

# London



Revised proposals

# Contents

Revised proposals summary .....	2
1. What is the Boundary Commission for England? .....	4
2. Background to the review .....	5
3. Revised proposals for London .....	8
4. How to have your say .....	53
Annex: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates .....	55

# Revised proposals summary

## Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

## 2013 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 502), resulting in the number of constituencies in London reducing by five, to 68. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 72,810 and no larger than 80,473.

## Revised proposals

Following the publication of our initial proposals in September 2011, and two extensive consultation exercises, we have now published our revised proposals. Information about the proposed constituencies is now available on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

## What are the revised proposals for London?

We have revised 50 of the 68 constituencies we proposed in September 2011. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the boundaries of the remaining 18 constituencies. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, three constituencies in London would remain the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to London boroughs, our initial proposals grouped some London boroughs into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose many constituencies that cross London borough boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposals are based on new sub-regions, shown in the table below.

We have revised our initial proposal for a constituency that crosses the River Lee between Chingford and Edmonton, proposing instead a constituency that crosses the Lee between Bow and Stratford.

We have revised our proposal to link the City of London with Islington, proposing instead to link it with the City of Westminster.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
North Thames	45*	43
South Thames	27*	25

\* One existing constituency (Richmond Park) is divided between these two sub-regions.

We have revised our initial proposals for Greenwich, retaining central Greenwich in a single constituency.

We have revised our initial proposals for constituencies containing the towns of Streatham, Thamesmead, Edmonton, Chingford, Romford, and Wimbledon, and those covering the Borough of Lambeth.

After careful consideration, we have not revised our initial proposals to include the College Park and Old Oak ward in a Willesden constituency, Feltham in a Hayes and Feltham constituency, or the Heathfield and Whitton wards in a Teddington and Hanworth constituency, though we do propose to rename this constituency.

### **How to have your say**

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 16 October 2012 to 10 December 2012. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us.

You can find more details of how to respond on our website, or you can write to us direct or email [london@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:london@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk). You can also find more details about the rest of the review on our website.

# 1. What is the Boundary Commission for England?

1.1 The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries.

1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair, Mr Justice Sales, and two further Commissioners take decisions on recommendations for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 27 Assistant Commissioners, three allocated to each of the nine regions of England. Further information about the Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our website.<sup>1</sup>

1.3 Our website also contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing [information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk), by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission  
Boundary Commission for England  
35 Great Smith Street  
London  
SW1P 3BQ

<sup>1</sup> At [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us/](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us/).

## 2. Background to the review

2.1 In February 2011, the UK Parliament passed legislation<sup>2</sup> stating that all four Boundary Commissions covering the UK (there are separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland) must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, by October 2013. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for London.

2.2 Parliamentary constituency boundaries are important, as they define the area that a Member of Parliament will represent once elected to Parliament. The next General Election is expected to be in 2015. Therefore, any recommendations we make, if accepted, are likely to be used for the first time at the General Election in 2015.

2.3 The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 502. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our *A guide to the 2013 Review*,<sup>3</sup> published in the summer of 2011, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 72,810 and 80,473 electors.

2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close

to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, constituencies currently range in electorate size from 55,077 to 110,924. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant amount of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 *A guide to the 2013 Review* contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the *Guide* to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

### The rules in the legislation

2.6 The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 72,810 and 80,473 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 76,641. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- a. special geographical considerations, including the size, shape, and accessibility of a constituency;
- b. local government boundaries as they existed on 6 May 2010;
- c. boundaries of existing constituencies; and

<sup>2</sup> Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011, available at [www.legislation.gov.uk](http://www.legislation.gov.uk).

<sup>3</sup> Available at [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/publications](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/publications) and at all places of deposit.

- d. any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.7 It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2010. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2010, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. *A guide to the 2013 Review* outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries.

2.8 In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this section, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained just under 6% of the existing constituencies in London – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

2.9 Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency

boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to ensure that all the factors are balanced satisfactorily. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain three of the existing 73 constituencies in London.

### **The use of the regions used for European elections**

2.10 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to London. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. In early 2011, following a consultation exercise on the issues, we decided to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in *A guide to the 2013 Review* and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

2.11 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report continues to use the regions as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

### **Timetable for the review**

#### ***Stage one – initial proposals***

2.12 We began this review in March 2011 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority, and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the regional

pages of our website. The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2011.

### ***Stage two – consultation on initial proposals***

2.13 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2011 to 5 December 2011. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received over 22,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including 5,151 unique written representations relating to London. We also heard 165 oral representations at the five public hearings in London. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

### ***Stage three – consultation on representations received***

2.14 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to make representations on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 6 March 2012 and invited comments on them until 3 April 2012. We received 1,237 unique written representations during that four-week period.

### ***Stage four – publication of revised proposals***

2.15 As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 16 October 2012, we published this report – *London: Revised proposals* – alongside eight others, one for

each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 10 December 2012. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

### ***Stage five – final recommendations***

2.16 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 10 December 2012, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this by 1 October 2013. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in *A guide to the 2013 Review*.

2.17 At the launch of each stage of consultation we have taken, and are continuing to take, all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

# 3. Revised proposals for London

3.1 In autumn 2011, we appointed three Assistant Commissioners for London – Judith Farbey QC, Nicole Smith, and Guy Roots QC – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. We asked them to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of the representations.

3.2 What follows in this chapter is their full report to us. After careful consideration of their report, and discussion with the Assistant Commissioners themselves, we accept and endorse their recommendations in full, and confirm that those recommendations form our revised proposals. We accept their reasoning and the conclusions they have drawn from the evidence received in the representations.

3.3 In particular, we agree with the report and recommendation of the Assistant Commissioners that dividing the region into two sub-regions, north and south of the River Thames, with one constituency crossing the river, allows for the best overall arrangement of constituencies in the region. We are grateful for their careful examination of the issue where that constituency should be located and found convincing their assessment that a constituency crossing the river at Richmond would be most appropriate.

3.4 We are persuaded that the Assistant Commissioners' recommendation for a constituency that crosses the River Lee between Bow and Stratford strikes a better balance between the statutory factors than either the initial proposal to cross between Chingford and Edmonton, or the other alternative to cross the river between Tower Hamlets and Newham.

3.5 We are also persuaded by the evidence and reasoning set out by the Assistant Commissioners in relation to the City of London, in favour of linking the City of London with the City of Westminster rather than with Islington, as in the initial proposals.

# Report by the Assistant Commissioners on London

## Introduction

AC1 The Boundary Commission for England ('the Commission') is required<sup>4</sup> to submit a report to the Secretary of State before 1 October 2013 showing the constituencies into which it recommends that England be divided in order to give effect to the rules set out in legislation.<sup>5</sup> The Commission determined that England should, for this purpose, be divided into regions, one of which is London.<sup>6</sup>

AC2 The Secretary of State has appointed<sup>7</sup> us (Judith Farbey QC, Nicole Smith, and Guy Roots QC) as Assistant Commissioners to assist the Commission in the discharge of its functions with respect to London. While Judith Farbey QC was designated as Lead Assistant Commissioner for the region, and as such has led the work for London, we have all three agreed the contents of this report.

AC3 Public hearings, chaired by Judith Farbey QC and attended by members of the Commission's staff, were held in London in 2011 as follows:

- on 17-18 October in Kensington;
- on 20-21 October in Brent;
- on 24-25 October in Lewisham;
- on 27-28 October in East Ham; and
- on 31 October-1 November in Wandsworth.

AC4 During the initial consultation period, 165 people, on their own behalf or representing organisations, made oral representations at the public hearings, and 5,151 people or organisations made written representations.

In the secondary consultation period, 1,237 people or organisations made written representations.

AC5 Following the conclusion of the two consultation periods, the task which we have been set by the Commission is to review all the representations that have been made (whether oral or written) and to provide to the Commission a written report that makes recommendations as to whether – and, if so, how – the Commission's initial proposals should be revised.

AC6 We were not involved in the preparation of the Commission's initial proposals. The evidence that we have received from the Commission to explain and justify its initial proposals is contained in the booklet published by the Commission entitled *London: Initial proposals*. While we have been provided with maps and other assistance by the Secretariat to the Commission, we have neither sought nor been provided with evidence from the Commission that has not been published.

AC7 The distribution of Parliamentary constituencies is governed by rules laid down in the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 2, which was substantially amended by the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011. As a result of the amendments, the rules which govern the current review of constituency boundaries are different in important respects from those which applied to previous reviews. Most significantly, the new legislation has introduced requirements for a fixed number of constituencies, and places an upper and lower limit on the size of the electorate of any

<sup>4</sup> Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, section 3.

<sup>5</sup> The rules are set out in the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 2 as amended.

<sup>6</sup> *A guide to the 2013 Review*, published by the Commission, and *London: Initial proposals*, also published by the Commission.

<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 1 paragraph 6.

constituency, save in relation to four protected constituencies that are outside London. Applying the new statutory electorate range has required extensive and wide-ranging changes.

AC8 Subject to the mandatory provision of Rule 2 that the electorate of a constituency is to be within 5% of the electoral quota, Rule 5 enables the Commission to take into account the following four factors:<sup>8</sup>

- a. special geographical considerations, including the size, shape, and accessibility of a constituency;
- b. local government boundaries as they existed on 6 May 2010;
- c. the boundaries of existing constituencies; and
- d. any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

AC9 While Rule 2 requires that the electorate of each constituency be within 5% of the electoral quota, this does not require the Commission to define constituencies as close as possible to the electoral quota. Rule 2 therefore allows a degree of flexibility which contributes to the ability of the Commission to give effect, to some extent, to the factors in Rule 5.

AC10 We have read all the written representations and the transcripts of the public hearings, together with the written material that was handed to the Lead Assistant Commissioner and the Commission staff at the public hearings. We are very grateful to the many people who must have put in a great

deal of time and effort in preparing their representations. We are grateful also to those who appeared at the public hearings for presenting their representations in a succinct manner, which enabled all the representations to be heard properly while adhering to the two-day limit for each hearing required by the legislation.

AC11 In making our recommendations to the Commission, we have taken into consideration all the representations (both written and oral) and all the written material handed in by speakers at the public hearings. In this report we have dealt with what we consider to be the main issues and the main points that have arisen from all the representations made. We have not, therefore, commented on all the representations made, but we have, nonetheless, considered all the representations made in coming to our conclusions and making our recommendations. We have taken account of all the factors listed in Rule 5 as far as possible, subject to the statutory electorate range. In formulating our recommendations, we have found that representations which proposed viable solutions in line with the rules as laid down by Parliament have often carried more weight than those which disagreed with the Commission's initial proposals without offering alternatives. Our recommendations to the Commission are therefore based on our view of the best reflection of the statutory factors (subject to the electorate range) for London.

AC12 Our report begins with an overview of the main issues we encountered during our consideration of the region; this is followed by a section relating to the question of the division of London into sub-regions. We then set out

<sup>8</sup> An explanation as to how the Commission has interpreted and applied these factors (and an explanation of factors that are not relevant) is set out in paragraphs 26–40 of the booklet *A guide to the 2013 Review*, published by the Commission. It may be noted that Schedule 2 lists a fifth factor, which does not apply to the 2013 Review but will apply to subsequent reviews: 'e. the inconveniences attendant on such changes'.

the basis of our recommendations for constituency boundaries in two sub-regions. The Commission has proposed (as it was required to do) a name and designation for each of the constituencies in its initial proposals. Some of the representations that have been made suggest names different from those proposed by the Commission. In addition, some of our proposed changes to the Commission's proposals mean that the original name is no longer appropriate. We make our recommendations about names after we have set out and explained our recommendations about constituency boundaries.

### Overview

AC13 The London region comprises the 32 London boroughs and the City of London. It is an urban area, densely populated, and largely developed. The region currently has 73 constituencies. Of these constituencies, only 20 have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota. The electorates of 44 constituencies currently fall below the lower 5% limit, while the electorates of nine fall above the upper limit. The Commission, following an earlier consultation, took a decision that the London region is to be allocated 68 constituencies, a reduction of five.<sup>9</sup> During the initial and secondary consultation periods, with which this report is concerned, no substantive representations were received suggesting an alternative allocation.

AC14 In producing initial proposals for the region, the Commission divided London into three sub-regions, each comprising groups of London boroughs: the North East London sub-region, the North, West, and Central London sub-region, and the South London sub-region. The Commission made clear that

the division of London into sub-regions was a purely practical approach. As discussed below, we have adopted two (different) sub-regions.

AC15 In making our recommendations for 68 whole constituencies, each with an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota, we have found that the most significant challenge is posed by London's geography, and specifically by the River Thames and the River Lee. The large reservoirs in the Lee Valley tend to emphasise the natural boundaries created by the river itself. We have treated the Lee Valley reservoirs as being special geographical considerations within the statutory factors that we may take into account.

AC16 It is not necessary for a constituency to cross the River Thames in order for the electoral quota in the 68 constituencies to be respected. However, we have decided that the statutory factors can be better reflected across London if a constituency does cross the River Thames. We have recommended a constituency that crosses the Thames between Richmond and Twickenham, as proposed by the Commission. It is not necessary for a constituency to cross the River Lee. However, the Commission received no counter-proposal that did not include a constituency crossing the River Lee. Nor would the various statutory factors be satisfactorily balanced across the 68 constituencies in London without crossing the River Lee. We have recommended that it be crossed between Bow and Stratford.

AC17 In considering the accessibility of constituencies, we have taken into account the fact that London's population is served by numerous transport links, including major roads and railway lines, many of which radiate from the centre. We have found that the boundaries of existing constituencies,

<sup>9</sup> See *A guide to the 2013 Review*, p 6.

boroughs, and wards in places follow such major roads and railway lines, but in other places cross them.

AC18 Heathrow Airport is a major landmark that affects the accessibility of the wards that surround it. The airport itself is wholly within Hillingdon, but it has an economic and environmental impact on wards all around it, including those in Hounslow. The representations reveal a divergence of opinion as to whether the Commission was correct to propose a constituency that would include wards both north and south of the airport. We consider this issue at paragraph AC127.

AC19 We have taken into consideration local government boundaries as they existed on the most recent ordinary council election day before the review date, which means those that were in place on 6 May 2010. The need to create constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota means it has often been necessary to cross borough boundaries. We have, however, preferred to respect existing borough boundaries where possible, so long as other statutory factors may also be met. The Commission decided to propose constituencies that contained wards from no more than two London boroughs, save that one of its proposed constituencies contained parts of two London boroughs and the City of London. We have managed to create constituencies that also do not contain wards from more than two boroughs. We have recommended one constituency comprising part of one borough, and the City of London.

AC20 A number of constituencies that contained parts of two boroughs in the initial proposals contained only a single ward from one borough. There were ten such 'orphan' wards across London. Some respondents have suggested that an orphan ward may cause

difficulties for an MP in representing all constituents, and so we would have preferred not to recommend constituencies with orphan wards. However, we noted that none of the counter-proposals covering the whole of London (see paragraph AC24) managed to suggest an alternative that did not contain orphan wards. In applying the statutory factors across London, we have concluded that it is necessary to recommend a number of orphan wards, and we have recommended ten constituencies that have such a ward. Kevin Larkin's counter-proposal (IP/019697) contained substantially fewer orphan wards across London (only two). However, he put forward a counter-proposal that contained no constituency crossing the River Thames. Even though it will lead to more orphan wards, we have decided that there should be such a constituency (see paragraph AC135), in order to achieve a better balance of the statutory factors across London.

AC21 We did not receive many representations that advocated dividing wards between constituencies. In *A guide to the 2013 Review*, the Commission set out (at paragraph 31) its policy that, in the absence of exceptional and compelling circumstances, it would not be appropriate to divide wards. We have found no exceptional or compelling reasons to divide any wards in London, and so none of our recommendations contain divided wards. It follows that we have used wards as the basic building blocks for recommending constituencies.

AC22 We have considered and given weight to the boundaries of existing constituencies. We have not treated any existing constituency as more immune to change than any other, but have considered the effects of retaining any existing constituencies in the application of all

the statutory factors across the 68 constituencies.

AC23 We have been greatly assisted by the very many organisations and individuals who have made representations about the effects of the initial proposals on local ties. We have given consideration to local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

AC24 The Commission received some representations about nearly every part of London. The representations included a number of counter-proposals, ranging from proposals to swap single wards to proposals for extensive changes across the London region. We are grateful to those organisations and individuals who submitted counter-proposals covering the whole of London, including, among others, the Conservative Party (IP/025302), the Labour Party (IP/025315), the Liberal Democrats (IP/025326), Adrian Bailey (CR/003988), John Bryant (CR/003085), Adam Gray (IP/018601), Kevin Larkin (IP/019697), Peter Smyth (IP/017873), Peter Whitehead (IP/019603), Robert Young (IP/017075), and David Rossiter together with Ron Johnston and Charles Pattie of the Department of Geography at the University of Sheffield (IP/020996). Austin Spreadbury had no objections to the initial proposals for the South London sub-region, but submitted a detailed counter-proposal relating to North East London and North, West, and Central London (IP/010559 modified in CR/003694). Others submitted localised counter-proposals covering a number of constituencies or wards. We are grateful to them all, and we deal with the more relevant of them below. These counter-proposals have assisted us in deciding whether and how the statutory factors can be reflected better than in the initial proposals.

AC25 The Commission received representations on a large number of contentious issues that will have a significant effect on London's electorate. Among the most significant are:

- linking wards in Chingford and Edmonton to form a single constituency across the River Lee;
- separating the City of London and the City of Westminster;
- dividing Greenwich West and Peninsula wards between two constituencies;
- dividing the four wards covering Streatham town centre between three constituencies;
- the dispersal of wards in Lambeth between six constituencies; and
- the division of Thamesmead by putting Thamesmead East and Thamesmead Moorings wards into two separate constituencies.

AC26 The Commission received many representations about individual wards, including opposition to:

- the exclusion of Belsize ward from a Hampstead-based constituency;
- the exclusion of College Park and Old Oak ward from a Hammersmith-based constituency;
- linking Fortune Green ward with Finchley and Golders Green, rather than a West Hampstead-based constituency;
- linking Higham Hill ward with Chingford, rather than Walthamstow;

- linking Hale End and Highams Park ward with Walthamstow, rather than Chingford;
- linking Stroud Green ward with Tottenham, rather than Hornsey and Wood Green; and
- linking Abbey and Trinity wards with Mitcham, rather than Wimbledon.

AC27 There were a number of local campaigns, including opposition to the initial proposals for Carshalton and Wallington, College Park and Old Oak ward, Edmonton, Romford, Streatham, and Wimbledon.

AC28 The Commission's proposal not to alter the existing Chipping Barnet constituency received strong support. There was strong support, but also very strong opposition, to the Commission's proposal not to alter either of the two existing constituencies within Tower Hamlets (Bethnal Green and Bow, and Poplar and Limehouse). The proposal to have three whole constituencies in Bromley received strong support, but some criticism.

AC29 We have been mindful of the impact on wards in the existing Twickenham constituency (such as Whitton) of the Commission's proposal to create a cross-Thames constituency in Richmond and Twickenham, as well as the consequential effects for Hanworth and Feltham. These and other significant issues which generated strong views among respondents are dealt with below.

AC30 Our analysis has focused on the representations and counter-proposals put forward by individuals and organisations in response to the Commission's initial and secondary consultations. These have been assessed according to whether the electoral quota makes them viable and, if so, according to the extent of their reflection of the statutory factors. No weight has been given to the

source or author of the counter-proposals: each has been assessed on merit only.

