

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**AT THE**

**2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND**

**HELD AT**

**KENTON HALL, WOODCOCK HILL, HARROW HA3 0PQ**

**ON**

**MONDAY 24 OCTOBER 2016**  
**DAY ONE**

**Before:**

**Mr Howard Simmons, The Lead Assistant Commissioner**

---

**Transcribed from audio by W B Gurney & Sons LLP**  
**83 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW**  
**Telephone Number: 0203 585 4721/22**

---

Time Noted: 10.10 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We will start the proceedings. Welcome to this public hearing for the Boundary Commission for England's initial proposals for parliamentary constituencies for the London region. My name is Howard Simmons, one of the Assistant Commissioners responsible for London. I was appointed to help the Commission to consider all the representations that are being made on the proposals they have put forward, to evaluate those, and then to go back to suggest whether they should be revised or amended in light of the representations that have been made.

I am assisted by two other Assistant Commissioners and I am supported by a team of staff from the Boundary Commission that is led by Gerald Tessier, next to me, and Gerald will be saying a few words in a moment. I think, as some of you already know, we have two days of hearings. The first will last from 10.10 till eight o'clock this evening, and the second is from nine till five tomorrow. We apparently have quite a lot of people signed in today, so I am expecting a fairly busy day, once we start running, but I will try and take opportunities to fit extra people in, should they arrive, and also adjourn, if necessary, to ensure we have some rest periods as well.

I stress again the purpose of the hearing today is to enable people to make oral representations, and they are working to given time slots. Two of our speakers have arrived, and, although they are scheduled to go on later in the morning, they are very willing to come on now and make their presentation, and they are going to come together to the podium. I stress again, this is not an opportunity to cross-examine or to take issue with the proposals, but for people to state and make representations about their ideas and suggestions. I will pass over to Gerald now, who has a number of points to make about the approach the Boundary Commission is taking, and some administrative details as well.

MR TESSIER: Thank you very much. Thank you very much and good morning. As Howard has mentioned, my name is Gerald Tessier, and I am a member of the Commission's staff. I am responsible for supporting the Commissioners in their role to recommend new parliamentary constituency boundaries, and at this hearing I will lead the team of staff responsible for ensuring that the hearing runs smoothly. As Howard has already stated, he will chair the hearing itself, and it is his responsibility to run the hearing at his discretion and take decisions about speakers, questioners and timings. My team and I are here today to support Howard in carrying out his role. Please ask one of us outside the hearing if you need any help or assistance.

I would like to talk now about the Commission's initial proposals for the London region, which were published on 13 September 2016. The Commission's proposals for this region are for 68 constituencies, a reduction of five. Our proposals leave four of the existing constituencies unchanged. We use the European electoral regions as a

template for the allocation of the 499 constituencies to which England is entitled. That 499 does not include the two constituencies to be allocated to the Isle of Wight. This approach is permitted by the legislation and has been supported by previous public consultation. This approach does not prevent anyone from putting forward counter-proposals that include one or more constituencies being split between the regions, but it is likely that compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us to depart from the regional-based approach we adopted in formulating our initial proposals. In considering the composition of each European electoral region, we noted that it might not be possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual boroughs in London. As it has not always been possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual London boroughs, we have grouped them into sub-regions. The number of constituencies allocated to each sub-region is determined by the electorate of the combined boroughs. Of the four existing constituencies we propose to retain, one is in the Borough of Havering, two are in the Borough of Richmond upon Thames, and one is in the Borough of Kingston upon Thames. Substantial change is required, however, throughout London in order to comply with the electoral quota. Consequently, it has been necessary to propose 38 constituencies that cross London borough boundaries. Of these, 36 contain part of two London boroughs, and two contain parts of three or more London boroughs. In order to create 68 constituencies wholly within London, we are proposing one constituency – that is, Bow and Canning Town – that crosses the River Lea. We have not proposed any constituencies that cross the River Thames.

The statutory rules allow us to take into account local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015. These include both the external boundaries of local councils and their internal boundaries, known as wards or electoral divisions. We seek to avoid dividing wards between constituencies wherever possible. Wards are well-defined and well-understood units which are generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest. We consider that any division of these units between constituencies will be likely to break local ties, disrupt political party organisations, and cause difficulties for electoral registration and returning officers, who are responsible for running elections. It is our view that only in exceptional and compelling circumstances will splitting a ward between constituencies be justified, and our initial proposals do not do so. If an alternative scheme proposes to split wards, strong evidence and justification will need to be provided, and the extent of such ward-splitting should be kept to a minimum.

The scale of change in this review is significant, and we look forward to hearing the views of people at this hearing, and throughout the rest of the consultation period. We are consulting on our proposals until Monday 5 December 2016, so there is still time after this hearing for people to contribute in writing. There are also reference copies of the proposals present at this hearing, and they are also available on our website and in a number of places of deposit around the region. You can make written representations

to us through our consultation website, which is [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk). I do urge everyone to submit written representations to us before the deadline of 5 December.

Finally, I would like to remind all participants that this hearing is part of a public consultation. You will be asked to provide us with your name and address if you make an oral representation. The Commission is legally required to take a record of the public hearings, and, as you can see, we are making a video recording, from which we will create a verbatim transcript. The Commission is required to publish the record of the public hearing, along with all written representations, for a four-week period, during which members of the public have an opportunity to comment on those representations. We expect this period to occur during the spring of next year. The publication of the hearing records and written representations include certain personal data of those who have made representations. I therefore invite all those contributing to read the Commission's data protection and privacy policy, a copy of which we have with us, and which is also available on our website.

Just before I hand back to the Chair to begin the public hearing, I thank you for your attendance today. If you require the toilets, they are outside in the lobby, and if there is a fire alarm, that means there is a fire, so please evacuate as quickly as possible. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you very much indeed, and if we commence the proceedings, I would ask Sona Mahtani and Seema Chandwani to come forward, please. If you come to the lectern here. They should put up the constituency you are interested in and want to talk about, and you have got a pointer there if you want to use it, a laser pointer. If you could just introduce yourselves both by name and address at the beginning? Thank you very much.

MS MAHTANI: Hi. My name is Sona Mahtani. I am here, really, because I work for a charity based in Tottenham. My residential address is 33 Southey Road, N15 5LJ, and our organisational address is Selby Trust, Selby Centre, Tottenham, London N17 8JL.

Now, Tottenham is very famous for its White Hart Lane notoriety, and that is a football club just up the road from us, so, you know, we are, kind of, flying the flag for Tottenham today. I hope that map does come up during the course of our deputation to you.

Firstly, thank you for arranging these sessions. We have found Harrow and made the trek here because it is a very important issue for us. The Selby Centre is located in the White Hart Lane ward, and sits close to the boundary of the neighbouring constituency in Edmonton. So, we are right at the top of that map, where it says White Hart Lane (indicating). Our key issue is that, in combining a segment from Edmonton and from Tottenham, it would bring together two very already deprived constituencies into a, kind of, mega-deprived area, and we feel that that would create a kind of ghetto in our patch

and really destabilise the area. We have already, kind of, survived two riots within a generation. Part of our briefing to you is to highlight the work done by Stuart Lipton in this deputation.

The second point we wanted to make was, given the work that we do, as a charity, we see many people in very desperate circumstances within the one place under our motto. Within the work we do, we have a food bank, various job support programmes, to really help local people. If the constituency was combined, what we would find is we ourselves would be overwhelmed, along with local services. We think it would be very confusing for local residents to have to work across two constituencies to get the day-to-day support that they need from their MP. In our patch, what we find is, people are not great complainers, and so it would really help if the Boundary Commission heard --- Actually, we feel that the original proposals were actually very good, the bringing on board of another ward of Stroud Green would actually make it a suitably sized constituency, as well as deliver the efficiencies. Perhaps what has happened between the original proposal and now is political parties are contributing in ways that best serve their purposes but not necessarily the residents from the area. Those are our key points. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you, and would you like to speak?

MS CHANDWANI: Hi. My name is Seema Chandwani. I am also from the Selby Trust, which is a charity based in Tottenham. Do you need my address?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Please, yes.

MS CHANDWANI: It is 11 Culross Close, Tottenham, London, N15 3RH, and the work address is the Selby Centre, Selby Road, Tottenham, London N17 8JL.

I guess we are in a really awkward position, because we are actually coming here to tell you that your initial proposals were spot on and right, and that we are asking you not to really change them regarding Tottenham. Since the last review, we have had riots, and we felt that the Boundary Commission have taken their social responsibility seriously to ensure that it does not create a piece of paper that has not taken that into account from Whitehall, but actually has looked at the social issues within the specific area. What we liked about it was that it was kept within one borough, that it avoided breaking local ties, and that it ensured that vulnerable people stayed within the same boundaries as the NHS, the council, and other service boundaries, and we feel that, if they were now split between two constituencies, that could become quite complicated for some of the most vulnerable people in our society, including people with severe mental health issues.

We also believe, as a charity, that a lot of the funding that comes into organisations that have to provide support is very borough-based in their geography, and we feel that if we

are now having to cover what feels like three boroughs, we know that the people do not move but we know that people will now get confused and associate themselves with Hackney or associate themselves with Edmonton and Enfield; that it could become quite difficult for us.

We do have serious concerns about the counter-proposals that have come in, because we believe that, in terms of North Tottenham and Edmonton, you are actually creating a constituency of mass deprivation, really. Tottenham is already one of the most deprived areas in London and in the UK, and in some wards it is the most deprived in the EU, so we are now in a situation where we will be paired up with others. So, we know that Sir Stuart Lipton has written to the Boundary Commission with his concerns. For the purposes of people in the room, he was the one who conducted the review into why the riots happened and what it is that we can do to prevent another riot, and we believe that everything that the counter-proposals are putting in is actually working against that, and we have made a lot of progress. I do want to say as somebody who grew up in Tottenham, who lives in Tottenham, and who works in Tottenham, that we have just faced our second riot, and we are still in a healing process from that. For those of you that do not live in Tottenham, it feels like something that happened a long time ago. We are still seeing the reaps of that, and we believe that any changes to that boundary will kind of make that a longer process, but will not create the stability and the need for us to move forward that we need, and we do believe that it needs its own advocate in Parliament to keep that on the right trajectory. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Any matters for clarification? So, essentially, your point is, you are speaking in favour of the Boundary Commission's initial proposals and you are concerned about some of the counter-proposals that you have seen or heard of?

MS CHANDWANI: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed.

MS CHANDWANI: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Helen Hayes? Would you like to come forward, and by way of introduction, name and address to start, please? Thank you very much indeed.

MS HAYES MP: (Member of Parliament for Dulwich and West Norwood) Thank you. There are a few slides, which I hope might appear in a second, but thank you very much and good morning, everybody. I am Helen Hayes. I am the Member of Parliament for Dulwich and West Norwood, Labour Member of Parliament, and I give my address for the purposes of this hearing as the House of Commons, if that is acceptable, and I will just wait for the slides, if that is okay.

I represent Dulwich and West Norwood in South London, and am very pleased to have found Harrow this morning, which is quite some distance away. It is a constituency which has been in existence with its current boundaries since 2010, but there has been a Dulwich and West Norwood constituency since 1997, and that constituency was formed substantially from the two constituencies of Dulwich and Norwood, which had been in existence since 1885, so there is depth and longevity in this series of communities being represented by the same elected representatives, and you will see the constituency takes in, on the map, a chunk of Brixton, Herne Hill, the Dulwich area of the constituency, West Norwood, Gipsy Hill, part of Crystal Palace, part of Camberwell, and part of Tulse Hill. (Indicating)

I am pleased to see, in the Boundary Commission's current proposal, a Dulwich and West Norwood constituency retained. I think that that reflects that depth and longevity of consistent parliamentary representation going back in one form or another since 1885. Dulwich and West Norwood is the only constituency within Lambeth and Southwark which crosses the borough boundary, but it does that very effectively and it reflects a longstanding and established set of working relationships between the two boroughs, most obviously reflected in a single Greater London Authority constituency boundary, which is the constituency of Lambeth and Southwark, but it also reflects local health economies. King's College Hospital sits within my constituency, just within Lambeth, but substantially serving the population in Southwark as well, and it reflects a number of shared services that operate between the boroughs, and it reflects several communities which cross the borough boundary, and I will speak a little bit about one of those in a moment. The Boundary Commission proposal loses the Brixton part of the constituency, proposes to lose Knight's Hill Ward, which is one of the West Norwood wards, down here, and adds in the South Camberwell ward, which was previously part of the constituencies that get swapped back in. (Indicating).

I think, just a little footnote, really, on the loss of Coldharbour ward, in the north, which is the most deprived part of the constituency, and which also changed constituencies back in 2010 and I think from my perspective as the local Member of Parliament, it is the part of the constituency that requires perhaps the most intensive and diligent representation because of the needs of that community, and I think there is perhaps an argument to be made for consistency of representation and for that being the part of the constituency that would benefit least from being swapped backwards and forwards over a short number of years.

However, the main points that I would like to make today relate to two other parts of the proposal. Firstly, West Norwood. So, this I brought to show you today, is the image that one of the local community forums is using to advertise a meeting which will take place next week to discuss the Boundary Commission proposals, because you will see on the left-hand side of the slide, this is Knight's Hill ward; on the right-hand side of the slide, this is Gipsy Hill at the top and then Thurlow Park wards, and this is West

Norwood town centre, which is a coherent community around a town centre, with a library, with a leisure centre, with local shops, with a strong independent retail community and many other facilities, which has a very coherent sense of identity around that high street, and there is a considerable amount of distress in the local community about the idea that that town centre would be split between two parliamentary constituencies, and the effect in particular of taking out Knight's Hill ward on the left and putting it, for representational purposes, in with Streatham and Mitcham is not going down at all well in the local community. People feel that they orient themselves towards West Norwood and then towards Brixton and towards central London, not towards Streatham and certainly not towards Mitcham, which is some considerable distance away, both geographically and psychologically. All of the topography, the hills in that area, the catchment areas for local schools, the health economies, the retail economies, pull this community together, not apart. I will make a written statement to the Boundary Commission, and I will set out some detail in that, but I wanted to flag up as early as possible that that particular part of the proposal does not sit comfortably with the community and I do not think works at all well for the purposes of representation.

The second and final point that I would like to make today concerns Herne Hill, which is a community which crosses the borough boundary, so you will see the images that I have brought today show the market, which takes place in Station Square at Herne Hill. Immediately across the road, the big pub, which is shortly to reopen, which serves the town centre and the high street environment along Half Moon Lane, and you will see on the map how the black line shows the borough - so this is Herne Hill centre here - shows the borough boundary, which slices between Herne Hill and then, just to note, here, to the bottom of the map, is Brockwell Park, which is a huge, great, beautiful open space. At the moment, my constituency of Dulwich and West Norwood crosses the Borough boundary and it is the only administrative unit that does so, so Herne Hill, I think it is fair to say, suffers from the borough divide on issues like waste collection, street maintenance, anti-social behaviour. Policing is challenging in that area; we have really big challenges around big events in Brockwell Park and the clear-up operation, and who takes responsibility in which of the boroughs, and the Member of Parliament, both my predecessor and myself, play a very strong and important convening role in pulling the councils together to make sure that everybody takes the responsibility that they have to take, and that is a very real, quite time-consuming, quite practical role that is played on a month-in, month-out basis in Herne Hill. I know that the Boundary Commission has received counter-proposals, which seek to consolidate constituencies within the borough boundaries for Lambeth and Southwark, and I wanted to put on record that in relation to the Herne Hill and Dulwich part of my constituency, that would not be acceptable to the local community and it really would not work well in practical terms, and it would have significantly negative consequences for the quality and the complexity of the representation that local people in that area of the constituency receive.

We are a constituency where there are other communities that are affected by that cross-boundary Lambeth-Southwark relationship, and where the constituency works well, including West Dulwich, and I will write to the Commission again in a little bit more detail about some of those communities. I wanted to say really, from the perspective of the constituency and the communities that I represent, the Boundary Commission's proposals are broadly acceptable, flagging the big problem around the carving up of West Norwood, some sadness and a little bit of concern about the potential loss of Coldharbour ward to the north, but also placing on record that proposals which seek to move things around so that we slice Herne Hill through the middle really would not be acceptable. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. It is very clear and helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? No. In which case, thank you very much indeed.

Julian Gallant? If, again, you could introduce yourself by way of name and address at the beginning? Thank you.

MR GALLANT: Good morning. I am Julian Gallant. I live at 30 Avenue Gardens, London, W3 8HB. I have lived in the area since 1998. This is currently in the Ealing Central and Acton constituency.

I would like to draw the Commission's attention to aspects of the newly proposed constituency of Ealing and Shepherd's Bush. This constituency would cede the ward of Southfield to the new Brentford and Chiswick seat, and it would cede the ward of Walpole to Southall and Heston, whilst adding the wards of Askew, Wormholt and White City, and Shepherd's Bush Green, which are currently in Hammersmith.

The upside of this: my sense is that Southfield, and I do live right on its border, can be ceded to the new Brentford and Chiswick constituency, in Hounslow borough, without undue concern. It is already in the W4 postal district and many residents feel they are more part of Chiswick than Ealing, and it shares issues with Hounslow as well as Ealing. The Overground railway line forms a natural border between the W4 and W3 postal districts, and residents of Southfield gravitate, certainly, towards the shops on Chiswick High Road rather than Acton High Street or indeed Ealing Broadway. So, Southfield, I feel, will be happily part of Brentford and Chiswick.

