

Pay & Conserve Consultation Analysis

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Total Responses
3. Frequency of visit, access and stay length
4. Visitor numbers and parking locations
5. How respondents use the sites they visit
6. Problems and issues impacting visitor experience
7. Views any on potential charging arrangements
8. View on the option to close less well used sites in order to reduce the management costs
9. Any other comments
10. Full table of preference responses
11. Table summary of letters and emails
12. Equalities and other monitoring information
13. Post code areas

1. Introduction

The Pay & Conserve Consultation was launched on the 25th September and ran for 6 weeks. The purpose was to ensure that Surrey residents who use the countryside car parks, or want to use them in the future, have the opportunity to feed into the consultation. The consultation was for all Surrey Residents with a particular focus on residents living in the most impacted areas, Surrey Heath, Guildford and Mole Valley. A mixture of Digital, social and printed media were used with printed media displayed in the car parks, district and borough council offices and libraries.

This paper shows the number of responses received and summarises the responses to the SurreySays consultation.

Written responses via letter and email have been captured separately.

It should be noted that multiple choice questions did not have any restrictions on the number of entries. This means that respondents could select as many options as they felt applied.

2. Total Responses

Online, via SurreySays – 1234

Hard Copy – 8

Letters - 2


Emails – 13

Letters and emails were received from:

- Chobham, Ockham, West Horsley and Worplesdon Parish Councils
- The Chobham & District Angling Club
- The Chobham Society
- Members of the public

3. Frequency of visit, access and stay length


The table below shows the frequency of respondents visiting any of the sites in the consultation



a. How people are accessing the sites


When asked how people got to the sites covered by the consultation, just under 85% of respondents stated they visit by car. Less than 7% said they did not drive.

The table below shows how long it takes people to get to the sites



Just over 26% of respondents travel for less than 10 minutes.
 Just under 52% of respondents travel for between 10 – 30 minutes.
 Only around 12% of respondents travel for more than 30 minutes.

b. The table below shows stay length



Nearly 50% of respondents to this question stay between 1-2 hours.
 Around 70% of respondents to this question stay less than 2 hours.

4. Visitor numbers and parking locations

a. The table below shows where respondents said they have visited in the last 12 months

Site	Visited	Not visited	Not answered
Wisley & Ockham Commons	551	541	150
Chobham Common	551	538	153
Norbury Park	421	665	156
Whitmoor Common	333	753	156
Rodborough Common	172	882	188

b. The tables below shows where people park their cars when visiting each site

Chobham Common

Option	Total
Jubilee Mount car park	120
Roundabout car park	273
Staple Hill car park	225
Monument car park	127
Fishpool car park	118
Longcross car park	162
Not Answered	706

Norbury Park

Option	Total
Fetcham car park	127
Young Street car park	198
Bocketts Farm car park	252
Crabtree Lane car park	118
Not Answered	834

Rodborough Common

There were no responses to this question. This is likely because there is only one car park at Rodborough Common.

Whitmoor Common

Option	Total
Salt Box Road car park	279
Britten's Pond car park	116
Not Answered	927

Wisley & Ockham Commons

Option	Total
Boldermere car park	271
Pond car park	316
Wren's Nest car park	189
Not Answered	713

c. The table below shows where people would park should any charging regime be introduced

Category	Count
I would keep parking where I usually do	225
I would seek free parking elsewhere within walking distance	633
I would avoid coming	665
I would keep parking where I usually do but visit less often	203

d. Other comments of general locations


The table reflects the general locations where people may choose to park.

Category	Count
Don't know	20
Any other free car park	54
Laybys	24
National Trust sites	44
Residential streets or road side	130
The car park, but will not pay	6
Walk instead of using the car	14

Full analysis of all the locations mentioned in responses, including specific locations such as Box Hill, is ongoing as a requirement for the Habitat Regulations.

5. How respondents use the sites they visit

a. The table below shows how respondents are spending their time at the sites in question




b. Where people stated 'Other' these are summarised below

Conservation work / volunteering	Fishing	Model airplane flying	Photography	Other
17	5	8	4	10


'Other' included running, orienteering, amateur archeology and just being outdoors.

c. The table below shows if respondents are visiting alone or with others




d. A question was specifically asked to identify the numbers of dog walkers.


The table below shows that 461 respondents said they visit with a dog or dogs.