AC31 Some respondents have used statistical methods in drawing up their counter-proposals. We have assessed the merits of counter-proposals against the statutory factors, and have not used any other methods for reaching our recommendations.

### **Sub-regional approach**

AC32 In its initial proposals for London, the Commission first considered whether, and how, the London boroughs could be grouped into sub-regions (see IPs, paragraphs 20–25). The Commission adopted a North East London sub-region comprising nine London boroughs (Barking and Dagenham, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Havering, Newham, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets, and Waltham Forest). The Commission allocated 19 constituencies to the North East London sub-region. The North, West, and Central London sub-region comprised 12 boroughs (Barnet, Brent, Camden, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea, Richmond upon Thames, and Westminster) and the City of London. The Commission allocated 24 constituencies to this sub-region. The South London sub-region was formed by the remaining 11 London boroughs (Bexley, Bromley, Croydon, Greenwich, Kingston upon Thames, Lambeth, Lewisham, Merton, Southwark, Sutton, and Wandsworth). The Commission allocated 25 constituencies to this sub-region. While adopting this sub-regional approach, the Commission nevertheless welcomed counter-proposals based on other groupings of boroughs (see IPs, paragraph 21).

AC33 Numerous respondents did not agree with the Commission's sub-regional approach. The Conservative Party supported the principle

of dividing London into sub-regions for the purposes of allocating constituencies, but did not support the Commission's division, particularly as it related to North and East London. While supporting the allocation of 25 constituencies in the Commission's South London sub-region, the Conservative Party proposed that 43 constituencies be allocated across North London as a whole.

AC34 The Labour Party saw no benefit to sub-regional units that had no real identity and that extended to ten or more boroughs. It was content to adopt the Commission's South London sub-region and agreed that it should be allocated 25 constituencies. It saw no value in dividing North London into two sub-regions, and its counter-proposal also allocated 43 constituencies across North London as a whole.

AC35 In the initial consultation period, the Liberal Democrats were content to follow the Commission's sub-regions. In their secondary representations (CR/004499), the Liberal Democrats generally supported the counter-proposal of David Rossiter and his colleagues at the University of Sheffield. That counter-proposal does not adopt a sub-regional approach. Other respondents suggested different sub-regions, and we took this into account in our deliberations.

AC36 We did not take any particular sub-regions as a fixed starting point. The policy of the Commission is to take into account all the statutory factors as far as possible, subject to the primacy of the electorate range (see the *Guide*, paragraph 33). We accept the submission of the Labour Party that the division of London into sub-regional units as a starting point could have acted as a constraint on us in determining whether the statutory factors could be better reflected than they are

in the initial proposals. We preferred not to place a limit on the range of options that such a starting point would have entailed.

AC37 A further reason for not using sub-regions in London as a starting point is that the constraints of the electoral quota mean that changes to one constituency will inevitably have an effect on the make-up of other constituencies. Some constituencies in London must be altered, as not doing so would mean that it would be difficult to meet the electoral quota across the 68 constituencies. We decided that a sub-regional starting point would add a further constraint, not required by statute, which would make it more complicated to apply the statutory factors across London as a whole. In the light of these considerations, we have found the counter-proposals that extended over a wide area to be of considerable assistance in observing the extent of linked changes.

AC38 It follows that we have not taken one fixed starting point from which we have worked to achieve our recommendations. We have not followed those counter-proposals that elevate one statutory factor above others. Rather, we have taken into account all the statutory factors and asked ourselves what weight they should be given in formulating any particular constituency, in light of the effect for London as a whole. It has emerged that our recommendations fall into two sub-regions: north Thames (allocated 43 constituencies) and south Thames (allocated 25 constituencies).

AC39 We therefore make recommendations in relation to a north Thames sub-region (which contains all the constituencies north of the River Thames, as well as the Richmond and Twickenham constituency) and a south Thames sub-region (which contains all the other constituencies).

## Proposals for London

AC40 We now address the initial proposals, representations, and counter-proposals for London in the two sub-regions: north Thames and south Thames (see paragraphs AC38–AC39).

### *North Thames*

AC41 In North London, we start with the question of where to create a constituency that crosses the River Lee, which is a major geographical consideration. This question attracted a great deal of comment and was the subject of a number of different counter-proposals. Its resolution inevitably has implications for the boundaries of constituencies elsewhere in London.

AC42 None of the London boroughs spans the River Lee. The Commission proposed that the River Lee should be crossed in a constituency that combines Chingford in Waltham Forest and Edmonton in Enfield. There was little positive support for this proposal. The Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats both regarded it as the ‘least worst’ option. The Liberal Democrats considered that this option would better respect local ties, local government boundaries, and the pattern of existing constituencies across a wider area of London. David Rossiter and his colleagues accepted the Chingford and Edmonton constituency, which had the advantage of enabling a number of existing constituencies in their counter-proposal either to remain unchanged or to undergo little change. The Labour Party, which disagreed with the proposed Chingford and Edmonton constituency, commented that it would be an artificial constituency, comprising completely different parts. Many respondents commented on the lack of local ties between Chingford and Edmonton, including Andy Love

MP (IP/021964), Iain Duncan Smith MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 3–6), and a large number of local residents.

AC43 We consider that a number of factors combine to make Chingford and Edmonton an unsatisfactory constituency, split down the middle by the Lee Valley, and failing to reflect a satisfactory balance of the statutory factors. First, the boundary formed by the River Lee is strongly accentuated at this point by the reservoir which abuts it. The reservoir forms a significant physical barrier between Chingford and Edmonton. Secondly, the Lee Valley at this point contains industrial estates, a retail park, a sewage works, and the London to Stansted railway line. We accept that these features exacerbate the barrier between Chingford and Edmonton. Thirdly, many respondents described the poor transport links between Chingford and Edmonton. The Commission considered that the North Circular Road provides a suitable link (see IPs, paragraph 29), but many respondents observed that the North Circular is a major road designed to serve passing traffic. We are in no doubt that the North Circular Road divides, rather than links, the communities on either side of it.

AC44 We have also considered the local authority boundaries. The boundary between Enfield and Waltham Forest follows the course of the River Lee, and does not cross it. The existing constituencies of Edmonton, and Chingford and Woodford Green have the river as a boundary between them. We accept, too, that local ties have been formed on either side of the River Lee, not across it, and that ties will therefore be broken by seeking to join communities on different sides of the river. A number of representations emphasised the general socio-economic differences between residents of Chingford and Edmonton, but we agree with the Liberal Democrats

(CR/004499) that the statutory factors do not prevent us from recommending diverse constituencies.

AC45 We recognise that crossing the River Lee between Chingford and Edmonton would create better outcomes for some other constituencies. Our task is to strike a balance between the statutory factors across London as a whole. We have concluded that the proposed Chingford and Edmonton constituency fails to take into account the statutory factors to such a significant degree that we are unable to recommend it, or to recommend that the River Lee should be crossed between Enfield and Waltham Forest.

AC46 Austin Spreadbury, Adam Gray, and some other respondents proposed that the River Lee should be crossed between Hackney and Waltham Forest, using the Lea Bridge Road as a link. The Liberal Democrats saw no great merit in a link between either Hackney and Waltham Forest, or Haringey and Waltham Forest, commenting on the wide gap in built development across these parts of the river. We accept the Liberal Democrats' observation, and do not recommend that the River Lee should be crossed at Hackney or Haringey.

AC47 The Commission rejected a constituency crossing the River Lee between Tower Hamlets and Newham because it had decided not to alter the two existing Tower Hamlets constituencies (IPs, paragraph 29). A number of respondents, including, notably, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrats, Lutfur Rahman, who is the Mayor of Tower Hamlets (IP/011836), and Councillor Craig Aston (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 28-32), strongly agreed with the Commission's decision not to alter the Tower Hamlets constituencies. They submitted that altering these constituencies would break local

ties. Other respondents, notably David Fell (IP/021019), described how the existing Tower Hamlets constituencies reflect the main transport arteries and geographical features (including the River Lee) that delineate the borough boundary. A number of other respondents, notably the Labour Party, Kevin Larkin, and Peter Smyth, proposed that the River Lee should be crossed between Blackwall and Cubitt Town ward in Tower Hamlets, and the Canning Town South ward in Newham. The Labour Party was among those respondents who contended that local ties between residents in Tower Hamlets and Newham are stronger than between Chingford and Edmonton, and that transport links are also stronger.

AC48 We do not, however, consider that the River Lee should be crossed between Blackwall and Cubitt Town, and Canning Town South wards. In the Canning Town wards, there is no continuous residential development close to the River Lee, and the roads and other buildings form a barrier with Tower Hamlets. We accept the representations of, notably, Councillor Aston and the Association of Island Communities Voluntary Council based on the Isle of Dogs (IP/007782) that it is not satisfactory to create a constituency across this barrier. We also accept the representations of those such as Councillor Emma Jones (IP/013556), who stressed that the Isle of Dogs constituencies have ties with Shadwell, and St Katharine's and Wapping wards to the west, rather than with Newham wards to the east.

AC49 We have decided that the River Lee should be crossed in a Bow and Stratford constituency. We note Councillor Aston's detailed objections to a crossing at any point on the boundary between Tower Hamlets and Newham. We have taken into account the fact that large stretches of the boundary contain

the waterways of the Lee Valley, as well as industrial estates, commercial buildings, and other urban infrastructure along the Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach road. However, in considering access across the borough boundary between Bow and Stratford, we have balanced the generally industrial landscape against the transport links, which include the Central Line and the Docklands Light Railway. The industrial landscape is itself interrupted by Stratford High Street. A site visit by the Lead Assistant Commissioner<sup>10</sup> confirmed that the High Street is well served by buses and is used by pedestrians. The Lead Assistant Commissioner did not consider there to be a barrier between Bow and Stratford of such significance that they should not form part of one constituency, in the context of applying the statutory factors across London.

AC50 We recognise that there has been significant support for the Commission's proposal to keep the two existing Tower Hamlets constituencies unaltered. A constituency that crosses the River Lee at Bow would change the existing Tower Hamlets constituencies and would cause Tower Hamlets wards to form parts of constituencies with wards in other boroughs. However, we consider that the advantage of unaltered constituencies in Tower Hamlets, in the context of the statutory factors as a whole, is outweighed by the disadvantages of crossing the River Lee elsewhere in London. Nor do we consider that the disruption to local ties would be so significant that it should prevent changes to the existing Tower Hamlets constituencies.

AC51 We have therefore preferred a River Lee crossing at Bow to one elsewhere in London. As proposed by Robert Young, we recommend a Bow and Stratford constituency comprising Bow East, Bow West, Bromley-by-Bow, and

Mile End East wards in Tower Hamlets, and Forest Gate North, Forest Gate South, Plaistow North, Stratford and New Town, and West Ham wards in Newham. The name Bow and Stratford, proposed by Mr Young, reflects the main population centres, and we adopt it.

AC52 Crossing the River Lee at Bow has enabled us to keep St Katharine's and Wapping, Shadwell, and Limehouse wards with the Isle of Dogs wards (Millwall, and Blackwall and Cubitt Town). All these wards are riparian and have the waterways from London's former docks as a common geographical feature. All form part of the existing Poplar and Limehouse constituency in Tower Hamlets. We recommend a Poplar and Stepney constituency comprising these wards, together with St Dunstan's and Stepney Green, Whitechapel, and East India and Lansbury wards, which are also in Tower Hamlets and are easily accessible from Poplar.

AC53 Adrian Bailey and Robert Young proposed the same constituency, under the name Stepney and Poplar. A small number of other respondents suggested that Canary Wharf should be included in the name of a constituency in this part of Tower Hamlets, as representing a major population and commercial centre. We recommend the name Poplar and Stepney, as being closer to the existing name and as reflecting the main population centres.

AC54 In Newham, three wards (Beckton, Canning Town South, and Royal Docks) border the River Thames in the south of the borough. A number of southern wards are linked by the Docklands Light Railway. As explained in paragraph AC48, there is a clear break in residential development between the Canning Town North ward and the Stratford and New

<sup>10</sup> On 11 June 2012.

Town, and West Ham wards to the north of the borough. We therefore agree with Robert Young that there should be a constituency containing wards in the south of Newham. We recommend a constituency containing four wards from the existing West Ham constituency (Canning Town North, Canning Town South, Custom House, and Plaistow South) and five wards from the existing East Ham constituency (Beckton, Boleyn, East Ham Central, East Ham South, and Royal Docks). The Commission proposed a West Ham and Royal Docks constituency that excluded East Ham Central and East Ham South wards, but included Plaistow North and West Ham wards. Although finely balanced, we have preferred to include East Ham Central and East Ham South wards, as that enables a better balance of the statutory factors to be achieved across North East London. Robert Young proposed the name Newham South, which we adopt as an accurate description.

AC55 In Barking and Dagenham, the Commission noted that the borough was too large for one constituency (IPs, paragraph 32). It proposed a Dagenham North constituency that would contain three wards (Alibon, Parsloes, and Valence) from the existing Barking constituency, four wards (Chadwell Heath, Eastbrook, Heath, and Whalebone) from the existing Dagenham and Rainham constituency, and two Havering wards (Brooklands and Mawneys) from the existing Romford constituency. Many respondents strongly disagreed with the inclusion of Romford wards in a Dagenham constituency, including Andrew Rosindell MP (IP/024442), Havering Council (IP/024083), Councillor Robert Benham (IP/024431), and a substantial number of members of the public, who stressed that this would break local ties. There were a number of different counter-proposals, which covered a wider area than Romford.

AC56 Two central planks of Mr Rosindell's counter-proposal were that the Brooklands and Mawneys wards should remain in a Romford constituency, while the existing Hornchurch and Upminster constituency in Havering should remain unaltered. Many members of the public agreed with him. The Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrats, and David Rossiter and his colleagues also made these two proposals.

AC57 Many respondents, however, disagreed strongly with Mr Rosindell. The Independent Residents' Group of the London Borough of Havering (IP/025630) was among a number of respondents who welcomed the Commission's proposal for a Hornchurch and Upminster constituency that was different from the existing constituency and that would restore Rainham wards to Hornchurch. Councillor Georgina V. Galpin (IP/019752) was among a number who submitted that the Hylands ward has ties with Hornchurch and Upminster. The Labour Party was content with the initial proposals as they related to Barking and Dagenham, and Havering (CR/004495).

AC58 We recognise the strength of feeling (both for and against) that the initial proposals, and Mr Rosindell's counter-proposal, generated about these two boroughs. We have reached the firm view, however, that Brooklands and Mawneys wards have strong ties with the other Romford wards. They are part of the existing Romford constituency. We see no good reason to place them in a Dagenham constituency, and we accept this part of Mr Rosindell's counter-proposal.

AC59 The Rush Green Regeneration Group (RGRG) emphasised that the Rush Green wards (Brooklands and Eastbrook) sustain strong local ties with each other across the boundary between Barking and Dagenham, and Havering. RGRG proposed that the existing

Romford constituency should be retained with the single addition of the Eastbrook ward, which is in the existing Dagenham and Rainham constituency. We note that there is continuous, built development across the borough boundary between Brooklands and Eastbrook wards, which supports RGRG's contention that Rush Green is an integrated area, despite being divided between two boroughs. Although finely balanced, we agree with RGRG's proposal for Romford. We recommend a Romford constituency that is the same as the existing constituency, with the addition of Eastbrook ward. RGRG suggested the name Romford and Rush Green. As the constituency would remain largely unchanged, we prefer the name Romford, which also reflects the main population centre.

AC60 We have noted the counter-proposals of Mr Rosindell and others that Chadwell Heath ward in the existing Dagenham and Rainham constituency should be part of a Romford constituency on the grounds that there are strong local ties. We note, however, that there is little continuous built development between Chadwell Heath ward and Romford, whereas there is built development between Chadwell Heath and Whalebone ward to the south, in the existing Dagenham and Rainham constituency. Kevin Larkin noted the ties between Chadwell Heath and Whalebone wards (CR/004175). We consider that Chadwell Heath should remain in a Dagenham and Rainham constituency.

AC61 We recognise the strength of feeling that Elm Park, Rainham and Wennington, and South Hornchurch wards should be reunited with other wards in a Hornchurch and Upminster constituency. We also note those representations advocating that Hylands ward should be part of such a constituency. However, we have decided that the existing

constituency of Hornchurch and Upminster should remain unaltered, as better reflecting the statutory factors across this area of London. As it would remain unchanged, we recommend its existing name.

AC62 The initial proposals placed River ward in a Barking and Dagenham constituency. A number of respondents (including Kevin Larkin and Robert Young) also preferred to place River ward in a Barking constituency. The Conservative Party proposed that River ward should remain in a Dagenham and Rainham constituency. We agree with the Conservative Party, and recommend a Dagenham and Rainham constituency containing Alibon, Chadwell Heath, Heath, River, Valence, Village, and Whalebone wards from Barking and Dagenham, together with Elm Park, Rainham and Wennington, and South Hornchurch wards from Havering. The Commission, in proposing a constituency drawn mainly from wards in the north of Barking and Dagenham, proposed the name Dagenham North. We have not recommended that this proposal should be retained, and we prefer the name Dagenham and Rainham for our recommended constituency, as it reflects the main population centres, and as the existing constituency of that name would remain largely unchanged.

AC63 We agree also with the Conservative Party that there is no reason to move Parsloes ward from a Barking constituency, as was proposed by the Commission. We recommend a Barking constituency containing nine wards from Barking and Dagenham, and two wards from Redbridge (Goodmayes and Mayfield). In doing so, we note that the Commission placed these Redbridge wards in a Barking constituency, as did the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, David Rossiter and his colleagues, Robert Young, and others. We

note, too, that Mike Gapes MP, in his detailed representations about Ilford South, did not oppose the loss of these two wards from the existing Ilford South constituency (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 17–20). We agree with the Commission that the inclusion of these two Redbridge wards represents an appropriate balance of the statutory factors.

AC64 The Commission’s proposed constituency was named Barking and Dagenham. We have recommended alterations so that the constituency would comprise wards from Barking, Dagenham, and Redbridge. The Conservative Party, Mr Rosindell, and David Rossiter and his colleagues (whose counter-proposals we have accepted in relation to this constituency) proposed the name Barking. We agree with this name, which is less liable to be confused with the Dagenham and Rainham constituency, and which would reflect the existing constituency name.

AC65 We recognise that our decisions about Barking and Dagenham, and Havering are finely balanced. Our decisions mean that Romford would be the same as the existing constituency, with the addition of a single ward. Hornchurch and Upminster would also be the same as the existing constituency. Dagenham and Rainham would be the same, save that one ward would move to the Romford constituency and two wards (Alibon and Valence) would be gained from the existing Barking constituency. Barking would include all except two of the wards of the existing constituency, with the addition of two Redbridge wards, in order to satisfy the electorate range.

AC66 In Redbridge, the Commission noted that the borough was too large for two constituencies. It proposed an Ilford North constituency containing eight Redbridge wards, including three (Chadwell, Newbury,

and Seven Kings) from the existing Ilford South constituency. A significant number of respondents opposed the exclusion of Clayhall ward from Ilford North, and opposed the decision of the Commission to place it in a Wanstead and Woodford constituency. Lee Scott MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 6–9), Ricki Williams, who is the agent for Iain Duncan Smith MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 9–12), Councillor Nicholas Hayes (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 8–12), as well as local organisations and residents, pointed to the ties between Clayhall ward and Ilford North wards, which would be broken by the Commission’s proposal.