Now, the problem is the title of the new seat, "Ealing Central and Shepherd's Bush", gives away the nub of the problem. It does not even mention Acton, and Acton lies between Ealing and Shepherd's Bush on The Vale (ancient Roman road). It was once a separate borough and it has a unique character and a unique set of issues. On the one hand, there are wonderful new factors, such as Crossrail; new commercial developments north of the A40; new schools; new housing developments, such as Acton Gardens. All good, but, on the other hand, we are talking about one of the most

deprived areas in London; people are actually displaced by the new developments; pollution on Horn Lane; homelessness and poverty. Acton simply does not look after itself.

Now, the three Acton wards of South Acton, Acton Central and East Acton currently form the eastern border of Ealing Borough. Under the current proposal, Acton would be sandwiched and therefore at risk of being sidelined as some kind of transit district. East Acton in particular is a very large ward, with constituents living as far north as the Grand Union Canal, over the Grand Union Canal, and in residential pockets on the Wesley Estate and Wales Farm Road. These constituents have to contend with big upheavals, such as HS2. Some of them are going to have the slag pile from the tunnelling from HS2 on one side and on the other side they will have the new Old Oak Common developments, scheduled for completion in 2070 and these people just might be neglected if this constituency includes the three Hammersmith wards.

Now, I realise that the new constituency must meet the required quota of electors, and therefore I propose that it keeps the name Ealing Central and Acton, and gains the wards of Cleveland and Perivale, which are currently in Ealing North. Cleveland is contiguous with the wards of Hanger Hill and Ealing Broadway. It gravitates towards the shops on Pitshanger Lane, The Avenue, and it gravitates towards the Church of St Barnabas and the Abbey of St Benedict's. Perivale, to the north, is a very self-contained ward, with its own schools, shopping centre and industrial area. It has southern links to the northern part of Ealing, via Pitshanger Park, the St Mary's Perivale Arts Centre, and the Gurnell Swimming Pool, all of which span the border between this ward and Cleveland ward, and the point is that both Cleveland and Perivale wards consider themselves – if wards have a personality, which they do – very much part of Ealing.

So, in conclusion, Ealing Central and Acton would be made up of the wards Acton Central, Cleveland, Ealing Broadway, Ealing Common, East Acton, Hanger Hill, Perivale and South Acton. It would have an electorate of 71,456. It would thus remain entirely in the Borough of Ealing under one local authority and this is much, much clearer for the MP, for the residents, for councillors, and council officers alike.

The same could be said of Ealing North. If this constituency loses Perivale and Cleveland, it might retain Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End, and gain Dormer's Wells and Lady Margaret, currently in Ealing Southall, thus Ealing North would also remain entirely within the lines of the Borough of Ealing. Ealing North would be comprised of Dormer's Wells, Greenford Broadway, Greenford Green, Hobbayne, Lady Margaret, North Greenford, Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End. It would have an electorate of 74,240. The central point, and I am sure you have heard it many, many times in this whole remarkable exercise, is that these constituencies would be much, much better if they remained within a single borough boundary. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, thank you very much indeed. Will you be making a written submission as well?

MR GALLANT: I will, and I was asked if I could leave this with you. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, please, if you would. That would be most helpful.

MR GALLANT: It is not wonderfully well-dressed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, that is perfect.

MR GALLANT: It has got my phone number and email.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely. Thank you. Next? We do not have a next. Right. Well, I suggest we adjourn for ten minutes and wait for some further speakers to arrive. Thank you.

Time Noted: 10.41 am

After a short break

Time Noted: 10.50 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Hi, ladies and gentlemen. Shall we reconvene? We have a speaker, and that is Mrs Chika Amadi. If you would like to come forward, please. Thank you. Speak here, just by the microphone here, and if you could just start by saying your name and address, and then give your presentation. Thank you very much.

CLLR AMADI: Good morning, everybody. It is my pleasure to be here. I am Cllr Chika Amadi. Address is 46 Evergreen Drive, West Drayton, UB7 9GH. I work in Harrow seven days a week, actually, because I am a councillor in Harrow, actually in Edgware, and I work as a legal advisor in Harrow and I am a pastor of a church, which is also in Harrow, so I am fully in Harrow.

Now, I am here to support the Labour proposal especially regarding the Hendon and Edgware constituency. Being a councillor in Edgware, I speak to residents every time and personally I shop in Edgware, in Burnt Oak. We have African shops there; we have Eastern European shops; we have Caribbean shops there; we have Asian shops; we have English shops; so it is a community. Edgware community is like the same community divided into two boroughs, Barnet and Harrow, but it would be very important and very good to combine them together, to bring them together, because

they are part of one community. It is one community, one culture, and one commercial hub. Burnt Oak Broadway is a commercial hub for these two communities, and is very important. If you go on the street of Burnt Oak Broadway, you will see people of diverse colour, and Harrow is known for diversity, and what can bring us closer than to make it one constituency? That would be the greatest reason, or the greatest point of connection, to make them as the one community they have been. We share the same architectural design; the buildings look alike. We share the same cultural bond, because when people come in there, you see Africans going into Caribbean shops; you see Africans going into Asian shops. In Edgware, in Barnet and Harrow, they use the same transport links. All the buses --- the bus travelling from Stonegrove and Burnt Oak Broadway links them. There are several buses interconnected. They use the same train stations. Burnt Oak train station is used by Harrow residents over here in Harrow and also used by people in the Hendon area, and also the Edgware train station serves residents of Harrow, and all the shopping facilities are being used by --- in fact, Edgware is a central shopping place for everybody in Harrow, in Edgware, in Canons area, and people in main Barnet. So it would be very wise, it is common sense, that people of the same commercial link, trading links, school links, hospital --- personally, when my daughter was sick, because I was living in Harrow – I just moved to West Drayton last year – the closest hospital – we were living in Belmont Circle, which is in Harrow and in Edgware, so I took her to the Community Hospital in Edgware – it was just close to my house – than driving to Northwick Park. So there is this connection. Strong connection.

The school is accessible to both of them, and if you look at the community that makes up Edgware in Harrow and Edgware in Brent, they are all, I would say, they are Jewish people. There is a community. They share synagogues together, so I would prefer, and I would like, and I will want this Commission to use this common sense, not to divide this community apart. Let them remain as one. Make it a constituency to keep that cultural bond, to keep that business bond, to keep that trading bond, to keep the school bonds. Keep the hospital. Everything. They are already one community, and it will be better served than looking at --- There is another option being proposed by the Boundary Commission and Conservatives, looking at Edgware --- Sorry, just give me a minute. Yes. Pairing Edgware and Hatch End. That is absurd. There is no connection whatsoever. There is no cultural connection. The build-up of the area is quite different. Hatch End is known as a highbrow area, affluent area, then Edgware is the other way round, so it is not going to be a very good connection. One part will be feeling up, and the other ones will be feeling threatened. Being somebody who is local to Edgware and who speaks to Edgware residents every week, week in, week out, we go door knocking, I know what matters to these people. Go in the Burnt Oak Broadway, the other side, you will see the high concentration of Romanian people, Polish people, on both sides, and that cultural language connection is there. Then I shop in African shops where I buy my hair stuff, I buy my African food. They are on both sides, and there is this interaction there, so if I get down there, I meet whomever I want to meet there because they are there, African people are there, Caribbean people are there, my food stuff is

there, so it is better. I am here, standing to say, both on a personal level and the community I represent there, they feel as a community, there is a community link, a community feeling, between Edgware in Harrow and Edgware in Barnet, so the best option, I am standing here to propose to you, is that the Hendon Edgware constituency is better off. While, apart from that, I will also say that they share architectural design. If you go to Burnt Oak and stand there, you look at Harrow this side, you look at Barnet, the buildings look alike, exactly alike, and they are being used almost in similar ways, and you know what? Every constituency needs a shopping hub, and the Burnt Oak Broadway is that hub. Now it is being built up, being used by people from this side and this side. It is a strong connection. To be honest, any wise and common sense, we see that there is a bigger bond in every way. Religious places of worship. I know my residents who live in this side of Edgware, the Harrow side of Edgware, their church is just by Burnt Oak train station, which is in Barnet, so there is council, religiously, culturally, topography. The topography is the same, like if it rains, or anything, it is the same topography, and all these things should be put into consideration. Look at the Hive. The Hive is owned by Edgware Football Team. Edgware, Barnet, but it is in Harrow. So you see, when there is a match, who goes there? It is the Edgware residents in Harrow and the Edgware residents in Barnet. So it is very strong. The connection is so strong that you cannot take it away. So, this is my proposal today, that I support the Harrow proposal that the Hendon and Edgware constituency is a strong, connected community and I will ask you, please: consider it and keep them as one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

CLLR AMADI: My pleasure.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You put that across very well and very passionately. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, then thank you very much indeed.

MRS AMADI: My pleasure.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Mukhtar Ghaffar? Would you like to come forward, Sir, to make your presentation? If you could start by just saying your name and address before you speak. Thank you.

MR GHAFAR: Morning, everyone. My name is Mukhtar Ghaffar. I live in Edgware. My address is 40 The Chase, Edgware, HA8 5DJ.

Again, very similar to the lady before me, I support the Edgware Hendon constituency proposal. I have lived in Edgware all my life. I have gone to school just down the road from there, in Canons High School, and now, currently, I am involved with a very strong local charity called Hope Kitchen, based in Burnt Oak, and we do a lot of work there. The other proposal I have just listened to as well, linking Edgware with Hatch End: they

are two opposite neighbourhoods, truly. There are no true similarities between them. We do a lot of work within the Morrisons stores, a lot of fundraising between Queensbury, Colindale, and Hatch End. The clientele that we work with, the individuals that fundraise, they are completely different. Edgware community, Burnt Oak, Colindale, Hendon: it is all one hub. We work with a lot of families. We provide free breakfast clubs to many primary schools, Edgware Primary School being one. We work with a lot of families and provide them with a food bank service and counselling. We also provide homework clubs and tuition clubs for free for children within the area. Most of these children go to Edgware Primary School or Colindale Primary School, but their families live within Edgware, Hendon, Colindale: all within the proposal of the Labour Party. It makes absolute sense to keep that as one boundary. It is a massive link. People that go to Edgware Community Hospital are the residents that live within Edgware, Colindale, Hendon or Canons. You will not find people coming to this area, or to these shopping centres, or these malls, from Hatch End, so it is very important that we keep this community as one.

As the lady before me did say, we are a diverse culture – people of all different races, religions, background and culture – but we all have integrated, very strong and very well, together. We are constantly evolving, integrating, and this is our strength. You do not find such integration in Hatch End. I have lived in this area all my life. I know Hatch End like the back of my hand. They are two different parts. Hatch End is the posher part of the neighbourhood, and Edgware, Burnt Oak, not so much, therefore it makes common sense to keep this community a community. Any increase or change in the boundaries will cause division and a divide, and it will be uncomfortable for members of the community to be together.

Again, our transport system, it is very simple: the train overline is Edgware, Burnt Oak, Colindale, Brent Cross. Our restaurants, our cafés, are based on Burnt Oak Broadway and West Hendon. We get our takeaways from there, we buy our food from there; our casual cultural shopping is within Burnt Oak Broadway and Watling Avenue, which links into Edgware Broadwalk, which is our local family shopping mall. It is our family shopping centre. If we want to have a bit of a nicer jazz, we go to Brent Cross shopping centre, but what I am trying to say, guys: we have established ourselves as a community. We have always been divided. I live on The Chase. Half of The Chase is Barnet; half of The Chase – one road – is partially covered by Harrow. It has always been a confusion when certain roadworks are being done, when the bins are being arranged, and it has been a confusion as I have grown up, but we have just dealt with it.

But it would be absolutely amazing for us to no longer have that confusion, for us to say: “You know what? We are now one boundary. We are one border”. I could not believe it can happen, but if this opportunity presents itself, it will be welcomed by every member living within that borough, within those areas, to be united, finally, under one boundary, because we have not had that privilege before, and it is very well needed.

I would like to further say, as a charity, I work with several hundred families a week. Single parents, young families. We provide them with an opportunity for their children to come to a free tuition centre, where they can get a free meal. In Burnt Oak Broadway, we are launching, God willing, before this side of Christmas, our first ever “pay as you feel” café for the community, where vulnerable members of that community can come along for a free meal, especially as winter is coming, for absolutely free. Hope Kitchen has created this, and we are all starting off in the next few months, and this pay as you feel café, or this community café, is going to serve members of that community as I have just mentioned, in that area. It will not serve members of Hatch End, for they do not need any help. It will not serve members of the upper class area that live in that area.

So, again, in closing, we have evolved and become one united community, and it is working very well. We all have supported each other. We are supporting each other, and we have truly become one voice. I would urge this council, if you can please make Hendon and Edgware a boundary, it will just allow us to flourish and to grow even more than we already have been, and it is a well-deserved opportunity for us and something we have truly been welcoming and I, a person who has lived all my life in this area, cannot say that this would be something we needed many years ago. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, then thank you.

MR GHAFAR: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr David Longstaff? Would you like to come forward, Sir? If you make your presentation. If you could just introduce yourself by way of name and address at the beginning? Thank you.

CLLR LONGSTAFF: Good morning. I am David Longstaff, and my address is 66 Hatley Close, Friern Barnet, London, N11 3LN.

I am here this morning to talk about the proposed Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency. I am the local councillor, and I am the Chair of the local Conservative Association and Chair of the local Town Team, and I feel it is important, for a number of reasons, that we keep Barnet together, rather than dividing it up across several constituencies. Brunswick Park, for example, is inextricably linked to East Barnet. A large number of the residents have East Barnet on their address. They feel they are part of East Barnet. To split off Brunswick Park would be to almost turn it into a, kind of, semi-schizophrenic feeling for the local residents, who would then think they are part of East Barnet, but in fact, they would be part of a different area. Interestingly, though, Coppetts ward does have its own town centre in the south of the borough, and a good deal of residents think they are already part of Muswell Hill, so we can understand why

that would be sensible for that to go, possibly, to a different constituency. But we also feel, as well, that the Mill Hill constituency, which has a, sort of, semi-rural nature, very similar to Totteridge, although it is not a logical urban part to be the constituency, it does make sense for Coppetts to be part of Totteridge and part of the Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency.

Chipping Barnet has been together since 1974 and it has that strong feel of being part of something, and if you look closely at the areas and where people feel they live, a large number of people, even though there is not a ward known as New Barnet, actually feel they belong to New Barnet town centre area, and that encompasses East Barnet and Brunswick Park. I think, as well, and it is slightly askew to that, is the Cockfosters ward, which does lend itself to the Cockfosters High Street, and that Cockfosters ward, although it is just beyond Hadley, it does lend itself to being part of a different area, unless of course you are including the whole of the Cockfosters High Street, which you are not, as part of the area, so that would make a difference.

I also find it, on a slightly more tricky note, that for those people who are the MPs in the area, the more cross-boundary you go, the more you are having to deal with different Chief Executives of different councils. The more you are having to deal with different police Borough Commanders with different boroughs, and so you are dividing up lots of time and indeed wasting lots of precious time of Members of Parliament going backwards and forwards between different areas to talk to different people, possibly in an environment where you are having to make relationships with people to get things done with the directors of certain institutions, with voluntary institutions, that quite often are limited by their name, you know, so you would get Age UK Barnet, and so therefore you would be having to deal with two efforts of Age UK Barnet, Age UK Enfield, and potentially if you are then splitting it off, you have got Age UK in Muswell Hill.

So, there are lots of different areas, I think, that are important, that need to be considered, but preferably from where I am standing, I would like to keep Barnet within Barnet. It makes sense, it is the second --- no, it is the largest borough in London, and I think it is important that we keep the MPs working for what amounts to about the tenth largest town in England, I think, is Barnet, so I think it is important that we do try and keep as much as possible within Barnet. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, then thank you very much indeed.

CLLR LONGSTAFF: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Theresa Villiers, would you like to come forward? If you could, again, just introduce yourself by way of name and address, thank you.

RT HON. THERESA VILLIERS MP: (Member of Parliament for Chipping Barnet) Yes. Certainly. My name is Theresa Villiers. I am Member of Parliament for Chipping Barnet and my address is the House of Commons.

Can I thank you for allowing me to say a few words this morning about what I think is a very important matter? I have represented the Chipping Barnet constituency for 17 years: for 11 years as its MP, and then prior to that, six years as its Member of the European Parliament, and I am here to support the Conservative proposals for Barnet and Enfield, and in particular, a Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency made up of the wards Brunswick Park, East Barnet, High Barnet, Mill Hill, Oakley, Totteridge and Underhill, and a new Finchley and Muswell Hill seat, into which Coppetts ward would go, and I have prepared some written submissions, which hopefully your colleague will have given to you.

So, what I am advocating is very similar for my constituency to the Boundary Commission proposals, except that I feel it is important to retain Brunswick Park in the new constituency rather than gaining Cockfosters ward. In both cases, your proposals and mine, Mill Hill is added to make up the new Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency. As you heard from my friend and colleague David Longstaff just now, we have been a constituency since 1974 and broadly based on, sort of, similar boundaries since 1945. In that time, the boundary has been relatively constant, linking together communities that grew up alongside the expansion of the railways and the London Underground network.

