood Parish)

- Number of responses: 6
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 5

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Charlwood Parish (including Hookwood)	33.33% 2	33.33% 2	33.33% 2	6

Effective delivery of community services in the parish

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
	No changes are required	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.	

Proposed Changes to Hookwood

Proposed Changes	Generic responses

Observations on unparished areas

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.

I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Responses for LEATHERHEAD



Total responses: 41

Resident responses: 41

Feedback: Responses were mixed, with some clear appetite for a parish to be created and others stating that no change required at this time.

Leatherhead (Currently unparished)

- Number of responses: 41
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 41

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish council in Leatherhead?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Leatherhead	19	15	7	41

Observations on parished areas

It would ensure the availability of candidates in the longer term if the "three B's" were to come together as a single grouped council. There are already problems filling roles in the management of Betchworth church. There is clear synergy between these villages and many people belong to groups, activities and businesses in one village while living in another. Similar proportions of residents commute out from these villages.

I am happy to support the residents in the parishes on whatever view they give.

I'm not clear what significant difference would be achieved, therefore what value is there in change for the sake of change.

In the 12 years I've lived in Leatherhead there's been a huge amount of consulting but very little action, apart from the costly hard landscaping that sadly isn't even being maintained in a timely way.

I have no interest in them

I am not aware of any difficulties with the above parishes. Mickleham seems to work especially well because they have active officers.

The proposed changes will disenfranchise local residents.

Leave the parishes as they are. They are community based and do not need to change.

I propose to use the existing parish boundaries and that each village would be a ward electing three councillors. The name of the council should be decided by those who live there.

They all have clear identity.

Living in Leatherhead I have no knowledge of these parish councils.

Support delivery of community services in Leatherhead

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
I feel that Leatherhead is too big and diverse a community to benefit from having a single parish council. There may, however, be benefit in having smaller areas represented by a parish council, such as North Leatherhead (or Leatherhead Common) which has a community feel very distinct from the rest of the town and has social and economic needs different to much of the rest of the town.	It is difficult to administer services across the existing unparished areas and there is already a perception of disparity in different areas individually, and compared to other unparished areas - I do not see how it could help to further create new parishes for representation purposes, without further creating a wider gulf between areas, services, local economy and representation.	I don't see how another layer of council governance would impact the local community
I think they could ensure allotments, playgrounds and links with the new Unitaries can be strong.	They best know their own area If it ain't broke don't fix it	

To Bridge the huge gap between council and the community	We do not need more civil servants and higher council taxes	
Democratic deficit	Leatherhead has two distinct areas: north and south. If there were separated, I think the differences would become even more marked, to the detriment of both.	
	Current works	
	Adding parish councils does not address the issues the larger changes will create. In these areas it just adds another layer of bureaucracy.	
	Why? Spending more money on things that don't need to be charged	
	I do not feel the need for a parish council. From what I hear of parish councils elsewhere, they are a complete waste of space.	
	I do not think creating a new Parish council would be a good idea. It would just add another level to local governance and make it more opaque and confusing.	

What might a Parish look like in Leatherhead?

Support	No Support	Generic Observation
Village Council, it's important that the people living in these areas get a voice on anything that may effect them.		Should be called Leatherhead, The Area Mole Valley Forget
I propose that new parish councils be established with the individual names Ashtead, Bookham, Dorking, Fetcham and Leatherhead. Leatherhead and Dorking parish councils would most likely then vote to rename themselves as town councils. The existing ecclesiastical parish or the electoral ward boundaries would be the appropriate new boundaries. Town mayors for Leatherhead and Dorking would be most advantageous in the new unitary structure (for either two or three unitaries). Indeed the role should already exist. A forum would be needed in which these town mayors could meet and cooperate, and in which the leaders of the parish councils around them, in North MV and separately in South MV could do the same. In the unitary system other nearby villages might prefer to join the structure, eg Oxshott, Effingham, especially if it proves beneficial to the villages already in the structure.		We do need some more focus in Leatherhead. I don't know about the other locations.
Leatherhead Five Every 5 years on the same day as other local government elections The current Leatherhead South		I believe that with the proposed move to unitary councils it's imperative that residents are represented at a local level

Ward boundaries. Community Council Should take on ownership of all the MVDC owned amenities within the boundaries following the formation of Unitary Authorities in 2026		
Call it Leatherhead It should have 4 councillors to reflect the areas of the town Elections 4 yearly		
The urban group of towns/villages to the north of mole valley. Called Leatherhead and district Same as on mole Valley now Ashtead 6, Bookham 6, Fetcham 3 Leatherhead 6		
Leatherhead and Fetcham are a distinct pair of towns that need some identity and focus, so either individual or a joint parish is needed.		
They should be named after their areas, obviously!! They should be made up of Community members not political party affiliated councillors. Election should be as soon as possible. Boundaries should be geographical and areas should not be split. I.e., North and South Leatherhead are just Leatherhead Community councils		
Elections should be every 4 years aligned with SCC/Unitary to enable turnout, or two years . Dorking should be a Town council and maybe include Pixham. North Holmwood and Westcott. Westhumble may want to join Mickelham/Box Hill or just Box Hill. Leatherhead and Fetcham may wish to be one Town Council, or even one larger one with Bookham and Ashtead, althought those two may wish to be separate.		

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I feel that local representation is key and bigger isn't always better, ie doing away with MVDC, again what's the significant benefit.
I propose to use the existing parish boundaries and that each village would be a ward electing three councillors. The name of the council should be decided by those who live there.
Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal

<p>Mark- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p>I propose that new parish councils be established with the individual names Ashtead, Bookham, Dorking Fetcham and Leatherhead. Leatherhead and Dorking parish councils would most likely then vote to rename themselves as town councils. The existing ecclesiastical parish or the electoral ward boundaries would be the appropriate new boundaries.</p>
<p>Town mayors for Leatherhead and Dorking would be most advantageous in the new unitary structure (for either two or three unitaries). Indeed the role should already exist. A forum would be needed in which these town mayors could meet and cooperate, and in which the leaders of the parish councils around them, in North MV and separately in South MV could do the same. In the unitary system other nearby villages might prefer to join the structure, eg Oxshott, Effingham, especially if it proves beneficial to the villages already in the structure.</p>
<p>Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.</p>
<p>Elections should be every 4 years aligned with SCC/Unitary to enable turnout, or two years .</p>
<p>Dorking should be a Town council and maybe include Pixham. North Holmwood and Westcott. Westhumble may want to join Mickelham/Box Hill or just Box Hill.</p>
<p>Leatherhead and Fetcham may wish to be one Town Council, or even one larger one with Bookham and Ashtead, although those two may wish to be separate.</p>
<p>The areas I have named are each a distinct community with its own identity. There are for example varying shopping facilities in these parishes, specific social and community activities. We see very few residents of the southern MV group taking part in northern MV activities - although I have no knowledge of employment trend for resident living on one side of the north/south divide while working in the other.</p>
<p>North MV has a greater population density than the south, while Dorking is the largest individual town. Ashtead chooses to title itself a village, although judging by the number of councillors it currently send to MV, it must have a larger population than Leatherhead town. Some might argue that a larger Leatherhead-Fetcham-Bookham parish or town council might be better. I would argue that the make-up and employment activities of Leatherhead town make it clearly different from its two neighbouring villages. Our boundaries may seem indistinct but we know who we are here!</p>
<p>Each of Ashtead, Leatherhead, Bookham and Fetcham has a U3A, and these also work together to provide some minority classes. Social events of other types are supported by residents from all four communities, not only the one which gives the activity its title.</p>
<p>Local people understand local needs far greater than those who do not live in these parishes.</p>
<p>I believe a Community Council within the Leatherhead South Ward boundaries would contain a coherent community with similar preferences and concerns</p>
<p>I fear that amenities currently owned and managed by MVDC in the proposed Community area might be neglected if ownership were to pass to the new Unitary Authority.</p>
<p>Leatherhead needs community and focussed support. It is overlooked, being overdeveloped and under represented. Mole Valley Council serves the community very poorly. We need champions.</p>
<p>Local town councils can be the eyes and ears of the community when the new and more distant local government is in place. They can ensure services are effective by providing a voice and lobbying.</p>
<p>We do need to have a local view on local issues and this seems to be a smart way of achieving that.</p>
<p>The settlements in the north Mole Valley would form a cohesive group with similar issues which are very different to the settlements further south due to being much more a commuter area for London. So much greater pressure on land pressure to build more houses, the impact of the M25 and traffic problems and be large enough to function within the new council structure.</p>
<p>Often it feels like Leatherhead and Fetcham are the poor cousins of the richer Ashtead, Bookham and the surrounding area. Decisions regarding youth services moving to Bookham at the expense of the poorest in Leatherhead are disgraceful and the Bull Hill development should not even be considered in one of the few bits of green space in Leatherhead. Leatherhead should not solely be considered for its high street, it is losing too much elsewhere.</p>
<p>Why do things have to change why can't things just can't the same. Its all about putting more money in councillor pockets sod the normal person</p>
<p>Whatever happens changes will be made irrespective of people's comments</p>
<p>The old saying - "if it ain't broke don't fix it"</p>
<p>No, I am quite happy with the arrangements for Community Governance in Leatherhead. The only comment I would make is that whenever a proposal comes along that involves two or even three areas, much effort must be expounded on ensuring that all are aware of the implications. eg Bull Hill and Waterway Road and Fetcham, Bookham etc.</p>
<p>will HMG disband the current 2 tier county and district council structure , only to then create another two tier county and parish council structure ?</p>
<p>will the new UA's be so remote from residents that a lower order body is required in order to maintain effective liaison ?</p>
<p>will residents be prepared to pay for a second tier body ?</p>

is consideration of this matter not premature ?

is yet another consultation the right way to test public opinion re this ?

North Leatherhead in particular has been neglected for far too long, anything that regains focus for the poorest in our area is needed. Often work for these communities is left to charities and volunteers and neglected when it comes to political investment.

The proposed changes are a retrograde step.

Responses for LEIGH



Total responses: 7

Resident responses: 6

Feedback: despite the low figures, no supporting evidence was provided for a change, and the majority of comments indicated that no alterations were needed to the current parish of Leigh.

Leigh

- Number of responses: 7
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 6

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Leigh	28.57% 2	42.86% 3	28.57% 2	7

Effective delivery of community services in Leigh

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
	No change necessary	am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.
	No change necessary	
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.	

Proposed Changes to Leigh

Proposed Changes	Generic responses

Observations on unparished areas

No change necessary. Would be a waste of money.
I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.
Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.
I don't think this is the right time to consider this.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Responses for MICKLEHAM



Total responses: 11

Resident responses: 9

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Mickleham is already an established parished area.

Mickleham

- Number of responses: 11
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 9

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Mickleham	36.36% 4	54.55% 6	9.09% 1	11

Effective delivery of community services in Mickleham

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
	<p>Mickleham Parish Council considered this matter at its meeting on 10 September. Three options were looked at.</p> <p>1 No change</p> <p>2 Merge with Westhumble Residents Association to form a larger parish council covering Mickleham and Westhumble</p> <p>3 Merge with Westhumble Residents Association and Dorking to form a Dorking town council incorporating Westhumble and Mickleham.</p> <p>No advantages were seen in either option 2 or 3.</p> <p>Option 1 was chosen.</p> <p>This response is submitted by the chair of Mickleham Parish Council on behalf of Mickleham Parish Council.</p>	<p>Personally, I would abolish parish councils. A significant percentage of council tax goes to funding PC's and I do not believe that they give value for money. A hefty proportion of their precept is spent on financing the PC itself - clerk's salary, meeting room hire etc. opinions among councillors can also be partial, where the greater good of the community takes second place to personal preferences. I do of course appreciate that parish councillors generously give their time for free, and many work very hard and with great commitment. However, local council tax is high enough, the actual work of the PC's could (and should) be done by MVDC. Local communities could choose to organise a group of residents to discuss local issues and bring them to the attention of MVDC if thought necessary.</p>
		Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
		Electors in those areas should make the decision about alternative style to parish council/ what they should be called.

Proposed Changes to MICKLEHAM

Proposed Changes	Generic responses

Observations on unparished areas

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone - I don't trust the government and their new 2 tier system? For larger areas will have less localised knowledge, meaning poor fit for specific community needs. The savings you plan will be overstated or take years to materialise. Mergers come with high upfront costs (redundancies, rebranding, IT system changes, etc.)</p>
<p>I live in Givons grove and not sure why the boundary changed from Leatherhead</p>
<p>1. Loss of Local Accountability Merging multiple district and borough councils into a single unitary authority will centralise decision-making and reduce democratic responsiveness. Surrey is a large and diverse county. A single council cannot adequately represent or respond to the distinct needs of its local communities. The current structure, while imperfect, allows for more direct and locally informed governance.</p>
<p>2. Overstated Financial Benefits The claimed cost savings from reorganisation are speculative and frequently overstated. Evidence from previous reconfigurations shows that any long-term savings are often offset by significant short-term costs, including redundancy payouts, IT system overhauls, service disruptions, and rebranding. In many cases, promised efficiencies do not materialise or result in reduced service levels.</p>
<p>3. Increased Bureaucratic Distance Creating a larger, centralised authority introduces another layer of bureaucracy between residents and decision-makers. Residents will find it harder to engage with council processes, access support, or challenge decisions. Services risk becoming more generic, less responsive, and less adapted to local conditions.</p>
<p>4. Undermining Democratic Representation Any move toward fewer, larger councils will mean fewer elected representatives per capita. This reduces public scrutiny, dilutes representation, and increases the workload on remaining councillors, weakening their ability to advocate effectively for constituents.</p>
<p>5. Timing and Prioritisation Given current financial and service pressures on local authorities, especially in adult social care and children's services, focus should be on stabilising delivery and funding – not on disruptive structural overhauls. Reorganisation is a distraction and a misuse of limited resources.</p>
<p>Again what isn't broken shouldn't be fixed - please stop this nonsense - Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone -</p>
<p>It's the same answer to all your questions -this Disruption to try and cut costs when funds are already tight is a waste of time and effort. Please leave the current system alone If you think changing the boundaries for more votes please stop this</p>
<p>the proposed changes are ill-timed, democratically regressive, and financially risky. Surrey's governance should be improved through targeted reform and investment, not wholesale restructuring.</p>
<p>Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.</p>
<p>Democratic deficit</p>
<p>I believe we need fewer publicly funded councils, especially in today's world where communication can be so quick and efficient. Money should be prioritised to much needed services.</p>

Responses for NEWDIGATE



Total responses: 10

Resident responses: 9

Feedback: No changes are suggested, as Newdigate is already an established parished area.

