

BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

PROCEEDINGS

AT THE

2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND

HELD AT

KENTON HALL, WOODCOCK HILL, HARROW HA3 0PQ

ON

TUESDAY 25 OCTOBER 2016
DAY TWO

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: 9.10 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the second day of the public hearing here in Harrow. My name is Howard Simmons, Assistant Commissioner leading the work on London, and we are going to have a number of speakers today. I think we have some 33 logged in, but I will just ask my colleague, Gerald, who is from the Boundary Commission, to say a few key points.

MR TESSIER: Good morning, everyone. My name is Gerald Tessier. I am leading the secretariat team here today. If you have any queries that you need to ask, ask myself or my colleagues, who are probably in the reception area. A couple of bits of information. We are video recording all the proceedings today, and I would advise everyone to read our data protection policy, which can be found on the board at the bottom of the room, or the other end of the room, shall we say, and there are a couple of bits of housekeeping. Toilets can be found from the reception, and if there is a fire alarm, it is real and we need to get out as fast as possible. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, and I believe our first speaker is Ms Lyn Tattum, is that right? Lovely. Thank you. Come to the podium, and if you would like to introduce yourself by way of name and address, please? Thank you.

CLLR TATTUM: Lyn Tattum, 18 Dundonald Road, Queen's Park, NW10 3HR. I have been living in the region, in that neighbourhood, for 30 years. I am a parent of three children who attended schools in the area. It is a very tight-knitted community, I would say, across the Queen's Park and Kilburn/Kensal Rise boundaries. My partner works in the area. We are very closely connected with a lot of local activities.

I am very disappointed that the current proposals are aiming to cut up this local area and create a division around what has become a tight-knit community in Queen's Park, Kilburn, Kensal Rise, and Mapesbury. One of the reasons that the area works so well is that there has been this legacy, I would say, of working, particularly across both sides of the Kilburn High Road. This has become a more recent event in the past five to ten years or so, either side of the High Road, because of the last boundary changes that split the wards --- supposedly united the wards but in fact split the previous community of Brent East and so the Brent East community regrouped, worked very hard to create a new community, which spanned Kilburn High Road, and now what we have got is a proposal that appears to be focused more around non-natural borders and dispersing people rather than bringing people together. We have these community groups in the region now that are set up, for example the Kilburn --- Kensal Rise Triangle and the Kensal to Kilburn working groups, and so this is an area that is more in what you would call the southern half of the community, the southern part of the community, that borders on to Westminster, working with a community on the other side of Kilburn High Road.

I think it is important to understand that Kilburn High Road is not a boundary. It is a focal point for a bringing together, in an effort to improve something that has been quite neglected, I would say, in many years, recently, and we are starting to see signs of improvement around Kilburn High Road and the communities around the High Road, and I think we have to really focus on that when we think about where those natural boundaries are and not create unnatural boundaries.

I would say that, you know, we have got different areas of affluence and that is quite important to think about, in northern and southern parts of regions, and close knit communities, again, for example, Queen's Park and Kilburn, are quite diverse in affluence, but quite positive impact on each other, through community groups and through school activities and so on, so we do not want to be disrupting that again after several years of making a big effort to work together. I would say that Mapesbury, the Mapesbury estate and so on, is also a very positive influence on areas that are more focused around housing estates, and so have had these communities that are really making a positive effort to help each other.

So, that would be my submission.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very clear and very helpful. Can I just check, are there any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you ever so much. Thank you.

Next speaker is Gareth Thomas. Thank you. Again, if you can introduce yourself by way of name and address? Thank you.

MR GARETH THOMAS MP: (Harrow West) My name is Gareth Thomas. I am the Member of Parliament for Harrow West; have been since 1997. I have always lived in the London Borough of Harrow, I am proud to say, and I wanted to focus my remarks specifically on how the various proposals will affect the London Borough of Harrow, but if I may, Mr Simmons, I wanted to take you to the end, to fast forward you to the end of your sojourn in Harrow today. You will have heard 33 proposals today. Goodness knows how many yesterday, and you might think by 5.00 today that you deserve a drink. Very close to here is the Castle pub, in Harrow, and the Castle pub are celebrating, this week, 300 years since there was first a pub on the site. The Castle pub is in what is the historic heart of Harrow, in Harrow-on-the-Hill, and I wanted to suggest to you that if the Boundary Commission are going to do justice to the people of Harrow, then they need to focus their attention on what happens to the ward of Harrow-on-the-Hill in the first instance.

Why does Harrow-on-the-Hill matter so much? Well, it is, as I indicated, the historic heart of Harrow. It has the famous Harrow School within its borders. It has the iconic church and spire of St Mary's Church of Harrow-on-the-Hill, which dominates the Harrow skyline. It used to have its own hospital on Roxeth Hill, and it once formed the

commercial --- exclusively the commercial heart of the Borough. More importantly, or as importantly, it forms one of six very distinct recognisable communities of Harrow, but arguably, it sits *primus inter pares* amongst those six communities. It has never before, certainly not in the last 100 years, been part of a constituency that has not overwhelmingly been in the District or Borough of Harrow, and therefore, as I say, where you put Harrow-on-the-Hill ward is, in my view, central to whether or not Harrow can feel that it is being properly represented going forward.

So, I suggested firstly that there are six distinct, recognisable communities in Harrow. There are some, sure, that have extending links into other areas. There are some with smaller recognisable centres within those communities, and there are some, certainly that cross borough borders, but there are six distinct communities, I would suggest, all that can date back down through the years, but all that are still recognisable as communities in their own right in the borough, and they are: Kenton, Edgware, Stanmore, South Harrow, the community of Pinner and Hatch End, and lastly, as I indicated, Harrow-on-the-Hill. Let me deal with the other five first.

So, Kenton is first recorded as “Keninton” in 1232. It currently largely straddles the Kenton Road, stretching from Kenton Recreation Ground to Kingsbury Circle and southwards to almost where we are here in Woodcock Hill. Claremont School is perhaps the classic public service that serves the community both sides of Kenton Road, and the community of Kenton is recognisably part of --- defined by Kenton East and West, or captured by the wards of Kenton East and Kenton West in Harrow, and by the ward of Kenton in Brent.

Edgware was an ancient parish in Middlesex and dates back to at least 1277, according to records. It straddles the Edgware Road. It includes the bulk of the council wards in Harrow, of Canons Park and Edgware. Arguably Edgware ward in Barnet, and similarly, parts of Colindale too. It had its own hospital and it still exists as a community hospital to this day.

Stanmore, recorded in the Domesday Book: it has had a station there since 1890. It was home to RAF Bentley Priory, from where the Battle of Britain was conducted. The first recorded parish church in Stanmore, built in the 14th Century. Today, a very strong residents’ association, a mosque, a temple; still its own hospital, although that is a specialist NHS facility. It is made up of the Harrow wards of Stanmore Park, parts of the ward of Harrow Weald, parts of the ward of Canons, and parts of the ward of Belmont arguably make up the community of Stanmore today.

South Harrow, where I lived until relatively recently also dates back over 900 years. Then, it was the village of Roxeth, or the hamlet of Roxeth, part of the parish of Harrow-on-the-Hill. Nowadays it is known as South Harrow and incorporates the council wards of Roxeth and South Harrow, and a large part of the ward of Rayners Lane. It sits adjacent to Harrow-on-the-Hill, along the main road to the south, hence it

has become known as South Harrow, and that is now the A312, and is a major artery, transport artery, from the A40 along through South Harrow into Greenhill and the town centre, and up to Harrow-on-the-Hill. Its public services include Rooks Heath College, formerly Rooks Heath High School, which serves the wards of Rayners Lane, the community of South Harrow in total, and parts of Harrow-on-the-Hill, and a little of West Harrow.

Pinner and Hatch End: the community of Pinner and Hatch End was first recorded as the hamlet of Pinner in 1231. Its modern character dates from the inter-war years, when a series of garden estates grew up around the historic core of Pinner, including the Pinner Wood estate, which straddles both the council wards of Pinner and Hatch End. Pinner and Hatch End are marked, too, by the annual Pinner Fair, which has been in existence since the Royal Charter of 1336. It has a --- its modern character today, a very big, thriving arts scene, Pinner Jazz Festival, the Harrow Arts Centre, it has got a very strong residents' association and community, and the community is now covered by the Harrow Council wards of Pinner, Pinner South, Hatch End, a little of Headstone North, and arguably too, the Hillingdon wards of Northwood Hills to a large extent and a little of Eastcote. It was historically served by the Mount Vernon hospital until its Accident and Emergency department was abolished in the late 1990s, and it has sat since 2010 pretty much exclusively within the Ruislip, Pinner and Northwood constituency, and again, it is linked today in effect by the Uxbridge Road, which is the major transport artery.