AC67 The Conservative Party proposed that Clayhall ward should be included in Ilford North in place of Newbury ward. We note, however, the submission of, among others, the Labour Party and Mike Gapes MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 17–20) that Newbury should not be separated from Seven Kings. Other respondents, such as Councillor Chris Cummins who is the Mayor of Redbridge (IP/022975) and Councillor Ian Bond (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 46–50) acknowledged that Clayhall has links with Ilford North, but also emphasised that Newbury ward does not have links with Wanstead and Woodford. Although finely balanced, we do not consider that replacing Newbury ward with Clayhall ward in an Ilford North constituency would represent a better reflection of the statutory factors. We recommend the initial proposal. The Liberal Democrats proposed Newbury Park and Hainault as an alternative name for this constituency, while accepting the name Ilford North. Peter Smyth proposed Hainault and Newbury Park. Our recommendation would make some changes to the existing constituency, but we do not regard those changes as being so extensive that a change

of name would be required. We recommend the name Ilford North.

AC68 The Commission proposed a Wanstead and Woodford constituency, which would comprise Bridge, Church End, Clayhall, Cranbrook, Monkams, Roding, Snaresbrook, Valentines, and Wanstead wards in Redbridge (IPs, paragraph 33). There was both considerable support for and opposition to the Commission's proposal. Among others, it was supported by the Mayor of Redbridge, the Conservative Party (subject only to the inclusion of Newbury ward rather than Clayhall ward), and Councillor Alex Wilson (IP/023179). A number of individuals whose counter-proposals covered the whole of London also supported a Wanstead and Woodford constituency, including Kevin Larkin, Peter Smyth, and Robert Young.

AC69 We have kept in mind that the Commission's proposal takes wards from four existing constituencies (Chingford and Woodford Green, Ilford North, Ilford South, and Leyton and Wanstead). We have also kept in mind the strong representations by Mike Gapes MP, and others, that the existing Ilford South constituency would no longer exist under the Commission's proposals, as its wards would be wholly divided between other constituencies. The Commission's proposals would divide Cranbrook and Valentines wards from Clementswood and Loxford wards, which the Commission placed in a constituency with Newham wards. Mr Gapes, and others, such as Councillor Dev Sharma (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 52-54), made a strong case why this division of central Ilford wards would break local ties.

AC70 We agree that the division of Cranbrook and Valentines wards from Clementswood and Loxford wards would break local ties. We are

nevertheless bound by the electoral quota, and our task is to balance the various statutory factors across London as a whole. We have noted the representations of those, such as Susan Herrington representing the Chingford and Woodford Green Conservative Association (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 13-15), who emphasised the ties between Chingford and Woodford. We have considered the Labour Party counter-proposal for a Chingford and Woodford constituency, which would keep together most, but not all, of the wards of the existing, cross-borough Chingford and Woodford Green constituency. This counter-proposal combines four Redbridge wards (Bridge, Church End, Monkams, and Roding) with five Waltham Forest wards, whereas we have decided that Waltham Forest should be divided into two single-borough constituencies (see paragraphs AC75-AC79). The proposed Wanstead and Woodford constituency also contains wards from only one borough.

AC71 The Labour Party proposed an Ilford South constituency that would keep Cranbrook and Valentines wards with Clementswood and Loxford wards. The proposal included Wanstead ward, but not Snaresbrook ward, which the Labour Party placed as an orphan ward in a Walthamstow constituency with Waltham Forest wards. The Commission's proposed Wanstead and Woodford constituency would keep Snaresbrook and Wanstead wards together. Both these wards are in Redbridge, and both are in the existing Leyton and Wanstead constituency. A number of respondents, such as Councillor Nicholas Hayes (East Ham public hearing, Day 1, pp 8-12), Councillor Ian Bond, and Councillor Alex Wilson, held the strong view that the separation of these two wards from each other would break local ties. We accept also that local ties would be broken by the separation of Snaresbrook ward from Wanstead ward.

AC72 We considered John Bryant’s proposal for an Ilford constituency that would contain the Clementswood and Loxford wards and the Cranbrook and Valentines wards. However, this proposal had a number of consequences for other wards, including placing Snaresbrook and Wanstead wards in an East Ham constituency. We do not consider that this proposal would better preserve local ties. Nor do we consider that any of the other counter-proposals would strike a better balance between the statutory factors in the context of London as a whole. We therefore recommend the Commission’s Wanstead and Woodford constituency, under that name.

AC73 The Commission placed the remaining Redbridge wards (Clementswood and Loxford) with Newham wards in a proposed East Ham constituency. We have already explained that we recognise that this would break existing ties in Ilford (paragraphs AC69–AC70). We have also noted that some respondents, including Stephen Timms MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 50–52), opposed the Commission’s East Ham constituency on the grounds that it would also break ties in East Ham. The Conservative Party, among others, accepted that the boundary between Newham and Redbridge should be crossed between East Ham and Ilford, but suggested a different configuration of Newham wards to be combined with Clementswood and Loxford wards.

AC74 We do not regard either the Commission’s proposal for East Ham or any of the counter-proposals as solving all problems. However, taking into account all the statutory factors across London, we prefer Robert Young’s proposal, which combines six Newham wards (East Ham North, Green Street East, Green Street West, Little Ilford, Manor Park, and Wall End) with Clementswood and Loxford

wards. Robert Young proposed the name Ilford Town and Manor Park. We have preferred to retain the name East Ham, while also recognising that this is a cross-borough constituency. Gareth Knight (IP/013694) suggested Loxford Park and East Ham as a constituency name. We prefer Gareth Knight’s approach, but recommend the name East Ham and Loxford, as there is no need to refer to the park.

AC75 In Waltham Forest, the Commission noted that the electorate of the borough is such that it could be divided into two constituencies (IPs, paragraph 35). However, the initial proposals included Waltham Forest wards with wards from Enfield in a Chingford and Edmonton constituency, which prevented two single-borough constituencies. We have not recommended the Commission’s proposed Chingford and Edmonton constituency (see paragraph AC45). It is possible to divide Waltham Forest into two single-borough constituencies. Taking account of the statutory factors, we have decided that such a division is appropriate.

AC76 The initial proposals placed four Leyton wards (Cann Hall, Cathall, Grove Green, and Leyton) with Newham wards in a Stratford constituency. Two other Leyton wards (Leytonstone and Forest) were placed in a Walthamstow constituency (IPs, paragraph 35). Among others, the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest (IP/022214) and David Hayes on behalf of John Cryer MP (East Ham public hearing, Day 1, p 5) expressed concern at the division of Leyton wards, on the grounds that this would break local ties in Leyton. The Liberal Democrats also regretted the proposal to divide Leytonstone from the Waltham Forest wards in the Commission’s proposed Stratford constituency, while cautioning against creating a constituency

that would keep together Leyton wards at the expense of disruption elsewhere.

AC77 We agree that the division of Leyton wards between two constituencies would break local ties. We do not agree that a constituency that keeps together Leyton wards will have such a significant effect elsewhere in London that we should not recommend it. We recommend a Leyton constituency as proposed by Robert Young, containing Leyton wards (Cann Hall, Cathall, Grove Green, and Leyton, together with Leytonstone, and Forest), and four other wards in the south of the borough (High Street, Hoe Street, Lea Bridge, and Markhouse). Robert Young proposed the name Leyton and Walthamstow. Kevin Larkin proposed the name Leyton for a constituency in this part of Waltham Forest. We recommend the name Leyton, as it describes the main population centre adequately.

AC78 The existing Chingford and Woodford Green constituency contains six wards in Waltham Forest and two wards in Redbridge. In relation to Chingford, we have disagreed with the Commission's proposed Chingford and Edmonton constituency (see paragraph AC45). Instead, we recommend a constituency containing all the Waltham Forest wards in the existing Chingford and Woodford Green constituency, together with four wards in the existing Walthamstow constituency (Chapel End, Higham Hill, William Morris, and Wood Street). We have noted that the North Circular Road passes between the Chingford wards and the Walthamstow wards, but we do not consider that it forms a significant barrier in the context of applying the statutory factors across London as a whole.

AC79 We have noted that a number of respondents, such as Iain Duncan Smith MP,

have suggested that local ties do not extend between Chingford and Walthamstow. Some respondents, including Mr Duncan Smith and the Labour Party, suggested that the existing Chingford and Woodford Green constituency should be enlarged by additional Redbridge wards. We note, too, the concern of the Liberal Democrats that a constituency extending south from Chingford to Walthamstow would break ties in Walthamstow. We do not, however, consider that a combination of Waltham Forest and Redbridge wards would strike a better balance between the statutory factors across London as a whole.

AC80 Adrian Bailey proposed that this constituency should be named Waltham Forest North. Robert Young proposed the name Chingford and Upper Walthamstow. Kevin Larkin proposed the name Chingford for a constituency in this part of Waltham Forest. We recommend the name Chingford, as it describes the main population centre adequately.

AC81 In Enfield, the Commission proposed an Enfield Southgate constituency containing six wards from the existing constituency of that name and two wards (Bush Hill Park and Haselbury) from the existing Edmonton constituency. The proposal was supported by, among others, the Conservative Party, and Dr Rossiter and his colleagues. The Labour Party's proposal for Enfield Southgate contained six wards from the existing constituency, together with Chase and Highlands wards from Edmonton.

AC82 We noted the support for the Commission's proposal that Bowes ward, which is part of the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency, should be placed in a Hornsey and Wood Green constituency (IPs, paragraph 38). The Liberal Democrats referred to strong

ties between Bowes ward and Haringey's Bounds Green ward in the Commission's proposed Hornsey and Wood Green constituency. The Conservative Party observed that Bowes ward is separated from the rest of Enfield by the North Circular Road. We noted, nevertheless, the evidence of the Weir Hall and District Ratepayers' Association (IP/025609) that residents of Bowes ward have no links with the Hornsey and Wood Green areas. Councillor Yasmin Brett stressed ties between Bowes ward and Southgate (IP/012504). We have decided that Bowes ward should remain in an Enfield Southgate constituency.

AC83 As proposed by Robert Young, we recommend an Enfield Southgate constituency containing all seven wards of the existing constituency, with the addition of one ward (Bush Hill Park) from Edmonton. This reflects the boundary of the existing constituency more closely. All the wards are in Enfield. A number of respondents, including Adrian Bailey and Robert Young, proposed the name Southgate. As our recommendation leaves the existing constituency largely unchanged, we have found no good reason to change the name Enfield Southgate.

AC84 The Commission proposed an Enfield North constituency containing all the wards of the existing constituency of that name, with the addition of Ponders End ward from the existing Edmonton constituency. There was support for the Commission's proposals from the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrats, Dr Rossiter and his colleagues, and Robert Young. We do not consider that any of the counter-proposals (containing different configurations of Enfield wards) better reflect the statutory factors. We recommend the Commission's proposal, and recommend that this constituency has the name Enfield North,

as the existing constituency would be largely unchanged.

AC85 In order to meet the electoral quota, the five remaining Enfield wards (Edmonton Green, Haselbury, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, and Upper Edmonton) should be placed with four Tottenham wards (Bruce Grove, Northumberland Park, Tottenham Hale, and White Hart Lane) which are in Haringey. We note that a number of respondents commented on local ties between Edmonton and Tottenham, such as Vivien Giladi who is a former councillor for Lower Edmonton ward (IP/024464), Councillor Peter Golds (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 35–41), and Councillor Rohini Simbodyal (East Ham public hearing, Day 2, pp 55–59). As proposed by Robert Young, we recommend a constituency of Edmonton and Tottenham Hale. Our recommendation would enable Upper Edmonton ward to be part of a constituency with other Enfield wards, rather than being an orphan ward in an otherwise Haringey constituency, as proposed by the Commission.

AC86 The Labour Party proposed a Tottenham and Edmonton constituency containing a different configuration of Haringey and Enfield wards. While we do not adopt it, we have considered whether the name Tottenham and Edmonton should be adopted to describe the constituency that we do recommend. Although finely balanced, we prefer to keep a reference to Tottenham Hale in the name, so that this constituency can be more easily distinguished from our recommended Stamford Hill and South Tottenham constituency (see paragraph AC92).

AC87 In Haringey, the Commission noted that the existing Hornsey and Wood Green constituency could be left unchanged (IPs, paragraph 38). In order to accommodate

changes elsewhere, the Commission proposed that Stroud Green ward in the existing constituency should be part of a proposed Tottenham constituency and that Bowes ward in the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency should be included in Hornsey and Wood Green (see paragraph AC82).

AC88 The proposal that Stroud Green should be included in a Tottenham constituency received very little support, and was opposed by a large number of people and organisations, including all three Parliamentary parties, the present councillors for Stroud Green ward (IP/025512),<sup>11</sup> and the Stroud Green Residents' Association (IP/023119). Many respondents emphasised that this proposal would break local ties between Stroud Green and other Hornsey wards. We have therefore decided that Stroud Green ward should be part of a Hornsey and Wood Green constituency.

AC89 The initial proposals keep Fortis Green ward in Hornsey and Wood Green. A number of respondents, notably the Labour Party, have commented that this preserves local ties between Fortis Green and Muswell Hill. In order to satisfy the electorate range, we have decided that this ward should be included in a Finchley and Golders Green constituency. While it would be the only Haringey ward in an otherwise Barnet constituency, a number of respondents emphasised the local ties between Fortis Green and East Finchley, such as the Hampstead and Kilburn Conservatives (IP/023275). We recognise that ties to Muswell Hill would be broken, but we have concluded that the inclusion of Fortis Green in a Barnet constituency would strike a better balance between the statutory factors across London. The Commission proposed that the electorate of Finchley and Golders Green should be increased by the inclusion of a single Camden

ward (Fortune Green). We are in no doubt that Fortis Green would be more appropriate than Fortune Green for inclusion in Finchley and Golders Green (see paragraph AC108).

AC90 In order to satisfy the electorate range, we have concluded that the Islington ward of Hillrise should be placed in the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency. While Hillrise ward would be a single Islington ward in an otherwise Haringey constituency, our recommendation enables us to strike a better balance between the statutory factors across North London. We recommend, therefore, a Hornsey and Wood Green constituency containing Alexandra, Bounds Green, Crouch End, Highgate, Hornsey, Muswell Hill, Noel Park, Stroud Green, and Woodside wards in Haringey, together with Hillrise ward. As the existing constituency would remain largely unchanged, we recommend that the existing name should be retained. The remaining Haringey wards (Harringay, St Ann's, Seven Sisters, Tottenham Green, and West Green) should be contained in a constituency with Hackney wards (see paragraph AC92).

AC91 In Hackney, the Commission proposed that there should be two Hackney constituencies on a north-south axis (IPs, paragraph 37). There were a number of different counter-proposals, from the Labour Party, Robert Young, and others, containing various combinations of Hackney wards. David Rossiter and his colleagues proposed that there should be two constituencies contained within a single borough, both unchanged from the existing constituencies. Balancing the statutory factors across London as a whole, we have been unable to achieve two single-borough constituencies, and we have decided to combine some Hackney wards with some

<sup>11</sup> Richard Wilson, Katherine Reece, and Ed Butcher.

wards in the existing Tottenham constituency in Haringey.

AC92 In dividing the Hackney wards between constituencies, we have taken into account local ties. A number of respondents, including the Labour Party, were concerned to keep Stamford Hill wards together. We recommend a Stamford Hill and South Tottenham constituency containing Brownswood, Cazenove, Lordship, New River, and Springfield wards in the existing Hackney North and Stoke Newington constituency, together with five wards in the existing Tottenham constituency, including Seven Sisters ward, which was an orphan ward in a Hackney constituency in the initial proposals. We have preferred this combination of wards to the Labour Party's proposal of a slightly different combination of wards, because it enables us to keep Stoke Newington wards together (Clissold, Dalston, Hackney Downs, and Stoke Newington Central wards) in a Hackney Central constituency with six other Hackney wards. The names of both our recommended constituencies reflect their main population centres, and we adopt them from the Labour Party's representations.

AC93 A number of respondents, including John Biggs as the London Assembly Member for City and East Constituency (East Ham public hearing, Day 1, pp 15–17), proposed that the boundary between Hackney and Tower Hamlets could be crossed without breaking local ties. The Labour Party agreed that this boundary could be crossed, and proposed a constituency combining Shoreditch wards (De Beauvoir, Haggerston, and Hoxton, which are in the existing Hackney South and Shoreditch constituency) with six wards in the existing Bethnal Green and Bow constituency. We have decided that two of the Tower Hamlets wards suggested by the Labour Party (Whitechapel, and St Dunstan's and Stepney

Green) would be better placed in a Poplar and Stepney constituency (see paragraph AC52). We recommend instead the inclusion of Mile End and Globe Town, which is also in the existing Bethnal Green and Bow constituency. We recommend that an additional ward in the existing Hackney South and Shoreditch constituency (Queensbridge) should be included to achieve the electoral quota and to recognise the concern of some respondents, such as the Liberal Democrats, that Queensbridge has ties to the other Shoreditch wards. The name Bethnal Green and Shoreditch has been proposed by the Labour Party and by Robert Young. We recommend it as reflecting the main population centres, and also as reflecting the names of the two existing constituencies that contain these population centres.

AC94 The Commission proposed that the City of London should be part of a constituency named The City of London and Islington South, comprising, in addition to the City of London, two Camden wards and seven Islington wards (IPs, paragraph 44). In describing this proposal, the Commission acknowledged that the City of London has longstanding links with wards in the City of Westminster, but it considered that the City of London also has close communication links with the south of Islington.

AC95 This proposal has been supported by Emily Thornberry MP (IP/017220) and Adam Gray, but has received very little other support. It has been strongly opposed by a large number of people and organisations, including all three Parliamentary parties, Mark Field MP (IP/004789), Sir Malcolm Rifkind MP (Kensington public hearing, Day 1, pp 38–41), the Corporation of the City of London (IP/025243), the City of Westminster (IP/021403), businesses, and residents. It would involve a significant departure from

the boundaries of the existing constituency, in which the City of London is part of a constituency with wards from Westminster, and many respondents emphasised that this proposal would break long-established ties between the City of London and the City of Westminster. We have therefore decided that the City of London should be part of a constituency with the City of Westminster.

AC96 The consequences of that decision directly affect the initial proposals for The City of London and Islington South constituency, and for a Westminster and Kensington constituency, and indirectly affect several other constituencies, the boundaries of which can only be determined by taking into account the representations and the statutory factors in respect of a wider area.

AC97 We have decided that the City of London should be joined with 12 Westminster wards, of which nine are in the existing constituency of Cities of London and Westminster. The nine wards include Marylebone High Street, and Bryanston and Dorset Square, which the Commission's proposals would have separated from West End ward, thereby breaking established ties, as evidenced by a large number of representations from the Marylebone area. In order to satisfy the electorate range, we have decided to include a further three Westminster wards that are in the existing Westminster North constituency. Although the representations reveal a difference of opinion as to whether Westbourne ward should be included, it is necessary to achieve the electoral quota. While noting the objections of respondents, such as Councillor David Boothroyd (CR/001025), we are satisfied from the representations of, among others, Tim Mitchell (IP/012585) that it has sufficient ties with other Westminster wards to the south to

justify this. We have decided not to include Knightsbridge and Belgravia ward. Although this ward is in the existing Cities of London and Westminster constituency, the representations indicate that it has ties with both Westminster and Kensington, and we have decided that it should be included in the Kensington constituency described below. Our decision in relation to this constituency is the same as the Conservative Party's counter-proposal. There is a consensus that the constituency containing the City of London should have the same name as the existing constituency, that is The Cities of London and Westminster.