Newdigate Parish

- Number of responses: 10
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 9

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Newdigate	30.00% 3	50.00% 5	20.00% 2	10

Effective delivery of community services in Newdigate

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
If I am honest I would prefer to get rid of parish councils and save the money involved!!	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.	I live a few hundred yards from the centre of Newdigate, I am in the Church Parish of Newdigate but not able to vote in Newdigate but have to drive past Newdigate village Hall (where voting takes place) and all the way to village hall at Beare Green which is ridiculous. The A24 should now be the obvious boundary!! The Parish of Capel (my current parish) has no interest in the needs of residents living in Newdigate and it needs to be changed I have requested this on several occasions over the years!!
	No changes are required	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.
		I don't think this is the right time to consider this.

Proposed Changes to Newdigate

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
If I am honest I would prefer to get rid of parish councils and save the money involved!! They don't really do much and just debate what they should spend their money on without agreement and many use it for their own personal reasons!!!!	

Observations on unparished areas

I live in a parished community, with a longstanding elected parish council. I feel this is the appropriate mechanism for my area. However, there might be areas in the Mole Valley district that don't fall into this category, and would benefit from having a town or parish council of their own, or joining an existing one nearby. I'm not aware of any myself.
With the loss of the Mole Valley district council, it will be vital for un-parished local communities to have a mechanism and focal point that is able to become a focus and hub for community issues, and be the local contact point with the unitary authority, when it arrives. Preferably, this would be an elected forum, so that it has democratic legitimacy and is accountable to locally resident voters.
I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.
Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">~ I don't mind. This could be decided by the local parish councils themselves, upon formation.~ Membership might be predicated on the size of the local population they represent.~ I'd have thought geographical boundaries ought to be contiguous with neighbouring parishes, so as not to leave any unrepresented orphan areas.~ I think the naming choice could be decided by the councils themselves, by an internal vote, depending on what they prefer to be called. They could consult their local residents too, when setting-up, to ask them, and let them know that they exist and why.
No more parishes Because areas without parish councils might struggle to make their voices heard to a large unitary authority that has responsibility for a good proportion of the county. It will also be a focal contact point for the elected local councillors to the unitary authority, helping them to liaise between the PC and the UA, and acting as a go-between in some cases perhaps, oiling the political wheels, and so on.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I think this is an excellent and needed initiative that will pay great dividends going forward, and be invaluable too for the new unitary authority, and the people working there, making their job actually much easier, by having identifiable local points of contact. Of course, the main representatives are supposed to be the local councillors who are elected to the unitary authority, and they will still be an important part of that chain of communication, but it will be invaluable to [continue to] have some localised representation at the village/parish/town level. Any elections to newly formed parish or town councils can be held at the same time as the UA council elections, so the additional cost would be negligible.
I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Responses for Ockley



Total responses: 10

Resident responses: 10

Feedback: There was no evidence provided to support a specific change to the parish; however, some generic comments suggested that parishes covering larger areas might be preferable.

Ockley Parish

- Number of responses: 10
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 10

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Ockley	30.00% 3	60.00% 6	10.00% 1	10

Effective delivery of community services Ockley

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
	I think the Parishes are fine as they are. people identify with the areas and surroundings where they live and raise their families. Change for no obvious good reason is not a reason to change something that has history and its own characteristics.	I am concerned about the reasons for this review, which are not clear. The parish councils in my division (8) all work well, in my opinion, and the very nature of the communities they represent, means that they could not be merged or changed and it should not be part of a higher authority programme but instigated from the community up.
	No changes are required	

Proposed Changes responses to Ockley

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
	Parish council are the part of mole valley that work
	The parishes reflect both geographical and demographic nature of the villages they represent and should not be changed. I don't think the district council has grasped or understood how parish councils work. They don't need to change, but the county and the districts do. The proposed LGR does not suggest any changes to parish councils - any changes should be from the bottom up not the top down as this review is trying to do.

Observations on unparished areas

I would like to see a Dorking Town Elected Council of some description
I think all the Holmwoods should be merged in to 1 parish.
Economy of scales must be the way forward with accountable councillors and even elected parish teams
Already work, changing is a cost the over taxed MV residence don't need
No one needs more levels of government

I believe it should be down to each community to decide whether their democratic representation is adequate. I don't think piling on more council tax for large town councils is fair on residents with the increase in council tax generally and the introduction of a mayoral precept. I think any decisions on this should be left post LGR to residents once they have lived under unitary authorities.

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

I don't think this is the right time to consider this

Other comments for all MVDC areas

I would like to see an elected town council for Dorking and elected town manager. Held directly accountable for what they deliver or what they do not deliver

Yes it should be addressing the problem in MV, that is MVDC, it has a culture of being unhelpful, uncooperative, anti the communities it supposed to support. All at a huge cost

I think I have covered most of this. I attend 8 parish councils in my capacity as a county councillor. Often in addition to my attendance there are three or more district councillors at the parish councils. Following LGR there are likely to be two or three councillors, which will be more than enough to manage and be able to listen to communities, feeding back to the new unitary, the needs and opinions of each community along with a neighbourhood area committee which will bring in other services like community safety and health. I think this is the wrong time to do this and any new parishing should wait until the new unitary authorities have had a chance to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Create bigger parishes as there is too much cost duplication running smaller ones.

Such as Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland could be one Parish

Headley and Boxhill one Parish

Capel and Ockley one Parish

Holmwood all North, South and Mid in to one

Larger Parishes deliver greater cost effectiveness. Some parishes struggle just to get a clerk as it's just a few hours a week for little salary. Merging them give best value for public purse

Reduce to cover Capel only

The 3 Bs are they are even referred to locally Brockam, Buckland and Betchworth are already closely linked with services and communities. Even the Councillors are the same and they have wasted costs going to multiple meetings etc.

Small parish projects can be grouped together to larger ones giving better value to the tax payer

Create bigger parishes as there is too much cost duplication running smaller ones.

Such as Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland could be one Parish

Headley and Boxhill one Parish

Capel and Ockley one Parish

Holmwood all North, South and Mid in to one

Responses for Pixham



Total responses: 9

Resident responses: 9

Feedback: Responses were largely supportive of Pixham being parished, with many favoring its inclusion within the Dorking parish. Some comments suggested Pixham should remain independent and have its own Community Council.
Note: In areas with an electorate under 150, it is not possible to establish a parish council.

Pixham (Currently unparished)

- Number of responses: 9
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 9

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish councils in Pixham?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Pixham	8	0	1	9

Observations on parished areas

I lived in this parish area (Beare Green) for 29 years and feel that the alignment with Coldharbour was out of place. It is high on Leith Hill with its own interests, social and travel patterns etc. Connections with Capel & Beare Green do not exist.
Far too much detail needed in this question. Coldharbour should be joined with other remote rural villages which could better represent all their interests as opposed to Capel & Beare Green which are linked geographically. The only way to find out more is to consult residents face-to-face.

Support delivery of community services in Pixham

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
Dorking should have its own parish council called Dorking Parish Council Pixham should have a separate community council called Pixham Community Council It has separate issues to Dorking as it is on the edge of the town with different issues. Pixham has major issues with traffic, building and bicycle traffic and needs representation. It is effected by hundreds of bicycles daily at weekends especially racing through the Lane, not stopping at the traffic lights and calling out noisily in one particular area.		Local needs should be reflected and dealt with locally, rather than dissipated to an amorphous, distant control.
Dorking North, South, East and West. There should be the minimum number of councillors (?5) for each parish. Suggest the elections should take place at the beginning of the financial year, whenever that may be. The function of the parish seems to be the same, whether it's called community or village council, so no views on the style.		Local needs should be reflected and dealt with locally, rather than dissipated to an amorphous, distant control.
Pixham has separate issues to Dorking as it is on the edge of the town with different issues.		