Lastly, I come back to my opening comments about Harrow-on-the-Hill. Harrow-on-the-Hill is arguably the most significant down the years of the communities in Harrow. It has been the, sort of, centrepiece in the community and now incorporates the commercial heart of Harrow-on-the-Hill, if you like, has now extended into Harrow town centre. Its earliest recorded name of Harrow-on-the-Hill was in 1398, but it can trace its history back to AD 900. It formed an ancient parish in the ancient county of Middlesex, and the bulk of the parish formed the Harrow-on-the-Hill urban district of Middlesex from 1894, and that in turn was replaced 60 years later, when Harrow became a London Borough. Uniquely, the Borough of Harrow was the only borough to be based exclusively on the boundaries of an urban district, and therefore you can point directly to Harrow-on-the-Hill having formed what is now the London Borough of Harrow, that parish. It has the parish church of St Mary's. It has a vibrant Catholic church. It has a famous public school, first established in 1243. It has educated eight former British and Indian prime ministers, including Peel, Palmerston, Churchill and Nehru, various royals and over 20 Victoria Cross holders and one George Cross holder. It has very strong links into what is now the commercial heart of Harrow, in the wards of Greenhill and Marlborough; the residential community of Harrow-on-the-Hill itself now incorporates parts of Greenhill, where I live now, West Harrow, off the A312, a little of Sudbury, and a little of the area around Northwick Park Hospital, so the business area in Harrow stretches along a corridor from Harrow-on-the-Hill, through Greenhill, to Marlborough and Wealdstone, and it is this area that Boris Johnson, when he was

Mayor of London, designated as an intensification zone, later a housing zone, for substantial new housing to be built to serve the Borough of Harrow, and there are plans to redevelop the current Harrow Council site in the Marlborough ward as part of this business and housing corridor, with a mix of residential housing and business, and to regenerate, crucially, Wealdstone, by relocating the council premises there, so you can see a spine through Harrow, if you like, stretching from Harrow-on-the-Hill ward, down through Greenhill, down through Marlborough, and into Wealdstone.

If those are the six key communities, I wanted to gently chide, if I may, Mr Simmons, the Boundary Commission for axing the Harrow West seat in half, effectively, which is what the current proposal seeks to do. The Harrow West seat has now --- is recognisable from when it was first established in 1945, so for over 70 years, there has been a recognisable Harrow West seat, which has had the historic heart of the borough, Harrow-on-the-Hill, as part of that seat, and indeed, the wards of Roxeth, and now, if you like, the community of South Harrow in general, for over 70 years. It has never, Harrow-on-the-Hill, been in a constituency which has been dominated by another borough, and if you will forgive me for saying so, the seat that Harrow-on-the-Hill you are placing --- in Wembley and Harrow-on-the-Hill, would be dominated by the Borough of Brent, with the many wards there.

The other problem with the current Boundary Commission proposals is that it splits Harrow-on-the-Hill from the town centre wards, which have always had very strong links. The town centre is very well used by Harrow-on-the-Hill and South Harrow residents, and there are very strong bus links up Peterborough Road on to the hill from the town centre itself, and for South Harrow residents, too. There are very few direct links to Wembley, which is very much a separate and competing business and commercial district. Services such as Whitmore High School, which is situated in the northernmost part of the Harrow-on-the-Hill ward, on Porlock Avenue, serve, yes, Harrow-on-the-Hill, but also, crucially, they serve parts of West Harrow, Rayners Lane ward, and Roxeth and Roxbourne, that make up with Rayners Lane the community of South Harrow. Newton Farm first and middle school are one of the top, if not the top, primary school in the country, according to recent records; it is just in the ward of Roxbourne, but serves South Harrow and Rayners Lane, so as a community around that particular --- a small community generated by that school, it is split in half by the current Boundary Commission proposals for a Wembley and a Harrow-on-the-Hill seat.

The links between Roxbourne in South Harrow and Wembley are convoluted, I would argue, to put it mildly. One either travels out of Harrow, down through Ealing, on to the A40 and then along the North Circular to get to Wembley, or during rush hour, the equally slow route of driving along through South Harrow to Greenhill, which is not currently in the Wembley and Harrow-on-the-Hill proposal, and then down past Northwick Park Hospital or over Harrow-on-the-Hill in order to get to Wembley. So, if you want to go from South Harrow to Wembley, you have to go through Greenhill, which is excluded from the current Harrow-on-the-Hill and Wembley proposal.

Let me, if I may, come to the Conservative Party proposals. Firstly, the proposal for a Northwood and West Harrow seat. That does have the virtue of bringing the ward of Rayners Lane back into the community of South Harrow, but there is little in common between South Harrow and Harefield. Arguably, the public transport links are non-existent, and travel by road from South Harrow to Harefield is for the very knowledgeable or for the satnav user. Moreover, it splits the community of Pinner and Hatch End in half, and splits the parts of the West Harrow ward that are more obviously in the communities of Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill from the rest of those communities. Now, we come to the proposal for Kenton. Sorry, let me just --- the last thing I would say about the Conservative Party proposal for Northwood and West Harrow is that there is a logic for linking Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill with Northwick Park, but it is difficult to see why you would not also take in Sudbury, which has always had strong links with Harrow-on-the-Hill.

The problem, I think, with the Conservative Party proposal for Kenton, is that it splits the community of Harrow-on-the-Hill from South Harrow, which have been in the same constituency for over 70 years without change. There are very strong transport and community links with the shopping facilities of the town centre and local schools between South Harrow, the Roxeth and Roxbourne wards, and Greenhill Harrow-on-the-Hill wards, for example, the Whitmore High School area ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Absolutely fascinating, but the time limit is meant to be around ten minutes, so are you ---

MR GARETH THOMAS MP: I am drawing to a peroration. A very short peroration.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right.

MR GARETH THOMAS MP: Just lastly on, then, the Labour Party proposals. The beauty, I think, of the Sudbury and Harrow South proposal is that it retains the bulk of Harrow West constituency. It keeps the town centre together, crucially. In 2010, the Boundary Commission recognised that the town centre should be linked with Harrow-on-the-Hill, given the developments that were going to happen. It brings the Rayners Lane ward back in with the other South Harrow wards of Roxeth and Roxbourne. The transport links, which are centred on the A312 into the town centre, all along the Watford Road and Harrow Road: there are very clear transport links that link the Sudbury and Harrow South seat together. They do bring in the wards of Northwick Park and Sudbury from Brent, but there are strong historical links to Harrow. We like to think that Northwick Park Hospital is actually the Harrow hospital rather than the Brent hospital. Indeed, Sudbury was a hamlet in the ancient parish of Harrow-on-the-Hill, and there is a geographical simplicity about the Sudbury and Harrow South seat, in that the Piccadilly and Chiltern Lines effectively form the boundaries of the triangle, which is the seat.

The other proposal, I just lastly wanted to flag in terms of the Labour Party that might be worth just leaving you with an impression of is the Harrow West and Northwood seat. Now, that brings together the urban villages of Stanmore, the communities of Pinner and Hatch End, the communities of Northwood, with smaller urban villages in North Harrow and Harefield. There are very good transport links along the Uxbridge Road, which then goes into the A404 at Pinner Green, and George V links North Harrow to those communities, so in general, Sir, I think those proposals make more sense and crucially, they retain the bulk of the current Pinner, Ruislip and Northwood seat, which residents are slowly getting used to, a seat having been created in 2010. So, I take you back to that drink that you will deserve, at the Castle Pub. Harrow-on-the-Hill is the historic heart of Harrow, and therefore I think if we are going to do justice in terms of the boundaries of the Parliamentary constituencies, you need to start, if I may say so, from Harrow-on-the-Hill and build out northwards.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. There are some very interesting information there. Can I just check, are there any matters arising or points for clarification? Please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Thanks, Gareth. Just a really quick point. In terms of Harrow-on-the-Hill, until 1983, it was actually added in Harrow Central. Harrow West was made up of Roxbourne, Roxeth, Pinner and Headstone, so Harrow-on-the-Hill until 1983 was not in Harrow West.

MR GARETH THOMAS MP: Well, as I say, Harrow-on-the-Hill has had a very extensive links with the, sort of, Harrow West seats, particularly the, sort of, bit of Roxeth, so forgive me, ma'am. I am not old enough in a political sense to remember 1983, although looking at the history, it was a pretty traumatic year for my Party, but the beauty, I think, of both recent changes to boundaries is it has brought back the ancient parish of Harrow-on-the-Hill more closely together with Roxeth, which was a hamlet in it. Sudbury was a hamlet in that ancient parish. Greenhill was part of that ancient parish, and I am sad to say I think your proposals do not recognise that, but the Sudbury and Harrow South does capture that.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thanks, both of you. Thanks very much indeed. Is it possible to get a copy of your submission or are you going to send us a written copy?