6. Problems and issues impacting visitor experience



a. People were then asked what could be done about these issues. The responses are summarised below



Notes:

- Categories were derived from the comments being made
- There are more comments than responses because many people made comments that covered multiple categories
- 528 people responded to this question, including 94 people who left no comment

Analysis of comments

Category	Comment focus
No comment	Comments were when people did not leave a comment or simply did not comment regarding a solution to the issues.
Good condition currently	Comments focused on being satisfied with the current condition of the areas.
Repair Pot Holes	Comments focused on filling the current pot holes for a smoother surface for car users and dog walkers.
Deal with dog mess	Comments focused on introducing a penalty fine for those who leave their dogs mess or do not use the bins provided. Some comments raised the idea of introducing a charge for professional dog walkers. Comments also included banning dogs from being walked in the area due to constant dog mess left behind.
Deal with litter	Comments focused on having more bins in the car park and around the area to hopefully encourage dog owners to use the bins instead of leaving the waste behind. Comments also focused on having more bins in the car park as there

	<p>is a lot of litter left in the car park.</p> <p>Comments also included having regular bin checks to ensure they don't over fill and cause more litter.</p>
Dealing with fly tipping	<p>Comments focused on having a Ranger/CCTV in the area to catch fly tippers and also the presence of cameras will deter people from fly-tipping.</p> <p>Comments mentioned using signage to also deter people from fly tipping.</p>
Stopping camping	<p>Comments focused on using signs on camping and litter to inform those who plan to stay to take their rubbish with them.</p> <p>Comments focused on having the police/CCTV to stop people from using the car park as a camping site.</p>
Tackle anti-Social behaviour	<p>Comments focused on having a Ranger/Police to regularly check the car park for those who partake in anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Comments focused on introducing car parking chargers to deter those from anti-social activities.</p> <p>Comments included closing the car park at night.</p>
Improve signage	<p>Comments focused on using signs to educate the public on litter/dog waste.</p> <p>Comments included using signs to deter people from fly tipping.</p>
Improve general site condition	<p>Comments focused on the general poor condition of the sites e.g. footpaths, bridges etc as well as the car parks.</p> <p>Comments mentioned that bridges were unstable for horses to pass over.</p>
Improve safety	<p>Comments focused on it being dangerous in the car park at night as they are unlit.</p> <p>Comments involved the issue of cars parking at the main gate, which could cause an obstruction for emergency access.</p> <p>Comments related to the poor condition of the bridges as it is a health and safety issue if the bridge was to collapse whilst a horse rider was passing.</p>
More spaces / capacity	<p>Comments focused on having the spaces marked out to improve parking behaviour and create more spaces.</p>
More maintenance at the sites, a greater visible presence and investment in CCTV	<p>Comments focused on implementing fines and use CCTV to deter people from littering / anti-social behaviour etc.</p> <p>Comments focused on having a Ranger / Someone to maintain the land regularly.</p> <p>Comments focused on greater use of volunteers to help maintain the land.</p> <p>Comments related to SWTs role and how it could be changed to benefit the land.</p>

- b. Respondents took the opportunity to comment about the implementation of charging. These comments are captured below.

	Oppose Charging	Support Charging	Other
Number	18	12	16
Sample Comments	<p>“Get more volunteers to maintain the sites rather than charge for parking. It will put a lot of people off.”</p> <p>“If you charge in these car parks you are discouraging people from walking regularly due to cost”</p>	<p>“I think a paid option for parking is acceptable - we all enjoy the grounds and should put towards its upkeep”</p> <p>“I totally agree with the proposal to charge for parking. Why should we not pay for our beautiful countryside?”</p>	<p>“Charges should be per visit not time related.”</p> <p>“If you charge for parking then you have to resurface the car park and put more dog bins there”</p>

c. Sample comments

No comment:

- “Unsure”
- “n/a”

Good Condition:

- “They seem to be well maintained.”
- “The sites we visit seem to be generally in good condition.”
- “The car park is nearly always clean and tidy.”

Pot Holes:

- “Car park surfaces could be monitored and repaired more frequently to prevent small potholes etc turning into larger, and more expensive to repair, problems.”

Dog Mess/Owners:

- “Prosecute those who don't clean up after their dogs.”
- “Stop dog walkers”
- “Dog owners to be respectful and put mess in bins”

Litter/Bins:

- “Put a litter bin in the car park.”
- “Put more bins up and actually empty them”

Fly-tipping:

- “Fly tipping is most prevalent when perpetrators think they can get away with it. Ranger presence and CCTV are strong deterrents.”