Pixham has major issues with traffic, building and bicycle traffic and needs representation. It is effected by hundreds of bicycles daily at weekends especially racing through the Lane, not stopping at the traffic lights and calling out noisily in one particular area.		
I believe it is very important that people living in Pixham and Dorking (and other areas too) have access to a local, elected and accountable group to be able to express their views on how their community should be looked after and nurtured. This is an essential part of a community's identity and for living in an effective democratic system where people feel, and can see, that their views and ideas are being heard and acted on.		
I am replying with reference to Dorking as I have lived in Pixham for many years and as Pixham is now electorally part of Dorking it seems logical to include Pixham in a Dorking Parish / Town Council. My comments apply to all areas. A) Decreasing representation for Dorking will lead to only 2 (possibly 3) councillors in the new East Surrey Unitary, with many implications for democracy. They will be small fish in a very big pond. B) There is no guarantee that the non-statutory obligations which MVDC and SCC fulfil right now will continue, despite the best efforts of our new councillors to protect them. With a stipend, a new parish council could undertake to maintain them. C) Local and smaller voices can be heard more clearly at this level. Dorking is lucky to have a good community but there are many who are isolated for many reasons; a good parish council can be responsive to their needs and more flexible in what it can do. D) A lot will depend on the make-up of new parish councils which will need to depend on local needs. As stated above, meaningful consultation is needed with a wide range of people consulted. E) Businesses are an essential part of a thriving community and must not be neglected, with specific consultations for them.		

What might a Parish look like in Pixham?

Support	No Support	Generic Observation

Other comments for all MVDC areas

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Local needs should be represented in local areas, rather than dissipated to larger, amorphous areas. All of the unparished areas could be represented by one or more parish councils, say, Dorking North, South, East and West

I cannot answer these questions as they require far too much detail and are for people who live within these parishes to answer after careful discussions, public meetings and consultations with local councillors and residents. Please emphasise specific consultations with businesses and social enterprises if you go into Stage 2. They have different needs from residents and are essential for communities to thrive.

a) your 'specifics' are often poorly phrased and inappropriate. For example, re the preceding box, asking members of unparished areas whether councils will deliver services more effectively - I have no knowledge as I don't live in a parished area. From my memories of living in Beare Green - people take the services provided by a PC pretty much for granted when they work and moan when they don't...
b) I would also like to raise the issue of publicity for this review. Having run the information hub at 165 High St from October 2nd – 11th, a major finding was that around 75% of people who came in had little if any idea of local govt reorganisation and what it meant. Others were confused between MVDC and SCC as they had seen the SCC leaflets. People needed to discuss and find out face-to-face and thoroughly appreciated what we were doing, including our website at Home 1 with its clear graphics.

I've attached a copy of our findings which you might find helpful.

If you decide to go to the 2nd stage, may I suggest that it is essential for a critical revaluation of your publicity to include face-to-face public meetings and easily understandable posters etc.

As there is no facility that I can find to download documents, I have pasted Dorking Community's findings from their hub below. I hope you find them useful and will seriously consider reevaluating your publicity accordingly.

DROP-IN HUB: 165 HIGH STREET

DORKING RH4 1AD

Thurs 2nd – Sat 11th October 2025.

An alarming percentage of people – around 75% possibly more – did not know or knew very little about changes in local councils.

During that time we:

- a) Gave out around 1800 postcards which publicised our aims, our website and MVDC's survey.
- b) Discussed with almost 400 people. Our aims were to publicise the survey and inform people. We did not 'take sides'.
- c) Displayed clear, informative posters on windows and inside the hub.
- d) Gave out paper copies of the MVDC survey.
- e) Advertised the hub and MVDC survey in central Dorking & on Facebook.
- f) Spoke on BBC Surrey Radio and Talk TV.
- g) Invited all MVDC local and Surrey Councillors to attend.

General findings and concerns of people we spoke to:

- a) The cost: that council tax will go up to cover changes.
- b) Appreciation that MVDC isn't perfect but it's generally approachable. Much more than SCC.
- c) Fear of increased bureaucracy and remoteness.
- d) Uncertainty about what might happen and the speed of change.
- e) Concern about MVDC and SCC assets and worry that some might be sold off.
- f) Where the central offices of the new East Surrey Council will be located, and what will happen to Pippbrook Offices.
- g) Concerns about people losing jobs.

Specific comments/ questions:

- a) I'm on the MV housing list. Once we become East Surrey, might I be re-located anywhere?
- b) What will happen to health services? We've lost audiology in Dorking Hospital and the nearest place doing hearing checks is now Leatherhead. What else will go?
- c) Thank you so much for doing this. You made it understandable.
- d) I'm now even more confused.
- e) How will I get to a council office to pay my bills or look at a planning application?
- f) I can't manage now – how can I cope when I have to pay more council tax?
- g) What will happen to Citizens' Advice?

<p>h) Will Pippbrook House / Dorking Halls / Meadowbank Stadium be sold? Other assets?</p> <p>i) What services will we lose?</p> <p>j) Once it's properly costed, will it go ahead even if it's more expensive than they first thought?</p> <p>k) What about Council debts, especially Woking?</p> <p>l) How will MVDC assets be protected once we move to an East Surrey council? Will my football ground (2 were named) be safe?</p>

Responses for Westcott



Total responses: 56

Resident responses: 53

Feedback: Resident responses indicate overwhelming support for establishing a parish council for the Westcott area.

Westcott

- Number of responses: 56
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 53

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish council ?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Westcott	82.14% 46	14.29% 8	3.57% 2	56

Observations on parished areas

No change
Wotton and Ranmore Common Parish should be combined with Westcott in terms of proximity and population size.
I think that as other changes are taking place at the same time, existing parishes, unless they wish to change, should stay as they are and be reviewed later, eg 5 years after the County change and changes with Village and Town Associations have been put in place. Allow the dust to settle and then see what else may need doing. If they are working, which I believe they do, no need to "fiddle".
Wotton to be merged with a newly formed WESTCOTT Parish Council
Don't know enough about the areas or the implication of them to comment
There should be no change to the boundary of existing parishes which provide the relevant local representation within the democratic framework of a Parish Council.
It would be for those PCs to decide what additional responsibilities or assets they would like to take on following LGR.
Small parish. Consider merging with another parish to form bigger Parish Council
I selected no opinion but I'm strongly in favour of devolving as much power to local parishes as is practicable. Especially with regard to the ownership and operation of community assets.
I don't think the proposed changes are a good thing
Newly formed Westcott Parish in close proximity to Wotton and by merging the community would be best served as a joint enterprise
I think that local parish councils on the whole do a very good job. They are made up of local people who are far more likely to understand local issues than anyone from elsewhere. I think with big changes going on and no big concerns regarding Parish Councils, they should be left alone.
They work at present as they are. No changes