MR GARETH THOMAS MP: If you do not mind, I will send it to you, Sir.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If you would, that would be most helpful. Thank you very much indeed, and can I just remind colleagues, when questions are asked, if you could just indicate your name when you ask the question? Thank you.

Tom Miller next. Yes? Thank you very much indeed. Okay, and if you would just introduce yourself by name and address to begin, please?

CLLR MILLER: Hello there. My name is Tom Miller. I am a councillor in Brent for the Borough of Willesden Green, and have been since 2014. My address is 64 Lancaster Road, which is just in the Dudden Hill ward, which is very close. You will be pleased to know today that I am going to make a submission which is very brief.

So, the London Borough of Willesden and the London Borough of Wembley were the two constituent parts that went into Brent, when Brent was formed in 1965. The Borough of Willesden had been extant since 1874, but since then, since 1965, we have seen a very, sort of, clear growing together of those boroughs and their uniting as a natural community, so it makes sense to me, and I suppose to most colleagues in local government, to build boundary proposals around local government boundaries and ensure as high a level of continuity as possible. The Willesden area, the map is a little small, I am afraid, but the Willesden area, you will see, there is a clear link between my ward there and Willesden Green, going down towards Kensal Green and Harlesden via Harlesden Road, and Roundwood Park, which sits at the bottom of my ward, is a facility shared by all of those three wards, which, kind of, have a cluster therefore within the seat and, kind of, give Willesden its central identity. Willesden also merges in the northern and eastern sides into Brondesbury Park and into Dudden Hill, where there is a strong, kind of, residential feeling to the area. It is easy to walk between the three of them on foot because of the nature of Willesden High Road, which provides the easy transport link there, and also because of the progress of the Jubilee Line along the top of my ward, so it makes a lot of sense, I think, that these wards sit together at the locus of this seat, which is now in Brent Central but would not necessarily change too much into the proposed Willesden, but what struck me about the proposals that have been put forward is what I, kind of, regard as a clear absurdity, which is the addition of a Hammersmith and Fulham borough to the south, which I thought was very, very interesting and I imagined myself walking from Willesden Green from the locus of this seat, down through into Kensal Green or into Harlesden, and trying to directly access that ward. To do so, I would have to walk over two or three train lines and through Wormwood Scrubs Prison to reach the residential area, and so it does not take many rocket science qualifications to work out how separated that community is from the rest of that Willesden cluster and from the Brent identity more generally. A very difficult place to get to, unless you want to come out and go all the way around, unless you like passing over or through railway lines, so I think that is a real challenge.

The second thing I wanted to say about this element of the proposal, though, is that there is currently a rather huge development corporation taking place in this area around the Park Royal development, which is going to be one of the largest business and residential focused developments in London, certainly after Canary Wharf, and this whole area, I think, does not really have its identity shaped as yet, but that is still on the other side of the train tracks from us, so it will fit together --- I believe this development

is going to span the two wards, one of which will then be in Willesden, and one of which will not be, and that will be a clear, planned community, which will then be divided by this line. So, as well as it being separated by these natural boundaries – I believe there is a canal as well, actually, which I probably should have added in – it will also be carved up, the area which will sit within this ward will then be carved up into two as well, so I think there are three key reasons why I think this is problematic. The first is that it does not fit within Brent or the Brent area, or our, kind of, efforts to unite Willesden and Wembley, which have largely been successful. Secondly, there are so many clear natural boundaries between that ward and the rest of the proposed Willesden seat, and thirdly, the risk of carving up that new development seems to me to be a massive problem for representation, whether it is from the point of view of business or actual voters, so for those three reasons, I think that that really is the biggest problem with that proposal, and that is my submission concluded.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can I just ask, are there any matters for clarification? No? Could I just --- in terms of the development, you are talking about, what is the time frame on that?

CLLR MILLER: I can write back to you with more information on that. I know that it is currently in planning. There are proposals for the development, which are accessible from the development corporation website. I would certainly be happy to assist in providing some more detail following the hearing.

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

CLLR MACLEOD-CULLINANE: Thank you very much. Cllr Barry Macleod-Cullinane. I am Deputy Group Leader in Harrow Council. I am a resident in Harrow-on-the-Hill ward and have lived there most of my life, and have schooled there, and so on.

This morning, I left home, I got out of my house, in Harrow-on-the-Hill ward, got in the car, drove down the hill to the boundary where Greenhill and Harrow-on-the-Hill join, and turned right on to the Kenton Road, and I drove along Kenton Road past, sort of, the boundaries where, sort of, we now see the Brent and Harrow start to join at Northwick Park, carried across that over the bridge, past Kenton West on my left, and then turned down into Kenton ward on my right, and drove down Woodcock Hill to where we are today. In other words, I have driven the whole way through what is the Conservative proposal for the reconfiguration of, sort of, this part of London.

Furthermore, as a long-time resident of this part of London, I was born in the old Harrow-on-the-Hill --- the old Queensbury Hospital, which is on Honeypot Lane, which is in Queensbury ward, which is in the Harrow side of the Queensbury ward, as opposed to the Brent side, and that is actually, sort of --- sorry, it is not. It is right on the boundary with Queensbury and Kenton West, and in Queensbury in Brent, sorry, and that is very much an old hospital that used to serve as the maternity hospital for this part

of London until Northwick Park came and supplanted it, so essentially, this area that the Conservatives are proposing here is very much a reconfiguration that brings together old communities around those two hospital points that serve that wide community stretch.

Furthermore, they also seem to bring back the old, sort of, Harrow Central in many ways, that --- up until 1983, a lot of these wards were all part of the, sort of, Harrow Central ward that ran down through, along that boundary zone, and furthermore, Harrow-on-the-Hill ward used to be part of a larger ward with Greenhill ward, which took in the town centre, so you have got --- Harrow-on-the-Hill station used to be actually within the ward boundary taking the name Harrow-on-the-Hill.

Why I am saying this is very much that I can agree with Mr Thomas's submission, in that Harrow-on-the-Hill ward looks very much towards Harrow, and towards the, sort of, the east along that, sort of, Kenton Road stretch. It has never really looked down towards Wembley and Brent. It has been very much orientated towards, sort of, the north and east as opposed to the south aspect. It is very much part of that, sort of, development that pre-existed before Metro-land, but then Metro-land really built up that part of London and is in fact where we are standing at the moment, and in fact, you could actually look at the proposed reconfigured Kenton ward --- Kenton constituency including Harrow-on-the-Hill as very much a, sort of, Metro-land constituency along with the Northwood and West Harrow constituency that has been proposed. That could also be renamed "Metro-land Two" or something. It could actually be very much that distinct drive out along the Metropolitan Line out towards, sort of, Amersham and Watford. It actually picks out a large chunk of those wards, and actually Harefield and so on are included within that thrust of Metro-land, so it is not a strange, sort of, device. It is very much in keeping with that, sort of, development.

So, thinking through the actual dynamics of it, the idea that we would want to make sure that we try to keep communities together within constituencies, at the moment, we have got one constituency in Harrow that spans a borough border. That is the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency, with three Harrow wards going into that. The other two constituencies are both within Harrow boundaries. The proposals from the Boundary Commission would actually increase that number quite significantly from not one to two, but two to three, so you would actually see three constituencies that span Harrow borders into other neighbouring councils. There may well be some links that you could, sort of, justify that, but it does seem to be, sort of, trying to divide up a place where you have already got two existing whole constituencies into other areas. By adopting the proposals on the table from the Conservatives, we would actually be reducing that number from three to two that would be spanning the boundaries, and it would be a more natural boundary spanning, particularly when you look at the, sort of, Harrow-on-the-Hill spanning through, along the Kenton Road to Queensbury in the easternmost edge of that. It actually has a community of interest that is clearly there, and the, sort of, Northwood Hill and West Harrow Metro-land again spreads in what

seems much more cohesive way, through up into the western part of Harrow into, sort of, Hillingdon constituency.

The other sense --- I really want to put on record that the communities where they are looking within Harrow are not looking down to the south. They are not looking --- that my constituency, which has boundaries with Ealing as well as Brent and there is a sense in which most of the constituents who are down on the Sudbury Hill side of it would be looking more towards Ealing if there was a look at another borough. There is a proposal on Sudbury Hill Station area with Transport for London that is looking at the Greenford Road, and this was the three councillors coming together on that. It is very much Ealing and Harrow that are making the running, so Brent is not really a, sort of, factor in that locality so there is a sense in which merging it together on the Wembley and Harrow-on-the-Hill axis would actually miss out an interest group who are perhaps slightly differently aligned, but the links back into the rest of the Hill are very much there, that people commute down to those stations, they walk down from the, sort of, top of the Hill into that. There is a sense in which it used to be brought back, a little bit back into the fold, but it is still very much part of Harrow as a ward and as a larger constituency. The orientation is more towards Harrow than it is towards any other part of London.