AC98 The Commission's proposals divided the 18 wards making up Kensington and Chelsea across three constituencies (IPs, paragraphs 46–47). Six wards in the south of the borough were included by the Commission in its proposed Chelsea and Fulham constituency, together with eight Hammersmith wards. The Commission's proposed Chelsea and Fulham constituency would include all but one of the wards in the existing Chelsea and Fulham constituency, with the addition of two Kensington wards, and two Hammersmith wards to satisfy the electorate range. The Commission's proposal for this constituency was generally supported, with very few objections. We recommend the Commission's proposed Chelsea and Fulham constituency, with that name.

AC99 We have decided that the other 12 Kensington and Chelsea wards should form a constituency with three Westminster wards. One of these is Knightsbridge and Belgravia ward, mentioned in paragraph AC97, and the other two are from the existing Westminster North constituency. A number of respondents, including Karen Buck MP (IP/020868), emphasised that there are ties between wards in the northern parts of Kensington and

Westminster. Since this constituency would contain 12 Kensington wards, we have decided that its name should be Kensington, as proposed by the Conservative Party.

AC100 The Commission proposed a Paddington constituency, comprising four wards in the northern part of Kensington and Chelsea, and nine wards in the northern part of Westminster. This proposal has received some support because it would link wards in north Kensington with wards in north Westminster. We have, however, decided to include four of the Westminster wards that the Commission included in the Paddington constituency (Bayswater, Hyde Park, Lancaster Gate, and Westbourne) in The Cities of London and Westminster constituency (see paragraphs AC95–AC97). We have included in the Kensington constituency two other Westminster wards (Harrow Road and Queen’s Park) that the Commission had proposed should be in a Paddington constituency. We have retained, with amendments, the Commission’s proposed Camden and Regent’s Park constituency, and its Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, as explained in paragraphs AC101–AC103. We have formed the view that the statutory factors can in this way be better reflected across several constituencies. We have therefore decided that the Commission’s Paddington constituency should not be retained.

AC101 In Camden, the Commission proposed a Camden and Regent’s Park constituency, comprising four Westminster wards and seven Camden wards (IPs, paragraph 45). The seven Camden wards included Belsize. Many respondents strongly objected to this proposal, as it would cause ties to be broken between Belsize and other Hampstead wards. We have decided that it would be appropriate to retain a Camden and Regent’s Park constituency, but

with different boundaries from those proposed by the Commission. We agree with the Conservative Party that it should include five Westminster wards and six Camden wards, but excluding Belsize ward, which we have decided should be in a Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, as explained in paragraphs AC102–AC103. This would keep Kentish Town and Cantelowes wards together, in contrast to the Commission’s proposal, which would divide them. This constituency would comprise wards from two boroughs. Although the Commission and a number of respondents have referred to this constituency as Camden and Regent’s Park, in recognition of the fact that this constituency would include wards from only part of Camden Borough, we have decided that the name of this constituency should be Camden Town and Regent’s Park.

AC102 The Commission proposed a Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, comprising two Brent wards and eight Camden wards, that would be similar, but not identical, to the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency (IPs, paragraph 45). The Commission did not include the Camden ward of Fortune Green in this constituency, but rather in a Finchley and Golders Green constituency (see paragraph AC89). It also did not include the Camden ward of Belsize, which it proposed should be included in the Camden and Regent’s Park constituency. Both these wards are in the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency.

AC103 In light of the many representations, such as from Camden Borough Council (CR/003868), that the Commission’s proposals in relation to both Fortune Green and Belsize wards would break existing ties, we have decided that these wards should be in a Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. To satisfy the electorate range, we have decided that two

other Camden wards, Gospel Oak and Kentish Town, which the Commission included in its Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, should instead be included in a Camden Town and Regent's Park constituency. Our proposed Hampstead and Kilburn constituency (which is the same as that proposed by the Conservative Party) comprises wards from two boroughs, as in the Commission's proposals. Since this constituency would be largely similar to the existing constituency, we have decided that the name should be retained.

AC104 A number of representations expressed the view that the existing Holborn and St Pancras constituency should be retained substantially as it is; but, balancing the statutory factors across several constituencies, we have found that it would not be possible to achieve this. Our decisions described above have enabled Camden to be divided across three constituencies, as compared with four in the initial proposals.

AC105 In Islington, the Commission noted that the electorate was too small for two constituencies (IPs, paragraph 44). As we have explained (in paragraph AC94), the Commission proposed that seven Islington wards and two Camden wards should, together with the City of London, comprise The City of London and Islington South constituency. Our decision regarding the City of London (paragraphs AC94–AC97), removes the City from this constituency. We accept the representations from a number of respondents that the Commission's proposal, by excluding the Camden ward of Bloomsbury, would break ties between that ward and two other Camden wards (King's Cross, and Holborn and Covent Garden). We have decided that these three Camden wards should be kept together by including Bloomsbury in an Islington South and Holborn constituency, and that, in addition, a

further Camden ward, St Pancras and Somers Town, should be included. To satisfy the electorate range, the Islington ward of Canonbury should be moved to the adjoining Islington North constituency described in paragraph AC106 below. The constituency would comprise wards from two boroughs. In order to recognise the addition of the Camden wards, we have decided that the name proposed by the Commission should be changed to Islington South and Holborn.

AC106 The Commission's proposal for Islington North was the same as the existing constituency of that name, with the addition of one ward (Holloway) from the existing Islington South and Finsbury constituency to satisfy the electorate range. This proposal was generally supported, but we have had to alter it to accommodate changes to neighbouring constituencies. We have decided that the Hillrise ward in the existing Islington North constituency should form part of a Hornsey and Wood Green constituency (see paragraph AC90). We have also decided that Canonbury ward (in the existing Islington South and Finsbury constituency) should be part of the Islington North constituency, to satisfy the electorate range. The Labour Party was among respondents who commented on ties between Canonbury ward and St Mary's and St Peter's wards in central Islington. We do not consider that such ties outweigh the advantages of our decision in the context of the application of the statutory factors across London. We recommend, therefore, an Islington North constituency that is the same as the existing constituency, with the addition of Holloway and Canonbury wards, and with the omission of Hillrise ward. The name reflects the main population centre.

AC107 In Barnet, the Commission noted that two of the three existing constituencies had

electorates within 5% of the electoral quota (IPs, paragraph 43). The Commission proposed not to alter either the existing Chipping Barnet or Hendon constituencies, which are composed entirely of Barnet wards. This proposal was supported by, among others, the Conservative Party, David Rossiter and his colleagues, Theresa Villiers MP (IP/019318), a number of local councillors, and local residents. We agree with the Commission and do not consider that any of the competing counter-proposals for these two constituencies represented a better balance of the statutory factors.

AC108 The Commission noted that the electorate of the existing Finchley and Golders Green constituency needs to be increased, and proposed that the Fortune Green ward in Camden should be added (IPs, paragraph 43). In consequence of our decision that Fortune Green ward should be moved into a Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, we have decided that the Haringey ward of Fortis Green should be included in a Finchley and Golders Green constituency (see paragraph AC89). We recommend a Finchley and Golders Green constituency that is the same as the existing constituency, with the addition of Fortis Green ward. As this constituency would remain largely unchanged, we recommend that it keeps its existing name.

AC109 Some respondents included wards in Barnet with other wards in Haringey, or with wards in other boroughs such as Brent, Enfield, or Harrow. We do not consider that the division of Barnet wards would bring sufficient benefit to the pattern of other constituencies that the disruption to local ties in Barnet would be justified.

AC110 In Hammersmith and Fulham, we have decided that the Commission's proposed Chelsea and Fulham constituency should be

retained. This would include eight of the 16 Hammersmith and Fulham wards (see paragraph AC98). Of the remaining eight Hammersmith and Fulham wards, the Commission proposed that seven be joined with three Ealing wards to form a Hammersmith and Acton constituency (IPs, paragraph 47). This proposal received a mixed reaction. While supported by some respondents, others objected on two principal grounds: the omission of College Park and Old Oak ward (which the Commission placed in a Willesden constituency), and the separation of the three Ealing wards from adjacent Acton wards which the Commission proposed should be in an Ealing constituency.

AC111 With regard to College Park and Old Oak ward, a significant number of respondents, including Andrew Slaughter MP (IP/023978), local councillors, and local residents, strongly opposed the proposal to place this ward in a Willesden constituency. The ward is crossed and bounded by several major roads and railway lines, and it contains Wormwood Scrubs park, a prison, Hammersmith Hospital, Linford Christie Stadium, and an industrial estate. Consequently, the electorate is distributed in relatively distinct areas around the peripheries to the north adjacent to Brent, to the south adjacent to Hammersmith, to the east adjacent to Kensington, and to the west adjacent to Ealing.

AC112 College Park and Old Oak ward is within Hammersmith and Fulham, and is in the existing Hammersmith constituency, with nine other Hammersmith and Fulham wards. Those factors taken on their own would point towards including this ward in a constituency with other Hammersmith and Fulham wards. However, the representations show that, while parts of this ward have strong ties with Hammersmith and

Fulham, other parts have ties with Brent, Kensington, and Ealing.

AC113 It would not be possible to move College Park and Old Oak ward without making a number of consequential alterations to other constituencies, each of which would have its own implications. For example, Philip Portwood, on behalf of the Labour Party and supported by Stephen Pound MP and Virendra Sharma MP (IP/023245), put forward a counter-proposal to move College Park and Old Oak into the proposed Hammersmith and Acton constituency, to move Acton Central ward to an Ealing constituency, and to move Hanger Hill ward to a Brent-based constituency. The suggestion that Hanger Hill ward be moved in this way has, in turn, generated significant opposition on the grounds that it would break established ties. Further, Mr Portwood's counter-proposal would not be confined to moving those three wards. There would have to be consequential changes to the Commission's proposals for Willesden, Wembley, and elsewhere. We are not satisfied that the aggregate of these changes would better reflect the statutory factors than the Commission's proposals, which many respondents have supported.

AC114 The final submissions of the Cabinet of Hammersmith and Fulham Borough (CR/004055) articulate the dilemma posed by the characteristics of College Park and Old Oak ward. They refer to the difficulty which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England found with this ward being situated in the north of the borough and bounded on each side by different boroughs and largely separated from the rest of Hammersmith and Fulham by the very busy A40 highway. They draw attention to the number of registered electors in the four distinct parts of the ward and recognise that any proposed alignment will

inevitably create difficulties. While recognising that this ward is integrated with Hammersmith and Fulham in terms of history and local government, they do not accept that it is integrated with Hammersmith and Fulham alone in terms of economy, geography, and local ties. We also note that the Conservative Party supports the Commission's proposed constituency. We find ourselves in agreement with the view that, on balance, the Commission's solution is appropriate. We therefore recommend that the Commission's proposal for a Hammersmith and Acton constituency be adopted, and that this name would be appropriate.

AC115 In Brent, the Commission proposed a Willesden constituency comprising nine Brent wards and one Hammersmith ward. This proposal is similar to the existing Brent Central constituency, but with the inclusion of the Brent ward of Brondesbury Park, and the exclusion of the Tokyngton ward in Brent, and also with the inclusion of the Hammersmith and Fulham ward of College Park and Old Oak. Our decision in relation to College Park and Old Oak ward has been explained above in the context of our recommended Hammersmith and Acton constituency (see paragraph AC114). Apart from that ward, the Commission's Willesden constituency generally received support. The Conservative Party, the Cabinet of Hammersmith and Fulham Borough, and Councillor Christopher Leaman (IP/016775) were among those who agreed with the proposal. We recommend that it be adopted. We consider that the name proposed by the Commission is appropriate to the location of wards included, and consequently that Willesden should be adopted.

AC116 The Commission proposed a Wembley and Perivale constituency, comprising seven Brent wards and one Ealing ward. This would

not include the three wards in the north of Brent (Kenton, Fryent, and Queensbury). A significant number of respondents, including the Conservative Party and local councillors, have explained that these three wards have stronger ties with other Brent wards than with Harrow wards, and we have therefore decided that they should be included in this constituency. We have also decided that three wards included in this constituency by the Commission should be moved to other constituencies on the grounds that they have stronger ties to those constituencies. These are Northwick Park ward, which should be moved to a Harrow West constituency (see paragraph AC118), and Perivale and Sudbury wards, which should be moved to a Greenford and Northolt constituency (see paragraph AC121). This would result in a constituency comprising eight Brent wards, as proposed in the counter-proposal of Peter Whitehead (IP/019603). Having decided that Perivale ward should not be part of this constituency, we have decided that the name proposed by the Commission should be changed to Wembley.

AC117 The Commission proposed a Stanmore constituency, comprising seven Harrow wards and two Brent wards. As explained in paragraph AC116, we have decided that the two Brent wards (Fryent and Queensbury) should be moved into a Wembley constituency. We have also decided that three Harrow wards (Kenton East, Kenton West, and Marlborough) should be part of this constituency, which would then comprise ten Harrow wards. It would be the same as the existing constituency, with the addition of Marlborough ward, as proposed by Peter Whitehead. We note that the Labour Party emphasised the ties between Marlborough ward and Wealdstone ward in this constituency. As the constituency would remain largely unchanged, the existing name should be kept, that is Harrow East.

AC118 The Commission proposed a Harrow constituency, comprising nine Harrow wards and one Brent ward. This proposal would separate Headstone North and Headstone South wards from other Harrow wards. Many respondents, including Bob Blackman MP (IP/021125), Councillor Stephen Greek (Brent public hearing, Day 1, pp 23–25), and local residents opposed this separation, on the grounds that it would break local ties. The existing Harrow West constituency comprises Greenhill, Harrow on the Hill, Headstone North, Headstone South, Marlborough, Rayners Lane, Roxbourne, Roxeth, and West Harrow wards. Apart from Marlborough (see paragraph AC117), we have decided that these wards should be kept together, with the addition of the Harrow ward of Hatch End and the Brent ward of Northwick Park, to satisfy the electorate range. A number of respondents explained that Hatch End has ties with Harrow, and especially with Headstone North and South. A number of respondents, including Bob Blackman MP, explained that Northwick Park has ties with Harrow. This constituency would then comprise nine Harrow wards and one Brent ward, as proposed by Peter Whitehead. As the constituency would remain largely unchanged, the existing name should be kept, that is Harrow West.

AC119 The Commission proposed a Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency, comprising five Harrow wards and five Hillingdon wards. This would be similar to the existing constituency of the same name, except that it would include the Harrow wards of Headstone North and Headstone South, and the Hillingdon ward of Ickenham. As explained in paragraph AC118, we have decided that Headstone North and Headstone South wards should be in a Harrow West constituency. We have decided that the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency should include three

additional Hillingdon wards (Cavendish, Manor, and South Ruislip), and that it should not include Harefield ward in Hillingdon. This would keep the whole of Ruislip together, using the A40 mainly as the southern boundary. It would result in a constituency comprising seven Hillingdon wards and two Harrow wards, as proposed by Peter Whitehead. Although we have recommended ward changes from the constituency proposed by the Commission, we consider that the name proposed by the Commission continues to reflect the location of the wards to be included, and that Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner should be adopted.

AC120 The Commission proposed an Ealing constituency, comprising nine Ealing Borough wards. This proposal received support from a number of respondents, including Angie Bray MP (IP/012656) and members of the public. However, as mentioned above (paragraphs AC113–AC114), some respondents have contended that the allocation of Central Acton and East Acton wards to a Hammersmith and Acton constituency would break local ties within Acton. While these Acton wards are together in the existing constituency, the need to meet the electorate range for all constituencies makes changes inevitable. We have not been persuaded that any alternative arrangement from that proposed by the Commission would keep these wards together while better reflecting the statutory factors over a wider area. Consequently, we recommend that the Commission's Ealing constituency should be adopted. A number of respondents have suggested alternative names, such as Ealing Central, or Ealing and Hanwell. As there will be other constituencies containing some Ealing wards, and as this constituency would contain the centre of the Borough of Ealing, we consider that the name should be Ealing Central.

AC121 The Commission proposed a Greenford and Northolt constituency, comprising six Ealing wards and two Hillingdon wards (Barnhill and Yeading). A significant number of respondents, including Hillingdon Council (IP/021208), explained that, by separating Barnhill and Yeading from Charville and other Hillingdon wards, the Commission's proposal would break local ties. We have decided that Barnhill and Yeading wards should not be included in this constituency, but that the Ealing ward of Perivale should be in this constituency, in order that its ties with other Ealing wards should not be broken. Six out of the eight wards of the existing Ealing North constituency (including Perivale) would then remain together, with the River Brent forming the southern boundary. To satisfy the electorate range, we have decided that Sudbury ward should be added, so that this constituency would comprise seven Ealing wards and one Brent ward, as proposed by Peter Whitehead. As Mr Whitehead emphasised, there are links between Sudbury and North Greenford wards. We consider that the name Greenford and Northolt, proposed by the Commission, properly reflects the location of the wards included, and so we recommend it.

AC122 In Hounslow, the Commission noted that the borough was too large for two constituencies (IPs, paragraph 54). The Commission proposed to reduce the electorate of the existing Brentford and Isleworth constituency by including one ward (Hounslow Heath) in a Teddington and Hanworth constituency. There have been relatively few representations about this proposal. Of the representations that have been made, a number, including by the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, supported the Commission's proposal. Among the competing counter-proposals, we have found no

representations that better reflect a balance between the statutory factors across London than the Commission's proposal. We recommend that the Commission's proposal be adopted. Although representations have been made by, among others, the Conservative Party and Mary Macleod MP (IP/006160) that the name should include reference to Chiswick, we recommend the name Brentford and Isleworth, as the existing constituency of that name would remain largely unchanged.

AC123 The Commission proposed a Southall and Heston constituency, comprising four wards from the existing Ealing, Southall constituency, and five Hounslow wards from the existing Feltham and Heston constituency. There have been relatively few representations about this proposal. Of those that were made, a number supported the Commission, including those by the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. We have found no counter-proposals that strike a better balance of the statutory factors than the Commission's proposal. We recommend the Commission's proposal, with the name Southall and Heston, as reflecting the main population centres.

AC124 As a result of our decisions described above, the London Borough of Ealing would fall across four constituencies, as compared with five in the Commission's proposals.

AC125 The Commission proposed an Uxbridge and South Ruislip constituency, comprising nine Hillingdon wards. This proposal was supported by, among others, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. Hillingdon Council welcomed the inclusion of Ickenham ward and the linking of Charville and Hillingdon East wards. There were few other representations specifically about the Commission's proposal. However, it is affected by our decisions in relation to other, adjacent constituencies.

We have decided (as explained in paragraph AC119) that Cavendish, Manor, and South Ruislip wards should be in a Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency, and not in this constituency, as was proposed by the Commission. In addition, our recommended Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency would not include Harefield ward, as was proposed by the Commission. We have decided that Harefield ward should join the remaining wards of the Commission's proposal to form an Uxbridge-based constituency. There have been a number of representations that the Hillingdon wards of Yiewsley and West Drayton, which are separated in the existing constituencies, should be brought together (for example, John McDonnell MP IP/023067 and Jenny Howard IP/011588). Although Hillingdon Council (IP/021046 and IP/021208) was content that they should be linked with Feltham, we have decided that these two wards should be added to the Uxbridge constituency to form a constituency comprising nine Hillingdon wards, as proposed by Peter Whitehead.