Support delivery of community services in Westcott

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
I would like a parish council for Westcott.	Services and support to the community has been vastly improved now that the same faces don't have the same influence, i.e. the WVA isn't all powerful.	What a rubbish question/document this is.
In order to give communities a clear line of communication and ability to liaise with the larger unified councils the local voice needs to be heard more clearly. Parish councils will give these voices a place to be heard.	Currently represented by the Village Hub, Village Association and will likely be represented by the NACs	Dorking and Westcott one Parish
I am strongly in favour of creating a new parish council in Westcott.	It should be part of Dorking or remain unparished	Village council and sub group of a youth council would be nice - how

		can we encourage the ships to be refilled and make the village more vibrant for tourist walkers and cyclists?
Westcott is so close to Dorking that it needs its own parish to retain its autonomy over decisions made in Dorking	I feel that the residents association already creates issues & unfairness & letting them have more power would not be beneficial	
I currently live in Westcott, my family moved here 26 years ago when my first child was 2, my next 4 children were born here, I began Cookie Club in Westcott and was a governor in the local primary school for around 8 years, I still volunteer here and am part of this wonderful community that I love dearly. I moved away for 9 years to be nearer my parents when they needed me, but moved back here last year as we missed our community and friends too much. I am concerned about the move to a larger more distant Council, one that may be given more power away from central Government but also further from the communities that people live in. The talk of giving more power to developers, for example, to provide more needed homes, concerns me even more, if it does not provide the balance of listening to the concerns of the communities and people whose lives will be massively affected by the developments they are doing. The lack of compassion and communication is already being seen in the exhaustion from the barrage of confusing messages that are already in play for local councils to have to manage, whilst trying to allow residents to live and work without being constantly hit with the daily struggles from developers, such as closed roads, noise pollution and the stress it causes while it is happening near to their homes. Having a Parish Council will allow an effective structure and voice close to the community that will be able to be heard at Council level, one that can be approached by every member of the community, and one that can also work alongside other local Parish/Town Councils for the benefit of our larger local area. We are best aware of the needs of our community and can communicate it most effectively with a unified and coherent voice. Without this unified voice, we will have no voice and find it harder and feel less empowered to feel part of the decision making when it comes to our own communities. It will mean some individuals will need to step into a role that is currently unknown, but our Westcott Village Association, for example, has some fantastic unpaid volunteers who already have given time and resources to do an	Westcott already has a village association which is operated by volunteers from within the community. The formation of a Parish Council will add costs to ratepayers and provide no benefit to the residents as their standing with the Local Authority, whether merged or not with others(s) under the 2026 reorganisation. In fact reorganisation will add new problems for all officers concerned and whether or not the Village Association or a Parish Council is heard more effectively than hitherto is most unlikely. Parish Councils can fix their own rate and it is not capped so the residents of Westcott could be faced with a rising Council Tax and IN ADDITION an fee for the created Parish Council. Not what any resident needs to happen in these difficult financial times for all.	Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

<p>outstanding contribution to our village, and I am sure that the right people will come forward to do the same in other places once the nerves and concerns are addressed. These areas flow beautifully into each other, our need to work together is important, but also to understand that some villages are more isolated and need the support of the local town council on some matters, and wider local community support represented at a bigger council meeting.</p> <p>People are fearful of change, but essentially this is about understanding how as a local area we can support one another and allow community voices to be heard, locally and then to the larger council that is to become established in 2027, having this tier set up in local areas gives the more official standing within the local areas for this to happen, without it, there is nothing.</p>		
<p>With Surrey County Council dividing into 2/3 bodies and Mole Valley disappearing having a Parish council will ensure local representation.</p>	<p>No Parish changes</p>	<p>I just want more, smaller parish councils to ensure proper representation</p>
<p>Westcott is currently unparished and represented by a voluntary unelected residents organisation....the Westcott Village Association. I feel that Westcott should be parished and merged with the Wotton Parish and perhaps Ranmore Common.</p>		<p>Simply the distance between the residents and a parish council should be short so that people know issues, know people and are available and engaged in local matters.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council should replace the existing Westcott Village association as a fully elected body with more powers. A minimum of 5 councillors should be adequate.</p>		<p>See above - also, Westcott sits in the national landscape so has great potential to be somewhere Mole Valley promotes in walking guides etc</p>
<p>I think a Westcott Parish council is a good idea, and would replace our existing village association. Beyond that I have no strong views on the above questions.</p>		<p>Village Associations have no legal powers and will get lost in the unitary authority model leading to poor decision making and even poorer democracy</p>
<p>With the move from district/borough councils to the new unitary authority, there is a risk that a small village like Westcott will get "lost in the noise". We have reasonable local representation at present in MVDC, but that will disappear with the new unitary authority. The non-statutory Westcott Village Association does a good job of keeping residents informed about local, district and council matters but it has no formal powers. Creating a Westcott Parish Council will give the village a formal voice under the new county arrangements.</p>		<p>Please provide support to the Westcott Village Association as it helps the community understand the benefits and changes a Parish Council would bring.</p>
<p>The Westcott Village Association (WVA) does a commendable job, but it is perceived by many as being unrepresentative of the social</p>		

structure of the residents. A large majority of the population make no financial contribution to the WVA. An elected Parish Council would require a precept and a wider range of tasks could be undertaken by a PC, footpath clearance, maintaining Rights of Way etc		
Following changes at Surrey CC level Westcott will lack very local representation. An elected Parish Council could address this issue effectively		
To ensure Westcott residents have a strong, democratically elected voice that also has statutory obligations and responsibility for owning and delivering local services. Critical in light of the plans for unitary authorities at County level.		
Westcott currently has a village association. With the removal of district councils it is too big a leap to a unitary from an unelected Village association. A parish council, either alone or combined with a council locally such as Wotton or Abinger would ensure representation. Village associations also great work but have no authority and no support. A parish council would ensure good admin support and locally elected members.		
The Westcott Village Association currently does a very good job of representing the village but I think people would engage better with a democratically elected body like a parish council.		
I think the only way to ensure that Westcott's interests and needs as a well structured and caring community are met is to have its own parish council.		
It at least creates a locally elected local representation.		
Being made up local people, parish councils are in the best position to work hard for the best outcomes for their residents. I believe that parish councils are effective. Councillors work hard to maintain playgrounds and other amenities, they are contact point for people in their communities that need additional help and support. Being local they are better able to represent local people than those with no connection to the area. They have a better understanding of problems, personalities, histories and possibilities within their own parishes to enable great representation and outcomes.		
I think a parish council should be created to help support the needs of Westcott village community as the Westcott Village Association will not have any powers to determine the		

needs of the village under the new proposal of Council		
Reflect and support local community. Have a closer relationship and understand local community needs.		
Currently Westcott is covered by a Village Association which has no statutory powers. An elected Community Council should limited powers to raise revenues for community improvements/facilities without reference to a Unitary body		
A Westcott Parish Council will provide a better way to collect the views and concerns of local residents and represent them at county level.		
The current Westcott Village Association doesn't seem to have any power in its representation for the Village, - despite all their hard work. A newly formed Westcott Parish Council would hopefully be able to represent the views of it's residents, - far better than the current three areas whose elected councillors who have little knowledge, or interest in Westcott.		
The current Westcott Village Association doesn't have sufficient legal status or statutory powers to represent Westcott under the new local government structure that's being introduced in Surrey.		
Local people often make the best decisions on local issues because they are most affected by them. I think it's really that simple.		
So we are heard and have a voice and influence and input into local villages matters, have 3 councillors representing numerous villages currently does not work, we need never see them, hear from them and they do not reply to email. When James friend was our sole councillor we had full representation we were listened to and he approachable to everyone and got the job done as he was also investigated in the community he lived and worked in		
Local people often make the best decisions on local issues because they are most affected by them. I think it's really that simple.		
A parish council would give Westcott a clear and democratic local voice, ensuring decisions reflect the village's character and priorities. It would strengthen community identity and engagement, support local events and initiatives, and provide a forum for residents to influence wider council decisions. It would also help deliver services more effectively by taking on		