It seems strange, also, that we should have two of the most iconic images, in fact, they were chosen by the boroughs themselves, for the Olympic Games as the borough emblems, the spire on the Hill and the Wembley Arch, to be imposed into one single constituency. That seems to be having two very iconic images that are images of two separate places, one of Harrow and one of Brent, and merging the two, kind of, misses, I think, a trick that it actually creates a community that really does not exist except on a map, and I think that the, sort of, development of where Harrow is now going, bringing Greenhill back into it, which formerly was part of that older constituency, seems to be a much better place, the northern edge of that constituency in Harrow town centre would be a road called Hindes Road, which cuts east to west across Station Road, and that, kind of, defines almost the northern edge of the real central hub of commerce within Harrow town centre. There is going to be a lot of housing, that was mentioned earlier, that spreads up through, sort of, the Station Road spine, where the Civic Centre currently resides, and further north, but most of that development, firstly it has got to get through Planning and there is no, sort of, timetable for that. Most of that is a residential development as opposed to a commercial development, the commercial development being very much in the heart of Greenhill and the lower steps of Harrow-on-the-Hill, and then along Kenton Road, so the commercial heart of Harrow would be split apart if you took those wards into different places. By bringing it together within a revised Kenton Road access that the Conservatives are proposing, you capture very much the heart of the economic vibrancy of most of the borough and, it would give far more sense to it. It becomes a very much more urban environment with, sort of, the important, immediate suburban housing around it, but it is very much an urban focus and having a, sort of, commuting focus into central London, so there is a sense in which there is a harmony of interests there, where there is not any link down that naturally defines down into

Wembley. If anything, the Metro-land development is more centred towards commuting into the city of London every day. That is how it emerged and how it continues, and reflecting that, I think, we should make sure that we understand people's interests and where they are going from.

I could go on about the various religious communities that we see along the, sort of Kenton Road, the Kenton Shul for the Jewish community, there is a big Hindu community centred along the Swaminarayan Temple along Kenton Road on the, sort of, the other side of the road, near the Grange Hospice. There is very much a centre of interest all along that, and at the footsteps of Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill ward, there is another Jewish community synagogue that again picks up that community area and focus there, and further along Kenton Road, there is a big community that serve --- big church that serves the Greek and Romanian Orthodox communities, so there is a very much a real interest of different groups all dotted along that geographical line, and I think that would give you a far greater access, those overlapping communities that serve their places of worship all along the, sort of, Kenton Road, really binding that constituency together as opposed to this, sort of, very much artificial creation down along the Piccadilly Line, if that, and a couple of bus lines. That really does not bring the community places of worship, places of business, places of commute to your places of work and leisure. That is what really binds, and it also reflects the historic development of Harrow over time, over that, sort of, not just a few years but for decades, and as Gareth Thomas pointed out, even centuries. It has much more focus, Harrow-on-the-Hill being part of that Harrow community that looks along, sort of, eastwards, along the, sort of Kenton Road and develop there.

So, that is where I would like to end my submission, and ask you to endorse the Conservatives' proposal.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is helpful, and is a, sort of, counter to the earlier submission we heard, but both enrich our understanding of the Harrow situation. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes? Would you like to please state your name?

CLLR MILLER: My name is Tom Miller and I spoke shortly before. I just wanted to --- so, there are two competing arguments here between the Labour and Conservative proposals about joining commercial centres. One between Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill, and the other between the South Harrow community, but how long is it? Because presently, Harrow-on-the-Hill is joined to the South Harrow, kind of, commercial area in terms of its representation. How long has that been the case?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry. There is an echo. I cannot quite hear what you are saying.

CLLR MILLER: Sorry. Am I not coming across clearly?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

CLLR MILLER: So, there is a competing argument between the two Party proposals on which commercial centre, effectively, Harrow-on-the-Hill, is joined to, between South Harrow on one side and the Kenton corridor on the other side, but is it not the case that in South Harrow and Harrow-on-the-Hill communities are currently joined? I mean, it is over 25 years that those two have been joined together, is it not?

CLLR MACLEOD-CULLINANE: I am looking at more how people orientate themselves towards activities, that the --- if you look at where South Harrow is, it is actually the, sort of, dividing line is the Piccadilly Line running through South Harrow station. There is a sense in which some people do move towards that along, sort of, the Northolt Road, but actually, the vast majority of activity takes place much more in towards Harrow town centre. That is where people tend to gravitate to the larger shopping areas. It has got all the, sort of, larger supermarkets and department stores, and so on. That is where the people go. There is bigger car parking. It has got a cinema multiplex and so on. It has got more eateries that serve, sort of, a wider range of tastes and so on. It is easier to park and get involved in activities there, so the orientation is typically towards Harrow, except for those smaller needs, which you run down to South Harrow for, but if you are on the top of the Hill, you are more likely to walk down into central Harrow. You are more likely to, sort of, go elsewhere than you are necessarily into, sort of, South Harrow, except for those small errands.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Questions to the Chair, please, not to the individual, and it is for clarification, not to examine the evidence. Thank you. Sir?

MR GARELICK: Stephen Garelick, resident. I would like to just ask a question. The comments made about Harefield being within Metro-land seem a little bit confusing. From my perspective, it is not exactly linked in easily within the ward structure. There is no immediate access, unless you go up towards Batchworth. There is no immediate facility to not have to cross other boundaries and other wards to actually get to it, so where is the thinking, in inclusiveness of Harefield?

CLLR MACLEOD-CULLINANE: I am positive it is basically this broad thrust from the central London outwards towards Amersham and so on, that this is very much, sort of, the direction of development and so on. The very mechanics of where, say, stations are, are immaterial but it is very much the direction of ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. I think you have contextualised it helpfully. I believe, Sir, you are the next speaker in any case, so you have the opportunity to enlarge on these points.

CLLR MACLEOD-CULLINANE: Thank you very much for your time.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Introduce yourself by name and address. Thank you.

MR GARELICK: Good morning. My name is Steve Garelick. 23 Stowe Crescent, HA4 7SR. I will be brief in my comments. I want to initially talk about demographics, and the actual overall remit of the Boundary Commission and how I see it.

My ultimate concern is, whilst there is a plan towards shrinkage of seats within the London area and potentially trying to create equilibrium over size of seat, my belief is that London is still, and the constituencies concerned, are still growing entities, and that in effect, we may not necessarily have the most robust set of proposals in place for the future and I think, frankly, some of the wards have been in place, as we know, and some of the seats have been in place, for quite a prolonged period, with minimal change, and with that in mind, my viewpoint is simply to say that these are only going to go one way, and they are going to grow more over the next few years, and whatever proposals are settled on, we need to give good consideration to the fact that there will be growth, and therefore, potentially shrinking down what we have may actually be an own goal, because what work we then ask MPs to do on our behalf, the MPs need to be able to take into account the size of the constituency.

Now, I understand there are some iniquities in what stands at the moment but what I am saying is, if we are not going to plan for something for a good few more years, we are going to continue to see that growth. My other concern is over demographic, and also how seats are fought and won, basically, throughout the country. I personally am of the opinion that there should not be such a thing as a "safe" seat. I would prefer to see a cross-demographic within all constituencies, so you can be sure that the MPs are working for all parties and there is not necessarily, if you like, a political will in one particular direction that then obfuscates those others' needs within the constituency, be they Liberal, Conservative, UKIP or Labour, for that matter. My ultimate concern is making sure that we as a nation cater for everyone, and there is inclusiveness, and I think that is an important aspect.

I will touch on the Harefield front, because I think it is quite important. Harefield is very disjointed as a community. There is little easy access to it. You can go out through Ducks Hill and up towards Batchworth and across to get into it, just near where the hospital is, or you can basically go out down Breakspear Road from the A40 to get out to it, but beyond that --- or you can come in from the other side of the A40, but beyond that, there is very little access --- or from the M25 from Maple Cross, there is very little access, and whilst I understand there is an argument for a broad thrust out, you know, akin to HS2's plans, the reality of the matter is, that is a community that is quite insular as it stands now, and it stands to potentially still be quite an insular community if it is that disjointed. My belief is that the moment you have --- I mean, it is not an easy

accessible, bearing in mind it was a village for all intents and purposes anyway, and is still a village, for all intents and purposes. Access, really, means that a lot of individuals do not really even know of its existence unless they have got to go to Harefield Hospital itself. The reality of the matter is that to try and lump it in with quite an urbanised district may potentially be an error in consideration, and it may be more pragmatic to include it within the existing area that it is in now, the existing CLP, Ruislip, Pinner and Northwood, for the sake of the residents more than anything, and for the sake of accessibility. I understand that you want a mix within a constituency. I get that, but I think it would be wholly inappropriate for the residents and potentially unfair on the residents of Harefield when giving that consideration.