AC126 In light of the changes to the Commission's proposal for this constituency that we have decided to recommend, the name proposed by the Commission would not be appropriate. The changes would result in a constituency largely made up of Uxbridge wards. We have decided that the name Uxbridge, as suggested by Mr Whitehead, should be adopted.

AC127 The Commission proposed a Feltham and Hayes constituency, comprising six Hillingdon wards and three Hounslow wards. This proposal was supported by a number of respondents, including the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, but it gave rise to a significant amount of objection. A number of respondents, including Alan Boyd (IP/008648),

Councillor Colin Ellar (Brent public hearing, Day 2, pp 6-10), John McDonnell MP (CR/001771), and Graham Tomlin (IP/015585) objected to a constituency in principle which crosses Heathrow Airport: that is, a constituency which includes wards both south and north of Heathrow Villages ward (which includes the airport). A constituency containing the airport and wards from a neighbouring borough was supported in principle by Hillingdon Council, but it was among a number of respondents who said that the Commission's proposal was wrong to put Feltham and Hayes together, because there are no links between them. A number of respondents, including Councillor Colin Ellar and Mark Savage (IP/015191), said that the Commission's proposal would break local ties by not including Hanworth Park ward, because this contains a significant part of Feltham town centre. We have not found an acceptable way of accommodating all the points of objection raised by respondents.

AC128 As explained in paragraph AC125 we agree with those respondents who argued that Yiewsley and West Drayton wards should not be in a Feltham constituency, and we have decided that they should form part of a constituency with Uxbridge wards. We also explained in paragraph AC121 that Barnhill and Yeading wards should not be in a Greenford and Northolt constituency. Some respondents, including John McDonnell MP and Hillingdon Council, contended that these two wards have ties with Charville and other Hillingdon wards to the west, but they could not be added to Uxbridge within the electorate range. We have therefore decided that they should be in a constituency with other wards in Hillingdon. We recommend a Feltham and Hayes constituency containing six Hillingdon wards and three Hounslow wards, as proposed by Peter Whitehead. In light of our recommendation, this constituency would

include wards both from Feltham and from Hayes, but the changes from the Commission's proposal that we have recommended would bring in more Hillingdon wards. For that reason, we consider that it would be appropriate to name this constituency Hayes and Feltham. A small number of respondents suggested that the name should instead refer to Heathrow, but our recommended name would better describe the main population centres.

AC129 As a result of our decisions described above, Hillingdon wards would fall across three constituencies, as compared with four in the Commission's proposals.

AC130 The Commission proposed a Richmond and Twickenham constituency that crosses the River Thames. This comprises the six Richmond upon Thames wards of the existing Richmond Park constituency, with the addition of four Twickenham wards, also in the borough, to satisfy the electorate range. A number of respondents supported this proposal, including the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. There have been few objections to this constituency as such, although the consequences of including the four Twickenham wards gave rise to a large number of representations in relation to Teddington and Hanworth.

AC131 David Rossiter and his colleagues proposed an alternative crossing of the River Thames, between Battersea and Pimlico. Their proposal for a Battersea and Victoria constituency would link six Wandsworth wards with three Westminster wards. By avoiding a river crossing at Richmond, this counter-proposal would, among other things, avoid the objections to the Commission's proposed Teddington and Hanworth constituency (see paragraphs AC136-AC138).

AC132 In the secondary consultation period, the Liberal Democrats supported a Battersea and Victoria constituency, but recognised that it would be a constituency made up of disparate parts, created for the purpose of a better pattern of constituencies in Richmond upon Thames and the surrounding areas. We did not discover much other support among respondents for crossing the River Thames in central London.

AC133 We are firmly of the view that a Battersea and Victoria constituency would not represent an appropriate balance of the statutory factors. The crossing of the River Thames proposed by the Commission would be within Richmond upon Thames, a borough which itself crosses the river. The River Thames is a significant physical barrier between Battersea and Pimlico. A Battersea and Victoria constituency would cross borough boundaries. It would not reflect existing constituency boundaries, and it would break ties between the three Westminster wards and adjacent wards.

AC134 A number of respondents, notably Kevin Larkin and Peter Smyth, made counter-proposals that avoided a constituency crossing the River Thames. We found that the decision on whether to recommend the Commission's proposal for a Richmond and Twickenham constituency or to endorse one of the counter-proposals in which no constituency crosses the River Thames was finely balanced. Each would involve some disruption to existing local ties. In recommending a Richmond and Twickenham constituency, we have had regard to the statutory factors across London as a whole, and have considered the representations in the context of making London-wide recommendations. On this approach, we have preferred constituencies across the region (combining North and South London) that

result in crossing the River Thames between Richmond and Twickenham to counter-proposals that do not contain a constituency that crosses the River Thames. We recognise that this would have consequences in the vicinity of Twickenham and Feltham, in that local ties would be broken (see paragraphs AC136–AC137). However, we have decided that our recommendation enables a better fit of the statutory factors in London as a whole.

AC135 We therefore recommend a constituency of Richmond and Twickenham, as proposed by the Commission. The Commission's proposal accurately reflects the two principal elements of the constituency either side of the River Thames, and we recommend the name Richmond and Twickenham.

AC136 The Commission proposed a Teddington and Hanworth constituency, comprising seven Richmond upon Thames wards and three Hounslow wards. A number of respondents supported this proposal, including the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, and a number of local residents, but it gave rise to a large number of objections. Some respondents, including Dr Rossiter and his colleagues, considered that the existing Twickenham constituency should remain unaltered. Some respondents, including local residents, contended that the Commission's proposal would break local ties by separating Hanworth Park ward from other Feltham wards. We noted, among others, the counter-proposal of Dr Rossiter and his colleagues, which would keep Hanworth Park in a Feltham constituency.

AC137 A number of respondents, including local residents, contended that Teddington should not be linked with the Hanworth wards, as proposed, since they are in a different borough and have different characteristics.

Some respondents contended that Whitton ward, which contains Twickenham rugby stadium and Twickenham Academy, should not be separated from other Twickenham wards, as was proposed by the Commission. We recognise that, taken on their own, each of these points has some force. However, our task is to apply the statutory factors in a balanced manner across London. We do not consider that any of the counter-proposals reflect a better balance of the statutory factors than the Commission's proposal.

AC138 We recommend, therefore, a Teddington and Hanworth constituency, as proposed by the Commission. A number of respondents have suggested that the name of this constituency should be, or should include, Hampton or Hampton Court. We do not consider that Hampton Court would be appropriate, but we do recognise that Hampton is a significant area between Hanworth and Teddington and that the boundaries between these places are not precise. We do not agree that the word Hampton should simply be added to Teddington and Hanworth, but we have decided that this constituency would be appropriately named Hampton, and we recommend this name.

### ***South Thames***

AC139 In the south Thames sub-region, we have found the counter-proposal submitted by Adam Gray to be the most useful in helping to balance the statutory factors across the sub-region and across London as a whole. We have reflected a significant number of his proposals in our recommendations, but have not adopted his proposals without amendment.

AC140 We start in South East London. The Commission's proposals divided the 22 wards making up Bromley across three

constituencies: Orpington, Bromley and Chislehurst, and Beckenham (IPs, paragraph 59). None of these are identical to existing constituencies, but in each case the constituency includes a majority of the wards from the existing constituency of the same name. The Commission proposed that the names should remain the same. The three constituencies would lie entirely within the borough boundary. The existing Lewisham West and Penge constituency would be divided between three of the Commission's proposed constituencies.

AC141 A substantial majority of respondents, including, notably, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrats, the London Borough of Bromley (IP/019244), and a number of local MPs and MEPs, strongly supported the Commission's proposal to create three constituencies wholly within the borough boundary. Local residents and community groups also supported the proposal, welcoming in particular the intention to link the wards of Cray Valley East and Cray Valley West together in a constituency with Orpington. Mr Larkin noted that there are more than 30 ways of combining the Bromley wards into three constituencies within the electoral range. He considered the combination chosen by the Commission to be the best of these.

AC142 The Labour Party, on the other hand, suggested that respecting the Bromley borough boundary imposed unreasonable restrictions on the creation of constituencies elsewhere in South London. The Labour Party and several members of the public also contended that the existing cross-borough constituency of Lewisham West and Penge should be preserved, not least because it was recently created. In balancing the statutory factors, we have given weight to having three constituencies within the borough boundary,

and have also concluded that it is not necessary to cross it in order to accommodate desirable changes elsewhere. We therefore recommend the Commission's proposed constituencies of Orpington, Bromley and Chislehurst, and Beckenham. We agree also with the names proposed by the Commission. There were a small number of representations in favour of using the name Beckenham and Penge, to acknowledge the northern part of the constituency currently within the Lewisham West and Penge constituency. However, this did not command widespread support.

AC143 In Greenwich, the Commission proposed a Deptford and Greenwich constituency, to include wards from Lewisham and Greenwich. The Conservative Party supported the proposed constituency, arguing that Deptford and Greenwich were linked historically. It also highlighted the advantages of including the Blackheath ward (in Lewisham) in a constituency with the Greenwich West and Blackheath Westcombe wards (both in Greenwich), given the shared responsibility between the two boroughs for the heath itself and broader local ties. Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats agreed, as did many local residents and civic organisations.

AC144 The Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats, the Royal Borough of Greenwich (IP/O23273), and a significant number of community groups and local residents objected to the Commission linking Greenwich with Deptford, commenting that the proposed constituency divided the two wards that form Greenwich town centre (Greenwich West and Peninsula). A number of respondents, notably the Labour Party, Kevin Larkin, Peter Smyth, Dr Rossiter and his colleagues, and the Royal Borough of Greenwich, proposed that Greenwich town centre be placed in a Woolwich constituency, wholly within the

Greenwich borough boundary and reflecting closely the boundary of the existing Greenwich and Woolwich constituency, as well as keeping the link with Blackheath ward.

AC145 We conclude that there are strong grounds for keeping together the wards that make up Greenwich town centre. The counter-proposals that were put forward for a Greenwich and Woolwich constituency would also involve either a change to the pattern of constituencies in Bromley, or a significant change to the River Thames crossing, or both. As we have already explained, we have preferred not to adopt either of these changes (see paragraphs AC134 and AC140–AC142).

AC146 As proposed by Adam Gray, we recommend a Greenwich and Lewisham Central constituency, comprising Greenwich West, Peninsula, and Blackheath Westcombe wards from Greenwich, and Blackheath, Lewisham Central, Lee Green, Rushey Green, and Catford South wards from Lewisham. This would keep together the two Greenwich town centre wards, and would link them to the two Blackheath wards, as many respondents urged, while also preserving the Commission's proposals for Bromley and for the crossing of the River Thames in a Richmond and Twickenham constituency. It also enables us to create neighbouring constituencies in the boroughs of Greenwich and Bexley that successfully resolve concerns about local ties that would be broken by the Commission's initial proposals. Adam Gray proposed the name Greenwich and Lewisham. We prefer the name Greenwich and Lewisham Central, as both describing a main population centre in Lewisham and indicating that the constituency does not cover the whole of that borough.

AC147 The initial proposals placed Thamesmead Moorings ward in a Woolwich

constituency and Thamesmead East ward in an Erith constituency by observing the borough boundary between Bexley and Greenwich. Many respondents objected to this division of the Thamesmead wards, both of which are in the existing Erith and Thamesmead constituency. The Labour Party, Teresa Pearce MP (Lewisham public hearing, Day 1, pp 10-12), the Board of Trust Thamesmead (IP/014371), and a number of local councillors considered that dividing these two wards would break important local ties.

AC148 Objections were also raised by the Labour Party and Teresa Pearce MP to the separation of Abbey Wood and Lesnes Abbey wards, which are likewise in the existing Erith and Thamesmead constituency and likewise were placed in different constituencies in the initial proposals. Ms Pearce stressed that the residents of these wards have strong local ties. In the light of the many representations that the Commission's initial proposals would break local ties, we have decided that the wards of Thamesmead East, Thamesmead Moorings, Abbey Wood, and Lesnes Abbey should be together in one constituency. Although this involves a constituency that crosses the boundary between Bexley and Greenwich, we note that the existing Erith and Thamesmead constituency likewise crosses the boundary.

AC149 Some respondents highlighted the ties between Glyndon ward and Thamesmead. Many local residents urged us to recognise the links between Plumstead and Glyndon wards, and, to a lesser extent, Shooters Hill ward. The Royal Borough of Greenwich, among others, suggested that these three wards make up the area commonly regarded as Plumstead, and their shared interests would be best served by their being together in one constituency. We therefore recommend a constituency that includes Thamesmead East and Lesnes Abbey

from Bexley, and Thamesmead Moorings, Abbey Wood, Plumstead, Glyndon, Shooters Hill, and Woolwich Common from Greenwich, as proposed by Adam Gray. He names the constituency Woolwich, but we prefer the name Thamesmead and Plumstead as reflecting the main population centres. We also consider that Woolwich would not be appropriate, as Woolwich town centre would not be contained in this constituency.

AC150 We have decided that the remaining wards in Greenwich should form an Eltham and Charlton constituency, containing all five Eltham wards, together with Kidbrooke with Hornfair, Charlton, and Woolwich Riverside wards in the north of the borough. This enables us to keep most of the Charlton area in one constituency, which was a concern of several respondents, including John Galloway (IP/006193), the Charlton Society (IP/018684), and Clive Efford MP (IP/023786), albeit that these respondents also made other suggestions that we have not followed. Our proposed name for the constituency reflects the main population centres and retains a reference to the existing Eltham constituency.

AC151 Our recommendation for an Eltham and Charlton constituency would also avoid crossing from Greenwich into Bexley, as was initially proposed by the Commission in its Eltham constituency. Although there were some supportive responses, this proposed borough crossing provoked considerable opposition from local residents on both sides of the boundary. The Labour Party expressed strong objections, and Clive Efford MP highlighted the strength of the existing constituency boundary (reflecting not only borough boundaries but also the former division between London and Kent), the limited number of cross-borough access routes, and

the division of residential areas on either side of the boundary.

AC152 In making this recommendation, we have again adopted proposals put forward by Adam Gray. Our proposed constituency would also have some similarities to a proposal from the Labour Party for a revised Eltham constituency heading north to the River Thames through Plumstead, which we found to have some merit. However, the Labour Party's proposal was not consistent with our wider recommendations for the sub-region, and we also noted the Conservative Party's disagreement with the suggestion that Eltham and Plumstead should be united (CR/003948).

AC153 We recognise that our recommendations result in the Woolwich area being split between two constituencies, but we have not found it possible to avoid this while balancing the statutory factors across London as a whole.

AC154 We have already noted the many objections raised to the inclusion of Bexley wards (Falconwood and Welling, and Blackfen and Lamorbey) in the Commission's proposed Eltham constituency. A large number of responses were also critical of the wider impact of the initial proposals on Welling town centre wards (Falconwood and Welling, East Wickham, St Michael's, and Danson Park), effectively dividing four wards between three constituencies (Eltham, Erith, and Bexleyheath and Sidcup). Although the Liberal Democrats endorsed the Commission's proposals, both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party made proposals that better retained the unity of Welling.

AC155 The Conservative Party's suggestion was an exchange of two wards, moving Danson Park ward into the Commission's proposed Erith constituency and North End ward into the

proposed Bexleyheath and Sidcup constituency. This would avoid the three-way division of Welling by putting three of the town centre wards in the Erith constituency, leaving only one outside (Falconwood and Welling). It would also keep together North End and Crayford wards. This proposal won support from a significant number of local residents, including a petition. The proposal was also echoed in submissions from David Evennett MP (IP/006163), James Brokenshire MP (IP/023262 and CR/004022), and the London Borough of Bexley (CR/004470). The Labour Party opposed the Conservative approach, which it said would break the ties between Danson Park and Christchurch wards, and between North End and Colyers wards (although we note that their own proposal would do the same in respect of the second point).

AC156 The Labour Party proposed instead bringing together all four Welling town centre wards as part of the wider pattern of changes that it proposed in South East London. This proposal was opposed by both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats, primarily because of the wider consequences, including the need to have a Bromley constituency with Bexley wards. Other respondents, including Adrian Bailey, Adam Gray, Kevin Larkin, and Peter Smyth, also made proposals designed better to protect existing local ties in and around Welling.

AC157 We accept that the initial proposals would break local ties by dividing Welling town centre three ways. Balancing the statutory factors across London as a whole, we recommend a Sidcup and Welling constituency, comprising Falconwood and Welling, Danson Park, East Wickham, St Michael's, Blendon and Penhill, Blackfen and Lamorbey, Longlands, Cray Meadows, and Sidcup wards. All these wards are in Bexley. Our recommendation

avoids dividing Welling town centre between three constituencies and, in doing so, brings together all four town centre wards. Our proposed name for the constituency reflects the main population centres and retains the reference to Sidcup from the existing Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency.

AC158 The remaining Bexley wards would then come together in a new Bexleyheath and Erith constituency, including six of the wards in the Commission's proposed Erith constituency, and a further four wards to the south of the borough. We noted that a number of responses raised concerns about dividing the area of Bexleyheath between two constituencies (Christchurch and Barnehurst wards in Bexleyheath and Sidcup, and Brampton ward in Erith). All three wards are in the existing Bexleyheath and Crayford constituency. The approach we have taken would keep together Bexleyheath town centre wards, and would resolve concerns raised by the Conservative Party, Labour Party, and others that the Commission's proposals would separate North End ward from Crayford ward. The local ties between North End ward and Colyers ward would also be retained. We have not found it possible to avoid breaking local ties in both Welling and Bexleyheath town centres while also keeping Danson Park and Christchurch wards together. Our proposed name for the constituency reflects the main population centres; both Bexleyheath and Erith are included in the names of existing constituencies.

AC159 In Lewisham, the Commission proposed a Lewisham and Catford constituency, made up of eight wards to the south and east of the borough (IPs, paragraph 61). We also recommend a constituency in the south of the borough, but we have preferred a different combination of wards to fit with our earlier

proposal for a Greenwich and Lewisham Central constituency. We recommend, therefore, a Lewisham South constituency, containing Grove Park, Whitefoot, Downham, Bellingham, Sydenham, Perry Vale, Forest Hill, and Crofton Park wards, which are all in Lewisham. In making this recommendation, we have again adopted proposals put forward by Adam Gray. The recommendation addresses the concerns of some respondents, including the Labour Party, that Bellingham ward should be kept with Sydenham, rather than joined with Catford.

AC160 Although there was support from the Conservative Party and a number of other respondents for linking Lewisham wards with Dulwich, as was initially proposed by the Commission, the Labour Party and other respondents highlighted the geographical barriers separating the two areas. In any case, we have not found it possible to retain the Commission's proposed Dulwich and Sydenham constituency and at the same time minimise the risk that local ties would be broken in other parts of South East London.

AC161 The five remaining Lewisham wards were originally included in the Commission's proposed Deptford and Greenwich constituency (IPs, paragraph 60), which we have decided not to adopt. We recommend that these Lewisham wards should instead be included in a Deptford and Rotherhithe constituency, comprising New Cross, Brockley, Ladywell, Telegraph Hill, and Evelyn wards (in Lewisham), and Rotherhithe, Surrey Docks, South Bermondsey, and Livesey wards (in Southwark).

AC162 In making this recommendation, we have taken account of the Labour Party's proposal for a constituency that would cross the boundary of Lewisham and Southwark in

the Deptford area. However, we also noted that a number of respondents objected to the Labour Party's proposed separation of Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks wards (the eastern and western halves of the Rotherhithe area). We have preferred the proposal from Adam Gray, which keeps these wards together. He names this constituency Deptford. We have preferred the name Deptford and Rotherhithe as a better reflection of the main population centres and the cross-borough nature of the constituency.