Camping:

- “There have been instances this year of camping, fires lit and barbeque rubbish which have been reported to the police and SWT.”
- “More signage warnings for overnight campers and littering would suffice”

Anti-Social Behaviour:

- “I would suggest that the car parks are closed off at night.”

- “But the problem with any measures to deal with this and other problems like littering, fly tipping, dog mess, is enforcement- not sure how you can enforce parking charges or fines without using all the revenue made to pay a warden! Perhaps CCTV would help?”

Poor Signage:

- “Signage regarding fly tipping”
- “Signage in car park, stating that dog fouling is illegal & informing of a meaningful financial penalty.”

Poor Condition:

- “To encourage more walkers, the paths need to be finished off”

Safety:

- “People park across the main gate. Which if there was a fire. Fire engines would not be able to pass through.”
- “The car park is not safe it is in pitch black.”

Spaces/Capacity:

- “Spaces could be formally marked out &/or reclaim some of the adjacent land to add more spaces.”
- “Enlarging the car park might be difficult, but marked bays with simple white lines would improve parking behaviour and allow more cars to park in the existing space.”

More maintenance at the sites, a greater visible presence and investment in CCTV:

- “Ranger presence and CCTV are strong deterrents.”
- “Volunteers in the area to do clean up days to cut back bushes”

7. Views any on potential charging arrangements

Respondents were asked to rank in terms of preference a potential approach to charging at these locations.

a. The table below shows the first preference response

Charge in all - 1st preference		Charge in some - 1st preference		Charge in none - 1st preference	
193	15.6%	127	10.3%	921	74.6%

Simplistically, this result shows an overall negative response towards charging.

The full table of preference responses is in section 10 at the end of this paper.


b. The next questions covered how people may prefer to pay, should charging be introduced

Option	Response (count)	Response (as a % of the total responses)
Pay by cash	726	59
Pay by card	571	46
Pay by phone	410	33
Buy an annual parking pass	446	36

c. People were then asked if there were any payment methods they would not want to use


Option	Response (count)	Response (as a % of the total responses)
Pay by cash	272	22
Pay by card	363	29
Pay by phone	697	56
Buy an annual parking pass	703	57

8. People were asked how they felt about the potential option to close less well used sites in order to reduce the management costs and therefore protect the sites with more visitors



714

9. People were asked if they any other comments they wanted to provide. The responses are summarised below



Note –

- The categories were derived from the comments being made
- There are more comments than responses because many people made comments that covered multiple categories

Analysis & Comments

Category	Comment focus
Free for SWT members & Volunteers	Some people stated that SWT members are already paying, in effect, through their membership. Also that people volunteering to help the site should not be charged for giving up their time
Impact Health & Wellbeing	These comments linked closely to those about the cost of visiting the countryside and the potentially reduction in the amount of time spent in the open air. Other comments focused on the physical and mental health benefits of being in the countryside. Also that this should be encouraged and that changing would deter people from visiting
Impact on people on low incomes	The main basis for comments was the affordability of people being able to visit the countryside
Neutral comment	These comments focused on where people who are not happy about the proposals, but accept them if it keeps sites open. Some comments were not specific to the proposals. For example, there were comments that the county council should work more with Government around appropriate funding for

	<p>the countryside. Also that more sustainable transport options should be available to access the countryside.</p> <p>Other comments made stated that people would support charging, but only if the sites were improved to include toilets, café etc</p>
No Comment	Comment field was left blank or people felt they had already answered
Oppose proposals	These comments are where people has stated they do not support the proposals, that they would never pay and they would not visit as a result of charging being introduced
Paid through Council Tax	<p>Comments were focused on how council tax should be used to fund the management of the countryside.</p> <p>Some comments suggested raising council tax specifically to fund the countryside, as it is a resource for all.</p> <p>Also included, are comments where people stated this is another form of taxation.</p>
Parking operation specific	<p>Comments focused on how any charging arrangement might work. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schemes similar to the National Trust • Cheaper weekdays / More expensive weekends & bank holidays • A donation or other voluntary scheme • Free parking for Surrey residents or 'locals'
Ringfence income for the countryside	Some people stated that they accept that funding would be ringfenced for countryside management
Save the money elsewhere or close least used car parks to keep others free	<p>Comments mainly stated that other savings and efficiencies should be made to fund these activities and keep the car parks free.</p> <p>Some people stated that an alternative to charging would be to close the least used car parks and return these to a natural state.</p>
Should not pay to use Common Land	These comments focused on the specific designation of the land as Common and therefore should be free to access
Supportive	These comments covered, for example, charging being the fairest means to fund the management of the sites.
Would create parking problems	<p>Comments were made that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If car parks are closed it will mean there would not be any places available at busy times • If charging is introduced people will park on residential roads or grass verges