I am struck by the proposals from both groups that again, there seems to be a move towards trying to set a role where there is almost a solid majority in each case and no thinking towards residents, and I come back to this demographic point. I have looked at some of it, and to be honest with you, I am more akin to the Labour proposals just because I think they offer a broader demographic into the package. Obviously you have got, you know, this plan for South Harrow and Sudbury, which in my view, makes a lot of sense and, you know, we have still obviously got this situation over Harrow West, but, you know, going further towards Hendon and Edgware, which is having a particular demographic again; I know the gentleman from the Conservatives mentioned the Jewish community. There is a large community, again, out in those particular districts, who, you know, are obviously wholly engaged in the community and what they do, and certainly they have a strong political bent, and when you look at the fact that we have got that, we have also got a situation where we are seeing a move of other communities into those areas, as London transcends, whether it is Polish, obviously Asian communities, and an African community is coming in, and therefore that, in my view, creates a better demographic again, because you have got people who are voting based on what they need, rather than what potentially the politicians think they need, and I think that is a very, very important point. The point of the Boundary Commission is to give the general public choice, and the reality of the matter is, trying to be partisan over where I think I might be able to get a seat, or where I might get a win, seems a little inequitable, in my view. There has got to be enough democratic mix. I know I keep coming back to it, but I believe there has to be enough democratic mix to make sure that everyone gets a fair bite of the cherry, and therefore, trying to shoehorn, as an example, Hammersmith and Fulham, which has got its own set of problems, unique problems, along with Willesden and that particular area, and I lived a great deal of my time originally in north-west London, in the Golders Green area, so I have a good knowledge of that locality, and I drive for a living, I should tell you, so I know my way around London quite well, and some of these are just not a good fit. They really are not. I mean, certainly, the Hammersmith one almost beggars belief, because it is a totally different kind of constituency. You have got a totally different kind of make up on the problems, some of the urban problems, and also, some of the problems that befit that constituency, be --- as a --- you know, in Hammersmith and Fulham, from Heathrow Airport and flight path, down to schooling and accessibility to central London, and either

those do not --- they are not a good fit and I was concerned that any MP who then takes on the mantle of such a constituency will find themselves spinning a lot of plates and then falling down.

So, I will just move on, just briefly to my conclusion, and just say that I am concerned that if you look at how constituencies work, North Harrow, Northwood and my CLP basically comes into that area, my local Party comes into that area, basically there is a boundary where you are crossing between Harrow and Hillingdon, and that in itself can create issues, of course, but frankly, enlarging that to include some of the areas over towards Uxbridge might be a better fit, overall, and therefore, changing possibly the west side of the A40 to accommodate that might be more pragmatic, and to bear in mind that when you are looking at Ruislip, Pinner and Northwood, Harefield is an integral part of those neighbourhoods that you can reach into.

So, in closing, what I am really asking for is that we keep a sense of propriety over demographic and sharing and also accessibility, and a big thing is whether it is going down the 312 which is fraught with its own problems, or getting further down the A40, that should not be necessarily seen as a boundary or barrier to those who can cross it every day. I can tell you, from the edge of Harefield and North Ruislip, to get into Uxbridge is a matter of less than a ten-minute ride, so frankly, not necessarily considering a pairing there, and from my home, it is a five to six-minute ride up to Harefield, but the point is, those districts make sense together. This is my key. Thank you.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You talked about your CLP. I do not know what that means.

MR GARELICK: Okay. Sorry. I am now a Labour Party member. I have joined.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would mean "Constituency Labour Party"?

MR GARELICK: Yes. Sorry. My apologies.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was not sure of the acronym.

MR GARELICK: That is my fault for abbreviation. Sorry. I have joined recently.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you very much.

MR GARELICK: You are welcome, Sir. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Bambos Charalambous? Introduce yourself, please, by name and address. Thank you.

CLLR CHARALAMBOUS: I am Cllr Bambos Charalambous. I live at 24A Devonshire Road, Palmers Green, London N13 4QX, and I am a councillor in the London Borough of Enfield, and have been councillor for Palmers Green ward for the last 22 years.

I am going to talk about the proposals for putting Palmers Green into the constituency of Edmonton. I am going to begin by first referencing the Boundary Commission report in 2007. This is the fifth periodic report, and at page 65 of the report is a reference to the new constituencies in the London Borough of Enfield, where the issue about putting Palmers Green into Edmonton was considered, and I am just going to read a short passage from that:

“The Assistant Commissioner reported that there was widespread support within the Palmers Green ward for its inclusion in Enfield Southgate boundary constituency, as its counter-proposals instead of in Edmonton constituency as in our provisional recommendations. He considered that the arguments for its inclusion in Enfield Southgate were compelling, and referred to the A10 road as a formidable boundary between the ward and the Edmonton constituency. He also reported that some of the area known as Palmers Green extended beyond the ward of the name into wards of Enfield Southgate, and the inclusion of the ward into Edmonton would divide the Palmers Green area between constituencies. He considered that, to include the ward in Edmonton would to some extent isolate part of the Bowes ward from other parts of Enfield Southgate. He accordingly recommended the ward should be located within Enfield Southgate.”

Now, obviously, that was different times, but those arguments have previously been made and accepted by the Boundary Commission, so I want to start off by referencing that, and just expanding on some things that have been said as a consequence of that.

So, the first point is about the major barrier between communities being the A10, the Great Cambridge Road. This is a formidable barrier. It is one of the main trunk roads in and out of London, and it does define and divide communities. It also --- there are no natural routes from Palmers Green into Edmonton, and Palmers Green is a distinct and separate entity from Edmonton. So I think that needs to be taken into account about where natural communities lie. There is a reference in the report, in the current proposals, about Bush Hill Park being in Edmonton, but I am going to go on to my next point, which is about lines of transport. Bush Hill Park station is a few stops after the line from Edmonton Green and other stations in Edmonton. However, Palmers Green Station on the train line is more aligned to Bowes, Winchmore Hill, and other areas, which fall into the constituency of Enfield Southgate at the moment. So, I would suggest there is a more natural affinity with the lines of transport for Palmers Green to

remain in Enfield Southgate or in a constituency that is to the west of the A10 rather than going to the east in Edmonton.

Still on the point of transport routes, a road that runs through the ward of Palmers Green and through other wards of Bowes and Winchmore Hill is Green Lanes, and many buses go along Green Lanes, go northwards, and this is a natural direction of transport for people, so communities are built around the routes and people will tend to gravitate northwards rather than east-west, so I would also wish to make that point.

Also, the shopping area of Palmers Green: people in Bowes will tend to go north to Palmers Green, where there are a number of --- it is a shopping centre, and it is a hub for people to come to, so my point there is the direction of travel is northwards, so the transportation is north-south rather than east-west, is that point. Also, as mentioned in the initial report, that was made in 2007, the Palmers Green area is wider than some of the parts, so even though there is a ward called Palmers Green, people understand Palmers Green as being a wider area than just the ward itself, so Palmers Green is actually the N13 postcode, and that covers a number of different wards, including the ward of Bowes. There are some parts of N13 in Southgate Green ward, and some small parts in Winchmore Hill ward, but predominantly it is Bowes and Palmers Green that fall into that N13 category. Also, this is a minor point, the actual former town hall of what was then Southgate District Council falls in Palmers Green ward, which again, it gives its definition to the area why it should not go into the Edmonton area.

The bottom line is that the community's transport links, hubs, people's identity, tends to be around N13, tends to be around the Palmers Green area, what is known as Palmers Green, rather than any connection to Edmonton, and for those reasons, I would argue that any final proposal should have Palmers Green, the generic area, together as it has been in the current proposals. So, whatever proposals come to mind, I think that would be a better fit for the area. How it is configured, I could not answer. I have seen proposals from the Labour Party that puts Bowes and Palmers Green into Hornsey and Wood Green. Whilst not ideal, I think that would be a far better fit than the current proposals, and I would support those proposals.

Just from a personal point of view, I am a governor at a school in the Bowes ward, and I know the communities around there share a lot of similarities with the area in Palmers Green, so I think those two wards should be kept together, and I think communities, people that get to know each other --- I am also of Cypriot heritage. There is a strong Cypriot community in the Palmers Green area, which is quite distinct and is separate from other parts of the borough in its concentration, so again, those cultural support networks would also be better represented in one constituency rather than others. Those are my points. I would be happy to take any questions.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. It was very clear and helpful. Are there any matters for clarification?

MR GARELICK: Can I just ask, on the Bowes area and the part leading down to Broomfield Park and the surrounding districts: knowing that Wood Green again has quite a sizeable Greek Cypriot community and that obviously envelops into Hornsey and those districts as well, would it be more pragmatic to look at those areas over and above the existing suggestion of Edmonton, also because the access to Edmonton down the A10 and off the North Circular is not exactly an immediate fit. Or am I missing something?