responsibility for small-scale amenities (such as play areas, footpaths, and village greens), responding quickly to local issues, and accessing funding opportunities not available without a parish-level body.		
Giving a more local voice to decision making. But truly representative, not the peculiar decisions of the Councillors.		
A Parish Council will have greater authority and its expanded remit would be helpful if engaging both internally with residents and externally. It would have a budget as opposed to having to raise funds from the village as needs arise.		
The councillors would be voted for by the residents and would be resident in Westcott to represent the needs of local people		
Parish Councils would be more supportive re all issues and would be able to deliver a good service for the local community.		
a better representation of the village as members are elected Recognised by other bodies as representative Supporting, organising and managing local interests Better able to comment as a collective regarding services and also to drive a change agenda, for example speed and noise		
With the impending change to the Local Government Reorganisation and the prospect of losing our local voice exercised by MVDC, we need to have effective local representation and agency. The current Village Association has been effective in discharging its duties but being a parish council would widen its sphere of influence and give the village greater decision making powers. But we really do need to ensure that the council represents the make up of all of the village and that the voices of those people who are not normally heard are listened to and input meaningfully into the decisions of the council.		
Having a parish council would help ensure that the village retains CIL from new development that could be used to improve local amenities.		
Because it will enable a wider range of feedback from particular councils		

What might a Parish look like in Westcott?

<p>A new Westcott Parish Council should be formed covering the area designated under the current Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan. This covers approximately 1,000 households. Elections should take place in May 2026 to coincide with the completion of the Neighbourhood Plan and the interim unitary authority elections.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parishes should be names after the core village / area they represent so all the names listed above - They should have an odd number to ensure a majority vote can be achieved. Number should be at least five to give substance, resilience and future proofing but in a ratio in common with the Surrey average - Elections should take place so the new councils can be in place before the new Unitary Councils replace County and District Councils. and therefore at the latest towards the end of the transition year leading to the abolition of District Councils. - Geographical boundaries to be based on something already in place - eg a Neighbourhood Development Plan or what seems reasonable for the geography of the main settlements - I like the idea of moving away from calling them Parish Councils as this suggests they are still somehow based on Church areas. Calling them all Community Council has resonance as long as all Parish Councils in Surrey - with the new unitary areas are renamed as such
Westcott Village Council with 5 councilors
<p>Called Westcott Follow normal practice for this size of village council Parish council Boundary between Wotton and Dorking west east and between Coldharbour Lane and Ranmore south north</p>
<p>Westcott is currently unparished and represented by a voluntary unelected residents organisation...the Westcott Village Association. I feel that Westcott should be parished and merged with the Wotton Parish and perhaps Ranmore Common. what the parish/es should be called: DORKING WEST how many councillors there should be: MINIMUM OF 5 how and when election should take place: EVERY FIVE YEARS the suggested geographical boundaries; MERGE WOTTON AND RANMORE COMMON WITH WESTCOTT whether the parish/es should have an alternative style (i.e. community council, village council); VILLAGE COUNCIL SOUNDS BETTER</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Minimum 6 councillors</p>
<p>A minimum of 5 councillors should be adequate.</p>
<p>Westcott parish should be created covering the area already designated for the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan. It should have 6 councillors from all geographic areas of the suggested parish. This will ensure Westcott residents have a strong, democratically elected voice with statutory obligations and responsibility for owning and delivering local services. Critical in light of the plans for unitary authorities at County level.</p>
<p>Westcott and Wotton 1 councillor May26 Westcott and Wotton as they are now Village Council</p>
<p>Westcott Village Parish Council Councillors: 10-12 Every three to four years Geographical boundaries are ensuring a complete division with Dorking</p>
<p>Westcott don't know don't know Milton St to Coast Hill Lane inclusive, Logmore Green to the railway line Village Council</p>
<p>Another daft question. Do you really expect people to spend hours filling in this daft question?</p>
<p>I live in Westcott as already indicated. Guess what I think our parish council should be called. But in case the person reading this is as daft as the ones who prepared this I make it clear that it should be Westcott Parish council.</p>
<p>The names could be those used in the list above - nothing should be over-complicated. The standard rules for councillor numbers should be followed - I think it is min. 5 with no maximum. I do not have a map to show you boundaries, but if you provide an app to allow this, I would be happy to make suggestions. This would probably best be done in negotiation with the existing resident association or other local representatives. There is no need to give these an alternative "style". Keep everything simple, uniform and fair. I believe it is very important that there is this level of local government and representation.</p>
<p>Westcott as per plan being submitted by Westcott Village Association. Five or more if deemed necessary. Elections as soon as possible in Westcott area.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council. An odd number Annually Current Westcott boundaries Community Council</p>
<p>Names: as in the list above Councillors: at least 5, more in larger parishes such as Dorking Elections: Can this not be modelled on other existing parishes? Boundaries: match existing geographical / ward / defined community boundaries. For Westcott this could be the area defined in</p>

<p>the new local neighbourhood development plan proposal (managed by the Westcott Village Forum) <u>Style: Village / Town Council as appropriate</u></p>
<p>The 'new' Westcott Parish Council should have that name. I feel that it should merge with the existing Wotton Parish council to strengthen any future resilience, and there is more likelihood of getting elected members representing both areas.</p>
<p>I don't understand the system sufficiently to sensibly suggest anything here. In general the parish councils should cover a small area so they remain focussed and representative of their residents.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council for Westcott. I have no opinion on other areas. That is for them. Minimum 5 In May at the same time as other elections in order to maximise turn out and engagement and minimise polling costs The area which matches the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan area for Westcott. I have no opinion on other areas. That is for them. Only if they have the same powers as a Parish Council</p>
<p>1 Westcott 2 = 7 if you can get them but no more 3 With other elections 4 Boundary should be exclusively Westcott. It should not be lumped in with Wotton, Coldharbour etc. and definitely nothing to do with Dorking! 5 I dont understand what you mean by community or village councils.</p>
<p>Name: Westcott Number of Councillors: 5 Elections every 2 years <u>Suggest same boundary as the existing Parish of Westcott</u></p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council 5-8 councillors May 2026 or 2027 Current Westcott Parish boundary There should be no difference between the legal obligations and authority of Parish Councils and any formed as a result of this review</p>
<p>WESTCOTT Village to decide Village to decide / every 2 years Village association to confirm No No particular care for the names. I'd suggest at least three councillors for each. Elections every 5 years. Boundaries to cover at least a large majority of those who consider themselves as living in the town/village. I'm unaware of the differing styles of councils, i believe the locals could suggest the most relevant, or current councillors if not. I would really like to protect the community assets, that's my main focus.</p>
<p>I would suggest Westcott Parish Council as the most straightforward and recognisable option, ensuring clarity for residents and neighbouring communities. I am not experienced in these matters and so would not be able to suggest a number. I suggest the number would be such as to strike a balance between broad representation and manageability. It would be good to have different areas of the village and community groups represented without making the council too large. I think elections should take place with the regular election cycle, that would surely minimise costs. A first election could happen out of this cycle, initially, if necessary. The parish boundaries should, as far as possible, reflect the existing identity of Westcott village, ensuring that the parish encompasses the main residential areas, community facilities, and surrounding rural spaces closely associated with the village. While "Parish Council" is the traditional style, alternatives such as "Village Council" or "Community Council" could be considered if residents feel these terms better reflect Westcott's character. Consultation with residents on preferred terminology would be valuable.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish 12 councillors Local survey, sponsorship campaign, followed by Local ballot <u>Westcott Village Parish Council</u></p>
<p>Westcott 7 councillors Election may 2026 Boundaries to remain as they are at present</p>
<p>It is important to be able to represent Westcott effectively once the new Unitary Authorities come in to being and a Parish Council would have more power to do this than the current Residents Association</p>
<p>The parish would be Westcott incorporating the same area as we currently have. The election would be as soon as is practically possible. Not sure how many councillors would be needed.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council Elections every year Boundary limited to Westcott and Milton</p>
<p>The Westcott Parish Council The appropriate number required for the size of the village As soon as possible</p>