Whilst many people did not state their specific objection to the proposals, many comments about the topics listed above were negative. These were about the potential impact on specific groups, the local area or the countryside as a whole.

a. Sample comments

Free for SWT members & Volunteers:

- “if this proposal goes ahead and if one of the purposes of charging is to raise funds to pay Surrey Wildlife Trust to manage the sites, then how about offering free parking to members of the SWT? This would encourage an increase in annual paid subscriptions to the SWT.”
- “Maybe introduce free/special rate for members of SWT or for their volunteers.”

Impact Health & Wellbeing:

- “This is a ridiculous proposal given you are meant to be encouraging a healthy lifestyle”
- “Access to the countryside for all is beneficial for physical health and for mental health.”

Impact on people on low incomes:

- “Charging to access a public common is nonsense. It will exclude poor people from the common”
- “It will hit poorer families the hardest as a walk over the common is a free, lovely, healthy way for families to enjoy a trip out.”
- “Imposing car park charges is regressive and will hit those least able to pay the hardest.”

Neutral comment:

- “Generally speaking I'm in favour of charging for parking so long as it doesn't feel like we're being ripped off and paying for it is easy (contactless payment being the best option imo). I would like to see the first 30mins free and then a charge of no more than 50p-£1 per hour, anything more will discourage people from using the beautiful countryside we have on our doorsteps.”
- “the answers to these questions are hypothetical pending some indication of the likely cost”

No Comment:

- “See my comments in earlier section.”

Oppose proposals:

- “No one should pay to enjoy the countryside”
- “What does Surrey County Council actually do for these car parks, nothing. Stop trying to make money out of us surrey residents”
- “It's deplorable that you are even considering this.”
- “Why does everybody always have to charge for using somewhere that should be free to enjoy.”
- “I fundamentally disagree with any form of charging to access the countryside!”

Paid through Council Tax:

- “I believe that costs associated with the land SCC owns for the benefit of the community ought to be funded via the Council Tax. If that Tax does not raise enough, as I appreciate that it currently does not, then the Tax should be raised. If that is not possible because of Central Government constraints, then the service should be reduced and it should be made clear to users that this is being done as a result of the central government's policy”
- “SCC should have held the Council Tax Referendum. That would have provided a clear mandate for either increasing Council Tax or making cuts/introducing charges. Instead we have this messy scratching around for views.”

Parking operation specific:

- “If charges are the only way forward make all car parks member only with annual membership which can be paid in one instalment or with monthly direct debit payments to make it more affordable for people to pay.”
- “How will this be "policed" at the car parks. If not no one will bother. Ticket machines nightmare when they fail. Managing by phones also problematic. The system has to be fair to all park users taking into account ages as well”
- “Pay by phone would be my least favourite option - I know lots of walkers avoid these sites after frustrating experiences with lack of signal/difficult to use systems. Do you have any statistics on how well honesty box type arrangements work? Would this allow you to have a low cost way of collecting contributions or have organisations like National Parks found they have low success rates? I always use honesty boxes but I don't know if that is true of everyone?”

Ringfence income for the countryside:

- “People won't mind paying to park if you emphasise thanks & what their money is helping to do”
- “All revenue from parking charges MUST go direct to Surrey Wildlife Trust. Members of the public would be far more open to paying for parking if they knew that all the revenue went to manage and maintain the wildlife habitats we go there to enjoy.”

Save the money elsewhere:

- “Find your cuts elsewhere such as management pay. Access to the countryside is free exercise for an obese society. Link countryside to health and promote walking. Recognise your obligations to protected places”
- “Funding should be found elsewhere to continue to provide these services (eg. cancel the 400k to Watts Gallery).”
- “if Surrey Wildlife need to raise more money they should breed more animals and sell the meat”

Should not pay to use Common Land:

- “The countryside is free and should remain so in order to encourage visitors.”
- “Countryside access should be free and encouraged not taxed”
- “I think the idea of charging to park on common land is outrageous.”
- “This is common land which should remain freely open for all residents. I do not agree with charging at all.”