CLLR CHARALAMBOUS: Well, just to respond to that, there is actually --- the only Cypriot community centre in the area is actually in Wood Green, just before Wood Green station, and so the community naturally gravitates down Green Lanes to that area, which would --- which is actually in the constituency, I think it is, Hornsey and Wood Green at the moment, but there is a natural community connection for the Cypriot community. Also, there are two churches just around the corner from Haringey Civic Centre, where the community also gravitates towards, so again, these are natural community hubs, and again, they are all situated along Green Lanes, and that is a far better fit for any solution, I would suggest.

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

Hello and welcome. Would you like to speak from the podium, and if you can just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please, to begin?

MRS HALAI: Hi. I am Hinna Halai. I live in Hendon and I also have a business in Edgware. I am here today in front of everyone to oppose a potential proposition to the changes in the boundaries and constituencies. More specifically, in the constituencies of Hendon and Edgware. Both Hendon and Edgware are very important in both my personal and family life, and in my business. I myself live with my family in Hendon, and my business is based in Edgware, therefore the impact on the proposed changes will have various potential implications on my life, which I will now further discuss.

Firstly, the current public transport system is an essential link between Edgware and Hendon, and surrounding areas. The current TfL links between these areas are vast, including but not limited to the Northern and Jubilee Underground lines and the bus routes. I myself do drive, but if the situation did arise where I had to use public transport, I could rely on the TfL network in its current form, but it would make my journey a bit more difficult. Proposed changes to the boundaries could lead to changes in the public transport system, which could lead --- and much more complicated time-consuming journey to me, and to my business from home. The proposed boundaries are trying to pair with Edgware areas which are further away in the centre and west of Harrow, areas to which the transport links are fairly non-existent. Secondly,

as stated previously, I am a business owner in Edgware and I do --- it is on Mollison Way, and I have been successfully running for over three years.

This could also impact me, maybe, on my special treatments licence. The process involved in applying for this licence is something I have become very familiar with. The proposed changes to these boundaries could potentially lead to different legal requirements for my business in relation to these licences, which could impact my business financially and affect my services that I can offer. I am able to offer, obviously, the current services from my salon, but it could limit me in future. My business could also --- it could hurt --- by changes in the public transport, as in terms of my business. Many of my clientele could not be able to travel easily and have accessibility to my services.

Thirdly, in the concern of mine is in relation to health and safety, not only for myself but for my staff and my clientele and the general public. A mere five minute journey from my business is Edgware Community Hospital, where in the event of an emergency, I have access to medical aid. Furthermore, the closer geographical connection to other emergency services such as police, ambulance and fire brigade, in such areas as Colindale and Mill Hill, which, if I had to call upon, would be better positioned to deal with an emergency more quickly and efficiently. If the proposed boundary changes are upheld, the closest emergency services would be much further away.

Lastly, by no means, I am a mother of two children. When I consider the implication of these boundary changes on the futures of my children, and how it can affect their lives in a negative way. That is why I am standing in front of you today to oppose this motion. Not only for myself, the constituencies, but the future of my children. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you. That is very clear. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed for your submission. Thank you.

Neil Nerva? Yes. Come forward. Lovely, so, name and address, please.

CLLR NERVA: Hi. Good morning, everybody. My name is Neil Nerva. I am a local councillor for Queen's Park ward in Brent, and I live at 52 Harvest Road, London NW6 6SH.

I have come today to speak in favour of the counter-proposal to create a West Hampstead and Kilburn seat, and I will go through why I think this is a very good idea.

I think the West Hampstead and Kilburn seat builds on the 2007 Hampstead and Kilburn seat, and I am very aware that your task is very specific, in that you have got to deliver seats of a specific size in a jigsaw across London, and one of the key features of the

2007 settlement was that, for the first time, it created some unity along Kilburn High Road. If you look at what the postcode NW6 is, it is Kilburn, and the 2007 Boundary Commission recommended and agreed that Kilburn should be united, whether it be in Brent or in Camden, and that has been very, very important, and I would refer you specifically to read the discussion which took place in that Boundary Commission, because the original Boundary Commission proposals were that actually Queen's Park and Kilburn be linked into the Westminster seat, the Westminster North seat, and the final Boundary Commission rejected that proposal, and I am again coming today to say that proposal should be rejected, and instead, that we should have a West Hampstead and Kilburn seat. Now, there is lots of NW6 in common. If the counter-proposal was agreed, then virtually every road in NW6, bar a very small number of streets in Westminster, would be unified and come under the same MP, whoever that may be.

Secondly, there is a great feeling of community along the Kilburn High Road, and the Kilburn High Road, if you look at the map, goes all the way from Kilburn Park, right along up to Cricklewood Broadway, and in the counter-proposal, it would include Mapesbury, which takes you right up to Kilburn, to the bus garage at Cricklewood, right down to Kilburn High Road, would have a single MP, bar the small bit of Barnet on the top right-hand corner, but secondly, if you look at this proposed seat, Kensal and Mapesbury would be added to it. Now, parts of Brent have got very hard boundaries, like the North Circular Road and railway lines, but in the case of Kensal, it is a soft boundary, going along College Road, and I would argue, as a Queen's Park councillor, working closely with Kensal Green councillors, that the Kensal Green community increasingly looks east, and the Mapesbury community often looks east and south, which is why this actually works as a seat, and secondly, if you look at --- people --- a councillor from Harrow earlier talked about getting out of bed and driving along the road. Well, I get out of bed and go on the London Overground, and I was counting the number of stations which would be in the new constituency, and on the Euston to Watford line, there would be four stations in the new constituency, and five if you include Willesden Junction, which is just on the outside, and on the North London line, there would be five stations in the new constituency, and six if you include Willesden Junction, and I think this shows the closeness of the constituency.

I would also now like to turn to the point about the task that you have got, which is a very difficult task, we know. I like the idea of being represented by an MP, whoever that is, where they are not saying, "Oh, I represent nine wards in one borough and one in another", and the proposal for Hampstead and Kilburn is a very --- for West Hampstead and Kilburn, is a very even model. It is five wards in Brent and five wards in Camden. That is very important, I think, as a councillor, and as a local resident, that I can expect some equal time.

Now, in the --- currently, it is three plus seven, and it does work, but going down to two, I do not think is a very good idea, and in terms of the --- why am I speaking in favour of five and five? Well, in the current proposal, we would have Westminster --- Kilburn and

Queen's Park going into Westminster, and we would be but two wards going in, and in the other direction, there would be two Barnet wards incorporated into what is really a Camden seat, and I do not think that is a very good idea.

What this offers is a concentration of population along Kilburn High Road, and along Finchley Road, which --- as I have illustrated, transport facilities, which bring the constituency together and in terms of what do people do, they gravitate towards Kilburn High Road, they gravitate to Finchley Road, and this would have a single MP working for them, and that is why I have come today to speak in favour of West Hampstead and Kilburn, and would urge you to look at previous Boundary Commission discussions, which came to exactly the same conclusion, that it is far better to link the southern part of Brent NW6 and associated wards with their east neighbour along Kilburn High Road than it is to go south into Westminster. Thank you very much for your time.

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

Right. So, Mr Charles Harvey? Yes. If you would like to come forward, Sir, and if you would introduce yourself by name and address, please?

MR HARVEY: Yes. My name is Charles Harvey and my address is 8A The Drive, Golders Green, London NW11 9SR.

I wish to talk about the southern part of Barnet, the London Borough of Barnet. I am a local resident. I grew up in Hampstead Garden Suburb ward. I lived for three years in what is now Childs Hill ward, and I currently live in Golders Green ward. I am agnostic, perhaps, over the overall boundaries, but the point I want to make is, it is important to keep Hampstead Garden Suburb, Childs Hill and Golders Green together, and there are two main reasons for that. One, if you like, ethnic, and one to do with transport and shopping links.

There is a large Jewish population in all three of those wards, and all the MPs, regardless of party, John Marshall, Rudi Vis, currently Mike Freer, have all recognised this, and it makes sense to me to have all the local Jewish community in one constituency, talking to the one MP.

The other is to do with transport links. Now, this is not quite true from some of the bits on Cricklewood Broadway, but broadly, for most people, the major transport hub is Golders Green. Most people in any of those three wards, if they are going to take a Tube, will go to Golders Green Station. If they are taking a bus, it will be a bus that starts or finishes at Golders Green Bus Yard. If they go shopping, they will tend to go to shop in Golders Green, because that is the obvious transport area. So, my plea is, whatever the final overall constituency boundary is, those three wards should be kept together. They are both a natural community in terms of, sort of, ethnic background and

so on, and in terms of the transport links. Golders Green Station is the obvious hub. It is just in Garden Suburb ward, but it touches on Golders Green ward and Childs Hill ward for that, sort of, ease of transport, it makes sense to keep all three in one constituency. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Again, very clear submission. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

MR HARVEY: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I suggest we now take a morning break. So, at 10.55, we will --- until 10.55. Thank you.