<p>The same boundaries as the Neighbourhood Plan I support the style of Village council</p> <p>To be honest I am still not totally clear about all the ins and outs of all this part! I am clear about the area I live in, I would like Westcott to be its own parish with Mickleham and Oakwood Ward, as this seems the most fitting way to set the boundary, it is how it has also been discussed and appears to least divide dwellings and land.</p> <p>As to councillors and elections, it would be good to fit this in as we start doing our own development plan which will be finalised 2026 We may end up evolving into our own village council, but we need to start here and evolve, currently we are not able to represent ourselves officially and we need to plan a way forward from here.</p>
<p>The parish should be called Westcott. I think it should be referred to as a Village Council to give it separation from the church parish council and encourage non-church attending residents to participate in its running. The boundary should include all of the Westcott village as shown on the Revised Map v2, which looks like the westcott electoral ward. There should be at least 7 councillors and no more than 15. Too many may be difficult to 'recruit' too. No opinion on the frequency of elections/term, but in line with national guidance. It is vital to ensure there is a wide range of ages, gender equality and appropriate representation of the village's ethnic and social mix.</p>
<p>Westcott Parish Council 12 3 years Use the neighbourhood plan boundary</p> <p>This would build on the work of the Westcott Village Association</p>
Dorking yes, Westcott and Dorking no. Westcott doesn't have the infrastructure or people to be its own Parish.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

<p>Having larger executive bodies will result in worse representation and weaken the connection between the electorate and the governing bodies. It's not a good thing for democracy. It actually comes across like an attack on democracy.</p>
<p>With the introduction of a unitary authority a Parish Council is a critical step to ensure the needs of Westcott can still be met effectively. The current Westcott Village Association acts as a residents association only and they would support being superseded by a Parish Council with the statutory obligations and responsibilities this brings.</p>
<p>= Creating new Parish Councils - or Community Councils - covering all Surrey will help to standardise administration and local involvement for everyone at an appropriate level - Without this democratically elected body, local communities will face a chasm between them and the Unitary Authority that unelected bodies will not be able to fill. - as they are elected, all eligible residents can have a say and influence what and how these councils operate. - They would need to be appropriately funded but if so will be in the best possible position to disburse these funds. <u>Whether they do so effectively will depend largely on the skills and ability of those elected to office.</u></p>
<p>As even local government gets more centralised and less local we need representatives close to the community to make community decisions. Not people who have never been there.</p>
<p>how they reflect and support the community: THE WVA IS AN EXCELLENT ORGANISATION BUT IS VOLUNTARY AND DOES NOT REPRESENT EVERYONE whether they help deliver services effectively; HOPEFULLY!</p>
<p>To create a level playing field for all communities in the new unitary authority. <u>To locally manage essential local services where there is no statutory responsibility on the unitary council</u></p>
<p>Two or three devolved Surrey councils is likely to be "faceless" and will need a more local layer of accountable government to understand aspirations and needs more effectively. Parish Councils should consider taking on MVDC assets, services and responsibilities to ensure effective service delivery</p>
<p>Removing mole valley means that local representation becomes even more crucial.</p>
<p>The dual authority idea is poorly thought through. Puts too much power into one person/ small group.</p>
<p>Parish Councils have been around a long time, those who are nervous about becoming one are not used to being within a parish council, however I think as times are changing quite dramatically and services are moving to be managed by staff away from local councils, local areas need to start understanding the need to become more involved in looking after certain parts of their communities, otherwise they will be lost. The fact that local parish councils can also be in control of their SIL is another massive plus, development is a huge issue at the moment, and in an area of such beauty as this, being able to discuss and manage more of where</p>

<p>housing will be put is an important bonus for having our own parish council. Especially when Westcott has a clear division in population and house size too, this needs to be dealt with carefully and with local community engagement. Choosing housing sites and development opportunities considerately and with thought to impact on residents, parking, environment, noise pollution and so on, this community is a special one and loved by the people in it. However we also love Dorking and travel into it most days, our kids go into its schools and we use its facilities daily, we all want to see it thrive and grow, we want to see its road network get better, not become more clogged up and delayed, we want to see better Gp facilities and better leisure services, better shops, we want to see its housing developments chosen wisely and carefully too and so on, it's a beautiful market town that I have known for 26 years and want to continue using and being a part of, as do all in Westcott, we are a part of each other's communities. I hope that it chooses to become a Parish Council, because it will then allow itself to have a voice of its own - whether it evolves into a Town Council or not, but a voice with an authority to be heard and listened to. This will impact all the villages it serves into and supports.</p>
<p>Just that I am very pleased that MVDC have launched this review. I hope that a significant number of MVDC Residents respond to it so I hope your publicity machine is working overtime on making everyone aware of the consultation.</p>
<p>Resident associations should be able to influence or dictate the requirement of a Parish Council as is being seen in Westcott. The WVA should be promoting the change.</p>
<p>The Village Association shouldn't be promoting a Parish Council.</p>
<p>Thought will need to be given how to encourage dynamic, community spirited people to put themselves forward as potential Parish Councillors as traditionally it is seen as a role for the retired</p>
<p>My only concern is that it's getting increasingly difficult for individuals to safely stick their head above the parapet and volunteer for roles with community responsibility. While the community are broadly supportive there are unpleasant or distrustful disruptive forces that can make life very difficult for those that step forward. Support needs to be provided to those who do volunteer to ensure their safety & sanity.</p>
<p>Dare not comment further!</p>
<p>When you prepare a survey just think how much time the average person would be willing to take to fill it in.</p>
<p>Suggest 8 minutes should be maximum. I could spend more than that on nearly every question you have asked, and I'm retired.</p>
<p>MVDC needs to assemble an accurate data room for existing and potential Parish Councils which sets out:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assets it owns and manages in each Parish - a recent FOI request for assets in Westcott revealed how incomplete the asset register is 2. The services it delivers, the associated third party contracts (external providers), term, cost and geographical area they cover. Are the contracts assignable? Are any of these contracts a shared service with other Districts and Boroughs. <p>If assets or services need to be transferred/ assigned to the devolved Surrey Councils or Parish Councils it will be essential to understand what the detail.</p>
<p>A referendum on moving to become a Parish council should be launched to ascertain the views of residents.</p>
<p>A parish council is the most local tier of government in England, with statutory powers to represent residents, manage certain services, and raise funds through a precept. Establishing one would therefore provide Westcott with both a legitimate democratic voice and the legal authority to act on local matters.</p>
<p>Shocked by the current traffic issues facing residents of the Surrey villages heading into Dorking daily. It's a problem That will only get worse with the new development and no realistic bus service to support it.</p>
<p>No more planning approval for large site housing developments in the area</p>
<p>It has been quite an exhausting survey!! I can appreciate that some will be put off by the questions, the choices are a bit confusing, I have lived in Parish councils as I grew up and am therefore not as confused by them, however It was a little confusing to be given the choice of all the Parish Councils to decide on! I don't know enough about Bookham or Leatherhead, or many others to make an opinion, and the first selection threw me somewhat! I hope I have provided some useful information and helped!</p>
<p>I feel that it is based on a mixture of confusion and lethargy that more people are not responding to the survey, they will if they realised how much more removed decision making may be in the future, and to cover all bases having these Parish Councils/Town Councils established will give all local communities a voice and some empowerment within these larger Councils. Better communication and more local inclusion and discussion is always good when done well.</p>
<p>As Local Government Reform progresses, a smaller local entity will mean that the local communities can continue to shape the places they live in rather than being left out.</p>
<p>It's not clear what benefit the proposals will provide. It looks like a corporate restructure with the talk of "efficiency", which is usually code for layoffs and decreased quality of service.</p>