Whilst I would be sorry to see the Coppetts ward go to a new constituency, I do think it makes sense to link it in the new Finchley and Muswell Hill constituency, which is advocated by the Conservatives. Coppetts has its own town centre. It shares parish boundaries and school catchment areas with Finchley. Residents do tend to look south towards Muswell Hill, as Cllr Longstaff told you. Actually, there are some people who are quite surprised to find that they do actually live in Barnet, and for example, they would view their local hospital as the Whittington, so for all sorts of reasons, I think Coppetts is a good fit with a new Finchley and Muswell Hill seat. I am not convinced by the Boundary Commission proposals for Finchley and Southgate, since it seems quite artificial and there are not huge community connections between the two.

Turning to Brunswick Park ward, as you have heard already this morning, it is very closely linked with East Barnet ward. Residents see themselves as being overall, sort of --- for example, the East Barnet and New Barnet area tends to overlap across East Barnet ward and Brunswick Park. It is very difficult to separate the two. For example, local residents' associations very much operate across both Brunswick Park ward and East Barnet, so I think there is a strong case for keeping Brunswick Park ward as part of a Barnet constituency, but where I do very much agree with the Boundary Commission is that Mill Hill is a good addition to a new constituency. It has lots in common with wards like Totteridge, Hadley and Arkley, which retain much of their village character,

open spaces, and green belt land, and in many ways, Mill Hill has more in common with those wards in the Chipping Barnet constituency than it does, perhaps, with many of the very urbanised Hendon wards in the constituency in which it currently sits, so I think that emphasis on conservation area, on green belt and on open spaces makes Mill Hill a very logical addition to the Chipping Barnet constituency.

Turning lastly to Cockfosters ward, which the Commission proposes to add to a new Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency, there are some connections between the Cockfosters area in Cockfosters ward and East Barnet ward, and there are some connections between Hadley Wood in Cockfosters and High Barnet, but I do not think these are strong enough to justify moving it out of an Enfield and Southgate constituency. I think my main concern with that proposal is that it is part of a bigger proposal, which essentially dismembers Enfield and Southgate, and leaves political representation in Enfield very dislocated. I do not think the residents of Enfield or Cockfosters ward would be well served by chopping up Enfield Southgate into five parts to be represented by five MPs, and therefore I think it is important that Cockfosters is retained in a recreated Enfield Southgate seat. I know the Boundary Commission are trying to avoid creating orphan wards, where a ward in one borough is attached to a constituency predominantly in another, and you heard from David Longstaff some of the disadvantages around that, but I think the big disadvantage in this case is, if you do detach Cockfosters and create an orphan ward, it leads to, I think, a significant deterioration in the logic of representation in Enfield, so I would very much hope that the Commission might be able to think again about that.

I know that the representations of political parties do not necessarily count more than anyone else's but all three of the main political parties feel that the proposals for Enfield Southgate on the table from the Commission at the moment just do not work, and certainly we in the Conservatives feel that we have got a good alternative, which I hope the Commission will take seriously.

Just to wrap up, I think the Commission's proposal for the Hendon constituency with the addition of Golders Green and Finchley Church End makes sense, and obviously make the numbers work, and those were broadly the reasons why I am here to advocate a new Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is most helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? In which case, can I thank you? Thank you very much indeed. We now have a gap with no speakers, so I suggest we have a recess for, say, 15 minutes. Thank you.

Time Noted: 11.26 am

After a short break

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, reconvening, but that is to say that no other speakers have turned up. Our next scheduled speaker is actually 12.20, so what I suggest is, we adjourn now till 12.20. That gives people the chance to pop out to the many hostelrys in the area. Thank you.

After a short break

Time Noted: 12.20 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene now. We have two speakers, in fact. It is quite exciting. So, we are starting with Angella Murphy-Strachan, I think it is? Angella, if you would like to come forward and speak from here, and if you could introduce yourself by way of your name and address just to begin? Thank you.

MS MURPHY-STRACHAN: My name is Angella Murphy-Strachan. I live at 41 Hartford Avenue in Harrow. That is in Kenton, and I am here to, sort of, speak about the proposals regarding the boundary changes. I have made some notes, because I am not very good at, sort of, remembering everything.

I live in Kenton, on the Harrow side of the Kenton Road, and have done so for over 20 years now. My mother and brother also live about a mile away from me, on the Harrow side of the Kenton Road, also. My youth was spent in the Tokyngton ward of Brent. My sister and her family still live there, in Tokyngton, in Brent, and being such a close family, I visit them frequently, travelling along the Preston Road. I often use the shopping facilities along the Preston Road, things like the Co-op. I use the banks quite a lot, Santander and Barclays, and so on. In addition to that, Claremont High School is on the Brent side of the border. My nieces and nephews attended there, although we live in Harrow. In the early stages of my teaching career, I worked at St Gregory's Roman Catholic High School, which is on the Brent side of the border.

So, to my mind, because I use, sort of, Preston Road quite a lot, and areas around Kenton, which are located in Brent, to my mind, including the Preston ward, from Brent, within Kenton, is better and also more relevant to the community in which I live, primarily because of the links provided by services such as the 223 bus and, of course, the Bakerloo line would provide a natural constituency boundary in that respect.

So, the next point I would like to make is that, before I was a teacher, I worked for Trading Standards, for both Harrow and Brent, and that was some years ago, and the service was delivered by one department to both boroughs, so crossing the local government boundary between Harrow and Brent to me is quite logical, because it is something, sort of, having worked cross-boundary in previous years, it is quite a logical conclusion to follow, and also, things like the GLA link both boroughs.

The third point I would like to make is that, as a Kenton resident, I use the Kenton Road quite a lot, whether I am, sort of, going to Northwick Park Hospital, and I have had to use Northwick Park Hospital quite a lot over the last ten, fifteen years. The shops along Kenton Road are Sainsbury's, the big Sainsbury's, I go there shopping quite a lot, and that is in Brent, so the main Kenton Road is, sort of, a main road that links, that runs through, the Kenton community, to my mind. I mean, all the shops along the Kenton Road, I visited at one time or another as my daughter was growing up. I certainly use them, especially the party shops, the balloon shops, and so on. I certainly, sort of, use them quite a lot.

So, the Kenton Road provides a key artery for Kenton community. At present, it is divided between constituencies. You have heard me mention, sort of, Sainsbury's in Brent and Northwick Park Hospital, and so on, and I think that would be better represented by a constituency which crosses the borough boundaries and combines both sides: so, rather than have the Kenton Road separating Brent and Harrow, having them combined into the Kenton constituency. The principle of a Kenton constituency crossing Brent and Harrow, to me, makes a great deal of sense, having used it so extensively over the last 20 years and more, because as a child I grew up in Brent, in Tokyngton, and Preston Road is just up the road.

Having looked at the proposals by the Boundary Commission, the Conservatives and Labour, it makes a great deal of sense why you have all agreed on, sort of, a Kenton constituency, but I think that the Labour proposal for a Kenton and Harrow East constituency, the south of the current Harrow East and the rest of Brent North, is most relevant to myself and my family, the people who I know and interact with, who live, sort of, in Kenton. As I said, I looked at the other proposals, and one of them relates to the fact that the Conservatives have proposed to join Kenton on to Greenhill and Harrow-on-the-Hill, and those communities, although I have been through them, I cannot relate them as being part of Kenton. You know, they are very different areas, to me, so I disagree with the idea of Kenton being joined on to Greenhill and Harrow-on-the-Hill, because that is very different to Kenton.

In addition, the other proposal that I noted was that Edgware, which is included with Kenton in the Boundary Commission's proposal, separates the Edgware ward from the rest of the Edgware community, and, sort of, being a teacher, as I said, I worked in St Gregory's, I worked for quite a long time in Edgware, and I think it is better to have an Edgware ward that is connected to Hendon, which is just down the road, not least because of the transport links between the two areas.

So, in conclusion, I agree with Labour's proposals, in particular, for a Kenton and Harrow East constituency, and Hendon and Edgware going together, and the other two points that they make, but the most important one for me is, you know, the Kenton and the Harrow East and I know something about Hendon and Edgware, so to my mind, I think it would be better to have them together as one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? In which case, thank you very much indeed. That is lovely. Thank you.

Mr Eddie Jagers? Would you like to come forward, Sir? Again, if you could speak from the podium, and introduce yourself by way of name and address. Thank you.

MR JAGGERS: My name is Eddie Jagers. I live in 155 Byron Road, Wealdstone, Harrow, HA3 7TB, which is in the Marlborough ward. I have lived in Harrow for over 65 years, and in Wealdstone, or Marlborough ward, for 35 years.

I would urge the Boundary Commission to form a new constituency of Harrow South and Sudbury, incorporating most of Harrow West and a slice of Brent North, rather than the draft proposal of a constituency that incorporates Stanmore Park and Canons with Wealdstone, Marlborough and Greenhill wards. There are few transport links or other links, such as medical or education, between Marlborough and Stanmore/Canons.

I live in the ward of Marlborough, which is now in Harrow West. However, the boundary has changed three times over my lifetime. Originally, it was Harrow Central, then Harrow East, now Harrow West, but always there has been a link that has existed between Greenhill, Wealdstone and Marlborough. After the last boundary change, Marlborough was split. The majority was placed in Harrow East, and a few roads were put into Harrow West. This does cause a lot of confusion during election times. This proposal that I am putting forward, and that I would urge the Boundary Commission to take heed of, Marlborough would be reunited and that community would be reunited. Wealdstone, Marlborough and Greenhill have clear links going south rather than north. We have a far better transport link, two train lines – although they run on the same line, actually – the Bakerloo and the Overground, and three bus routes going south to South Harrow and Sudbury. The GLA seat is elected across Brent and Harrow. This is a clear political link, unlike the Conservative Party proposal that would create a constituency incorporating Harrow West with Northwood, part of Hillingdon. Links do not exist between these two areas, politically or otherwise.

There is the common usage of Northwick Park hospital across Wealdstone, Marlborough, Greenhill, South Harrow, and North Brent. Since the local NHS has incorporated Northwick Park Hospital and Central Middlesex Hospital, Marlborough residents are increasingly being referred to the latter hospital, which has a direct bus link from South Harrow, which is the 487 bus, and a link using the Bakerloo line, from Harrow and Wealdstone station, which is disabled use friendly, which is very important for myself, suffering from asthma quite severely. Marlborough is seen as part of the Harrow town centre. This has been reinforced by Harrow Council's redevelopment plans, that strongly link Marlborough, Greenhill, and Wealdstone wards, and in fact, there is the proposal to build a new civic centre in Wealdstone High Street, which is part

of the Marlborough ward. If the Conservative Party proposal was to be adopted, and Northwood was to be part of the new constituency, it would create a constituency that is not cohesive and parts that have nothing in common with each other. Marlborough has no educational or health links with Northwood. Also, there is limited travel by bus to Harrow-on-the-Hill. You need to get a bus to Harrow-on-the-Hill, and Harrow-on-the-Hill has got three flights of steps up and down, which makes it impossible for disabled access, and it makes it extremely difficult, if possible at all, for me to use it, and I avoid it like the plague. This would alienate me from part of that new proposed constituency under the Conservatives' proposals, as it would other disabled people.

Regarding the link in between Marlborough and the south of the Borough, I regularly do my shopping in South Harrow, Harrow town centre, the majority of it, and also visit, especially for Christmas shopping, to Brent Cross, and we have got services that link us, again by bus, and I tend to use the bus a lot, because it is more disabled access friendly, and I tend to go to Brent Cross on the 182, which is very useful, so there are clear links between that central part of Harrow, the southern part of the borough, and the northern part of Brent. So, to finalise, I would urge the Boundary Commission to take this into account when looking at that. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes?

LORD HAYWARD: Sir, you said you are a resident of Marlborough?

MR JAGGERS: Yes.

LORD HAYWARD: And you were referring to the Conservative proposals including Marlborough in a Ruislip, Northwood and West Harrow constituency?

MR JAGGERS: Yes. Including Northwood.

LORD HAYWARD: The Conservative submission does not include your ward. It actually includes it in a Harrow and Stanmore constituency.

MR JAGGERS: Oh. Right. I beg your pardon.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for the clarification. Thank you very much indeed. Did you want to leave your notes with us?

MR JAGGERS: Yes, certainly. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. That is most helpful. Thank you very much indeed, Mr Jagers. (After a short pause) We do have another speaker, but she is just registering, so if we just wait for a moment or two. (After a short pause) She is

here. Do you want a five-minute break while we just let her come in and get settled? Okay.

Time Noted: 12.37 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 12.45 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene. We have our next speaker. Katharine Bligh, is it not? Yes. Right, Katharine, if you would like to stand here.

MS BLIGH: Do you have maps?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will call up the map on the back here.

MS BLIGH: Katharine Bligh. I have been living in 62B Priory Road, which is just off the Kilburn High Road. It is between Kilburn High Road and Finchley Road, and it is in the centre of the current constituency of Hampstead and Kilburn. It is around there, Priory Road (indicating). It is along there somewhere, and the centre of the current constituency, which goes across the Kilburn High Road, this way, and off your map, really, basically. Queen's Park, Brondesbury, up here, Brondesbury Park, and South Kilburn down here. So, as you can see, I am now currently in the middle of the current constituency.

Now, I have been living at this address for 36 years, so I do know the area pretty well, and as I have said, I am between the Finchley Road and the Kilburn High Road. I will just start by my daily and weekly activities. I should perhaps have mentioned that I am a retired archivist. I shop locally, along the Kilburn High Road, or sometimes up to Finchley Road, to Waitrose, for basic shopping, local shopping. Occasionally, I am down in Queen's Park, for bigger shopping, departmental stores, I am down in Oxford Street. The connections are along the Jubilee Line, so I am using the Jubilee Line. I do not have a car, so I walk everywhere as much as possible, or I use public transport, and West Hampstead is ideal for public transport. You have what used to be called the North London Line, now the Overground, the railway overground, so that runs from Kentish Town in the east, Kentish Town West, right the way through to Richmond Park, but it goes through West Hampstead, Brondesbury, Kensal Rise and beyond, so it is on an east-west projection, and in my exercising and my walking, I am walking around the area. Kilburn Grange Park is my nearest local park, I walk down – brisk walking for exercise – into Queen's Park. I take my grandchildren to Kilburn Grange. I am a member of the Friends of Kilburn Grange Park, and most people from there are across the Kilburn High Road, not just the Camden side, but the Kilburn side, and then I am also a member of my local residents' association, which is the combined residents'

association of South Hampstead. We are in a conservation area, where we are, and also the Safer Neighbourhood of Swiss Cottage, that is, the police, Safer Neighbourhood. I am on their panel. I am also a member of the Fortune Green Choir, which is a local community choir. Most people are within walking distance of where we meet, which is in West Hampstead, Emmanuel Church. I am a little bit further away. Some come from Hampstead. Some come from as far as Willesden Green. Well, that is just two stops on the Jubilee Line, so it is not very far away. None of them at all I have ever come across come from Hendon or Golders Green, or the Hampstead Garden Suburb. It is just not in that orbit.

As I said, all my friends and acquaintances are in the area stretching from Hampstead right the way through to Brondesbury, Kensal Green; I have a son in Willesden Green. If I go to the local cinema, the Tricycle, or sometimes in Hampstead or Belsize Park, and there is a lovely little one called the Lexie Cinema in Kensal Rise, Kensal Green, where I have seen the performances from the Metropolitan Opera, New York, when they have been screened like that, so I like doing that. So, really, I do not go north. I do not have anything to do with Golders Green. It is like Timbuktu to me. It is not easy to get to. There is no easy train ride, like if you go to Hampstead Heath Station, I can go on the train, but just going up a bus up Finchley Road and getting jammed up in traffic is not my idea of --- and anyway, there is nothing there for me at all. The links are just not there, and this year, the Kilburn Neighbourhood Forum was formed, in fact. That is linking --- because Kilburn is divided administratively between two London Boroughs, this is an attempt to keep Kilburn together, and it has been agreed by Camden and Brent and, at the moment, a plan is being formed. This is to strengthen the links between both sides of the Kilburn High Road, the Camden and Brent side, and I just hope that this plan will carry on and become a success, because on the wider Kilburn area, it would tend to feel a bit neglected, basically, and this is an attempt to strengthen those links. The links are there, on the ground; in the communities, the communities I have mentioned, we do not regard the Kilburn High Road as a divide, in fact. It is a meeting place rather than anything else. If there are any questions?

Perhaps I ought to conclude by saying I have looked at some of the other proposals, apart from yours, and the one put forward by the Labour Party seems to fit what I have been saying more than anything else, anybody else's, including the ones that you have put forward here. I regard Hampstead Heath as a barrier. If you go to Hampstead Heath on one side, okay, you walk across it but I do not emerge the other side and try and get home from there. It is impossible to do that. You go back down to the south to Hampstead Heath station and get the train back home, so it is a complete divide as far as communities are concerned. It is a totally different area. Even the housing is different. Where we are mostly living in flats, they may converted housing, Victorian houses, as well as council-built properties, but we do not have any, or not very many people are living in, single houses that were built as single houses, whereas as you go further north, you get a completely different area and people, I do not know, somehow, they are different. Okay.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. Thank you very much indeed. That is helpful. Any matters for clarification? Sorry, yes. You did give your name and address at the beginning but I think ---

MS BLIGH: I gave my name and address.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You were facing that way. Could you just do it again?