Time Noted: 10.35 am

After a short break

Time Noted: 10.55 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, shall we reconvene, then? Thank you. If I can call Dr Anton Emmanuel, please, to the stand? Thank you very much, Sir. If you can introduce yourself by way of name and address? Thank you.

DR EMMANUEL: Sure. Thank you. My name is Anton Emmanuel. I am a professor of medicine at UCH in London, and live at Kingsgate, Sudbury Hill, Harrow-on-the-Hill, and have been there for the last 15 years.

I would really like to make comment to three particular aspects in support of leaving the boundary of our constituency as it stands currently intact. From the point of view of my -- I am a father of four children aged between 12 and 22, and their community life, their schooling, has been based at Whitmore School, which is currently within our boundary. Their schoolmates all live in that, kind of, corridor, which shoots out from our point of view, west of where we live within our current constituency. They look, sort of --- second part of that point, they look to Harrow town centre as their location for accessing local services.

From a personal point of view, I am ethnically Tamil, and I have great kinship with the Tamil community that is present in South Harrow in terms of services, shops, restaurants, and avail myself of that on a, sort of, weekly basis. I walk my dog in Roxeth Park, the recreation park, with other residents in that area, mostly Tamil, and find the community as it stands now a very homogenous pleasing mix of, sort of, the

leafy, affluent Harrow-on-the-Hill residents and the more normal working people around where I choose to shop, and the like.

Along that line, sort of, a second, I suppose, again, to do with transport, most of my community and friends live along the lower reaches of the Bakerloo Line as it heads north on the Chiltern Overground, and again, that is pleasingly within the boundary as it stands now.

The final thing would be a professional point, I guess, which is, in the years I was working at Northwick Park and still do work at the Clementine Churchill, it is apparent to me that patients look to the services there from our area. I had almost no patients coming up from Wembley and Brent up to us. I cannot think of a single patient in the course of my years, fifteen years at the Clementine Churchill, who came up from Brent to see me from Wembley, and I have been, sort of, in full-time practice since 2001 as a consultant. So, my representation would be for the sake of the integrity of the boundary as it stands now, the fact that it is pleasingly homogenous, the fact that it keeps, in terms of its social mix, that it keeps ethnic communities ensconced within an area but with the other mixed ethnic groups around it.

I would make a recommendation for keeping the boundary as it stands now.

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

So, Mrs Nazma Rahman? Lovely. Would you like to come forward? Hello. Welcome, and if when you introduce yourself, just say your name and address, please, at the beginning. Thank you.

MRS RAHMAN: Hello, my name is Nazma Rahman and I am from Flat C, 15 Sherriff Road, West Hampstead, NW6 2AS.

Today, I want to talk about --- in favour to keep West Hampstead and Kilburn together. Kilburn High Road is the heart of the constituency. West Hampstead and both sides of Kilburn must be kept united. It is a very economically deprived area and the community is resilient because they have always worked together. Breaking up the community in Kilburn and West Hampstead would be devastating, especially for the Muslim community. The Muslim community is in both Kilburn (Brent) and Kilburn (Camden), West Hampstead, and Mapesbury, work together and use the same mosque in the Kilburn High Road. It is called the Qalam Mosque, in Kilburn High Road, opposite the Tricycle Theatre. They all congregate on Eid Day and other occasions and pray in the park, Kilburn Grange Park. It is a united community and we have to keep them together. For the women around West Hampstead Fortune Green, both Kilburn and

Mapesbury, all have a strong network, and all use the West Hampstead Women's Centre.

We do lots of activities together, such as gardening, health and nutrition awareness sessions, and other activities. It would be a big shame to cut this community up, as the women all support each other. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is great. Thank you. Very clear. Any matters for clarification? In which case, thank you very much indeed for your evidence.

Mr Shahin Rahman, are you? To speak as well? Right.

MR SHAHIN RAHMAN: Hello. My name is Shahin Rahman and I live at 1 Chelsea Crescent, NW2 3QP. I am talking today in favour of Hampstead and Kilburn, because we have got a big Muslim community within Brondesbury, Kensal Rise, Kilburn, West Hampstead, Fortune Green, because we work together, we are running Arabic classes, and Bangladeshi cultural classes, with our children running within our community centre, which is in Kilburn High Street. We are running a community centre in Kilburn High Street, and mosque, which is run by North West (inaudible) association, and we have got activities for our disabled people, like we have got vulnerable people, so we are running classes down there, so if this boundary changes, then it is going to be really difficult for us, because they are going to be divided, Kilburn and Brondesbury, from our estate. So if our community is going to be divided because of the new boundary changes, it will be very upsetting for all our hard work. Okay. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Again, thank you very much. Points clearly made. Matters for clarification? No. In which case, thank you very much indeed. That is great.

Just pause, naturally, while we look for the speaker.

We will just have a few minutes' pause. Okay.

Time Noted: 11.04 am

After a short break

Time Noted: 11.08 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely. Okay, so, if you would like to come forward and make your submission? You have to stand. Is that going to be okay? Yes, and if you just talk into the microphone and start by giving your name and address, and then just give us your evidence. Thank you.

MRS BANTON: Good morning. My name is Samantha Banton. I work at Ealing Central and Acton Conservative Association, 39 Broughton Road, West Ealing, London W13 8QW.

My name is Samantha Banton. I work in Ealing Broadway ward, in Ealing Central and Acton constituency. I am the Campaign and Office Manager for Ealing Central and Acton Conservative Association. I fully support the Boundary Commission's proposals to move Southfield and Northfield wards to the newly proposed Brentford and Chiswick constituency. Southfield ward residents have a postal code of W4, which is a Chiswick postcode. The W4 postcode is shared with the Chiswick wards in the Brentford and Isleworth constituency. Southfield ward residents go shopping in Chiswick High Road and attend churches and schools in Brentford and Isleworth constituency. Southfield residents do not identify themselves as Ealing residents, but as Chiswick residents.

Northfield ward borders the London Borough of Hounslow with Brentford ward. Residents from both wards use Boston Manor Underground station. Gunnersbury Roman Catholic Boys' School is located in Brentford and Isleworth constituency and serves many students living in the South Ealing area, which is Northfield ward. Gunnersbury Park is used by many Ealing residents, which is in Brentford and Isleworth constituency, but commonly used by Ealing residents. Moving Northfield ward to the new Brentford and Chiswick constituency means residents will have a closer connection with the Brentford area. Currently, the London Borough of Ealing has three constituencies which are within the borough boundary. The current Boundary Commission proposals mean that the borough boundary would be broken across into three other boroughs, which are Hillingdon, Hounslow, and Hammersmith and Fulham. I feel that this proposal is a loss to our community in Ealing, and community life and supporting one another is very important when living in a bustling London borough. Ealing Central and Acton constituency has a great community feel. There are many well-attended churches in the area, especially in Ealing Broadway ward, and we have Ealing Liberal Synagogue in Cleveland ward, which serves residents from all over Ealing Borough.

I support the Conservative Party proposals for including Cleveland and Perivale wards to Ealing Central and Acton constituency. St Stephen's Church in Ealing Broadway ward serves both communities of Ealing Broadway and Cleveland wards. We also have St Peter's Church in Ealing Broadway, and Cleveland ward residents worship there, too. In addition, Christ the Saviour Church in Ealing Broadway town centre has parishioners attending from all over the borough. In addition, many families who attend Christ the Saviour Church also attend the primary school. The Abbey of St Benedict's serves residents from all over Ealing Borough. The school is popular and students attend from all over the borough, too. The Avenue shopping parade in Ealing Broadway ward serves residents from both Ealing Broadway and Cleveland wards. Cleveland ward is proud to have an award-winning shopping parade at Pitshanger Lane. Residents from Cleveland, Ealing Broadway, Hanger Hill and Perivale wards all use this fantastic and

unique shopping parade, containing many independent small shops. Cleveland ward residents, living in the north of the ward, also visit shopping centres in Perivale wards, therefore strengthening the community link between the two wards.

With the current proposals, including the three Hammersmith and Fulham wards to Ealing Central and Acton would be a mistake. Ealing residents do not feel any community connection with the three Hammersmith and Fulham wards. The Ealing churches, schools and shopping centres are not patronised by the Hammersmith and Fulham wards. Residents in Ealing Central and Acton do not feel any community connection with Shepherd's Bush at all. I wish to therefore propose that the new Ealing Central and Acton constituency should contain the following wards: Acton Central, Cleveland, Ealing Broadway, Ealing Common, East Acton, Hanger Hill, Perivale, and South Acton. Many thanks for listening.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any matters for clarification? No? Would it be possible to have a copy of your ---

MRS BANTON: Yes. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Brilliant. Thank you.