AC163 Moving along the river in Southwark, the Commission proposed a Bermondsey and Waterloo constituency, containing eight wards from the existing constituency of Bermondsey and Old Southwark, and one ward (Bishop's) from the existing Vauxhall constituency in Lambeth (IPs, paragraph 62). The Commission's proposal was supported by all the Parliamentary parties, although the Liberal Democrats suggested that the name be changed to Bermondsey and The South Bank.

AC164 A number of representations from individuals and community organisations objected to separating Bishop's ward from other Lambeth wards, including Waterloo Action Centre (IP/016288), South Bank Employers' Group (IP/018307), Iain Tuckett on behalf of Coin Street Community Builders (Kensington public hearing, Day 1, pp 45-50), and a petition of 26 residents (CR/004484). The Liberal Democrats were sympathetic to this concern, but concluded that there was no better alternative. We agree with this view. Balancing the statutory factors across several constituencies, we have found it is not possible to avoid linking Bishop's ward with Southwark wards without significant consequences for much of South London. We also found that this particular orphan ward is part of a cohesive

community with the neighbouring Cathedrals ward across the borough boundary.

AC165 We recommend a Bermondsey and South Bank constituency, comprising Bishop's ward from Lambeth and eight wards from Southwark (Camberwell Green, Cathedrals, Chaucer, East Walworth, Faraday, Grange, Newington, and Riverside). The recommendation reflects a proposal from Adam Gray. It varies by two wards from the Commission's initial proposal, in order to accommodate changes made elsewhere in Southwark. Adam Gray proposed the name Bermondsey, but we agree with the Liberal Democrats that including a reference to the South Bank would better reflect the geographical reach of the constituency and would best describe the area spanning the borough boundary.

AC166 The remaining Southwark wards would then form a Dulwich and Peckham constituency, comprising Brunswick Park, College, East Dulwich, Nunhead, Peckham, Peckham Rye, South Camberwell, The Lane, and Village wards, as proposed by Adam Gray. This would differ slightly from the Commission's initial proposal for a Camberwell and Peckham constituency (IPs, paragraph 62), in order to accommodate our recommendations elsewhere in South London. We accept the evidence from Dame Tessa Jowell MP (Lewisham Public Hearing, Day 1, pp 15-17) that Dulwich wards have strong links with Peckham and Camberwell. We have been able to keep together six of the wards that make up the existing Camberwell and Peckham constituency, while also respecting the local ties between East Dulwich, Village, and College wards. We note that several West Norwood residents responding to the initial consultation were keen to keep the ties with Dulwich that are reflected in the existing constituency of

Dulwich and West Norwood. However, we have been unable to achieve this while balancing the statutory factors across South London. The name Dulwich and Peckham has been proposed for the new constituency by Adam Gray. We recommend it.

AC167 In Wandsworth and Lambeth, the Commission proposed three shared constituencies running east to west: Clapham Common (three Lambeth wards and five Wandsworth wards), Streatham and Tooting (four Lambeth wards and four Wandsworth wards), and Battersea and Vauxhall (four Lambeth wards and four Wandsworth wards). Under the Commission's proposals, the remaining Wandsworth wards would be contained in a Putney constituency, together with Wimbledon Park ward in Merton to satisfy the electorate range. In Lambeth, the remaining wards would be divided between three constituencies. A Brixton constituency would be made up wholly of Lambeth wards. Bishop's ward would be part of a Bermondsey constituency (as discussed in paragraphs AC163–AC165), and Streatham South ward would be part of a Mitcham constituency, otherwise made up of Merton wards.

AC168 The Commission's proposal for Putney (IPs, paragraph 67) was generally supported, with few objections. Among others, endorsement came from the three Parliamentary parties and Wandsworth Council (IP/010436). We recognise that some local residents in Wimbledon Park ward disagreed with the proposal, as failing to reflect their ties to the wider Wimbledon area. The Putney Labour Party (IP/010612) also objected to the inclusion of Wimbledon Park ward in the new constituency. Nevertheless, Councillor Oonagh Moulton (IP/018395) submitted, on behalf of the local councillors who currently represent the Wimbledon Park ward, that it had much in

common with Putney. She noted that the councillors had no objection to the proposal and could see merits. We also note the continuous residential development between Wimbledon Park ward and the Southfields ward in Wandsworth. A number of other respondents observed that linking Wimbledon Park to Putney would provide the best option for ensuring compliance with the electoral quota. We concur with this view.

AC169 We recommend the Commission's proposed Putney constituency, subject to one change. We consider that Fairfield ward should be in a Battersea and Vauxhall constituency, and note that several respondents, such as Lydia Harding (IP/000149) and Peter Wolstenholme (Wandsworth public hearing, Day 1, pp 66–67), objected to its inclusion in a Putney constituency, as it would break local ties and would not respect the boundary of the existing Battersea constituency. This change would also enable us to recommend wider changes in Wandsworth and Lambeth (see paragraphs AC177–AC184). In place of Fairfield ward, we would include Earlsfield ward from Wandsworth, noting the continuous residential development between here and the Southfields ward in Putney. Therefore the wards making up the Putney constituency would be: East Putney, Earlsfield, Roehampton and Putney Heath, Southfields, Thamesfield, West Hill, and West Putney (in Wandsworth) and Wimbledon Park (in Merton). We do not consider it necessary to change the constituency name proposed by the Commission.

AC170 The proposed Brixton constituency (IPs, paragraph 68) also had widespread support among respondents, including, notably, the three Parliamentary parties and Lambeth Council (IP/023235). A number of responses objected to the inclusion of Larkhall ward, on the basis that it has local ties with

Clapham or Stockwell, rather than with Brixton. Some, including Kevin Craig (Wandsworth public hearing, Day 2, pp 25–27), made proposals for keeping Larkhall ward with other wards of the existing Vauxhall constituency in the context of the Commission's proposals. However, these suggestions are not consistent with our wider recommendations, and we have not identified a way to keep Larkhall with other Vauxhall wards without its place being taken in the Brixton constituency by another Vauxhall ward. We also note the explanation provided by Glyn Chambers (IP/018311) that Larkhall ward is split between two areas with approximately half identifying themselves with, and living geographically close to, Brixton.

AC171 Some respondents, including a group of local councillors led by Matthew Bennett (IP/022203), objected to the separation of Thurlow Park ward (included in the proposed Brixton constituency) from Gipsy Hill and Knight's Hill wards (included in the proposed Streatham and Tooting constituency). They point out that these three wards have been together as part of a Parliamentary constituency for at least 130 years and that the proposed constituency boundary would divide the West Norwood area. We recognise these concerns, but we consider that alternative proposals to address them would not balance the statutory factors to the same extent as the Commission's proposal.

AC172 We recommend the Commission's proposed Brixton constituency. It comprises Brixton Hill, Coldharbour, Ferndale, Larkhall, Herne Hill, Thurlow Park, Tulse Hill, and Vassall wards. We noted that a small number of respondents advocated including reference to Herne Hill alongside Brixton in the constituency name. However, this suggestion did not command widespread support, and we consider that Brixton accurately reflects the

main population centre. We therefore recommend the name Brixton, as proposed by the Commission.

AC173 The Commission's proposals for three cross-borough Wandsworth and Lambeth constituencies (IPs, paragraph 68) met with a mixed response. Both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party initially endorsed all three constituencies. During the secondary consultation period, the Conservative Party also supported a proposal from Keith Hill, former MP for Streatham (IP/020866), for a limited number of changes to the Commission's proposals. The Liberal Democrats opposed all three cross-borough constituencies from the outset, largely because they considered that the Commission was wrong to link Streatham (in Lambeth) and Tooting (in Wandsworth). They observed that the two areas are divided by Tooting Bec Common, with poor road and public transport links, and contended that the constituencies should follow established north-south transport routes instead. Their counter-proposal would retain much of the proposed Battersea and Vauxhall constituency, but would create three new cross-borough constituencies across Croydon and Merton, as well as across Lambeth and Wandsworth.

AC174 The Commission proposed to divide Streatham between three new constituencies. Under its proposals, Streatham Hill ward would be part of a Clapham Common constituency. St Leonard's ward and Streatham Wells ward would be in a Streatham and Tooting constituency. Streatham South ward would be the only Lambeth ward in the Merton-based Mitcham constituency. Significant numbers of residents, local councillors, and civic organisations made submissions in favour of keeping the town wards in one constituency. Campaigners emphasised the strong local ties across these wards, and observed that

Streatham South, in particular, provided the focus of the community's leisure activities. Very significant numbers of residents signed petitions calling for Streatham wards to be kept together (IP/018239).

AC175 Wandsworth Council accepted the initial proposals in broad terms, while noting the disruption to existing community loyalties likely to be caused and the practical difficulties created by cross-borough constituencies. Lambeth's three MPs and Lambeth Council expressed strongly their concerns about the impact of the Commission's proposals in dividing Lambeth wards between six different constituencies, suggesting that the approach taken by the Commission disregarded borough boundaries and historic districts.

AC176 Several other respondents, including local councillors, considered that Lambeth was unfairly treated by the Commission's proposals in having two orphan wards and only one constituency made up wholly of Lambeth wards. A number of proposals were made to reduce the number of Lambeth constituencies. However, many of these involved major changes across South London and beyond. Simon Hooberman (IP/022969) expressed objections to the statutory electorate range, and so put forward counter-proposals that were inconsistent with that range. He was supported by a significant number of respondents.

AC177 We agree that the Commission's proposals would be unnecessarily disruptive in Lambeth, especially by comparison with other parts of London. We consider that an alternative arrangement could be made in Lambeth and Wandsworth that would better reflect the statutory criteria. In light of the many strong representations that the Commission's proposals would break local ties

within Streatham, we have also decided that the four main Streatham wards should be kept together. We found the proposals from a number of respondents particularly useful in identifying how best to balance the statutory factors in this area: Adrian Bailey, Adam Gray, Keith Hill, and Councillor David Malley and his fellow councillors in Streatham South (IP/025051).

AC178 In making our own recommendations, we have built on these proposals, but we do not adopt any of them directly. Our recommendations instead reconfigure two of the Commission's proposed Wandsworth and Lambeth constituencies (Clapham Common, and Streatham and Tooting) so that they would run on a north-south axis, respecting the borough boundary, instead of crossing between the boroughs on an east-west axis.

AC179 The Clapham and Streatham constituency would comprise nine wards from Lambeth (Clapham Town, Clapham Common, Thornton, Knight's Hill, Gipsy Hill, St Leonard's, Streatham Hill, Streatham South, and Streatham Wells). The Streatham South ward would not be part of a Merton-based constituency, and all four Streatham wards would be kept together. Our decision also enables us to link Clapham Town and Clapham Common wards, as advocated by the Liberal Democrats and a significant number of local residents. Our proposed name for the constituency reflects the main population centres and retains the reference to Streatham from the existing constituency of that name.

AC180 The Balham and Tooting constituency would contain seven Wandsworth wards (Balham, Nightingale, Bedford, Wandsworth Common, Tooting, Graveney, and Northcote). This constituency would include five of the seven wards in the existing Tooting

constituency. Our proposed name for the constituency reflects the main population centres and retains the reference to Tooting from the existing constituency of that name.

AC181 To enable these changes, the Wandsworth ward of Furzedown would form part of a Merton-based constituency. Furzedown is a mainly residential area between Streatham and Tooting. Although it has strong ties to Tooting in particular, we note that the Liberal Democrats identified this area as a good place to cross the Wandsworth–Merton boundary, as residential development is continuous. While it is not ideal that Furzedown ward would be a single Wandsworth ward in an otherwise Merton constituency, our recommendation enables us to strike a better balance between the statutory factors across South London.

AC182 The remaining wards from Lambeth and Wandsworth would form a Battersea and Vauxhall constituency, similar to that proposed by the Commission (IPs, paragraph 68), running along the River Thames. The constituency would differ by one ward from the Commission’s proposals, in that we consider that Fairfield ward should be in this constituency rather than in a Putney constituency (see paragraph AC169). To balance this, we have decided that Clapham Town ward should be in a Clapham and Streatham constituency (see paragraph AC179). We have found no good reason to change the name proposed by the Commission.

AC183 A number of respondents contended that Northcote ward should be kept with other Battersea wards in the Battersea and Vauxhall constituency. Some, including Simon Partlett (IP/O18606), suggested how this might be achieved in the context of the Commission’s

initial proposals. However, these suggestions are not consistent with our wider recommendations, and we also note that the southern end of the ward has close ties with Balham. We therefore include the Northcote ward in our recommended Balham and Tooting constituency, as discussed at paragraph AC180 above.

AC184 Our recommendations mean that Wandsworth would have an orphan ward. However, taken together, our recommendations reduce the number of Lambeth constituencies from six to four, and the number of Lambeth orphan wards from two to one. Wandsworth would have four constituencies, as in the initial proposals (although with some variations from those proposed by the Commission). A further advantage is that Wandsworth would have one constituency made up wholly of Wandsworth wards, which the Commission’s proposals did not achieve. Lambeth would have two constituencies made up wholly of Lambeth wards, rather than one, as in the initial proposals.

AC185 In Merton, the Commission proposed a Mitcham constituency (IPs, paragraph 66) that contained ten wards, including two (Abbey and Trinity) from the existing Wimbledon constituency, and one from Lambeth (Streatham South). It also proposed a Wimbledon and New Malden constituency (IPs, paragraph 65) made up of seven Merton wards and five Kingston upon Thames wards.

AC186 Both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party supported the Commission’s proposal for a Mitcham constituency. There was also widespread support from residents, local councillors, and local organisations for keeping together the wards that cover Mitcham town centre and its immediate environs, including Cricket Green, Figge’s Marsh, and

Lavender Fields wards. The Liberal Democrats' initial counter-proposal to divide Mitcham wards in order to accommodate changes in Wandsworth and Lambeth provoked strong opposition. We agree that the Mitcham wards should be kept together.

AC187 A strong local campaign opposed the inclusion of Abbey and Trinity wards in Mitcham, primarily because of the resulting division of Wimbledon town centre. Trinity ward covers much of Wimbledon town centre, including Wimbledon station. Abbey ward contains South Wimbledon station and a significant part of Wimbledon Broadway shopping centre. The local campaigners submitted a petition of 1,411 signatures (IP/025405) in support of keeping the central Wimbledon wards united. A number of local councillors also supported the campaign.

AC188 The Wimbledon campaigners proposed to move six wards within three of the Commission's proposed constituencies. Lower Morden and St Helier wards would move from the proposed Sutton and Cheam constituency to the proposed Mitcham constituency. Abbey and Trinity wards would move from the proposed Mitcham constituency to the proposed Wimbledon and New Malden constituency. St James and Old Malden wards would move from the proposed Wimbledon and New Malden constituency to the proposed Sutton and Cheam constituency.

AC189 A local resident, Roger Pratt (IP/002921), made a similar proposal, but he proposed in addition that Wimbledon Park ward should be moved from Putney into a Wimbledon constituency, and that Coombe Hill ward should be moved into Putney in its place. His proposal gained support from a significant number of other respondents.

AC190 The Liberal Democrats supported the inclusion of Abbey and Trinity wards in a Wimbledon constituency, but disagreed with the campaign's counter-proposal, preferring the proposal of David Rossiter and his colleagues for the Wimbledon town centre wards. David Rossiter and his colleagues recommended a Mitcham and Tooting constituency (crossing between Merton and Wandsworth), and a Wimbledon constituency based closely on the existing constituency of the same name. The Conservative Party expressed sympathy with the campaigners, but considered that the alternative option advocated by the local campaign would break local ties elsewhere. The Conservative Party suggested instead that the Commission's proposed constituency be renamed Mitcham and South Wimbledon to reflect the distinct parts. The Labour Party, Kevin Larkin, Peter Smyth, and Adam Gray suggested no changes to the Commission's proposal.

AC191 We have decided that the proposals made by the Wimbledon local campaigners would provide the best way of limiting the extent to which local ties are broken in Wimbledon, while also respecting the various statutory factors across a wider area. By allowing Lower Morden and St Helier wards to remain in Merton, the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency would be preserved, supplemented only by the Wandsworth ward of Furzedown for the reasons explained above (paragraph AC181). We have preferred to keep Coombe Hill and Coombe Vale wards together, rather than make the further changes in Wimbledon advocated by Roger Pratt. The benefit of keeping Wimbledon Park ward with other Wimbledon wards in a Merton-based constituency would be achieved at the expense of breaking local ties in Coombe and so creating a new orphan ward on the west of Putney.

AC192 We therefore recommend a Mitcham and Morden constituency comprising Cricket Green, Figge's Marsh, Lavender Fields, Longthornton, Pollards Hill, Graveney, Ravensbury, St Helier, Lower Morden, and Colliers Wood wards (in Merton), and Furzedown ward (in Wandsworth). We consider that the existing constituency name should be retained, given that our recommendation is largely the same as the existing constituency.

AC193 We also recommend a Wimbledon and Coombe constituency, which differs from the Commission's proposed Wimbledon and New Malden constituency only by the wards necessary to keep together the Wimbledon town centre wards. It would comprise Abbey, Cannon Hill, Dundonald, Hillside, Merton Park, Raynes Park, Trinity, Village, and West Barnes in Merton, and Coombe Hill, Coombe Vale, and Beverley wards in Kingston upon Thames. We agree with the Commission that the Kingston upon Thames wards should be recognised in the name of the constituency. We consider that Coombe, rather than New Malden, better describes the main population centres, reflecting suggestions made by Adam Gray, John Cartwright (IP/008287), and others.

AC194 The Commission's proposal for the other Kingston upon Thames wards was generally supported by respondents. Its proposal for a Kingston and Surbiton constituency differed from the existing constituency of the same name by the addition of two Kingston upon Thames wards (Tudor and Canbury) and the omission of three Kingston upon Thames wards (Beverley, Old Malden, and St James), in order to use the northern borough boundary as the constituency boundary (IPs, paragraph 65). This proposal contains wards from only one borough. We have, therefore, decided to

recommend the proposed constituency Kingston and Surbiton, with that name.

AC195 In Sutton, the Commission proposed a Sutton and Cheam constituency (IPs, paragraph 64), containing the same wards as the existing constituency of that name, with the addition of two wards (Lower Morden and St Helier) from Merton, in order to satisfy the electorate range. This proposal was widely supported, including by the three Parliamentary parties and Adam Gray. Others, including David Rossiter and his colleagues, Kevin Larkin, and Peter Smyth, proposed to supplement the existing constituency with wards from either Kingston or elsewhere in Sutton.

AC196 As noted in paragraph AC191, we have accepted representations that the Commission's proposals should be altered, in order to allow the wards that make up the centre of Wimbledon to be kept together. As a result, we recommend a Sutton and Cheam constituency, including two Kingston upon Thames wards (St James and Old Malden) instead of two Merton wards. The Sutton wards would remain as proposed by the Commission (Belmont, Cheam, Nonsuch, Stonecot, Sutton Central, Sutton North, Sutton South, Sutton West, and Worcester Park). We recommend that the name of this constituency should be Sutton and Cheam. Some respondents suggested that other main population centres in the constituency should be reflected in the name (including, in particular, Worcester Park), and others proposed that the name should reflect the cross-borough nature of the new constituency. However, as the original constituency would remain largely unchanged, we recommend that the existing name should be retained.