Supportive:

- “A sensible charge for an annual ticket, the profits from which going to maintain the commons seems reasonable.”
- “What a wonderful idea. The Crown Estate charges very high costs for parking and has wonderful facilities as a result. We should all be encouraging greener forms of transport and it feels a real step forward to start converting some car parks back to nature.”

Would create parking problems:

- “It will just lead to illegal and inconsiderate parking elsewhere.”
- “People will park on the road thereby causing obstructions.”
- “My concern is that closing least used car parks and additionally charging for parking will cause some members of the public to park on the roads or verges and in dangerous places. These are the reasons why I have said charge for some car parks. I would agree to charging all car parks if there is a way of preventing selfish members of the public from parking in dangerous positions or disturbing/inconveniencing other member of the public.”

10. Full table of preference responses

Charge in all - 1st preference		Charge in some - 1st preference		Charge in none - 1st preference	
193	15.6%	127	10.3%	921	74.6%
Charge in all - 2nd preference		Charge in some - 2nd preference		Charge in none - 2nd preference	
117	9.5%	983	79.7%	135	10.9%
Charge in all - 3rd preference		Charge in some - 3rd preference		Charge in none - 3rd preference	
926	75.0%	127	10.3%	183	14.8%

11. Summary of letters and emails

a. Correspondence from stakeholder groups

Stakeholder groups	Points covered
Chobham & District Angling Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charges would place an unfair burden on members, who already pay for the right to use Fishpool • The club also helps with maintenance of the lake and volunteers with the Surrey Wildlife Trust • None of the car parks at Chobham Common are served by any public transport
Chobham Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation is flawed and should be invalid because there is no option to only object to charging
Ockham Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the councils financial situation • Questioning the feasibility and enforcement at the sites because of • There is no detail of charging charges or how and when they would be applied. Would Ockham residents be issued with free permits? • There has been vandalism at these sites in the past • Imposing charges will not deal with the current issues of anti-social behaviour and may exacerbate them
The Chobham Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrey residents already pay for upkeep through Council Tax • The public have a right to access the common and charging is seen as a barrier in the same way as fencing • Will result in the urbanisation of the countryside • There is no information about charging levies, which any amount would deter people from visiting • It is likely that there will be an appeal against charging. Has this cost been considered? • The consultation is flawed
West Horsley Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once charging is established, it will spread • Access to commons is beneficial for health and wellbeing, charging goes against this • Will result in the urbanisation of the countryside • If charging is introduced car parks need to be better maintained • Charging will increase the cost to the council through enforcement cost
Worplesdon Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parks are already well used • Need to introduce parking restrictions or parking problems on verges will get worse • Must be a guarantee of funding ring-fenced for improvements at the specific commons, or at least the countryside • The questionnaire seems loaded


b. Correspondence from members of the public

Points covered across all the correspondence:


- Strongly object / proposals should be scrapped
- The consultation questionnaire is leading
- Chobham Common is too far to walk for most people in the village
- Many people are struggling to pay for cost of living already, charging will increase that pressure
- Commons are necessary for people's health
- Will cause people to park in residential roads, laybys and verges
- The council is spending money on other projects and then claiming it needs to charge because of lack of funds
- Access to Common Land is a public right
- There are no facilities at all these sites, toilets etc, so charging seems unnecessary
- The council seem to not want to protect the countryside and instead monetise it
- The cost of this consultation should have been used to fund the countryside
- There is no safe pedestrian access to Whitmoor Common
- A National Trust style scheme would make sense
- Any and all money raised must go to the countryside
- We already pay for services and being asked to pay again
- Charging volunteers would be outrageous
- Many people use the countryside, but charges only effect motorists. It would be fairer to increase Council Tax