Responses for Westhumble



Total responses: 15

Resident responses: 13

Feedback: Responses were mixed. Most comments indicated no change was needed as the Residents' Association was effective. However, some suggested changes, either by extending Mickleham Parish Council's boundaries or creating a standalone parish.

Westhumble

- Number of responses: 15
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 13

Do you feel there is a need to establish one or more new parish council in Westhumble?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Westhumble	8	3	4	15

Observations on parished areas

No change
Change Mickleham Parish boundary to include Westhumble and Givons Grove

Support delivery of community services in Weshumble

Support change	Do not support change	Generic Observations
	Mickleham Parish Council should not extend its boundary to include Westhumble. Westhumble Residents Association works well and we do need the revenue raising powers of a Parish Council and all the bullshit which goes with it	Reflect the options of their members
	Residents are generally not in a position to make an informed choice on this topic, but the old adage that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" is probably relevant.	Parished areas opinion should be the guidance on what changes they want
	Works well as it is and no change required	Local opinion supports its incursion
	Westhumble Residents Associations works well	
	All runs and performs well	
	support of the community	

What might a Parish look like in Westhumble?

If Mickleham PC jurisdiction were to be changed, the incentive might be to incorporate Westhumble, but I would need to see the pros and cons of such a change before deciding.
The inclusion of Westhumble in the parish of Mickleham would be a logical combination of the two adjacent villages.
Sensible to combine Mickleham parish with unparished Westhumble and possibly Givons Grove
In the event that Mickleham parish do not want to join with Westhumble then a separate parish should be established to allow better governance of the village. Combining with Dorking parish would not be representative of the rural nature of Westhumble.
Westhumble should remain in the parish of Mickleham
Westhumble should remain in the parish of Mickleham Constitution, elections and boundaries should evolve through Westhumble Residents Association which currently represents the village.

Westhumble district council
Parish of Mickleham and Westhumble Suggest 3/4 councillors from each village Boundary to include current Mickleham parish, Westhumble, Fredley and Norbury Park (possibly Givons Grove)

Other comments for all MVDC areas

No changes should be made by MVDC until after new Unitary Authorities have been created. Once established UA's should be required to carry out a consultation process and referendum with the community to determine future local governance.

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Provide a wider range of services to the community.

Why are we having to plan for this event now? It is probably desirable any way

Responses for WOTTON



Total responses: 6

Resident responses: 6

Feedback: Responses were mixed. Some comments suggested that properties in Coldharbour should be part of Wotton rather than Capel; however, there was insufficient evidence to support this change.

Wotton

- Number of responses: 6
- Number of Responses from Mole Valley Residents: 6

Do you feel there is a need to make any changes to the existing Parish?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	No Opinion	Response Total
Wotton	50.00% 3	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	6

Effective delivery of community services in Wotton

Support change	Do not support change	Generic observations
Wotton Parish Council boundary should be extended to take in the remaining housing in Coldharbour which is currently included within Capel Parish Council's boundary.		

Proposed Changes to Wotton

Proposed Changes	Generic responses
<p>Capel Parish Council covers three distinct villages: Capel, Beare Green, Coldharbour. These villages are quite different in character, totally geographically separate, and the combined population is too big to be adequately represented by one parish council.</p> <p>I used to be Capel Parish Council clerk and am aware of the way the parish council operates and the concerns of the separate villages it serves. Capel village area has a very large population and deserves its own parish council. It is a busy and active community and as such it takes up much of the parish council's time and expenditure.</p> <p>Beare Green village area also has a very large population. But it is quite different in character to Capel Village. Beare Green is quieter with many retirees and economically inactive residents. It has few community activities compared to Capel. It has the benefit of a mainline train service to central London and a junior school. Beare Green also deserves its own parish council.</p> <p>Coldharbour has a tiny population and is geographically separate from Beare Green. Coldharbour village should be amalgamated with Wotton Parish Council, which already includes much of Coldharbour, including Leith Hill, within its parish boundary. If you look at the boundary map you will see that Wotton's boundary runs alongside the main residential area of Coldharbour</p>	

<p>village. It would make more sense to extend Wotton's boundary to take in the Coldharbour houses.</p> <p>Wotton Parish Council has a tiny population spread over a very large rural area and Coldharbour's rural character fits more logically into the Wotton parish council area than the present situation where it is tacked on as an afterthought Beare Green.</p>	

Observations on unparished areas

Unparished areas should all be fully consulted at the stage 2 consultation level, with individual direct contact with electors in those areas (letters). It should explain clearly that they will have fewer elected representation due to LGR, i.e. less councillors covering larger geographical areas. It should explain clearly that parish councils are not affiliated with the church, and some geographical areas may view themselves as a town, community, etc, but the first step to becoming any form of local council starts with becoming a parish council. It should set out what those organisations can potentially do (manage xyz specific assets and services) if that is desired by the local community, which otherwise would be managed by the larger unitary councils (who may or may not continue to fund them in the future). If a more local style council decides to take on those assets/ services then that may mean that the precept is increased to fund those things (explaining what a precept is as almost no-one is likely to know). It should explain what a Neighbourhood Area Committee does and which people/ organisations are likely to take part. It should ask if the elector would like some kind of local council under the level of unitary council, based on the above information. The information within the stage 2 and elector letter should meet the criteria of the Plain English Campaign's 'Crystal Mark'- MVDC are one of the only local councils that have not had this accreditation, and on such a fundamental issue should achieve this.

Other comments for all MVDC areas

All the areas selected above need a local council to represent them now the district council is to be wound up. The number of councillors should be a minimum of 7 maximum of 10. Elections for existing parish councils occur every 4 years. There is no need to change this timeframe for new parish or town councils.

The small communities of Box Hill and Westhumble are geographically close and should form a new Parish Council.

There should be a Dorking Town Council.

Leatherhead should have a Town Council.

Westcott should have a parish council. It already has an active residents group.

Pixham should be included in Dorking Town Council's area.

Ashtead should have a parish council. It already has an active residents group.

Bookham and Fetcham could combine as one parish council as they are similar in character. Or they could have two separate parish councils. They are both large residential areas which seem to have few facilities for residents.

Areas with existing parish councils are well served. All areas should have similar representation.

The new unitary authorities will need input from residents in every area within Surrey in order to run services effectively