AC197 In making this recommendation, we recognise that some respondents suggested that the ties between Sutton and Kingston upon Thames are not as strong as those between Sutton and Merton. Others contended that local ties in the New Malden area would be broken by separating the two wards of St James and Beverley. Taken on their own, each of these points has some force, but we have found no suggestions of a different arrangement of constituency boundaries that would better reflect the statutory factors across South West London.

AC198 The Commission proposed to divide the remaining nine Sutton wards between two constituencies, both also containing Croydon wards (IPs, paragraph 64). The proposed Croydon Central and St Helier constituency included four Croydon wards and five Sutton wards, while the proposed Purley and Carshalton constituency contained five Croydon wards and four Sutton wards. Responses included strong views both for and against the Commission's proposals.

AC199 The proposals were supported by the Labour Party and the Conservative Party. A significant number of local residents also considered that the proposals reflected well the direction and nature of local ties. The Liberal Democrats opposed the Commission's proposals, contending that the constituencies should instead be designed to minimise the crossing of the Sutton and Croydon boundary, and should run north-south rather than east-west. Councillor Roger Thistle (IP/009480) shared this view, as did a substantial number of members of the public. Many pointed out that Carshalton, Wallington, and Beddington wards run in pairs, north and south, because they were established along the River Wandle. They contend that the River Wandle is therefore a unifying geographical feature rather than a

natural boundary. Several counter-proposals for this area accept this contention as a starting point, including the Liberal Democrats, David Rossiter and his colleagues, Adam Gray, Kevin Larkin, and Peter Smyth.

AC200 We have formed the view that the statutory factors can be better reflected by adopting a different approach to that proposed by the Commission. We consider that the borough boundary between Croydon and Sutton should be crossed, where necessary to achieve the electoral quota, in the south of the two boroughs where community ties are strongest. We also accept the contention that the River Wandle and the railway line are not barriers. We consider that Adam Gray's proposals in relation to Croydon and Sutton respect the various statutory factors more effectively than the Commission's proposals. They would lessen the impact on local ties and avoid dividing a number of town or village centres between constituencies, including Carshalton and Wallington. They also reflect more closely the existing constituencies in the two boroughs.

AC201 We therefore recommend the Carshalton and Coulsdon constituency proposed by Adam Gray. His proposal contains all but one ward from the existing Carshalton and Wallington constituency, together with two Croydon wards, in order to achieve the electoral quota. The link with the Coulsdon wards would have the benefit of providing a direct link to the Clockhouse area, which several respondents explained can only be accessed at present by going out of the constituency and back in again. This constituency would comprise Beddington North, Carshalton Central, Carshalton South and Clockhouse, St Helier, The Wrythe, Wallington North, Wallington South and Wandle Valley (in Sutton), and the Croydon

wards of Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West. The name Carshalton and Coulsdon has been proposed by Adam Gray. We recommend it.

AC202 The electoral quota means that one Sutton ward from the existing Carshalton and Wallington constituency (Beddington South) cannot be accommodated in this constituency. Instead, it should join with seven Croydon wards to create a new Croydon South constituency, based on the existing Croydon South constituency.

AC203 While we would have preferred Beddington South ward to be included in a constituency based on Carshalton, we take the view that this is a better approach than separating the two Coulsdon wards in order to satisfy the electorate range. A number of respondents observed that there are close ties between Beddington South, and Purley and Woodcote. The Liberal Democrats' initial counter-proposal also included Beddington South as an orphan ward in a predominantly Croydon constituency. We agree with their view that this is one of the few places where there is continuous residential development across the borough boundary.

AC204 Our recommended constituency of Croydon South would comprise Beddington South ward (in Sutton), Croham, Fairfield, Kenley, Sanderstead, Selsdon and Ballards, Waddon, and Purley wards (in Croydon). We adopt the name proposed by Adam Gray, noting also that six of the eight wards are part of the existing constituency of the same name.

AC205 The Commission proposed that the remaining Croydon wards should be divided between two constituencies (IPs, paragraph 63). Its proposed Croydon East constituency would contain eight wards, seven of which are part of the existing Croydon Central constituency. Its proposed Croydon North

constituency would contain seven wards, representing all but one of the wards of the existing constituency of the same name. These proposals were supported by the Conservative Party (subject only to expanding the name of the Croydon East constituency to include New Addington) and by the Labour Party. The Liberal Democrats initially proposed retaining the existing Croydon Central constituency and dividing the remaining wards between two constituencies, but subsequently preferred the counter-proposals of David Rossiter and his colleagues. These would preserve much of the existing constituencies but also would create two orphan wards in the north of the borough.

AC206 We, too, recommend a Croydon East constituency and a Croydon North constituency, but with slightly different boundaries from those proposed by the Commission. Croydon East would contain Addiscombe, Ashburton, Fieldway, Heathfield, New Addington, Selhurst, Shirley, and Woodside wards. Croydon North would contain Bensham Manor, Broad Green, Norbury, South Norwood, Thornton Heath, Upper Norwood, and West Thornton wards. Both constituencies would contain only Croydon wards.

AC207 Our recommendations are again based on proposals made by Adam Gray, and they accommodate changes in neighbouring constituencies (such as Croydon South) while also respecting local ties. As in the initial proposals, both constituencies align closely with existing constituencies. We recommend the names proposed by Adam Gray, which are, in turn, the same as those proposed by the Commission. We recognise that New Addington is an area in its own right, but consider that it would not be appropriate to distinguish it from the rest of the eastern side of Croydon Borough.

### **Conclusion and recommendations**

AC208 We have considered and weighed the very many, helpful representations made by the Parliamentary parties, organisations, local groups, and individuals in the initial and secondary consultation periods. We have taken into account the statutory factors and balanced them across proposals for 68 constituencies in London. We have concluded that our recommendations are a better balance of the statutory factors than other proposals. We commend them to the Commission.

**Judith Farbey QC**

**Nicole Smith**

**Guy Roots QC**

July 2012

# 4. How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 16 October 2012 to 10 December 2012. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

4.2 People are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, but our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. These appear in red on the accompanying maps. We will consider representations on initial proposals we have not revised (blue on the maps). However, particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to make changes now to proposals that have already withstood intensive scrutiny of representations made in the earlier stages of consultation. Further representations on unmodified initial proposals that simply repeat evidence or arguments already raised in previous consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

4.3 When responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in *A guide to the 2013 Review*. Most importantly:

- a. we cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight);

- b. we are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (as at May 2010) as the building blocks of constituencies. Our view is that, in the absence of exceptional and compelling circumstances, it would not be appropriate to divide wards in cases where it is possible to construct constituencies that meet the 5% statutory requirement without doing so; and
- c. we have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

4.4 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

## How can you give us your views?

4.5 We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, at [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk), when contributing to our consultation. The website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can have your say on our revised proposals.

4.6 You can also contribute to our consultation by writing directly to us or by emailing us with your views, to [london@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:london@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk). If you wish to comment on more than one region, please send your email to [reviews@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk). You can also find these details on the separate summary sheet, copies of which can be found at your local place of deposit, or downloaded from our website, at [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk).

4.7 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available at [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/privacy-and-cookies/](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/privacy-and-cookies/).

### **What do we want views on?**

4.8 We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who are happy with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a rather distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

4.9 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in 2013.

4.10 It would be very helpful if in your response you specify clearly in what form you accessed this revised proposals report, i.e. either:

- a. in electronic form (even if you then printed it off to read); or
- b. as a hard copy publication.

# Annex: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>1. Balham and Tooting BC</b>			<b>73,269</b>
	Balham	Wandsworth	10,883
	Bedford	Wandsworth	10,625
	Graveney	Wandsworth	9,956
	Nightingale	Wandsworth	10,882
	Northcote	Wandsworth	10,439
	Tooting	Wandsworth	10,465
	Wandsworth Common	Wandsworth	10,019
<b>2. Barking BC</b>			<b>79,420</b>
	Abbey	Barking and Dagenham	7,203
	Becontree	Barking and Dagenham	7,142
	Eastbury	Barking and Dagenham	6,895
	Gascoigne	Barking and Dagenham	6,593
	Goresbrook	Barking and Dagenham	6,972
	Longbridge	Barking and Dagenham	7,689
	Mayesbrook	Barking and Dagenham	6,328
	Parsloes	Barking and Dagenham	6,361
	Thames	Barking and Dagenham	5,858
	Goodmayes	Redbridge	8,842
	Mayfield	Redbridge	9,537
<b>3. Battersea and Vauxhall BC</b>			<b>79,188</b>
	Oval	Lambeth	9,387
	Prince's	Lambeth	9,630
	Stockwell	Lambeth	8,465
	Fairfield	Wandsworth	10,594
	Latchmere	Wandsworth	9,698
	Queenstown	Wandsworth	10,200
	Shaftesbury	Wandsworth	10,475
	St Mary's Park	Wandsworth	10,739
<b>4. Beckenham BC</b>			<b>73,517</b>
	Clock House	Bromley	11,259
	Copers Cope	Bromley	11,822
	Crystal Palace	Bromley	7,907
	Kelsey and Eden Park	Bromley	11,934
	Penge and Cator	Bromley	11,463
	Shortlands	Bromley	7,535
	West Wickham	Bromley	11,597
<b>5. Bermondsey and South Bank BC</b>			<b>77,548</b>
	Bishop's	Lambeth	6,855
	Camberwell Green	Southwark	9,543
	Cathedrals	Southwark	10,147
	Chaucer	Southwark	9,374
	East Walworth	Southwark	6,881
	Faraday	Southwark	7,758
	Grange	Southwark	9,635
	Newington	Southwark	8,786
	Riverside	Southwark	8,569
<b>6. Bethnal Green and Shoreditch BC</b>			<b>76,265</b>
	De Beauvoir	Hackney	8,746
	Haggerston	Hackney	8,183
	Hoxton	Hackney	9,173
	Queensbridge	Hackney	8,630
	Bethnal Green North	Tower Hamlets	8,696
	Bethnal Green South	Tower Hamlets	8,786

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
	Mile End and Globe Town	Tower Hamlets	9,365
	Spitalfields and Banglatown	Tower Hamlets	6,541
	Weavers	Tower Hamlets	8,145
<b>7. Bexleyheath and Erith BC</b>			<b>80,233</b>
	Barnehurst	Bexley	7,973
	Belvedere	Bexley	8,122
	Brampton	Bexley	8,386
	Christchurch	Bexley	8,293
	Colyers	Bexley	7,866
	Crayford	Bexley	8,138
	Erith	Bexley	8,060
	North End	Bexley	7,437
	Northumberland Heath	Bexley	7,799
	St Mary's	Bexley	8,159
<b>8. Bow and Stratford BC</b>			<b>79,794</b>
	Forest Gate North	Newham	8,883
	Forest Gate South	Newham	9,497
	Plaistow North	Newham	8,725
	Stratford and New Town	Newham	9,206
	West Ham	Newham	8,431
	Bow East	Tower Hamlets	9,784
	Bow West	Tower Hamlets	8,516
	Bromley-by-Bow	Tower Hamlets	8,678
	Mile End East	Tower Hamlets	8,074
<b>9. Brentford and Isleworth BC</b>			<b>74,543</b>
	Brentford	Hounslow	9,160
	Chiswick Homefields	Hounslow	7,558
	Chiswick Riverside	Hounslow	7,882
	Hounslow Central	Hounslow	9,736
	Hounslow South	Hounslow	7,813
	Isleworth	Hounslow	7,814
	Osterley and Spring Grove	Hounslow	8,655
	Syon	Hounslow	8,489
	Turnham Green	Hounslow	7,436
<b>10. Brixton BC</b>			<b>77,575</b>
	Brixton Hill	Lambeth	9,842
	Coldharbour	Lambeth	10,216
	Ferndale	Lambeth	9,879
	Herne Hill	Lambeth	9,613
	Larkhall	Lambeth	10,516
	Thurlow Park	Lambeth	8,871
	Tulse Hill	Lambeth	9,701
	Vassall	Lambeth	8,937
<b>11. Bromley and Chislehurst BC</b>			<b>77,196</b>
	Bickley	Bromley	11,608
	Bromley Common and Keston	Bromley	11,270
	Bromley Town	Bromley	12,057
	Chislehurst	Bromley	11,481
	Hayes and Coney Hall	Bromley	12,312
	Mottingham and Chislehurst North	Bromley	7,192
	Plaistow and Sundridge	Bromley	11,276
<b>12. Camden Town and Regent's Park BC</b>			<b>80,452</b>
	Camden Town with Primrose Hill	Camden	8,184
	Canteloves	Camden	7,888
	Gospel Oak	Camden	7,302
	Haverstock	Camden	7,880
	Kentish Town	Camden	8,654
	Regent's Park	Camden	8,115
	Abbey Road	Westminster	6,429
	Church Street	Westminster	6,729
	Little Venice	Westminster	6,212
	Maida Vale	Westminster	6,255
	Regent's Park	Westminster	6,804

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>13. Carshalton and Coulsdon BC</b>			<b>78,814</b>
	Coulsdon East	Croydon	9,394
	Coulsdon West	Croydon	10,099
	Beddington North	Sutton	7,412
	Carshalton Central	Sutton	7,279
	Carshalton South and Clockhouse	Sutton	7,220
	St Helier	Sutton	7,500
	The Wrythe	Sutton	7,442
	Wallington North	Sutton	7,537
	Wallington South	Sutton	7,523
	Wandle Valley	Sutton	7,408
<b>14. Chelsea and Fulham BC</b>			<b>80,247</b>
	Fulham Broadway	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,756
	Fulham Reach	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,991
	Munster	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,706
	North End	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,649
	Palace Riverside	Hammersmith and Fulham	4,994
	Parsons Green and Walham	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,562
	Sands End	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,707
	Town	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,605
	Courtfield	Kensington and Chelsea	4,305
	Cremorne	Kensington and Chelsea	4,909
	Earl's Court	Kensington and Chelsea	4,597
	Redcliffe	Kensington and Chelsea	4,669
	Royal Hospital	Kensington and Chelsea	4,569
	Stanley	Kensington and Chelsea	4,228
<b>15. Chingford BC</b>			<b>80,073</b>
	Chapel End	Waltham Forest	8,140
	Chingford Green	Waltham Forest	7,848
	Endlebury	Waltham Forest	8,139
	Hale End and Highams Park	Waltham Forest	7,883
	Hatch Lane	Waltham Forest	8,131
	Higham Hill	Waltham Forest	7,644
	Larkwood	Waltham Forest	8,200
	Valley	Waltham Forest	8,094
	William Morris	Waltham Forest	7,719
	Wood Street	Waltham Forest	8,275
<b>16. Chipping Barnet BC</b>			<b>76,455</b>
	Brunswick Park	Barnet	11,340
	Coppetts	Barnet	10,620
	East Barnet	Barnet	11,340
	High Barnet	Barnet	10,873
	Oakleigh	Barnet	11,191
	Totteridge	Barnet	9,963
	Underhill	Barnet	11,128
<b>17. Clapham and Streatham BC</b>			<b>79,752</b>
	Clapham Common	Lambeth	8,758
	Clapham Town	Lambeth	9,605
	Gipsy Hill	Lambeth	9,023
	Knight's Hill	Lambeth	8,754
	St Leonard's	Lambeth	8,713
	Streatham Hill	Lambeth	9,107
	Streatham South	Lambeth	8,645
	Streatham Wells	Lambeth	8,766
	Thornton	Lambeth	8,381
<b>18. Croydon East BC</b>			<b>77,251</b>
	Addiscombe	Croydon	10,982
	Ashburton	Croydon	10,411
	Fieldway	Croydon	6,849
	Heathfield	Croydon	9,912
	New Addington	Croydon	7,202
	Selhurst	Croydon	10,754
	Shirley	Croydon	10,569
	Woodside	Croydon	10,572

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>19. Croydon North BC</b>			<b>74,353</b>
	Bensham Manor	Croydon	10,554
	Broad Green	Croydon	10,945
	Norbury	Croydon	10,749
	South Norwood	Croydon	10,490
	Thornton Heath	Croydon	10,244
	Upper Norwood	Croydon	10,501
	West Thornton	Croydon	10,870
<b>20. Croydon South BC</b>			<b>80,267</b>
	Croham	Croydon	10,819
	Fairfield	Croydon	10,483
	Kenley	Croydon	10,679
	Purley	Croydon	10,496
	Sanderstead	Croydon	9,728
	Selsdon and Ballards	Croydon	9,427
	Waddon	Croydon	10,912
	Beddington South	Sutton	7,723
<b>21. Dagenham and Rainham BC</b>			<b>75,880</b>
	Alibon	Barking and Dagenham	6,538
	Chadwell Heath	Barking and Dagenham	6,717
	Heath	Barking and Dagenham	6,822
	River	Barking and Dagenham	6,592
	Valence	Barking and Dagenham	6,448
	Village	Barking and Dagenham	6,891
	Whalebone	Barking and Dagenham	6,873
	Elm Park	Havering	9,664
	Rainham and Wennington	Havering	9,375
	South Hornchurch	Havering	9,960
<b>22. Deptford and Rotherhithe BC</b>			<b>80,130</b>
	Brockley	Lewisham	10,555
	Evelyn	Lewisham	9,193
	Ladywell	Lewisham	8,778
	New Cross	Lewisham	9,236
	Telegraph Hill	Lewisham	9,862
	Livesey	Southwark	8,712
	Rotherhithe	Southwark	7,902
	South Bermondsey	Southwark	7,957
	Surrey Docks	Southwark	7,935
<b>23. Dulwich and Peckham BC</b>			<b>77,638</b>
	Brunswick Park	Southwark	8,221
	College	Southwark	8,119
	East Dulwich	Southwark	8,492
	Nunhead	Southwark	8,513
	Peckham	Southwark	9,045
	Peckham Rye	Southwark	8,854
	South Camberwell	Southwark	8,051
	The Lane	Southwark	9,908
	Village	Southwark	8,435
<b>24. Ealing Central BC</b>			<b>78,832</b>
	Cleveland	Ealing	9,493
	Ealing Broadway	Ealing	8,803
	Ealing Common	Ealing	8,844
	Elthorne	Ealing	8,869
	Hanger Hill	Ealing	8,604
	Hobbayne	Ealing	8,603
	Northfield	Ealing	8,730
	South Acton	Ealing	8,304
	Walpole	Ealing	8,582
<b>25. East Ham and Loxford BC</b>			<b>77,471</b>
	East Ham North	Newham	9,640
	Green Street East	Newham	10,328
	Green Street West	Newham	9,724
	Little Ilford	Newham	9,469
	Manor Park	Newham	9,602