12. Equalities and other monitoring information


a. Gender




b. Age




c. Disability of longstanding condition



d. Employment or education status



e. Ethnicity



13. Post code areas

Post code area	Count	Area
kt22	83	Leatherhead, Oxshott, Fetcham, Ashtead, Great Bookham
gu2	65	Guildford
gu24	67	Woking, Chobham, Bisley, Pirbright, Brookwood, Donkey Town, Surrey, West End, Normandy, West End
gu21	63	Woking, Knaphill, Sheerwater
gu20	47	Windlesham, Bagshot, Chobham, Sunningdale, Winkfield Row
kt23	47	Great Bookham, Effingham, Surrey
gu22	34	Woking, West Byfleet, Brookwood, Pyrford, Send, Send, Mayford, Ripley
gu1	33	Guildford
gu23	33	Ripley, Woking, Send, Send, West Clandon, Wisley, Ockham, Ockham, Send Marsh, Bridge End, Ockham
gu4	33	Guildford, Woking, Shalford, West Clandon, Chilworth, Albury, West Horsley, East Clandon, Sutton Green, Surrey, Jacobs Well, Surrey, Blackheath
rh4	34	Dorking, Brockham, Wotton, Westcott
gu18	32	Lightwater
kt15	32	Addlestone, Woking, Weybridge, Chertsey, Ottershaw
rh5	31	Dorking, Shere, Great Bookham, Ockley, Abinger Hammer, Effingham, Surrey, Ranmore Common, Newdigate, Capel, Holmbury St Mary, Friday Street, Beare Green, Westhumble, Walliswood, Abinger, Abinger Common, Abinger, Sutton Abinger, Abinger, Russ Hill, Holmbury Saint Mary, Shere, Wotton, Oakwoodhill, Abinger, Coldharbour, Mickleham, Mickleham, Jayes Park, Ockley, Leith Hill, Wotton, Forest Green, Abinger, Parkgate, South Holmwood, South Holmwood, Holmwood, South Holmwood
gu8	30	Chiddingfold, Milford, Elstead, Dunsfold, Witley, Plaistow and Ifold, Shackleford, Hydestile, Hambledon, Hambledon, Pitch Place, Thursley, Bowlhead Green, Thursley, Enton, Loxhill, Thursley, Thursley, Busbridge, Busbridge, Wormley, Surrey, Sandhills, Surrey, Brook, Surrey, Peper Harow, Highstreet Green, Enton Green, Hascombe, Hascombe
kt24	29	Shere, East Horsley, Effingham, Surrey, West Horsley, Ripley
gu15	29	Camberley
gu7	28	Godalming, Shalford, Eashing, Hurtmore
kt16	28	Chertsey, Ottershaw, Addlestone, Chobham, Longcross, Lyne,
sl5	26	Sunningdale, Ascot, Windlesham, Chobham, Sunninghill, Winkfield Row, South Ascot, Chavey Down, Cheapside
gu3	24	Guildford, Normandy, Compton, Woking, Pirbright, Worplesdon, Puttenham, Fairlands, Wood Street Village, Wanborough, Artington, Artington
kt21	24	Ashtead, Epsom
kt11	21	Cobham, Oxshott, Hersham, East Horsley, Great Bookham, Fetcham, Stoke d'Abernon, Downside, Martyr's Green, Ockham
gu16	19	Camberley, Frimley, Pirbright, Deepcut, Frimley Green, Mytchett
tw20	17	Egham, Englefield Green, Staines, Chertsey, Thorpe
kt12	16	Walton-on-Thames, Hersham, Weybridge, West Molesey, Molesey
gu19	15	Bagshot
gu5	15	Shere, Bramley, Gomshall, Shalford, Peaslake, Albury, Shamley Green,