MS BLIGH: Okay. I will give it again, yes. It is Katharine Bligh, and I live at 62B Priory Road, and that is London NW6 3RE.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed, Katharine. Thank you. That is splendid.

So, our next scheduled speaker is Mrs Dee Stuart? Lovely. Thank you. If you would like to come forward, and if you could just say your name and address at the beginning, please? Thank you.

MRS STUART: Hello. My name is Dee Stuart. I live at 21 Hayden Drive, HA5 2PL. That is in Pinner.

I am very much for the Labour Party proposal rather than the Boundary Commission proposal, because I live in an existing, already, pro-Tory area, and I feel that I have no representation whatsoever, and the current Boundary Commission proposals and the Conservative proposals for boundary changes are making virtually the whole of north-west London going to be an area that has no representation for working class people.

I feel that the north of London should be in one band and the slightly inner southernmost part of the region should be a separate area, because it is predominantly working class people, rather than where I live, which --- I live on a very small council estate, which I feel you get nothing from the local council. If I write to my MP, I get very, very little in the way of help back, and if I express my concern about anything, I just get the government line trotted back at me, and it may as well be a formatted letter that I receive, and I just feel that the way that the boundaries are being done, it is going to mean that more people are going to be put in that position that I am. I think the only things that --- there were just two items that I have ever had a reasonable response on. One was about putting guards at the back of people's letterboxes, for the protection of anybody distributing leaflets or people like postmen delivering letters, because I got bitten quite badly myself when I was putting some leaflets through a door, and so he forwarded that to the relevant department. I cannot remember what the other item was, but it was something of similar nature that actually went, but anything else, I just get the

government line trotted out. I do not feel that I am being represented and I just do not want that to happen to other people, and the way that the proposals are being drawn up, it just means that it is going to be very unlikely that any other than a Conservative Member of Parliament will be elected in my area and surrounding areas. Okay?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So, essentially, you are saying that you are concerned about the Boundary Commission proposals because you feel that that is the wrong configuration, and that you would support the Labour Party proposals because they are better, to your point of view. Is that correct?

MS STUART: Correct.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely. Thank you very much indeed.

MS STUART: Okay.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Any matters for clarification? In which case, thank you very much indeed. Thank you.

Mr Bob Blackman, would you like to come forward, please, and introduce yourself by way of name and address? Thank you.

MR BOB BLACKMAN MP: (Member of Parliament for Harrow East) Apologies, slightly in advance. I have got a bad cold, so I am having difficulty in hearing, so if there are questions, I may have to seek clarification.

I am Bob Blackman, Member of Parliament for Harrow East, and I have represented the area since May 2010. I was previously a councillor in the London Borough of Brent for 24 years, and Conservative group leader on Brent Council for 20 years, in which time I was leader of the Council for five years and deputy leader for four years. I served on the Greater London Assembly, representing Brent and Harrow for four years, I stood for Parliament in both Brent South in 1992 and Brent North in 2005, and I also co-authored the existing ward boundaries in Brent under the last review of local government boundaries.

I want to comment, obviously, on the Commission's proposals for Harrow and Stanmore, the vast majority of which comprises wards from Harrow East, and support the Conservative Party's alternative proposals for that seat. If time permits, I will comment on other Commission proposals for the Brent and Harrow area.

In relation to the proposed Harrow and Stanmore seat, I am pleased that the Commission has retained the Harrow East wards of Canons, Stanmore Park, Harrow Weald, and Wealdstone, in Stanmore. These wards have very strong community links. Hindus attend the temple in Wood Lane in Stanmore. Jewish people attend the

synagogues in Stanmore, Belmont, and in Edgware. Christians attend a variety of churches. Equally, there are very strong links between the schools, both secondary and primary, as well as both Harrow and Stanmore colleges. I note that the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Stanmore, Stanmore Hindu Temple, Stanmore Islamic Centre, Stanmore Synagogue – with the largest congregation in Europe – and Stanmore station, which is the terminus of the Jubilee Line, are clearly part of Stanmore, and everyone would recognise that as being an important link. They are all located in Canons Ward, and therefore anyone that suggests separating Canons from Stanmore Park is approaching and diverting community interests quite dramatically.

The Edgware Road is a natural boundary between Barnet and Harrow and Brent. I am pleased that the Commission has proposed to retain that boundary between Harrow and Barnet, and if one looks at the boundary along the Edgware Road, it is mainly industrial or commercial. There is very little actual people who live directly on the Edgware Road, so it represents a natural boundary to be used for a constituency boundary.

The secondary schools across the area proposed include Bentley Wood, which is a girls-only school, Park High School, Canons, Hatch End High School, Salvatorian College, and Sacred Heart. We also have Stanmore and Harrow colleges, which provide post-16 education. We are now adding Whitefriars and Avanti House as schools serving the northern part of Harrow. In addition, we have got North London Collegiate School, with a wide catchment area, therefore this represents a close-knit community of interest, which could potentially be split up under alternative proposals.

I strongly support the addition of Hatch End, Headstone North, Headstone South, and Marlborough, into the proposed Harrow and Stanmore seat. There are clear community links between Headstone North and South, with both Wealdstone and Harrow Weald wards. There is a natural linkage between Marlborough and Wealdstone. Hatch End has very strong community links with Harrow Weald ward. I support these proposals because Hatch End is a natural extension of Harrow East and the Uxbridge Road runs directly from London Road at Canons Corner through to Harrow Weald and Canons Stanmore Park into Hatch End ward. This road link provides a natural community link. Headstone Lane provides a further major road link between the Uxbridge Road and central Harrow. This link brings together Hatch End, Headstone North, and Headstone South. Hatch End is centred around the Watford to Euston main line, and Hatch End station is the natural link for Hatch End residents to travel north or south. Residents of Harrow Weald and Hatch End use this station for commuting to and from work, and the rail link continues to Headstone Lane Station, in Headstone North ward, and to Harrow and Wealdstone Station, which is a major transport hub for Harrow. Headstone North and Headstone South have natural community links to the east, where they join Wealdstone, Hatch End and Harrow Weald. Greenhill, however, is Harrow Town Centre. It has a natural linkage with Harrow-on-the-Hill ward. I therefore support the

inclusion of Greenhill in the proposed Kenton seat as a change to the Commission's proposals.

I support the proposed move of Queensbury, Kenton East and Kenton West wards from Harrow East to the new constituency of Kenton. However, I do support the inclusion of Belmont and Edgware wards being included as part of the Harrow and Stanmore constituency, at variance with the Commission proposals. Belmont is essentially Stanmore. It contains Belmont Synagogue, with strong links to Stanmore. It also has the Stanmore Baptist Church as a strong part of this ward. Historically, Stanmore Park, Canons and Belmont have formed a strong community and geographical link. Belmont forms a strong link with Stanmore Park, with the Duck in the Pond public house representing a focal point of the community and the actual centre point of the link between Belmont, Stanmore Park, Harrow Weald, and Wealdstone wards. I support the principle of Edgware ward remaining as part of the Harrow and Stanmore seat to represent continuity of service, and also the strong geographic link between Edgware and the rest of Harrow and Stanmore.

Turning to the Kenton seat, I support the core of the Commission proposals, with the inclusion of Queensbury, Kenton East and Kenton wards from Harrow, and Queensbury and Kenton wards from Brent. These wards form a strong community of interest around the Kenton Road. Kenton Hindu Temple provides facilities for Hindus on both sides of the Kenton Road, as does the Greek Orthodox Church. All of those Kenton wards share a common community with strong links around the Temple and local churches. St Luke's Hospice on Kenton Road provides services across the north of Brent, and the southern area of Harrow. All Saints Church and Kenton Baptist Church provide facilities for the wider Kenton area, but they are on the Brent side, and support the Harrow side. St Gregory's and Claremont High Schools draw widespread applications from across the Kenton areas both of Harrow and of Brent. South Kenton station, Kenton Station, Preston Road Station, Northwick Park Station, Harrow-on-the-Hill Station, form a solid transport infrastructure for the Kenton proposed constituency, and so I support the inclusion of Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill wards from Harrow into this Kenton constituency. Equally, I support the inclusion of Northwick Park and Preston from Brent. Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill are strongly associated wards and link directly to the Kenton Road. Northwick Park ward is directly on the Kenton Road already, and Northwick Park Hospital will clearly be the focal point of the new constituency, and is a focal point, obviously, of the local community. Preston ward, which I represented on Brent Council for 24 years, has 40% of the population living in the South Kenton estate. It is clearly part of Kenton, with direct links to Kenton, and people associate it with being part of Kenton, so together, that is a cross-borough constituency, with five wards from Harrow and four wards from Brent, and represents a strong community interest.

If I may just touch on the other areas? Wembley and Harrow: the wards of Sudbury, Alperton and Wembley Central have consistently been part of the same constituency. They represent a solid geographic link as well as strong community of interest.

Tokington ward is the centre of Wembley now, with the stadium and a key shopping area as well as the Brent Civic Centre, so I support the transfer of Harrow-on-the-Hill, Northwick Park, and Preston from the Commission-proposed constituency of Wembley and Harrow to the revised Kenton constituency but also the transfer of Fryent and Barnhill wards from the Commission-proposed Kenton constituency to the Wembley and Neasden constituency. Each of these wards has a strong link with Welsh Harp, and linkage to Tokington ward. They are directly affected by events at Wembley Stadium, so their inclusion in the Wembley and Neasden constituency is sensible from a community of interest perspective.

I also support the inclusion of Dollis Hill, Dudden Hill and Welsh Harp wards into the revised constituency. These wards are closely associated geographically and are interwoven with the North Circular Road. In fact, Welsh Harp, Fryent, and Barnhill were created out of five original wards of Brent, under those proposals, and that constituency will be wholly within the Borough of Brent as a result.

I support the retention of the Hillingdon wards that are proposed in the Ruislip North and Pinner constituency, plus the Harrow wards of Pinner, Pinner South, and Rayners Lane, but I also suggest that including the Harrow wards of Roxeth, Roxbourne, and West Harrow would actually create a common geography and strong community of interest with Rayners Lane. It is a sensible linkage based around the Alexandra Avenue to the Harrow-Ealing boundary, so therefore that would create a cross-borough constituency with four Hillingdon wards and six Harrow wards, and on the Willesden side, I support the proposed Willesden and Hammersmith North alternative as a sensible linkage of different communities.

So, in conclusion, I note that the counter-proposals that are made by the Conservative Party provide a stand-alone set of alternative arrangements for parliamentary boundaries, within the envelope that is being created by the Commission. These counter-proposals therefore have no knock-on effect to other areas. The counter-proposals have the result of reducing the number of cross-border constituencies, which simplify electoral arrangements, and better represent people. They also reunite natural community transport and geographical links, and in my view, they provide a more straightforward geographical set of proposals. So, I trust that you will see the wisdom of these counter-proposals and that you will approve them en bloc.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? No. In which case, thank you very much indeed. Is it possible to have a copy of your ---

MR BOB BLACKMAN MP: Yes, indeed. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That would be very helpful.

All right, then, I suggest we now break for lunch until 2.40, and we will see the next scheduled speaker at 2.50. Thank you.

Time Noted: 1.14 pm

After the luncheon adjournment

Time Noted: 2.40 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, shall we convene? We have a speaker with us. It is Mr Simon Wookey. Sir, if you would like to come forward and speak at the podium here, and if you could start your address by introducing yourself by way of name and address, please? Thank you.

MR WOOKEY: Hello, everybody. My name is Simon Wookey. I live at 31 Malvern Mews, NW6 5PT. I am the Chair of the Kilburn Neighbourhood Plan Forum. I am a Trustee for the South Kilburn Trust, and I am also the Head of our local residents' association.

I am here to speak about the proposed boundary changes for the new constituency of Queen's Park and Regent's Park, or The Regent's Park. One of the issues that why I am speaking today is the dividing line between the community of Kilburn. Kilburn to this day is still divided between two boroughs, between Brent, which is an outer borough, and Camden, which is an inner borough, and one of the founding principles of the Kilburn Neighbourhood Plan forum was to find a way to unite this community that has been, sort of, split over administrative boundaries. One of the very good things that we have had in our corner in creating this forum is that we have had a singular MP. Dividing Kilburn between two separate MPs would actually only reinforce the division, and administrative divisions that are problematic for our community.

If we can look at the top line, it is the boundary line is the old Roman road, or the Kilburn High Road, and it is not a boundary (indicating). The Kilburn High Road, in fact, is more the spine of the community that unites both sides of the Camden and Brent sides, so to divide the community again is something that really just does not work, and that is pretty much it. If anybody has any questions?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: So you are speaking against the proposal to ---

MR WOOKEY: I am speaking against this proposal. I am not speaking against the idea of redistricting. I agree with the idea in principle, but what I have to do is say, you know, the way that this map is drawn right now does not respect the real strong community bonds between either side of Kilburn, and you know, the community has come forward quite strongly to try to, sort of, rectify previous divisions and administrative divisions,

and, you know, again having this, sort of, like, forced on to the community is something that we are not really looking for. We are looking for a singular representation, not multiple representation.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. In your words, this does not divide the community, it unites the community, the road, and ---

MR WOOKEY: Exactly.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: --- that is why you are concerned about that boundary.

MR WOOKEY: Exactly. As I said, it is the spine. It is not a dividing line. It is not a border. It is something that unites.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is very helpful. Thank you. Are there any matters of information required? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

MR WOOKEY: You are welcome.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Portwood? If you would like to speak from the podium and if you could introduce yourself by way of name and address, please. Thank you.

MR PORTWOOD: (Labour) My name is Philip Portwood. I am here on behalf of the Ealing Central and Acton Labour Party. Our address is Ruskin Hall, 16 Church Road, Acton, W3 8PP.

This is very much an interim response from us. We have not yet had the chance to have a general meeting since the Commission proposals were published, but we have now responses from our members to know that this is the view that they want us to put forward. Essentially, we are, you will not be surprised to hear, supporting the Labour Party's proposals for our area, but also I want to make some comments about naming, both in the Commission's proposals and the Labour Party's proposals.

Can I start with the naming issues, to get them out of the way? If the Commission is minded to go with the option in the plans of the proposed Ealing Central and Shepherd's Bush seat, we strongly urge that the word "Acton" be in that name. Acton is the biggest of the three towns in that proposed boundary. Acton is the largest electorate and it is a very key part of the area. The biggest response we saw locally, in local fora and local comments, when the proposals first came out was: "Where is Acton, then?" and there was some local anger about our town being ignored in that, so we would argue a name something like "Acton, Ealing Central and Shepherd's Bush" or "Acton, Ealing Broadway and Shepherd's Bush", given that Ealing Central is not entirely within the proposed seat.

I know it is long but you have already “Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner” in this area of London, and other parts of the country have longer names.

For the Labour Party’s proposals, their names they put forward as options, which were “Ealing South and Acton”, or “Ealing Acton”, I much prefer “Ealing South and Acton”, although preferable to that, “South Ealing and Acton”. I appreciate your naming issues are outlined in the guidance, and I make the distinction about why the Commission do use certain compass points as suffixes and prefixes, but for local people, in plain English terms the area south of the Ealing Town Hall, or south of Ealing Green, really, is “South Ealing”, not “Ealing South”. South Ealing Road, South Ealing Tube Station. It is always used that way round, so that would be the plain English name for it, and therefore we prefer “South Ealing and Acton” for the Labour Party’s proposals.

Moving on to the actual boundaries proposed themselves, I will take them in east to west order, going on four areas. Firstly, Shepherd’s Bush, then Acton, then the Southfield/Turnham Green area, and then Ealing. On Shepherd’s Bush, we have no terror over a link to Hammersmith and Fulham as a borough, it worked very successfully in the previous Ealing, Acton, Shepherd’s Bush constituency, which existed from 1997 to 2010. However, there is a fatal flaw in the Commission proposals, which is leaving out of that proposed area the College Park and Old Oak ward. That is supposed to go up into Willesden, where only a small part of that ward actually borders the actual eponymous College Park area, and actually means that the benefits had in the old EASBC of all of East Acton being united, would not be there any more. It would remain to be split. So actually, you would split up an area, Shepherd’s Bush, with a clear community interest, and not combine anywhere else, like East Acton. So, we would argue that this was a fatal flaw in the proposals to put the three wards in Shepherd’s Bush into the proposed Ealing Central and Shepherd’s Bush seat.

Moving to Acton, we welcome, very much, the proposal to keep the three Acton W3 wards together: East Acton, Acton Central and South Acton were proposed to be divided in the boundary review. It has caused a lot of anger in the area and made little sense, and we would welcome the fact that they are now being proposed to be combined together. However, moving on to Southfield, we see that that is not the case in all of Acton. Now, Southfield ward, clearly, most of it is in W4 postal district and you know as well as I, and others, that postal districts matter a lot in local ties in London. They distinguish an area, not only in house price terms, but an identity on W3 and W4 websites are named after them and so on, and clearly, most of Southfield is in W4. It looks to the Chiswick High Road area for its shopping and other associated services, particularly Chiswick Health Centre, which is in Fisher’s Lane, just over the borough boundary in Hounslow. As a catchment, it includes all of the Ealing W4 area, and other public services, like Belmont School in Hounslow and Southfield School in Ealing, swap children across the border fairly easily, so there clearly is a link there, as the Commission identified in proposing that Southfield should be linked to parts of Chiswick. However, a fifth of Southfield ward’s electorate live in W3 postally. They were added to

Southfield ward in the last ward boundary review in Ealing at the turn of the last century. For electoral equality reasons, no logic of community, really, there had to be a line drawn to make the numbers work, and that means that those areas are now attached to Southfield. But they are very much part of the Acton Vale community, and it is called the Vale from the Hammersmith border up to the railway bridge, which marks the start of the town centre, and they look towards Acton town centre for their shopping and for their community services. The boundary would be a very narrow bit of Valetta Road, which is a small road just south of the Acton Vale. Ironically, the boundary between East Acton and Southfield ward is at the narrowest point of it, on a little bend, and it does not look at all like a logical boundary. A resident locally said to me, when complaining about the proposal, "Hardly 'Checkpoint Charlie', is it?" and it clearly isn't.