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
	Wall End	Newham	9,396
	Clementswood	Redbridge	9,241
	Loxford	Redbridge	10,071
<b>26. Edmonton and Tottenham Hale BC</b>			<b>76,786</b>
	Edmonton Green	Enfield	9,461
	Haselbury	Enfield	8,916
	Jubilee	Enfield	8,746
	Lower Edmonton	Enfield	9,151
	Upper Edmonton	Enfield	9,232
	Bruce Grove	Haringey	7,733
	Northumberland Park	Haringey	7,935
	Tottenham Hale	Haringey	7,813
	White Hart Lane	Haringey	7,799
<b>27. Eltham and Charlton BC</b>			<b>73,541</b>
	Charlton	Greenwich	9,194
	Coldharbour and New Eltham	Greenwich	9,595
	Eltham North	Greenwich	9,330
	Eltham South	Greenwich	9,191
	Eltham West	Greenwich	7,082
	Kidbrooke with Hornfair	Greenwich	9,408
	Middle Park and Sutcliffe	Greenwich	9,219
	Woolwich Riverside	Greenwich	10,522
<b>28. Enfield North BC</b>			<b>75,526</b>
	Chase	Enfield	9,355
	Enfield Highway	Enfield	9,704
	Enfield Lock	Enfield	9,689
	Highlands	Enfield	9,721
	Ponders End	Enfield	8,765
	Southbury	Enfield	8,838
	Town	Enfield	10,670
	Turkey Street	Enfield	8,784
<b>29. Enfield Southgate BC</b>			<b>75,017</b>
	Bowes	Enfield	7,912
	Bush Hill Park	Enfield	10,085
	Cockfosters	Enfield	10,093
	Grange	Enfield	9,512
	Palmers Green	Enfield	9,344
	Southgate	Enfield	9,394
	Southgate Green	Enfield	9,253
	Winchmore Hill	Enfield	9,424
<b>30. Finchley and Golders Green BC</b>			<b>80,058</b>
	Childs Hill	Barnet	10,559
	East Finchley	Barnet	10,363
	Finchley Church End	Barnet	10,091
	Garden Suburb	Barnet	9,906
	Golders Green	Barnet	9,733
	West Finchley	Barnet	9,863
	Woodhouse	Barnet	11,080
	Fortis Green	Haringey	8,463
<b>31. Greenford and Northolt BC</b>			<b>73,942</b>
	Sudbury	Brent	9,160
	Greenford Broadway	Ealing	10,314
	Greenford Green	Ealing	8,406
	Lady Margaret	Ealing	9,773
	North Greenford	Ealing	8,978
	Northolt Mandeville	Ealing	9,199
	Northolt West End	Ealing	9,126
	Perivale	Ealing	8,986
<b>32. Greenwich and Lewisham Central BC</b>			<b>75,368</b>
	Blackheath Westcombe	Greenwich	9,135
	Greenwich West	Greenwich	9,992
	Peninsula	Greenwich	8,837
	Blackheath	Lewisham	9,235

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
	Catford South	Lewisham	9,858
	Lee Green	Lewisham	9,559
	Lewisham Central	Lewisham	10,222
	Rushey Green	Lewisham	8,530
<b>33. Hackney Central BC</b>			<b>79,599</b>
	Chatham	Hackney	7,904
	Clissold	Hackney	7,882
	Dalston	Hackney	8,729
	Hackney Central	Hackney	8,056
	Hackney Downs	Hackney	7,878
	King's Park	Hackney	7,015
	Leabridge	Hackney	8,074
	Stoke Newington Central	Hackney	7,990
	Victoria	Hackney	8,671
	Wick	Hackney	7,400
<b>34. Hammersmith and Acton BC</b>			<b>78,165</b>
	Acton Central	Ealing	8,491
	East Acton	Ealing	9,400
	Southfield	Ealing	8,800
	Addison	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,111
	Askew	Hammersmith and Fulham	8,208
	Avonmore and Brook Green	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,996
	Hammersmith Broadway	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,170
	Ravenscourt Park	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,931
	Shepherd's Bush Green	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,278
	Wormholt and White City	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,780
<b>35. Hampstead and Kilburn BC</b>			<b>78,225</b>
	Kilburn	Brent	9,777
	Queens Park	Brent	8,882
	Belsize	Camden	7,555
	Fortune Green	Camden	7,181
	Frognaal and Fitzjohns	Camden	7,036
	Hampstead Town	Camden	7,047
	Highgate	Camden	7,634
	Kilburn	Camden	7,504
	Swiss Cottage	Camden	7,916
	West Hampstead	Camden	7,693
<b>36. Hampton BC</b>			<b>74,175</b>
	Hanworth	Hounslow	7,718
	Hanworth Park	Hounslow	7,612
	Hounslow Heath	Hounslow	8,789
	Fulwell and Hampton Hill	Richmond upon Thames	7,089
	Hampton	Richmond upon Thames	7,286
	Hampton North	Richmond upon Thames	6,833
	Hampton Wick	Richmond upon Thames	7,287
	Heathfield	Richmond upon Thames	7,240
	Teddington	Richmond upon Thames	7,435
	Whitton	Richmond upon Thames	6,886
<b>37. Harrow East BC</b>			<b>80,359</b>
	Belmont	Harrow	7,947
	Canons	Harrow	9,173
	Edgware	Harrow	7,280
	Harrow Weald	Harrow	8,265
	Kenton East	Harrow	7,661
	Kenton West	Harrow	8,474
	Marlborough	Harrow	7,822
	Queensbury	Harrow	8,073
	Stanmore Park	Harrow	8,409
	Wealdstone	Harrow	7,255
<b>38. Harrow West BC</b>			<b>78,549</b>
	Northwick Park	Brent	9,146
	Greenhill	Harrow	7,666
	Harrow on the Hill	Harrow	7,820
	Hatch End	Harrow	8,090
	Headstone North	Harrow	7,713

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
	Headstone South	Harrow	7,494
	Rayners Lane	Harrow	7,829
	Roxbourne	Harrow	8,098
	Roxeth	Harrow	7,525
	West Harrow	Harrow	7,168
<b>39. Hayes and Feltham BC</b>			<b>77,412</b>
	Barnhill	Hillingdon	8,722
	Botwell	Hillingdon	9,439
	Heathrow Villages	Hillingdon	7,386
	Pinkwell	Hillingdon	9,239
	Townfield	Hillingdon	8,953
	Yeading	Hillingdon	8,754
	Bedfont	Hounslow	8,136
	Feltham North	Hounslow	7,362
	Feltham West	Hounslow	9,421
<b>40. Hendon BC</b>			<b>74,329</b>
	Burnt Oak	Barnet	10,248
	Colindale	Barnet	9,777
	Edgware	Barnet	11,013
	Hale	Barnet	11,310
	Hendon	Barnet	10,233
	Mill Hill	Barnet	12,094
	West Hendon	Barnet	9,654
<b>41. Hornchurch and Upminster BC</b>			<b>79,568</b>
	Cranham	Havering	10,069
	Emerson Park	Havering	9,647
	Gooshays	Havering	10,164
	Hacton	Havering	9,806
	Harold Wood	Havering	9,837
	Heaton	Havering	8,880
	St Andrew's	Havering	10,701
	Upminster	Havering	10,464
<b>42. Hornsey and Wood Green BC</b>			<b>79,339</b>
	Alexandra	Haringey	7,975
	Bounds Green	Haringey	7,758
	Crouch End	Haringey	8,472
	Highgate	Haringey	7,777
	Hornsey	Haringey	8,321
	Muswell Hill	Haringey	7,612
	Noel Park	Haringey	7,866
	Stroud Green	Haringey	8,196
	Woodside	Haringey	7,438
	Hillrise	Islington	7,924
<b>43. Ilford North BC</b>			<b>76,673</b>
	Aldborough	Redbridge	9,944
	Barkingside	Redbridge	9,205
	Chadwell	Redbridge	9,683
	Fairlop	Redbridge	9,013
	Fullwell	Redbridge	9,175
	Hainault	Redbridge	8,844
	Newbury	Redbridge	10,927
	Seven Kings	Redbridge	9,882
<b>44. Islington North BC</b>			<b>78,622</b>
	Canonbury	Islington	8,408
	Finsbury Park	Islington	8,814
	Highbury East	Islington	8,018
	Highbury West	Islington	10,127
	Holloway	Islington	9,361
	Junction	Islington	8,046
	Mildmay	Islington	8,605
	St George's	Islington	8,253
	Tollington	Islington	8,990

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>45. Islington South and Holborn BC</b>			<b>79,430</b>
	Bloomsbury	Camden	6,660
	Holborn and Covent Garden	Camden	7,692
	King's Cross	Camden	7,030
	St Pancras and Somers Town	Camden	8,204
	Barnsbury	Islington	8,063
	Bunhill	Islington	9,075
	Caledonian	Islington	8,721
	Clerkenwell	Islington	7,542
	St Mary's	Islington	8,184
	St Peter's	Islington	8,259
<b>46. Kensington BC</b>			<b>78,544</b>
	Abingdon	Kensington and Chelsea	4,862
	Brompton	Kensington and Chelsea	4,100
	Campden	Kensington and Chelsea	4,404
	Colville	Kensington and Chelsea	4,968
	Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	5,391
	Hans Town	Kensington and Chelsea	5,253
	Holland	Kensington and Chelsea	4,869
	Norland	Kensington and Chelsea	5,404
	Notting Barns	Kensington and Chelsea	5,626
	Pembridge	Kensington and Chelsea	4,248
	Queen's Gate	Kensington and Chelsea	4,517
	St Charles	Kensington and Chelsea	5,493
	Harrow Road	Westminster	7,049
	Knightsbridge and Belgravia	Westminster	5,059
	Queen's Park	Westminster	7,301
<b>47. Kingston and Surbiton BC</b>			<b>75,384</b>
	Alexandra	Kingston upon Thames	6,502
	Berrylands	Kingston upon Thames	6,666
	Canbury	Kingston upon Thames	7,718
	Chessington North and Hook	Kingston upon Thames	6,319
	Chessington South	Kingston upon Thames	7,219
	Grove	Kingston upon Thames	7,145
	Norbiton	Kingston upon Thames	6,195
	St Mark's	Kingston upon Thames	7,297
	Surbiton Hill	Kingston upon Thames	7,195
	Tolworth and Hook Rise	Kingston upon Thames	6,707
	Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	6,421
<b>48. Lewisham South BC</b>			<b>76,840</b>
	Bellingham	Lewisham	9,262
	Crofton Park	Lewisham	9,744
	Downham	Lewisham	9,507
	Forest Hill	Lewisham	9,462
	Grove Park	Lewisham	9,761
	Perry Vale	Lewisham	9,858
	Sydenham	Lewisham	10,188
	Whitefoot	Lewisham	9,058
<b>49. Leyton BC</b>			<b>78,377</b>
	Cann Hall	Waltham Forest	7,347
	Cathall	Waltham Forest	7,046
	Forest	Waltham Forest	7,650
	Grove Green	Waltham Forest	7,678
	High Street	Waltham Forest	8,017
	Hoe Street	Waltham Forest	7,923
	Lea Bridge	Waltham Forest	9,004
	Leyton	Waltham Forest	8,068
	Leytonstone	Waltham Forest	7,884
	Markhouse	Waltham Forest	7,760
<b>50. Mitcham and Morden BC</b>			<b>76,949</b>
	Colliers Wood	Merton	6,844
	Cricket Green	Merton	7,163
	Figge's Marsh	Merton	7,077
	Graveney	Merton	6,215
	Lavender Fields	Merton	6,288
	Longthornton	Merton	6,532

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
	Lower Morden	Merton	6,599
	Pollards Hill	Merton	7,009
	Ravensbury	Merton	6,657
	St Helier	Merton	6,690
	Furzedown	Wandsworth	9,875
<b>51. Newham South BC</b>			<b>75,030</b>
	Beckton	Newham	8,776
	Boleyn	Newham	9,307
	Canning Town North	Newham	8,094
	Canning Town South	Newham	8,243
	Custom House	Newham	7,305
	East Ham Central	Newham	9,906
	East Ham South	Newham	9,025
	Plaistow South	Newham	8,292
	Royal Docks	Newham	6,082
<b>52. Orpington BC</b>			<b>80,115</b>
	Biggin Hill	Bromley	7,897
	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Bromley	11,298
	Cray Valley East	Bromley	10,954
	Cray Valley West	Bromley	11,894
	Darwin	Bromley	4,070
	Farnborough and Crofton	Bromley	11,500
	Orpington	Bromley	11,697
	Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	10,805
<b>53. Poplar and Stepney BC</b>			<b>77,915</b>
	Blackwall and Cubitt Town	Tower Hamlets	10,434
	East India and Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	8,906
	Limehouse	Tower Hamlets	9,350
	Millwall	Tower Hamlets	12,040
	St Dunstan's and Stepney Green	Tower Hamlets	10,452
	St Katharine's and Wapping	Tower Hamlets	8,204
	Shadwell	Tower Hamlets	9,233
	Whitechapel	Tower Hamlets	9,296
<b>54. Putney BC</b>			<b>80,364</b>
	Wimbledon Park	Merton	7,326
	Earlsfield	Wandsworth	10,885
	East Putney	Wandsworth	10,586
	Roehampton and Putney Heath	Wandsworth	9,332
	Southfields	Wandsworth	11,106
	Thamesfield	Wandsworth	10,928
	West Hill	Wandsworth	10,288
	West Putney	Wandsworth	9,913
<b>55. Richmond and Twickenham BC</b>			<b>78,790</b>
	Barnes	Richmond upon Thames	6,763
	East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	6,969
	Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	6,613
	Kew	Richmond upon Thames	7,583
	Mortlake and Barnes Common	Richmond upon Thames	7,458
	North Richmond	Richmond upon Thames	7,250
	St Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	7,554
	South Richmond	Richmond upon Thames	7,038
	South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	7,331
	Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	6,910
	West Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	7,321
<b>56. Romford BC</b>			<b>79,271</b>
	Eastbrook	Barking and Dagenham	7,293
	Brooklands	Havering	10,536
	Havering Park	Havering	9,694
	Hylands	Havering	10,188
	Mawneys	Havering	9,616
	Pettits	Havering	10,276
	Romford Town	Havering	11,545
	Squirrel's Heath	Havering	10,123

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>57. Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner BC</b>			<b>75,535</b>
	Pinner	Harrow	7,687
	Pinner South	Harrow	7,914
	Cavendish	Hillingdon	8,676
	Eastcote and East Ruislip	Hillingdon	9,375
	Manor	Hillingdon	8,504
	Northwood	Hillingdon	8,254
	Northwood Hills	Hillingdon	8,562
	South Ruislip	Hillingdon	8,420
	West Ruislip	Hillingdon	8,143
<b>58. Sidcup and Welling BC</b>			<b>73,053</b>
	Blackfen and Lamorbey	Bexley	8,031
	Blendon and Penhill	Bexley	8,325
	Cray Meadows	Bexley	8,148
	Danson Park	Bexley	8,121
	East Wickham	Bexley	7,952
	Falconwood and Welling	Bexley	8,098
	Longlands	Bexley	8,167
	St Michael's	Bexley	7,930
	Sidcup	Bexley	8,281
<b>59. Southall and Heston BC</b>			<b>78,584</b>
	Dormers Wells	Ealing	9,149
	Norwood Green	Ealing	9,153
	Southall Broadway	Ealing	10,029
	Southall Green	Ealing	10,065
	Cranford	Hounslow	7,590
	Heston Central	Hounslow	8,062
	Heston East	Hounslow	8,284
	Heston West	Hounslow	8,177
	Hounslow West	Hounslow	8,075
<b>60. Stamford Hill and South Tottenham BC</b>			<b>73,109</b>
	Brownswood	Hackney	6,875
	Cazenove	Hackney	7,468
	Lordship	Hackney	7,117
	New River	Hackney	6,402
	Springfield	Hackney	6,365
	Harringay	Haringey	7,565
	St Ann's	Haringey	7,654
	Seven Sisters	Haringey	7,975
	Tottenham Green	Haringey	8,135
	West Green	Haringey	7,553
<b>61. Sutton and Cheam BC</b>			<b>79,421</b>
	Old Malden	Kingston upon Thames	6,573
	St James	Kingston upon Thames	6,277
	Belmont	Sutton	7,183
	Cheam	Sutton	7,611
	Nonsuch	Sutton	7,807
	Stonecot	Sutton	7,866
	Sutton Central	Sutton	6,926
	Sutton North	Sutton	7,171
	Sutton South	Sutton	6,646
	Sutton West	Sutton	7,375
	Worcester Park	Sutton	7,986
<b>62. Thamesmead and Plumstead BC</b>			<b>74,273</b>
	Lesnes Abbey	Bexley	8,300
	Thamesmead East	Bexley	7,808
	Abbey Wood	Greenwich	9,763
	Glyndon	Greenwich	10,054
	Plumstead	Greenwich	9,467
	Shooters Hill	Greenwich	9,234
	Thamesmead Moorings	Greenwich	10,399
	Woolwich Common	Greenwich	9,248

Constituency	Ward	London borough	Electorate
<b>63. The Cities of London and Westminster BC</b>			<b>79,238</b>
	-	The City of London	5,933
	Bayswater	Westminster	5,838
	Bryanston and Dorset Square	Westminster	6,203
	Churchill	Westminster	5,701
	Hyde Park	Westminster	6,370
	Lancaster Gate	Westminster	6,123
	Marylebone High Street	Westminster	5,675
	St James's	Westminster	6,679
	Tachbrook	Westminster	5,524
	Vincent Square	Westminster	6,318
	Warwick	Westminster	6,113
	West End	Westminster	5,565
	Westbourne	Westminster	7,196
<b>64. Uxbridge BC</b>			<b>78,131</b>
	Brunel	Hillingdon	9,824
	Charville	Hillingdon	8,678
	Harefield	Hillingdon	5,570
	Hillingdon East	Hillingdon	8,921
	Ickenham	Hillingdon	8,111
	Uxbridge North	Hillingdon	9,216
	Uxbridge South	Hillingdon	9,843
	West Drayton	Hillingdon	9,418
	Yiewsley	Hillingdon	8,550
<b>65. Wanstead and Woodford BC</b>			<b>78,562</b>
	Bridge	Redbridge	8,377
	Church End	Redbridge	8,260
	Clayhall	Redbridge	9,883
	Cranbrook	Redbridge	9,015
	Monkhams	Redbridge	8,215
	Roding	Redbridge	8,261
	Snaresbrook	Redbridge	8,771
	Valentines	Redbridge	9,203
	Wanstead	Redbridge	8,577
<b>66. Wembley BC</b>			<b>73,303</b>
	Alperton	Brent	8,742
	Barnhill	Brent	9,773
	Fryent	Brent	8,274
	Kenton	Brent	8,922
	Preston	Brent	9,256
	Queensbury	Brent	10,080
	Tokynpton	Brent	8,961
	Wembley Central	Brent	9,295
<b>67. Willesden BC</b>			<b>77,279</b>
	Brondesbury Park	Brent	7,961
	Dollis Hill	Brent	7,627
	Dudden Hill	Brent	7,947
	Harlesden	Brent	8,254
	Kensal Green	Brent	7,677
	Mapesbury	Brent	8,359
	Stonebridge	Brent	9,240
	Welsh Harp	Brent	7,908
	Willesden Green	Brent	7,412
	College Park and Old Oak	Hammersmith and Fulham	4,894
<b>68. Wimbledon and Coombe BC</b>			<b>77,991</b>
	Beverley	Kingston upon Thames	6,544
	Coombe Hill	Kingston upon Thames	6,457
	Coombe Vale	Kingston upon Thames	6,380
	Abbey	Merton	6,708
	Cannon Hill	Merton	6,696
	Dundonald	Merton	6,491
	Hillside	Merton	6,061
	Merton Park	Merton	6,507
	Raynes Park	Merton	6,801
	Trinity	Merton	6,639
	Village	Merton	5,969
	West Barnes	Merton	6,738

Boundary Commission for England  
35 Great Smith Street  
London  
SW1P 3BQ

Tel: 020 7276 1102

Email: [information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk)

Website: [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

Any enquiries regarding this document should be sent to us at: [information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk)

This document can also be viewed on our website at: [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk)

The material used in this publication is constituted from 75% consumer waste and 25% virgin fibre.