		Wonersh, Farley Green, Surrey, Stroud Common, Thorncombe Street, Palmers Cross, Grafham, Burrows Cross, Shere
kt17	13	Epsom, Ewell, Banstead, Sutton
rh2	13	Reigate, Reigate Heath, Sidlow, Buckland, Irons Bottom, Leigh, Leigh
cr3	12	Caterham, Woldingham, Coulsdon, Warlingham, Kenley, Whyteleafe, Bletchingley, Chaldon
kt8	12	West Molesey, Molesey, Walton-on-Thames, Hampton, London, Esher, Hampton Wick, Molesey
tw18	12	Staines, Stanwell, Egham Hythe
gu9	11	Farnham, Badshot Lea, Runfold
kt18	10	Epsom, Leatherhead, Ashted, Headley
rh1	10	Redhill, Merstham, Nutfield, Surrey, Bletchingley, Salfords, South Nutfield, Whitebushes, Outwood
kt14	9	West Byfleet, Byfleet, Woking, Weybridge
kt19	9	Epsom, Ewell
rh6	10	Horley, Burstow, Crawley, Copthorne, Charlwood, Norwood Hill, Horne, Horne, Surrey, Shipley Bridge, Wrays, Burstow
gu10	8	Farnham, Churt, Frensham, Tilford, Tongham, Crondall, Wrecclesham, Rowledge, Ewshot, Runfold, Bucks Horn Oak, Dippenhall, Spreakley, Shortfield Common, Batt's Corner, Bentley, Charleshill, The Sands, Millbridge, Headley, Holt Pound, Rushmoor, Surrey, Dockenfield, Seale
gu25	8	Virginia Water, Chobham, Lyne, Surrey, Stroude
cr6	7	Warlingham, Farleigh, Hamsey Green, Chelsham
rh3	7	Betchworth, Brockham, Buckland
gu27	6	Haslemere, Chiddingfold, Fernhurst, Easebourne, Grayswood, Linchmere, Kingsley Green, Henley, Easebourne
gu6	6	Cranleigh, Ewhurst, Alfold, Alfold Crossways, Ewhurst Green, Ewhurst
kt10	6	Esher, Claygate, Oxshott
tw17	6	Shepperton, Upper Halliford, Littleton, Spelthorne, Lower Halliford
kt1	5	Kingston upon Thames, Molesey, Hampton Wick, Molesey
kt20	5	Epsom, Banstead, Tadworth, Walton-on-the-Hill, Buckland, Pebble Coombe, Lower Kingswood, Box Hill, Mogador, Surrey, The Hermitage
rh8	5	Oxted, Limpsfield, Crowhurst Lane End, Tandridge, Surrey, Titsey, Tandridge, Tandridge, Surrey, Limpsfield Chart
cr5	4	Coulsdon, Chipstead, Banstead, Old Coulsdon, Hooley, Mugswell
cr8	4	Purley, London, Kenley, Coulsdon, South Croydon, Caterham
gu12	4	Aldershot, Ash Vale, Tongham, Ash, Normandy
gu26	4	Hindhead, Grayshott, Beacon Hill, Headley, Bramshott Common
kt13	4	Weybridge, Addlestone
kt9	4	Chessington, Esher, Claygate, Malden Rushett
sm2	4	Sutton, Epsom, Banstead, Ewell
sm7	4	Banstead, Epsom, Sutton
tw15	4	Ashford, Feltham, Staines, Stanwell, Ashford Common
tw16	4	Sunbury-on-Thames, Feltham, Walton-on-Thames, Hampton, London
gu11	3	Aldershot
kt2	3	Kingston upon Thames, New Malden
kt3	3	New Malden, Morden
rg12	3	Bracknell, Binfield, Winkfield Row
rh7	3	Dormansland, South Godstone, Lingfield, Felbridge, Newchapel, Surrey, Felcourt, Crowhurst, Crowhurst, Surrey
rh9	3	Godstone, Woldingham, Bletchingley, South Godstone

sm1	3	Sutton
gu14	2	Farnborough
gu46	2	Yateley
kt7	2	Thames Ditton, Molesey, Esher, Long Ditton, Molesey
rg42	2	Bracknell, Binfield, Warfield, Winkfield Row, Hawthorn Hill, Berkshire, Popeswood
sm5	2	Carshalton, Sutton, Coulsdon, Banstead
sm6	2	Wallington, London, Croydon, Carshalton, Purley, London
tw1	2	Twickenham, Isleworth
aa1 1aa	1	-
cr2	1	Croydon
g69	1	Glasgow
gu0	1	-
gu51	1	Fleet, Church Crookham, Crookham Village
gu52	1	Fleet, Church Crookham
hu1	1	Kingston upon Hull
kt4	1	Worcester Park
kt5	1	Surbiton, Kingston upon Thames, New Malden, Chessington, Worcester Park
ne65	1	Northumberland
rh12	1	Horsham
rh19	1	East Grinstead
se24	1	Dulwich, London
sm3	1	Sutton, Worcester Park
sw16	1	Wandsworth
sw19	1	London
tn3	1	Tunbridge Wells,
tw10	1	Richmond
tw12	1	Hampton
tw2	1	Twickenham
ub10	1	Uxbridge, Ickenham, Hayes, Ruislip