In contrast, the proposal from the Labour Party to use the A4/M4 as the boundary seems to me as a very clear, stark and demonstrable boundary between areas. The A4 is, in a sense, which is the southern boundary of the Turnham Green ward, the boundary between what you might call Thameside Chiswick and Retail Chiswick, the Thameside wards of Homefields and Riverside, and the Turnham Green area around Chiswick High Road, and its shops, pubs and public services. It divides up very clearly. Also, the other advantage of the Labour Party's proposal for a Turnham Green ward, sort of bring into with Acton areas like the Country Park Garden Estate, and the row of shops down there, which used to be called Acton Broadway, which are Acton enclaves within Hounslow, currently.

Moving on to Ealing, the town, rather than the borough, I stress: the key issue here the Commission faces is difficult for them, I appreciate. In the boundary review, the proposal much welcomed locally, proposed a combined Central Ealing seat. It includes all the wards of central Ealing, all the eight wards together in one constituency. That was widely welcomed, particularly in the Northfield and Elthorne wards, which have historically, in recent years, been associated with Southall, but do not see any connection with Southall across the River Brent, in a very different part of our borough. That is not possible with the current numbers. I do not like splitting wards and I appreciate the Commission's aversion to splitting wards in cases like Ealing, where clearly there are alternatives are available. Therefore the issue is: what is the best way to split central Ealing wards, rather than whether to do it. It seems to us, the logic is to go with a proposal that actually unites the historic boundaries and the two towns, which are North and South Ealing, and it always has been a division there, along the corridor of the Uxbridge Road railway.

If you look at the map, that is clearly a ward boundary for most of its way (indicating). Historically, ward boundaries were always divided there, and as far as the distinction of the architecture and the nature of the housing, and the nature of the topography, it is hills above the Uxbridge Road and flat below.

The proposal of the Labour Party would helpfully link all the four wards of South Ealing: Ealing Common, Walpole, Northfield, and Elthorne, the southern bit of which is in South Ealing, but the northern bit is clearly more (inaudible) in one patch, and these are very much a linked area. The ward boundaries here, if you look at the map, are not strong, not very much logical. The boundary between Northfield and Walpole, which currently is the constituency boundary, are relatively small roads, the Windermere Road and Northcroft Road. These do not make a lot of sense. Again, the electoral equality was the driver here in writing the ward boundaries, rather than a strong, natural community boundary.

Walpole ward is rather unique in our borough and probably unusual in the rest of London in not having a school within it. It has an electorate of nearly 10,000 electors. Its schools are all in neighbouring wards: Grange ward in Ealing Common, St John's ward in Elthorne, Fielding ward in Northfield, Little Ealing ward in Northfield, and the Catholic School of Mount Carmel in Northfield. So the Walpole children go to all of these schools but none of them go to school within their own ward, and currently, that is split up between the constituency, so the ones in the Grange are currently in the same seat, or the same MP, but not those who go to schools in Northfield or Elthorne. Equally, the boundaries around there are linked, community services, health services and so on. The main roads there are not generally boundaries within wards. Northfield Avenue, despite its name, is not a ward boundary, and these make a lot of ---

The other point to the south, I would say is, the other problem boundary is Walpole and Elthorne. This is a point made rather well by Mr Potts of the Conservative Party at the Westminster Enquiry, who I used to serve with on the Boundary Committee of Ealing Council. He and I agreed, I am pleased to say, about the boundaries of wards, and we have, for historical reasons, split both sides, the two sides of West Ealing Broadway, one into Elthorne and one into Walpole. That is not popular locally. The local West Ealing Neighbours residents' group has previously objected to this and raised concerns about it, and as I have said, one side of it is St John's School. The other side of it is the local library. It is logical and a positive welcome, I think, for linking those two together, if Elthorne and Walpole were in the same constituency.

In the north of Ealing, we, like the Conservatives, support the idea of linking together Cleveland, Ealing Broadway and Hanger Hill. There are links between those three wards. The boundaries, again, are not strong. There is a link around the Argyle Road community, which is the border between Cleveland and Ealing Broadway. There is a particular link at Brentham Estate, which actually is part in Hanger Hill ward and part in Cleveland ward, and the associated wider Pitshanger Lane community, which has a very strong community spirit, as shown last year by its national award of the top high street in London.

So actually we think there is logic in combining Cleveland, Ealing Broadway and Hanger Hill in the same territory, but looking to the north, as all of them have in the past been

there. The majority of Ealing Broadway ward used to be in the Ealing North seat, and in previous days much of the northern bit of Hanger Hill was in the Ealing North seat, so there are strong connections there, and remain. The Argyle Road, Castlebar Park, Brentham communities, look to be a common area north of the High Street, and certainly have more in common with each other than they have with areas to the south of the Uxbridge Road and the railway.

In conclusion, therefore, I think the point I make to you is that the benefit of the Labour Party scheme is it unites all of Acton, including the bits in Southfield, with all of South Ealing. It is a simple two-town seat, obviously with other bits, boundaries are never perfect around this area, there are mixes there, but it essentially combines those two towns very simply and straightforwardly in a South Ealing and Acton seat. The other options, between the Commission's option, ones that link us to other areas in parts of North Ealing, in linking parts of the Bush. One proposal even puts, bizarrely, Perivale into Acton, which is, kind of, a weird proposal which I do not think will get a lot recognition in Perivale.

We think this is the neatest solution to the problem of how you split Ealing, the town rather than the borough. It is not perfect. There would be ideal if you could combine the whole town of Ealing into one seat. We cannot, without splitting wards, and therefore I recommend this as the best option available to the Commission. Thank you, Sir.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very interesting. Are there any matters for clarification? There is a microphone on its way, possibly.

MR PORTWOOD: Can I just say that I will be putting in, on behalf of our constituency, a more substantial proposal before 5 December.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. No, I understood that. Thank you very much. That will indeed be most helpful. Thank you.

LORD HAYWARD: (Conservative Party) Lord Hayward, on behalf of the Conservative Party. Good afternoon. Can I just seek clarification? Have you looked at the Boundary Commission map in relation to Turnham Green? Are you saying you disagree with the fact that it has got the word "Chiswick" written across the ward of Turnham Green?

MR PORTWOOD: Chiswick is a popular constituency, W4 postally. People say "W4". Chiswick Health Centre's catchment is W4, postally. That is what Chiswick is. What I am saying is the northern bit of Southfield is not Chiswick, and there is a dividing street that the A4 provides between Turnham Green ward and Southfield, and the Riverside ward, or Thameside ward.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Any other points? In which case, thank you very much indeed, and I look forward to your formal written submission.

MR PORTWOOD: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Tony McNulty? Yes. Would you like to come forward, Sir? Fine. We will take a five minute recess.

Time Noted: 2.58 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 3.03 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay? Right, Mr McNulty.

MR McNULTY: My name is Tony McNulty. I have lived in north-west, or west London, all my life, apart from interludes with education. I currently reside in Hammersmith. I put the detailed address on the card outside.

I was, and had the great privilege of being, an elected representative in the constituency of Harrow East for some 24 years: 11 as a Borough Councillor for Stanmore South, which is the south-east corner on the map, below Canons. (Indicating) It was a much larger ward than the current Edgware one, but part Edgware and part of the existing Queensbury, and then in 1997 to 2010, I was subsequently the Member of Parliament of an enlarged Harrow East. Not the current Harrow East. It was the current Harrow East plus Greenhill and Marlborough wards that currently reside in Harrow West since the last boundary review, so I think I could say I do have some experience of the sort of communities involved and offer my comments in that regard.

My comments, I offer as an informed member of the public. I support the Labour Party proposals – there is a shock – not for any professional perspective but purely because I think they are the best on offer compared to the Boundary Commission views. What I would like to do is start by making some general comments about the Borough of Harrow, including the portion I represented, and then go into detail comparing the Labour Party proposals and the Boundary Commission of England's proposals.

I think, given my experience, I have lived in Harrow since I was ten, so most of my education was in Harrow as well, over in Harrow West, as it happened, in North Harrow, that there are probably four discernible community focal points in the borough, if you wanted to break it down. Unusually, for a suburban borough, much of that goes around transport links, the transport network.

Firstly, I would say, having been a representative of that south-east corner, and then subsequently of the whole of the eastern part of the borough, Canons and Edgware ward look towards the Edgware Road and the community and Barnet on the other side of the Edgware Road as a commonality of interest, as I think the speaker before last said, in that context, the A5, the same road, as it happened, is not a “Berlin Wall” or a division. It is the spine for the community. I would contend, happily, that it is not as pronounced or developed as the Kilburn example, because it has not been there as historically long, but it is nonetheless a spine of that community rather than otherwise.

Secondly, given my experience as a representative for Canons, Stanmore Park and Harrow Weald, and more generally in terms of Harrow, there is a commonality of interest for those northern boroughs that focuses on green belt issues and issues that are distinct from the much more urbanised southern portions of both the Borough of Harrow and Hillingdon.

Thirdly, I think, as both the Boundary Commission of England’s proposals and the Labour Party proposals attest to, there is a Kenton community. There is a community along the Kenton Road that is, again, not divided by the Kenton Road from Kenton Station up to Kingsbury Circle, but actually, that is the spine of the community, both sides of that road. If you look at the map, you will see very clearly why Edgware does not fit into that. That southern portion of the Edgware ward in the corner is all residential. All its amenities, all its focal point for a community, face eastward towards the Edgware Road and not below, to north Brent, so that is the third of the four commonalities of interest, or focal points, that I would say.

The final one, and probably the most important, is if you ask anyone about Harrow, if they do not know much about Harrow, they will say, “the school” or “the spire”, “St Mary’s Church”, and everything else. If you ask them a little bit more, they will tell you that Harrow-on-the-Hill and the town centre and all the environs around there is the crucial core and hub of the Borough of Harrow. It is quintessentially Harrow, so how the Boundary Commission proposals can obliterate into two or three different directions that core, I think, is really a mistake. In that core, I include, yes, Harrow-on-the-Hill, of course, as the cultural focal point, if you like, but around it the amenities focal point of the town centre, which since the mid-80s and the GLC has been defined as the Harrow and Wealdstone corridor, so the whole corridor, embracing both elements of the town centre, and equally the urban areas, town centre wards, around the town centre, and the foothills, the slopes, if you like, in the south, of what we could usefully call the South Harrow wards, principally, Rayners Lane, Roxeth and Roxbourne. All of them make a really quite substantial community focal point for the whole borough, and probably on a more north-west regional basis, and that is what I read through to the Labour party proposals and do not see in the Boundary Commission proposals.

So, with Canons and Edgware going to the east into Hendon, and I know, certainly up to 1983 and the boundary reviews, whilst the Boundary Commission bit the bullet on

cross-border, cross-borough seats, in the south of London, they were resisting it in the north but that dam has been burst, so --- and I think the Hillingdon-Harrow link has worked well, and there is a natural south-north link-up between Brent and Harrow and, as I argue, eastwards with Barnet. If you accept the broad premise of those being the four key areas of the borough in terms of community focal points, then I think the Labour Party proposals make much, much more sense and respect overwhelmingly those community focal points than the Boundary Commission's proposals do, particularly around what, as I say, is probably the most important focal point, and that is this town centre/Harrow-on-the-Hill, for all sorts of historic, cultural, social and amenity reasons, which you can see from this map is divided. The whole south. You can see on there, immediately below the line of West Harrow and Greenhill is the Hill ward, and the South Harrow wards are just below that, so you can see that commonality of interest. You cannot --- it is better if you have got all three superimposed on each other but that is by the by, and in that context, if you follow that through with that, sort of, South Harrow and town centre focus ward, you will see, if you know anything about Brent, that Preston does not fit into that. Preston is much more naturally the hinterland of the Kenton and Harrow East, I think, the Labour Party call it, or the Kenton seat, as the Boundary Commission would have it, and then much more neatly, Sudbury and Northwick Park fold around the hill as that community focal point and do it in a very considered fashion.

That is why I think all those elements work much, much better than the proposals from the Boundary Commission, and equally, I think, make for much, much better and much neater examples below, when you get further into Brent and the links between Brent and Camden. I was very interested to see that the Boundary Commission wanted Old Oak and College Park to be part of --- out of Hammersmith and in some Brent configuration, because certainly in the Eighties, certainly in the last boundary review, this was discussed informally both inside the Labour Party and I think maybe in a formal capacity within the Commission, and the Commission were in no uncertain terms that the link was completely inorganic and wrong, that they did not quite say this, but there were more railway sleepers and railway lines between Hammersmith and Brent than there were people, and the notion you could open up into that and go into a link between the two boroughs was a complete anomaly. I shall elaborate that more readily in my written proposal because I am a resident of Hammersmith now and that interests me and I would rather see the Hammersmith seat that is preserved with the addition of Fulham Broadway as the Labour Party propose, and which I think there is common agreement on, preserve the Chelsea-Fulham link that has only just been in existence since the last proposals were first implemented in 2010. So here we have a rather disruptive proposal that the Boundary Commission brought in last time round, that Chelsea and Fulham be linked and Hammersmith stay as one seat, and now, on the provisional views of the Commission, they want to unpick that and go back to the previous Ealing, Acton and Shepherd's Bush. Pretty much, apart from the interregnum, when there was Ealing, Acton and Shepherd's Bush, there has been a Hammersmith North seat of roughly, given the vagaries in size where it is now, since 1918, and there is a commonality of interest from Old Oak all the way down to Hammersmith Broadway,

and Fulham Broadway does not disrupt that overwhelmingly, and that is the price of keeping that link and one single seat with the Chelsea-Fulham link, and I think it is one worth paying.

I fully accept that the Boundary Commission have a difficult job. I would contend, in conclusion, that it is not helped by silly politicians talking about gerrymandering when we know entirely that the Boundary Commission is completely independent. People can disagree or agree with the government's notion of seats with a 5% tolerance rather than a 10% tolerance, and 650 to 600. They are issues above and beyond the Commission.

I think, generally, in all my experience, going way, way back to the early Eighties, the Commission has done its job, I am not just buttering you up, but has done it well and in a professional capacity, and has taken account of the commonality of interest that sometimes does overlook what obviously I understand entirely, too, looks like a nice pretty solid straight line on a map that should not be transgressed for any reason at all. I shall elaborate those more readily if I may in a written submission. This is my draft, which I would be ashamed to give you, but I shall give you one subsequently and hope that the Labour Party proposals or something similar prevails rather than the Boundary Commission's, because I think they go more to the preservation of our communities in what is a difficult job.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. Any matters for clarification? In which case, thank you and I look forward to the written submission.

MR McNULTY: My pleasure. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Robert Pitt, would you like to come forward and make a submission, Sir? Lovely, and if you could just introduce yourself with your full name and address, please, to begin. Thank you.

MR PITT: Hi. My name is Robert Pitt. I am from Harrow. 20 Trevone Gardens, Pinner, HA5 5LW, and my concern is about the Boundary Commission's decision to move the boundaries between Ruislip North and Pinner and the new Harrow and Stanmore seats, the old boundary between Ruislip North and Pinner, Harrow East and Harrow West, especially on the points where it moves from the Yeading Brook, the natural geographic boundary, and also the main road between Hatch End and Harrow Weald wards, and seems to now split the estate between --- in Rayners Lane and Roxbourne, which as a ward, you cannot necessarily avoid splitting, but as a constituency, I feel it makes much more sense to keep it on the geographical boundary and a similar issue between Pinner and Hatch End, where the boundary will now split, a fairly obvious geographical group of areas, and instead of having the main road that it currently has.

The change also means that instead of encircling on three sides the farm in Headstone North, it now ends up only having two sides and then the farm is no longer an obvious boundary, which again, to me, seems like it would be an obvious boundary to keep.

I think that is all I have to say, really.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Yes? Sorry. Matters of clarification.

LORD HAYWARD: Lord Hayward. I am just trying to clarify: you are saying that you believe that the boundary down , I think you called it the brook?

MR PITT: The Yeading Brook.

LORD HAYWARD: The Yeading Brook actually makes sense as a division.

MR PITT: Yes.

LORD HAYWARD: Is that what you are saying?

MR PITT: Yes. It is in Rayners Lane and Pinner South wards. So it is the current river.

LORD HAYWARD: Okay. That is all I wanted to seek clarification on.

MR PITT: Yes, and I think reverting to that boundary, rather than having the new boundary, it would not make a difference in terms of the sizes and it is a fairly minor change in terms of the actual constituencies proposed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you. Thank you very much indeed. That is very helpful. Thank you.

Christine Robson? Would you like to come and give evidence or do you want two minutes to just compose yourself? (After a short pause) If you just introduce yourself by way of your name and address, and tell us what it is you would like to tell us, really. You have up to ten minutes, at least.

CLLR ROBSON: Right. Hello, everybody. I am Christine Robson. I am here, I am a councillor in Harrow for the ward of West Harrow, but I am also a resident of Harrow-on-the-Hill. I have lived in Harrow for 36 years, so I would like to think that I am here speaking in both aspects.

I am here because I am a bit concerned about this, what looks to me like a carve-up of Harrow, in ways that do not seem to me to actually fit, certainly with my experience of living in Harrow.

As a resident of Harrow-on-the-Hill, I live in Hillside Crescent, and since 2013, a councillor for West Harrow, I do feel as though I can speak for the local residents as well as myself. My son went to school at Vaughan, which is in West Harrow. He went to school at Whitmore, which is in Harrow-on-the-Hill. My doctor is in West Harrow. I live and walk into Harrow to go to the shops. I am aware of how these areas adhere together and my concern is, it seems as though there is a thought about stretching it across to come to Kenton, that actually is one of the plans. Now, I was just explaining to the very nice gentleman on the door when I came here today, I had no idea where this was. I got some directions from the gentleman in the Tube station as to how to get here. He sent me the wrong way. I was lucky enough to meet a very nice lady, who did walk me down, almost to the door, so that I found Kenton Hall. Kenton is not part of my patch. It is not part of the patch of the people whom I represent in West Harrow. We fit together with Harrow-on-the-Hill. There are good logical links through.

I understand that there are proposals to, sort of, have a "snail's trail" that goes diagonally across Harrow. I mean, I have got some notes here. I am not reading them. These are just my thoughts from having looked at it. Somewhere, from where I live, snaking across to Northwood Hill, Stanmore Park. You cannot even get a bus. In order to get there, one would have to go on a very complicated bus journey in order to get across those bits of Harrow. They do not fit together. They do not fit together in terms of geography; they do not fit together in terms of the feeling of the people who live where I live, and the area that I represent, and I am really disappointed in that. I think that really what one wants to do in doing this, is clearly to represent the people and I understand in my limited way how some of these proposals fit together, but there is presently a logic into how these wards are stuck together, and what I have seen looks to me as though it defies logic. It certainly defies the natural clumping and grouping of local communities. The children who go to Whitmore School come from Harrow-on-the-Hill ward and West Harrow, and some of them travel a bit across. The people who actually live in West Harrow shop in Harrow-on-the-Hill. They are not going to go --- I mean, like me perhaps, they get lost, I mean, coming across to Kenton. I am sure Kenton is really nice place, but you know, it is not --- it does not fit together, and I think if you are representing people, they have got to feel represented. They are going to feel represented if what you are suggesting fits together for them logically, and I think the argument as to how these wards clump together somehow seems to have disappeared off the agenda, from what I can see.

We have got better community links with the south and west of the borough than the north and east, with the idea that you should go into the Stanmore area --- there are no community links with Hillingdon. Actually, no, forgive me, I declare an interest here, I used to actually work in the London Borough of Hillingdon, but I have retired now, and I

used to have quite a trek to get there. What does that mean, a community link with Hillingdon? It does not seem to make any kind of sense to me. We do not have transport links with Wembley. Trying to get to Wembley is a bit of a dog's dinner, really, you know. I do not see the logic behind it, if the logic, as I would hope it is, is driven by the needs and the natural affinities of the local communities. If the logic is some other kind of logic, which is not based upon the needs of the local communities, then I would be very disappointed.

I think that is what I have to say. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, then thank you very much indeed for your submission. Thank you.

We will adjourn now for ten minutes, since the speakers have not yet arrived. Thank you.

Time Noted: 3.25 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 3.45 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene, then. Mr Hutchison, are you ready to come forward? Thank you very much. If you would like to speak from the podium here, and if you could introduce yourself by way of your name and address to commence, please? Thank you.

MR HUTCHISON: Good afternoon. My name is Gordon Hutchison. I am a resident of Stroud Green Ward since 1978, and I am active in a number of local community organisations, including the Stroud Green residents' association. I have requested to speak to you today to ask you to reconsider your proposal to remove Stroud Green ward from the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency to the Tottenham constituency.

Hornsey and Wood Green constituency actually complies with the Boundary Commission for England's criteria. It has an electorate of 74,641. We would like you to leave the constituency as it presently is. In the introduction, from your documentation regarding the boundary changes, you mention a number of rules, which include special geographical considerations including in particular the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency, local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015, boundaries of existing constituencies and any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

What I would like to add is that, particularly regarding ties, the proposal includes an illogical leap across the main Edinburgh-London railway line, which forms the existing natural boundary and has been there since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century, so a natural existing boundary between Stroud Green ward and the Tottenham constituency. The residents of Stroud Green ward relate to Stroud Green Road and Crouch End for community, commercial and other activities. This is also recognised in neighbourhood forum boundaries. If Stroud Green becomes part of Tottenham constituency, there is danger that we will become a peripheral area too easily ignored or forgotten.

Regarding Tottenham, I think it is widely acknowledged that it is undergoing huge population increases. For example, Haringey Council have recently approved development plans at Tottenham Hotspur ground, which will include 580 new units, so I think it is important to, in the overall proposal you have for Hornsey, Wood Green and the Tottenham constituency to look at the huge increase in the population in the Tottenham constituency and the huge caseload that I know that the current MP has. Anyway, that is all I have to say. I am very grateful for you to give me space to come here today and to present my views. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? If not, thank you, and will you be writing in as well?

MR HUTCHISON: Yes, I will be. I hope to write in on behalf of the Stroud Green residents' association. We are planning to have a local consultation with residents to find out what their views are on this matter.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. Excellent. I would welcome that, once you have consulted and got a clear view. That would be very helpful. Thank you very much indeed.

MR HUTCHISON: Okay. Thanks very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

Thank you, Sir. If you would like to come forward and, as again, introduce yourself by name and address, and have we got the slides loaded up there? It is all happening, is it? If you need it, there is a pointer.

MR COX: While we are waiting for that, I will introduce myself. My name is Laurence Cox. I live at 62 Lamorna Grove, Stanmore, and I am a local resident with a good deal of activity in local --- in the community, and I am an ex-councillor from 1991 through to 2002, but I have not been on the Council since, so I am very much speaking as an individual now, rather than as a representative of any particular party.

(After a short pause) Right. So, two things. The first, which actually really follows on from the previous speaker, which is talking about main railway lines as natural boundaries, and the second, what I would call exceptional housing development, where although the Boundary Commission is not required to take them into account, I think I am going to argue that it might be sensible for them to take them into account, so that will be the second item.

So, I will start with an Ordnance Survey Map. This is Harrow, just before the railways, and as you can see, the entire area between Harrow-on-the-Hill at the bottom, and the Harrow Weald Ridge, which runs across the top, was pretty well all open farmland (indicating). You have only actually got two significant roads there at the time, running east-west: the Kenton Road, which runs just slightly to the north of the Harrow Weald, Harrow-on-the-Hill area, that is there, and the Uxbridge Road, which runs all the way along there, and those were the two original roads. There are a number of north-south roads which actually reflect the current north-south roads in the borough. Now, unfortunately, this does not help, because there should be another map there. Those two sets of arrows actually represent the main railway line. This is between Euston and Birmingham. That is this line here, and the Metropolitan Railway Line, which --- that is the Watford branch; that is the Uxbridge branch. We have got a bit of the Piccadilly Line coming in there.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that over a large part of their length, these lines actually are used as ward boundaries. It just occasionally, for reasons of the size of wards and the number of residents, we have had in Harrow to actually cross these as boundaries, and there are a couple of places in Harrow, which I will draw your attention to. This one up here, which is Hatch End, and here in the middle, Marlborough.

Okay. I am just going to have to do this without the pictures. I am sorry. Hatch End has three polling districts. This is the polling district to the west of the railway line, and there are two polling districts to the east: one here, and one down there. Historically, Harrow Weald, the polling district down here, was associated with the adjacent polling district in Harrow Weald, so you have got a Hatch End polling district there and all of Harrow Weald here, and they used to be associated until we had, I think it was the 1973 boundary changes, but if you look at this particular polling district here in Hatch End, you have got it --- on the northern side of it you have got the green belt, on the southern side you have got the Metropolitan open land, and to the east, you have got more green belt, which is part of the Harrow Weald Ridge, so that particular polling district very much has an east-west axis, and that is why I would argue that even though the railway goes through the middle of it, because of that east-west axis and the fact that the Uxbridge Road preceded the railway, is a good reason for keeping those two halves together.

Now, if we now look at the Marlborough ward that is here, again you have got the main line running straight through the middle of it, but this time, you have also got the branch

line, which used to be the branch line to Stanmore. It is now a nature trail, which basically isolates Marlborough from Kenton West ward, which is that ward there. Now, Marlborough, the eastern side of Marlborough, is very naturally associated with Wealdstone ward, which is the ward immediately above it, that one there, whereas the west side of Marlborough is naturally associated with Greenhill ward, which is the ward immediately below it, and Headstone South ward, the ward to its right. Left, as you look at it. So, that is the situation which I would say that if you decided that you wanted to use the main line as a natural boundary, and you decided that, in order to make the numbers come out right for the various constituencies, if I had to split a ward in Harrow, that is the one I would split, simply because the natural community on the east side looks towards the north and the natural community on the west side looks towards the west and south, so there is not so much of a natural community between the two sides as there would be in Headstone --- in Hatch End.

Now, just going to go on to the second issue, which --- I suspect the map is not going to come up. Right. This is Canons ward. I am just going to go back and point that out. That is Canons ward up there. It is a very large ward, but it is mostly green space. That is why it is so large. Very recently, in the last year or so, we have had a great deal of development here, and specifically down here in Stanmore Place in the very south of the ward, where there is a development of 816 housing units, which is not yet complete. The largest building in that, Stanmore Royal Crescent, and a couple of other smaller buildings, have not been occupied yet. Stanmore Royal Crescent is still being built. The others are more or less completed, but they certainly will not have residents in from the 2015 electoral register, so that is part of it.

Also, at the very other end of the ward, right up here, is the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital. They have just received approval from their Trust to redevelop the hospital as a part of which they will be selling part of the land for housing, and their last planning application in 2012 envisaged 324 housing units. Now, if we look at the current proposed Harrow and Stanmore constituency, it will actually only require an additional 883 electors to push it above that 5% above the nominal quota. Also, Canons will only require another 703 electors to push it more than 30% above the average for Harrow, which will then trigger a local authority re-warding approach, so again, we have got some issues there, and I am going to --- I would like to suggest that you discuss with Harrow Council specifically both the electoral services department and the planning department, as to what they expect the developments to total and then make a decision on whether you should actually think about trying to bring the number of electors in the Harrow and Stanmore constituency down a bit so that we do not run into this problem where, even before 2020, we have got more than the upper limit already in that borough.

So, those are the two points I wanted to make. I am sure, as we all know, it is difficult to form natural constituencies from whole wards in London, simply because the wards are so big. I am suggesting that, where we cannot, it may be a good idea to split wards

using railway lines, the main railway lines, and that we have a consideration about whether we should look at the --- particularly at the Canons situation to decide whether it would be appropriate, perhaps, to change the boundaries a little bit so that we could avoid going over that 130% mark, and over the 105%. That is really all I have got to say.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you. That is very helpful and I am sorry that we were not able to fully use your slides.

MR COX: You will have the ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: This is evidence, yes. No, excellent.

MR COX: It is all there.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We can look at it properly, but I mean, I think you have got your points across fairly clearly anyway, so thank you. Before you rush off, are there any matters for clarification at all? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed. That is splendid.

I suggest we now recess. The next speaker is not until 4.50, scheduled speaker, so we will recess till 4.45. Thank you.

Time noted: 4.04 pm

After a short break

Time noted: 4.47 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, then, we will reconvene and we have a speaker. Ms Joy Morrissey, would you like to come to the podium, and if you start by way of introduction by just your name and address, and then say what you would like to say to us? That is great. Thank you.

CLLR MORRISSEY: My name is Joy Morrissey. My address is 7 Woodstock Grange, 95 Grange Road, Ealing, W5 3PE.

I would like to comment today on community cohesion aspects of the proposal. I am a councillor in Ealing and I was Vice Chair of a scrutiny panel overseeing the possible closure of several community centres. Four of those community centres were in Northolt, and the main argument for their closure was that there was so much community cohesion within the two Northolt wards that they did not need so many community centres. That is the, sort of, line that Ealing Council has been taking, and I would say I have to agree with that. The two Northolt wards have always been

historically linked. Also, they have very strong ties to Greenford, as well. There are a lot of social similarities between the two wards and also some of the highest --- there are complex social issues in certain areas, and also high pockets of deprivation in the Northolt wards, and they can best be served by the same constituency MP. Ealing does deal with these cases very well and efficiently, but they do consider the two Northolt wards to be a unit, and always historically tied together, and also to Greenford. I think I would have to support this. This is Ealing Council's view, and I just wanted to point that out.

On a wider scale, I am an Ealing Central resident. I live in Ealing Common ward but I am a Hanger Hill councillor, and Hanger Hill is traditionally linked, very closely, with Cleveland ward. Before the ward boundary changes, they were actually one ward, joined. They were called Pitshanger. So, those two wards were actually one. They are very closely tied to Ealing Broadway, Hanger Hill and Cleveland ward. The demographic is very similar. They all go to the same schools. Many of the parents, where my daughter goes to primary school, live in Cleveland ward but think they live in Hanger Hill or Ealing Broadway because it is so undistinguishable between the three wards, and then you have Perivale, which is right above, so also with the cost of housing in Ealing, what you are seeing is families my age or traditional families who grew up in Ealing, who perhaps cannot afford houses in Ealing Broadway, they are moving to Perivale but they are still going to school in Ealing Central, so you have very strong ties to Perivale. I was just there with my daughter for a community day, because there are so many children that go to her school that live in Perivale, and so you, sort of, have this Perivale-Ealing Broadway-Hanger Hill-Cleveland-Ealing Common cluster that are very socially similar. If you look at the wellbeing report, they have the same sort of demographic wellbeing outcomes and they are more, sort of, socially joined together, so I just wanted to point that out. That is more as a resident and as a local councillor. Those were the main points that I wanted to make. Thank you so much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. So, I understand the points you are making about cohesion, and therefore you have any issues with the Boundary Commission proposals? You are concerned about them?

CLLR MORRISSEY: Well, I think it is important that the two Northolt wards remain together.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

CLLR MORRISSEY: I think, regardless of where they are, I think they should remain together and probably within Ealing, because Ealing Council is very involved: social services, housing. There is a lot, and they do a great job, Ealing Council does an excellent job, but I think they are best served within an Ealing constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, rather than --- yes.

CLLR MORRISSEY: Yes, because whatever for the MP they are going to be dealing with a lot of these things and writing to the council and working with the council, and a lot of the families have been there for generations. They may be in a different estate, but they are still from Northolt, so you could have a family that lives in Northolt Mandeville and then one across the street who are expecting their MP to deal with their problems but they are in two different constituencies, so I think it is essential that the two of them remain ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Linked.

CLLR MORRISSEY: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.

CLLR MORRISSEY: No problem.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is very helpful. Are there any matters arising or issues? Clarification? No? Thank you very much indeed, then.

CLLR MORRISSEY: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So, next, Councillor Jean Lammiman? Would you like to come forward?

CLLR LAMMIMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Cllr Jean Lammiman, and my address is Fiverden, 6 Crest View, HA5 1AN. Okay? Thank you.

Thank you very much for this opportunity. Just a little bit about me, to give some underpinning to what I am going to be saying: I have lived in Hatch End, or near Hatch End, most of my life. My parents lived in Hatch End. I am the Councillor for Hatch End and have been for over 22 years now, and my record in terms of council work has been: I chaired the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, five committees, for four years, before becoming Deputy Mayor and then Mayor of Harrow about nine years ago. Consequent to that, I became the portfolio holder for community and culture and the arts, and that included, if you like, the softer side of the arts but also the more difficult sides around diversity and threats of demonstrations, et cetera, at mosques, so I think I have got a very good understanding of the good people of Harrow and especially the people of the area I am talking about.

In particular, I am pleased that the proposal is that Hatch End move with, if you like, its natural bedfellows into North Harrow and Stanmore. If you look at the geography of it, it is very logical, but also, the other aspects are very important, and I am going to cover

these very briefly, if I may. I am going to look at communications, including travel, commerce, culture and education, and the natural boundaries.

One of the natural boundaries really is Hatch End, linking through to North Harrow, Headstone North, and that area. The natural transport links: Hatch End, naturally, has a connection through the railway system to Headstone Lane and North Harrow. The other transport links are excellent bus services, serving that part of Harrow. By road, of course, you can go from Hatch End through to Headstone, which is also a very important main station for the area. In terms of other aspects, the communications in terms of the community, if you like, is very important. Two things I would like to look at. One is culture, which is the arts centre, and although it is based in Hatch End, it serves, obviously, the whole of Harrow, and it brings a lot of people from that side of the borough into Hatch End, and there is a natural link there in terms of serving people. It is not only arts in terms of things that are put on, but also practicalities in terms of people participating in groups, learning arts, performing arts, et cetera.

In terms of the Broadway itself in Hatch End, if you looked at Google Earth, you would just say, "Oh, well, that's just a through road". In fact, the Broadway is very, very vibrant, and again, it is really the dining centre of that area, going right the way up, if you like, to Stanmore. It is a place of choice for people to come and spend their evenings. We do not get that many coming across from Hillingdon because they have their own natural areas.

In terms of education, Hatch End High School is a very successful school. It has become outstanding, and in terms of that, the young people are drawn from the area, the natural area of Harrow, North Harrow and Stanmore, Headstone North and so on, to that bit. Further south, Nower Hill High School, where I was a governor, is attended by youngsters from south of the borough, but north of the borough, it is Hatch End High School. In addition, just to declare an interest, I am the Chairman of the Governing Body of Shaftesbury High School, which is a high school for children with special needs, and that serves the area, too. That sits next door to Hatch End High School, and there is a lot of symmetry, if you like, between the two in terms of serving that part of the community of Hatch End, North Harrow, et cetera, on that side of the borough. Finally, in terms of recreation, et cetera, people tend to gravitate towards that part of the world in terms of social life, in terms of sports. I was one of the founders of the Hatch End triathlon, which drew a lot of people into that area for sports and so on, and again, it is a natural bedfellow for that area.

That is essentially, I think, the key thing. We moved over, as you know, to Ruislip North from Pinner, and whilst we always make the best efforts that we can with Hatch End to link through, it is not a natural link in the same way as it would be perhaps for the two Pinner, because obviously, they border Eastcote, whereas Hatch End naturally borders Harrow Weald, Headstone North, et cetera, so it is a natural thing as well, and the communities themselves tend to settle in that way, and essentially, as I said, it is a more

--- what can I say? It is organic, but it has got the natural boundaries that I think would serve the people of Harrow. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Any matters arising? Observations? Clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

CLLR LAMMIMAN: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: John Hinkley? If you would like to come to the podium, Sir? Name and address to begin, please.

CLLR HINKLEY: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. My name is John Hinkley and I live at 6 Crest View, Pinner, HA5 1AN. I have been a Hatch End ward councillor since 2014, but I have been shadowing the work in Hatch End for 22 years, so I do know it extremely well, all the bumps in the pavements and everything else.

My biggest task is to avoid duplicating what Cllr Lammiman just said, so I just wanted to stress the community links. Hatch End has three synagogues --- sorry, two synagogues, and it is one of the centres of the Jewish faith and there is a long corridor that goes up to Stanmore, where there is the biggest synagogue, I think, in the area.

Councillor Lammiman has stressed the number of eating places in Hatch End. It is a vibrant community. We have a big parking issue, particularly in the evenings, and everybody from Stanmore way, as a matter of choice, will come to Hatch End to eat. I think it was ten years ago that Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency was created, and many of our residents still have not got used to the fact that they are no longer part of Harrow, and we were talking to the Hatch End association of this, which is the pre-eminent local association, and their view was that they were in favour of the Boundary Commission's existing proposal, i.e. one dear lady said, "We'll get Harrow back like it used to be". So, I think that is really all I wanted to say on the Hatch End side. Am I able to talk about some other proposals? Am I able to mention ---

I just wanted to mention the case of Harrow-on-the-Hill, which, according to the Boundary Commission, is going to disappear off into --- it shows you how parochial we are, "darkest Wembley", though even though I say that, it is a jolly nice place, and it has nothing to do with Wembley. It is basically Harrow-on-the-Hill, and Harrow-on-the-Hill is Harrow, and there is a counter-proposal, which matches Harrow-on-the-Hill into the Kenton constituency of Greenhill and Queensbury, and the two Kentons and also Northwick Park, just up the road, and many people feel that that is a more natural way of handling Harrow-on-the-Hill; even though you can see the London Borough of Brent, there are playing fields, you know, the Harrow School playing fields, and that does actually provide a natural boundary, so I would hope that the Boundary Commission

could consider putting Harrow-on-the-Hill in the Kenton constituency, rather than its existing proposals. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you.

Mr Ali Habib? Would you like to come forward and present? Splendid. So, if you just speak from there, and just start by giving your name and address, please. Thank you.

MR HABIB: Ali Habib, 1 Green Farm Close, Harrow, HA2 0QA. I am here to speak about the current changes of the constituents. Living in South Harrow for around ten years of my life, I am someone that uses Sudbury and Harrow town centre quite regularly. I believe that South Harrow, Harrow town centre and Sudbury should be an integral --- is, sort of, a community feel that should remain. I believe that people in South Harrow and Harrow regularly use Northwick Park Hospital, and Harrow town centre is something that is quite integral to South Harrow and Sudbury, and mainly residents between South Harrow and Sudbury use it.

Living in South Harrow, my constituency is going to change and I am going to be part of Northwood, according to the plans currently set in place, and I think that it is something that would divide the community, especially because it has been such a feeling that I am part of Harrow, but I am going to become part of Northwood, which is a bit different to Harrow, because I have pretty much never been to Northwood in my life, except on one or two occasions. I believe that South Harrow and Harrow should be together, along with Sudbury, because it is something that works and I believe it is something that --- should be something that, will work forever, I guess. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you very much. I take it there are no matters for clarification? No? Right. Thank you.

So, our next speaker is scheduled for 6.20 pm, so I suggest we adjourn until then. Thank you.

Time Noted: 5.05 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 6.28 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene. The absent speakers, I think, have arrived. Mr Peter Taheri, would you like to come forward? Lovely. If you could just commence by saying your name and address, please?

MR TAHERI: Sure. Peter Taheri, Flat 3, 123 Canfield Gardens, London NW6 3DY. So that is, I think, in terms of ward, Swiss Cottage in the London Borough of Camden, but I think estate agents would call it South Hampstead.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you.

MR TAHERI: So, I just wanted to speak about the Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. I saw the initial proposals of the Commission, which I was really rather concerned by, because I have --- I will just tell you a little bit about myself first, really.

I was born in London; lived for the first three years of my life in Brondesbury Park, which is within the constituency at the moment, and would not be under the initial proposals of the Commission. I went to school for a good ten years or so, roughly, in and around Fitzjohn's Avenue, which is within the constituency. I lived with my parents, obviously, for most of my youth and early adulthood. I have, in the last two or three years, moved into my present address in the Swiss Cottage/South Hampstead part of the world, so I feel quite a close affinity with the area, and although I cannot claim to know every single community organisation, every single part of the community like the back of my hand, I know it as well as anyone could know it who has been living in London pretty much all my life, and one thing that really struck me about the initial proposals was the proposal to divide Kilburn. It is bad enough, if you like, that there is already a division there in terms of Brent Council and Camden Council, but in my view, this would be exacerbated by putting them in separate constituencies. Kilburn is very much a single coherent community. It is an area focused on the Kilburn High Road, with the Kilburn High Road being a focal point rather than a point of division, transport links such as buses being shared along the Kilburn High Road, community ties being shared across and throughout the area. There is the neighbourhood development forum. I understand there is a mosque that the local Somali community use quite a lot, and as you would expect with a community focused on a High Road, there are common issues. There are common challenges. I understand that the local councillors on both sides of the High Road have done a lot of work on problem gambling, and have to liaise with each other in terms of licensing, and I also understand that it is an area that has provided a lot of case work for our local MP, and in that context, it is an area where a lot of work has been put in already by the local MP into working with that community.

So, that is the first and I think the most important thing that I wanted to say, that the initial proposal has a very worrying division of Kilburn. I have seen the Labour Party's counter-proposal, which, in my humble view, would provide for a more sensible and logical, in terms of community ties, layout. It does involve the present constituency losing Belsize and Hampstead Town, but in terms of communities which are similar, and which are comparable, West Hampstead, I would say, is actually a bit of a misnomer. West Hampstead does not really have that much in common with Hampstead Town. It has got, I would say, much more in common, living as I do around the corner from West Hampstead, much more in common with places like Kilburn and Queens Park, and if

you are going to make the, sort of, comparison between the Hampsteads and between the Kilburns, I would say that Kilburn (Brent) and Kilburn (Camden) are much more alike than West Hampstead and Hampstead Town are alike, and the proposals of the Boundary Commission include bringing into the constituency Hampstead Garden Suburb and Charles Hill, which, when I was going to school in the Fitzjohns part of the world, I had friends who lived in Hampstead Garden Suburb; I would go and visit them quite often, I know them quite well; but what struck me whenever I would go there is that they are very different. They are a very different part of the world. The centre of gravity in terms of the places of work, in terms of shopping, in terms of socialising, of the people who live in Hampstead Garden Suburb, is much more towards Golders Green, I would suggest, than it is towards somewhere like West Hampstead, and my concern is, if you bring in Hampstead Garden Suburb, and to a lesser extent maybe Charles Hill, into the present constituency, you are separating those people from their local ties. It is almost, you are, kind of, top of the hill, bottom of the hill, and we are on the bottom of the hill, and the people on the top of the hill --- moreover, if you want to talk about geography, separated by Hampstead Heath, which I would say is a significant natural barrier. They are in a different part of London. They are in a much more suburban part of London, whereas Kilburn and West Hampstead are much more urban, I would say, in terms of feel, in terms of issues, in terms of challenges, in terms of the community, and the issues and challenges of the community.

The other thing I would say, I do not know how I am doing for time, is that, having had a look at the numbers, the numbers for Hampstead Garden Suburb and Charles Hill, they are large wards, and if you bring in these large wards into a constituency that is largely made up of smaller wards, you are going to have a real impact on how coherent the constituency is, particularly given what I have said about the urban-suburban difference between those wards and the rest of the constituency, and my concern is that you would have a much less coherent constituency.

So, bringing all of this together, my overall view, irrespective of party politics, irrespective of political positions, is that what you have under the present, current constituency boundaries is a relatively coherent seat, a relatively coherent set of constituencies with strong constituency ties, and I recognise that there need to be some changes because of the quota and whatnot, but I would suggest that the Labour Party's counter-proposal keeps the current constituency together more than the Boundary Commission's initial proposals, and it has a better respect for community ties for the reasons I have tried to set out. If you are going to do a cross-borough constituency, we have a link and a co-operation and a good working between the councillors in Camden and Brent. There is not as much of a link and a co-operation to date between those in Camden and Barnet, I would say. Sorry, I have kind of unloaded all of that at you in one go. Can I --- any questions for me? Anything I can help with?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is clear to me. Thank you. It has been helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

MR TAHERI: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Will you be making a written submission as well, or not?

MR TAHERI: I was not planning to, but I can think about that. I had not really thought that one could.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, you certainly can, up to 5 December. You may want to submit that, with, possibly, any further thoughts by the fifth and you would be very welcome.

MR TAHERI: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you like to come next? Thank you. Again, if you could just introduce yourself by name and address, to begin. Thank you.

MS RODGERS: My name is Sienna Rodgers and I live in Fortune Green, 1 St Cuthbert's Road, NW2 3QJ. Is that all right?

So, I will start by talking about transport. In order to get to Hampstead, which, you know, I really like going to Hampstead. I love Hampstead Heath, but in order to get there, I have to take the Overground. Golders Green, Hampstead and Belsize Park are also all on the Northern Line, and in order for me --- I live about two minutes away from Kilburn Station. In order for me to get to Hampstead or Belsize, or Golders Green, I have to go into town, make two changes on the Tube, so I have to go to Green Park, and then I have to take the Victoria to Euston, and then change again, all the way down there and all the way back up again, whereas Kilburn, West Hampstead and Finchley Road are all on the Jubilee Line, which creates a nice little unit, because they are all three together on the Jubilee. So, that is a strong transport link, tying those wards together.

In terms of shopping, Fortune Green, Mapesbury, Brondesbury Park, Kilburn, both sides of it, and to a lesser extent, Swiss Cottage and West Hampstead: we all use Kilburn High Road for food shopping. There is Kilburn Market at the bottom, and there are also lots of big shops for clothes shopping as well as food shopping, all along the Kilburn High Road, whereas Frognal and Fitzjohns, Fortune Green, West Hampstead and Swiss Cottage, they all use West End Lane as well, and Finchley Road. So, Frognal and Fitzjohns looks on to Finchley Road, whereas Hampstead, which is next to Frognal

and Fitzjohns, more looks on to Hampstead town in terms of shopping. So, Hampstead and Belsize, they, kind of, look to Haverstock Hill, to the A502, Heath Street, those kind of streets, in terms of where they amass for food shopping, you know. Day to day, that is where they go.

In terms of boroughs, I think I saw in these initial proposals that we are bringing in Barnet into our seat. So, we are already a two-borough constituency, Hampstead and Kilburn, and to bring in Barnet, which is a very large outer London borough, basically, kind of, overcomplicates things again and I feel like we need these new changes to be as simple as possible. So, to bring in just a little slice of Barnet, which is enormous and stretches all the way north, does not seem to me to make much sense.

So, Kilburn, I believe to be a community hub, basically, and it is all centred around Kilburn High Road. So, I will give you a few examples of the, kind of, community spirit in Kilburn. There is Kilburn Grange Park, which --- recently over the summer we had a festival, which brought people from all sides, from both sides of the Kilburn High Road, from all areas, from Fortune Green, West Hampstead, all those areas, all brought together, where everyone was doing, kind of, independent stalls, food, that kind of thing, and launching their campaigns, local campaigns, and that has only just, kind of, got back up and running again. There is Kilburn Library, which, of course, people from both sides of the road use, and there is Kilburn Neighbourhood Forum, which has only just, kind of, got into the swing of things in terms of --- they had their AGM last week and they are, kind of, addressing issues that affect people on both sides of the High Road, because, of course, they are the same issues. In terms of transport, there are so many buses that run down it. In terms of Kilburn Station, Brondesbury Park and Mapesbury and Fortune Green, we go to Kilburn Station, basically, and if there were any, kind of, changes, like, if there are any issues at Kilburn Station, we would all be concerned, just as people have been talking recently about changes to West Hampstead station, around that area, so there are some common links there.

Yes, I feel like, for these discussions about local issues, we do need unity across the High Road. There are also places like the Tricycle Theatre, that put on – that is on the Brent side of Kilburn High Road, and they put on things for kids. I mean, I have lived in Fortune Green since I was six years old, and I used to go there for art classes, things like that. Lots of free activities for youths, and I know that people from Brent and Camden use that. So yes, it is a renowned theatre and there are amazing plays and people from all across London come to Kilburn, and that is a point, as well, that people come to Kilburn. They do not come to Kilburn (Camden). They do not come to Kilburn (Brent). They come to Kilburn as a community, as a hub of so many activities, as a shopping centre.

There are also places like Kingsgate Community Centre, which I think people from Brent also use, and The Good Ship, which is a pub and a comedy venue, and they do free room hire, which lots of groups use. So, yes, and there are also demographic

similarities across Kilburn (Brent) and Kilburn (Camden), so I think I have read that both of those wards, the second highest background is Irish, so there is still that strong Irish community there. I know from just talking to, you know, residents, that much of the community is Irish and they still have a community centre, actually, that specifically addresses Irish residents. So yes, I also found it very weird in these proposals that, not only are we splitting Kilburn into two, gutting Kilburn in half; we are also dividing it into three, so on the Brent side, North Kilburn and South Kilburn would also be separated, which just seems to add insult to injury. So, it, kind of, seems like, I mean, South Kilburn is a more deprived area than North Kilburn. It seems that we are dividing that across class, or income lines there, and I feel like we really need to preserve those mixed communities in London, because that is the best thing about London. That is all what we all love and appreciate about London is that people live side by side, council estates and three-million-pound houses are right next to each other, and I feel like Kilburn really represents that, because it is such a diverse community.

So, yes, that is basically all I wanted to say.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is great. That is a lot. That is tremendous. Thank you very much indeed.

MS RODGERS: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That fills out a number of things. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

Do we have another speaker now? Right. Natasha? Yes. Would you like to come forward? Smashing, and if you introduce yourself by way of your name and address, just to begin, okay? Thank you.

MS PROCTOR: My name is Natasha Proctor. I am a resident in Harrow Weald, so I am in the Harrow East constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. Please start.

MS PROCTOR: So, basically, I just wanted to come today to, kind of, emphasise the point of everyone I know who lives around me in Harrow Weald, that we share much more in common towards Hatch End and Pinner than we do out in the other direction, the whole way from Stanmore to Harrow Weald and along.

So, I live in Harrow Weald. My grandparents, just my grandad now, live in Stanmore and I went to school in Hatch End. Technically, it is on the border between Harrow Weald and Hatch End. So, straight away, one of the main high schools straddles that line between Harrow Weald and Hatch End. So, lots, most of my friends from High School lived towards Hatch End into Pinner, that direction, that went to my school, and

Hatch End is where the Morrisons is. That is where everybody does their shopping at the weekend and things like that, and so, that entire line along the Uxbridge Road is basically just the vein that runs through the whole of the community along there, I believe, taking you through from Stanmore, through the High Street there, where there are various shops and shopping, but not much parking, down into Harrow Weald, where you have Waitrose, and a little tiny high street there, too, there are the residential areas, where everybody lives, towards Hatch End High School, where I went, and then down in towards Hatch End, we have the leisure centre, the library, where I used to go all the time as a teenager, not so much now, and then into Hatch End High Street, which is full of amazing restaurants. It is where I go, still.

I live at home with my mum and my brother and now we do, most weeks, we will probably go for dinner there at least once along that road, and then into Pinner as well, so the main transport links along there are, I think, key, and the train line as well, kind of, running from Hatch End down to Headstone Lane, which, you know, you walk past to get into that way, as well. Everything is linked up directly. The bus routes are the same as the trains, the H12, that runs from Stanmore Station, the whole way through Stanmore, Harrow Weald, into Hatch End and then into Pinner. It seems just bizarre to me to be splitting it up when it is clearly a line of transport and local community all in one go, and yes, so the other proposal is to go towards, into, Harrow, or even up to Edgware. I just do not --- it is just not, really, I do not think, for anybody in the local community, part of our daily lives and what we do. During the week, we will go to Hatch End for dinner and for shopping, and then at the weekend, we will go into Hatch End to do our food shopping rather than for recreation and things like that, and obviously, I have not been at school for quite some time now, but my local primary school was Cedars, which is Harrow Weald, and it directly feeds into Hatch End High School. It is -- - everybody in my class, save for, I think, two children, went to Hatch End, and again, we are all part of such a close community together across different demographics, whether it is religion or age, things like that, but everybody is as one where I live, and to split us up when we have all been as one community for such a long time, I do not know, it just does not seem at all logical to me, basically, so I wanted to come today to, kind of, just represent that point, that we are part of that community rather than another, basically. That is all I have to say, really.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. No, that is good. You have made it very clearly, the point. Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? No. Okay, well, thank you very much, then. That is great.

We will have a five-minute recess while we wait for the next speaker, who is due shortly. Thank you.

Time Noted: 6.48 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 6.56 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen. We will reconvene. Mr Will Marshall, is it? Yes, thank you, Sir. If you would like to come to the podium, and if you start by introducing yourself by name and address?

MR MARSHALL: Absolutely. My name is Will Marshall. My address is 156C Sinclair Road, so that is to the north of the proposed Hammersmith and Fulham seat. I have been a longstanding Hammersmith resident. I first moved in in 2004 and generally lived in the area I have been living in at the moment. So, in west London, total years would be something like five or six years, on and off.

I am going to limit, first of all, my comments to where I actually know the area. So, first of all, I want to put on record my congratulation to the Boundary Commission for what I think is a very strong set of proposals. I really support the Hammersmith and Fulham seat as proposed, for several reasons.

Primarily, well, first of all, it involves a cross-borough seat with Kensington and Chelsea. As we can currently see at the moment, we have a seat that crosses two boroughs. Now, that is great, I suppose, for the sitting MP, but what it means is that actually, a large amount of Chelsea and Fulham, who have not historically been a merged seat, actually find that, you know, they do not necessarily have the same interests, not least of all because they do not sit in the same borough. By putting the current proposal here, what you find is that all of Fulham is in the same seat. The current Chelsea and Fulham seat does not actually include all of Fulham. As you will see right there, Fulham Reach is excluded, an area that used to be in the Fulham seat back even to the 1930s (indicating). Likewise, Fulham Palace Road, the identity of the road seems relatively clear from the name, and yet it is excluded from the current Fulham and Chelsea seat, which to my mind has always been somewhat anomalous.

Thirdly, it recreates the old Hammersmith and Fulham seat of 1997 to 2010. The seat is a logical constituency. It has got very clear north-south roads that are not, frankly, very well used, and I am going to come back on to the traffic point in a second.

Residents of Addison, where I live, there, is the densest of the wards. You get people who say, "Addison: that's just South Shepherd's Bush". Could not be more untrue. I walk into Shepherd's Bush Tube station like so many other residents of Addison, and yet, when we come back from Shepherd's Bush Tube station, we do not hang around Shepherd's Bush. You do not find any social intermingling. In fact, you see a steady stream of human traffic going over the road, not even going out of its way to the zebra crossings, but literally, over the road. That is a three-lane highway in each direction, and they do that because they are leaving Shepherd's Bush, often as quickly as possible.

It reflects the reality, which is that the Goldhawk Road forms a real boundary, and you can see this boundary in many senses. You can see it in the sense of traffic going north and south. Human traffic. Car traffic. There is very little, so when you go on out to Ravenscourt Park, here, there is a one-way system north of there, and the council built a one-way system there because there was no real traffic going north of the Goldhawk Road, because there was very little traffic from the south of Goldhawk Road that wished to go north, and you can see this today with the human traffic as well. Those folks in Ravenscourt Park maybe go down to Fulham, maybe stay in Ravenscourt Park, maybe take the Tube. They do not venture north. It is a separate community. You can see it likewise, actually, in terms of the first languages that the non-English immigrants into the area speak. South of the Goldhawk Road, you get French; you get a fair amount of Italian. North of Goldhawk Road, you get Somali. You do not get any European languages spoken. So what you find is that the communities are very distinct.

I also want to congratulate the Commission on avoiding the temptation to pair Hammersmith with Brentford and Isleworth. Brentford and Isleworth, the proposed seat is far more compact than the current sprawling seat, and I agree with the inclusion of Southwark ward from Enfield into that seat. The area has strong ties with Chiswick and it is a welcome change.

I want to disagree --- I want to discuss Shepherd's Bush in a bit more detail. I am a governor in a school in Shepherd's Bush. We have an intake that, frankly, we would like to be larger than the current intake. The current intake comes from College Park and Old Oak. The current intake comes from the White City, primarily. We have no intake from south of the Goldhawk Road. What we find is that our parents find themselves, as a social group, to come from around that area. We have, frankly, tried to encourage parents from below the Goldhawk Road to send their children north. We have had literally zero. At the moment, we are looking north to Willesden, where, actually, we find that parents are far more interested in coming south into what they clearly do not see to be as big a bounded area, despite the fact that they are actually further away.

The area is a unique one, ideally one that should be kept together. The four wards of what are currently, I suppose, termed North Hammersmith, do have a very similar identity. I mentioned ethnic groups and languages spoken, but you could equally look at it, frankly, in terms of house prices. The difference between the Goldhawk Road north and south is very clear. As someone who is looking to buy, myself, it is a 50% premium below the Goldhawk Road. Now, I am sure that if the market really thought that the two areas were so similar, the prices would jump, or indeed, jump north or fall south.

The transport links are also strong. You have Wood Lane; you have the Overground. It ties the area together.

Finally, I would like to comment on Labour's counter-proposal to retain the Hammersmith seat with the addition of Fulham Broadway. Taking Fulham Broadway out of that area would remove the heart of Fulham. It is a commercial centre. It is where everyone in what is currently the Fulham wards, south of Lillie Road, go towards. You know, it is where they do their shopping, it is often where they commute into, even if it is not the closest Tube stop to their house. They go to Fulham Broadway and then they expand outwards. What that means, then, is that they have the same interests as people who already live in Fulham Broadway. They have an interest, likewise, in keeping the character of Fulham Broadway, and as such, it makes sense, at least to my mind, that they should be represented by the same Member of Parliament.

So, to conclude, I support the Hammersmith and Fulham seat, as well as the Kensington and Chelsea and Brentford and Isleworth seats. We recommend reuniting all the four Shepherd's Bush wards into Willesden, and oppose the proposed dismemberment of Fulham put forward by the Labour Party. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes. Sorry, could you just ---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mentioned a ward in, I think it is, sorry, in Ealing, which you called "Southwark", which I believe is a London Borough. It is called "Southfield", is it not?

MR MARSHALL: Apologies. That must have been my mistake.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Okay. Thank you. That is fine. Thank you very much indeed. That is good.

So, a five-minute recess before our next speaker. Thank you.

Time Noted: 7.04 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 7.14 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, if we reconvene. I think we have a speaker who has arrived. Mr Myles Swaine-Gray? Lovely. If you would like to come to the podium, Sir, and if you start by just saying your name and address, and then go into your presentation. Thanks very much.

MR SWAINE-GRAY: Hi there. My name is Myles Swaine-Gray. My address is 11 Lulworth Gardens, South Harrow, HA2 9NW. I have been a resident of Harrow all my

life and a resident of Roxbourne ward for the past five or six years. I would just like to start talking about Roxbourne ward itself. I believe Roxbourne and the residents, they are part of the South Harrow community, which, under proposals, could be split, and the Roxbourne community definitely have, you know, strong, strong links with being Harrow residents, certainly not --- they definitely do not see themselves as residents of Wembley or residents of Pinner, and that is mainly because Roxbourne really does not have that many historical links with Wembley, wider Brent or Hillingdon as a whole. It definitely looks to Harrow for its vital services, such as hospitals and schools, and social services. Roxbourne ward itself is well-linked with Harrow, with its transport links with the Metropolitan line and the H10 and H12 bus links.

Just to speak widely of Harrow as a whole, I believe that splitting Harrow into four constituencies would definitely harm local services and definitely, you know, would be detrimental for every resident in Harrow. I have looked at all the proposals. I think there were three that I looked at, which was the Boundary Commission proposal, the Conservative Party proposal and the Labour Party proposal, and in my opinion, the Labour Party proposal for Harrow South and Sudbury ward --- sorry, Sudbury constituency, would definitely be the best alternative for reasons, you know --- that proposal would keep the majority of the historic Harrow West constituency, which has been a constituency since the 1950s, I believe. Harrow South and Sudbury would be well connected by rail links and bus links, and Tube links, unlike the Boundary Commission proposal, which would link Central Harrow with Stanmore, which really does not have those kind of links or ties. I also think for the proposed Harrow South and Sudbury constituency, the residents there would definitely look for the same vital services, you know, whether --- they definitely look for the vital services, schools and hospitals, I think I mentioned before, so, yes. So, I think ---

Again, quickly, just going back to Roxbourne ward itself, it has been in Harrow West since its formation. I looked at the Conservative Party proposal, which was to put it in Pinner, Ruislip and Northwood. I definitely do not think the residents there see themselves as residents of Pinner or --- you know, and they certainly do not look --- they do not go to the local hospitals. I mean, I would not look to go to a hospital in Hillingdon or Brent. I would look for the main hospital that serves Harrow, which would be Northwick Park Hospital, and just, sort of, splitting, you know, these communities up, you know, might --- definitely will affect these services, and I think that is really all I want to say about Roxbourne. Sorry. I was a bit nervous.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, you were not. You spoke very clearly and that is very helpful. Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, a really quick point, Myles. You talked about the main hospital in Harrow being Northwick Park.

MR SWAINE-GRAY: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You appreciate that is in Brent? In the Brent borough?

MR SWAINE-GRAY: It is, yes. It is in Brent, but I think it is right on the border with Harrow.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is right. I just wanted to make sure that you appreciate that is in Brent, which is why --- looking for Harrow services.

MR SWAINE-GRAY: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely. Thank you very much indeed, then. That is great.

MR SWAINE-GRAY: Sorry about that misunderstanding.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: (After a short pause) Am I right in thinking this is Sheila Peacock? Okay. Right, and are you ready to come and speak? Fantastic. Well, if you would like to come forward, to the podium, and if you could just start by stating your name and address before you give your presentation? Thank you.

CLLR PEACOCK: My name is Cllr Sheila Peacock and I am from 62 Hampden Lane in Tottenham, N17 0AS.

First of all, I would like to thank the Boundary Commission for their initial proposals, which are to keep the constituency of Tottenham intact with the addition of Stroud Green ward. We support this brilliant proposal, and still do.

Can I just introduce myself? I am a long-serving local councillor of 23 years. I came on the council in 1994 and I have lived in Tottenham all my life. I have been the Mayor of Haringey three times. I studied to be a teacher in the College of All Saints in Tottenham as a mature student. I taught at three Tottenham schools and ended my career as head teacher of a primary school in Seven Sisters in 1993. I joined the Tottenham and Wood Green pensioners' action group on my retirement. It was founded in 1982 by a group of pensioners concerned at the constant erosion of pensioners' rights, and I became the Chair of that group. It now has 350 members. It is the biggest pensioners' group in London, and I am still the Chair.

We fear that any proposals, such as the counter-proposals forwarded by the Labour and Conservatives to split Tottenham in half would have a severe impact on my local pensioners. Under both sets of proposals, there would be a lack of centre of town for

elderly people. It is particularly important for the local people and vulnerable adults with the closure of day centres such as the Haven and the Grange, which cater for people with Alzheimer's and dementia. The last thing they want is to change the area where they live. The last round of government cuts in Haringey both based in Tottenham have already decimated our care services. Most older people currently use the Seven Sisters Tottenham Green area as a centre of town, where they can gather for events and activities. Tottenham Green is currently described as the cultural heart of Tottenham. Within the Tottenham Green area, there are many facilities including first, Tottenham Town Hall, Marcus Garvey Library, the College of Haringey, Enfield and North East London, the Bernie Grant Arts Centre, the Tottenham Green Leisure Centre, which offers free facilities and classes for the over-60s, and also my group, which I get there for free. There is easy access to free sports, keep-fit facilities, which are particularly important as Tottenham is already a deprived area, where life expectancy is significantly lower than the national average. There has been a positive wave of investment in health and community facilities, which have been essential in rebuilding the community since the riots, and for providing elderly people with vital services.

The proposed new boundary will mean that the poorest parts of Tottenham and Edmonton will be combined. The original proposal in 1965, I think before any of you were involved in politics or in the Boundary Commission, the idea was to create a new Borough called Haringey and combine Tottenham and Edmonton, but it was rejected for the very reason that I served on the Committee at that time, that it would make the poorest parts drawn together, the Tottenham and Edmonton proposal will in fact create a super-deprived area. I represent Northumberland Park ward, which I think is about the third most deprived ward in London. Results from Tottenham CLP Members' Survey show that members believe that if Tottenham were to be split, it would cause distress and confusion for elderly and vulnerable people, who may not know where to go for help. Neighbouring constituencies have names similar to their councils, which has the potential to be confusing. Even now, we see confusion about access and contact points. This confusion would be likely to increase significantly under both the Labour and Conservative proposals. Because of this, 84% of the survey respondents felt that it was important that Tottenham stayed within one borough, with 53% feeling very strongly about this.

I commend to you the letter sent to you on 14 October 2016 from Sir Stuart Lipton. He is Chair of the Independent Panel on Tottenham, and he was appointed by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, and is the author of "It Took a Second Riot", and I was pleased to serve on that committee. I would like to quote Boris Johnson's statement on the publication of the report in December 2012:

"What happened in Tottenham last year was a wake up call to us all, and I am determined that these scenes should never be repeated. There can be no doubt that Tottenham needs greater support. This report puts renewed focus on the part of London that has been overlooked for far too long. I believe the conclusions of our

independent report demonstrate how important it is for Tottenham, a once prosperous area that fell into decline, to be managed as a coherent whole”.

Another worrying aspect would be that Tottenham would lose its only independent advocate in Parliament, and Tottenham would have a far more deprived profile than it currently does, and so Tottenham would lose out once again. In his report in 2012, Sir Stuart Lipton concluded the right attitude is crucial. Sustained negativity breeds a perception, and that perception influences whether people will choose to visit, to work, to live, or invest locally. We do not doubt that Tottenham can return to being a place of prosperity. Many locals are already rightly proud of being from the area, yet it is still an area that affords its residents much disadvantages. If there is one goal we should promote, it is regeneration, then this must stop the disadvantages. Being from Tottenham should be an advantage in life. Unfortunately, however, both sets of counter-proposals do not address this, and that is why we support the Boundary Commission’s proposals. Historically, Tottenham, as a defined area, is older than 1066. It is believed to be as old as the settlers who first set up home along the course of the Roman Road, some of which now forms the A10. I beg you, I implore you, to keep Tottenham as a whole.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. May we have a copy of your paper? That would be most helpful.

CLLR PEACOCK: Yes, and also I have brought with me the letter from Sir Stuart, in case you want it. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Perfect. That is even better. I was going to say, because I wanted to look up the reference. Thank you. That is good. Just before you go, are there any matters for clarification? No. In which case, thank you very much indeed for that.

(After a short pause) We have actually heard from our last registered speaker for the evening. Is there anyone else present who wants to make a submission, wants to say anything? No? Well, are my colleagues content that we should draw the proceedings to a close for this evening? Yes? You do not want to sit here for another half hour? No? Right. Okay, then, so shall we close tonight, and I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow morning at 9.00. Thank you.

Adjourned until 9.00 am on Tuesday 25 October 2016

Time Noted: 7.29 pm

**A**

CLLR AMADI, 11, 13

**B**

MR BOB BLACKMAN MP, 26, 29  
MS BLIGH, 23, 25

**C**

MS CHANDWANI, 5, 6  
MR COX, 43, 46

**G**

MR GALLANT, 9, 11  
MR GHAFAR, 13, 15

**H**

MR HABIB, 51  
MS HELEN HAYES MP, 6  
CLLR HINKLEY, 50  
MR HUTCHISON, 42, 43

**J**

MR JAGGERS, 21, 22

**L**

CLLR LAMMIMAN, 48, 50  
CLLR LONGSTAFF, 15, 16  
LORD HAYWARD, 22,35, 40

**M**

MS MAHTANI, 4  
MR MARSHALL, 58, 60  
MR McNULTY, 36, 39  
CLLR MORRISSEY, 46, 47, 48  
MS MURPHY-STRACHAN, 19

**P**

CLLR PEACOCK, 62, 64  
MR PITT, 39, 40  
MR PORTWOOD, 31, 35, 36  
MS PROCTOR, 56

**R**

CLLR ROBSON, 41  
MS RODGERS, 54, 56

**S**

MS STUART, 25, 26  
MR SWAINE-GRAY, 60, 62

**T**

MR TAHERI, 52, 54  
MR TESSIER, 2  
THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 40,  
42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64

**U**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER, 60, 61, 62

**V**

RT HON THERESA VILLIERS MP, 17

**W**

MR WOOKEY, 30, 31