MRS BANTON: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry. A two-minute recess while we sort out the next speakers. They are here? Right.

Time Noted: 11.15 am

After a short break

Time Noted: 11.17 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Shall we? Great. So, if you would like to come here and speak into the microphone, please, and if you could just start off by giving us your name and address?

MRS HENSON: Yes. It is Maxine Henson, and I live at 360 Eastcote Lane, South Harrow.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely, so if you would tell us what you would like to say, really?

MRS HENSON: I just wanted to say about these boundary changes. I think they are --- we have a long-standing Member of Parliament, and he understands the issues in our

area, because I live in one of the poorer parts of Harrow. I am not a resident of Hillingdon. I am a resident of Harrow, and I want it to stay that way. I live, and I also work, in Harrow, and I use most of the amenities in Harrow, the swimming pool and that type of thing. Our MP locally is --- like, we have a strong community, and I feel that that would be damaged, because our Member of Parliament is well known in our area and people respect him. I think that is it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. Thank you. That is very helpful and it is very clear. It is important that the community is able to say what their concerns and worries are, and you have done that very well, so thank you very much.

MRS HENSON: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Graham, are you going to speak as well? Right. So, if you would like to come forward and say --- and if you can again, introduce yourself by name and address, please.

CLLR HENSON: My name is Graham Henson. I am a councillor in South Harrow. I am also the portfolio holder for environment, community safety and crime within Harrow, so I get a good understanding and breadth of what is happening around the whole of the Borough.

I have lived in Harrow for over 55 years and have seen it change into one of the most ethnically and religiously diverse boroughs in London, with people of many different backgrounds and life experiences living side by side, and it is the richness of this diversity and the positive impact that it has on the borough, and our community, that I believe helps make Harrow such a great place to live, work and even visit, and I believe equality is about describing a vision for the area that is built on recognising the needs of every local community, promoting inclusion and cohesion, fairness and justice, and as a local councillor, I will continue to work in partnership with the public, voluntary and private sectors to ensure we achieve this vision for our borough that builds on the sense of community that makes up Harrow as a place, and this is one of the reasons why I fervently believe that the proposed changes to the parliamentary constituency boundaries in their current form show no respect for Harrow's many diverse communities, and in effect, will carve up the borough and rip those communities apart.

I have to say, I do not come here today saying no to change, but I want that change to take due cognisance of historical boundaries, that respects the strong community ties that have evolved within Harrow, and that builds on the sense of place and purpose. Most importantly, I do not want to lose our sense of identity. The proposals make no sense at all to the reality of the community's close links within Harrow, the current local authority administration or indeed the GLA boundaries. I also fervently believe that the proposals make no rational geographical sense. They totally ignore common boundaries that have defined Harrow for over 60 years, and which are still relevant

today: our parishes, shopping centres, rail links into London, the main artery roads and the rivers.

Indeed, it was these rail links that defined Harrow as Metro-land many years ago. For my own ward, Roxbourne, which is in South Harrow, is an integral part of South Harrow community, and will be divided under the Commission's proposals. Our residents in South Harrow look to Harrow as their main town centre, just as they have for many years. When the postcode system was introduced, South Harrow was allocated HA2, as it was seen as the primary sub-district of Harrow, which is HA1. We are well-linked within Harrow town centre by the Metropolitan Line from Rayners Lane station, which is the same TfL zone, and the numerous bus routes. It is also well linked with Sudbury by the Piccadilly Line from South Harrow station. There are no natural barriers between Roxbourne ward or Rayners Lane ward, and to separate them now will only bring division to the South Harrow community.

I personally feel that some of the alternative proposals that have been submitted have been motivated by political considerations rather than building constituencies that would support the communities that they are meant to serve. I would also like to point out that there are very few community or transport links with Wembley, to which South Harrow is partnered with the current proposals. Proposals would mean that a deprived area of London will lose their voice, which would be dominated by the affluent areas of either Brent or Hillingdon. One example is the fact that Harrow is home to the country's largest Sri Lankan-born community, with most based in the Rayners Lane and South Harrow wards, and currently their MP speaks for a united voice.

Another example, if these proposals were to proceed, would see the Rayners Lane Estate, which falls within my own ward – I am in Roxbourne – separated from the rest of Rayners Lane, where currently, there is a sense of community. Also the Nash Estates in the west of the ward will be divided along residential streets. Quite frankly, a split of these two wards would be unnecessarily disruptive. We have no links at all with the proposed wards in the Borough of Hillingdon that make up some alternative proposals. In fact, they have totally different socioeconomic characteristics than what is currently in place, which will only lead to the voices of the most vulnerable being drowned out.

It is quite clear that the current proposed changes to constituency boundaries and even some of the alternative proposals that are being suggested will adversely affect Harrow for many years to come. When our residents want a common voice to speak on behalf of Harrow, we see it being split into four separate constituencies, which do not make sense in terms of those close affiliations and the corresponding local authority structure. Our residents' communities need someone to represent them to health services, to government departments and to local government, because all too often, these people lose out. If they are split between four constituencies, spread across three boroughs, no one will focus on them as communities. I believe that the Electoral Commission must look again at how the proposed parliamentary boundaries make sense to

communities and families within Harrow, and importantly, how they fit within the natural boundaries that formed Harrow in the first place. Harrow is growing very quickly, and I would not like to see it broken up and destroyed in this way. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any matters for clarification?

MS LUMLEY: My name is Lizzie Lumley. Can I just check please whether you are a supporter of the Labour Party proposals to cut across Barnet?

CLLR HENSON: To Barnet? I am doing from the left-hand side of the Borough, mainly around the South Harrow area, which would link in, probably expanded, if it is necessary into a ward which is just over the Borough, into Brent. Barnet is over the other side.

MS LUMLEY: Okay. That is cool. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Is it possible to --- I mean, you have given us a very interesting submission.

CLLR HENSON: Yes. I said to the lady I would email it through.

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

The next scheduled speaker is 11.50, so I suggest we adjourn till that time. Thank you.

Time Noted: 11.26 am

After a short break

Time Noted: 11.50 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene, and we have two speakers with us. I think we are starting with Mr James Yarde. If you would like to come to the front and make your presentation here? You can leave your stuff there, that is fine. If you start just by introducing yourself by way of name and address, please. Thank you.

CLLR YARDE: Sir, my name is James Yarde. I live at 25C Fordwych Road, which is located nearby to Kilburn Tube station in Fortune Green ward. I am a councillor for West Hampstead ward, which is the neighbouring ward, and I am also here, I suppose, as a local resident, but also as an academic. I teach at the London School of Economics. I teach political science there.

I come with reference to the proposed Hampstead and Golders Green constituency, particularly. I think the importance of the boundary review for me was reflected when I posed the question to my students in my class earlier this year: what are the important political events which have happened this summer? The first response I got was: "the boundary review", which I think --- there are two senses in which that could be taken. So, there are of course, the aggregate political consequences of the boundary review, which of course, is beyond the remit of the Boundary Commission itself; that is a political decision taken at the top, but I think the local consequences are extremely important and we see that coming out in terms of these proposals and in terms of the potential benefits and harms that they could bring, and so within this, I wanted to pay particular attention to the local context of the proposals, and particularly, bring my perspective as a ward councillor for West Hampstead to bear on this, and in Rule 5 of Schedule 2, it says that any local ties which would be broken by changes in constituencies should be considered, and I think the proposals, as they exist currently, unfortunately fall foul of this. I think breaking such links does not just undermine the ability of the community to forge a sense of togetherness. It also undermines the ability of MPs to fulfil their representative function.

I think, as a local councillor, you quickly discover where the divides and the links between communities in a local area exist, and that comes, to my mind, in two senses. You have residents who self-define as living in one area or the other. We also see it in terms of who attends your local surgeries, and you frequently get people who mistake your surgery for another councillor's, so I find that in West Hampstead with particular reference to Fortune Green ward, which I view as very much interlinked, and I am grateful that the current proposals seek to continue to pair those wards together. I think that is important. Many people living in Fortune Green would not define themselves as living in Fortune Green. They view themselves as either living in Kilburn or West Hampstead, and so it is critical that those two are kept together.

Similarly, and I sort of hinted at it there, it is of critical importance that West Hampstead, Fortune Green and Kilburn are also kept together. I think what is important to recognise here is that West Hampstead and Fortune Green are both extremely expansive wards, which cover areas between the Finchley Road and Kilburn High Road, and while there are a diverse range of people who live in there, they commonly either self-define as either living in West Hampstead or Kilburn. I think when I first moved to the area, I would have described myself as living in Kilburn, and of course, the great meeting point between these two parts is along the Kilburn High Road. I think it is important that, of course, Kilburn (Camden) is kept with West Hampstead and Fortune Green. That is currently done within the proposals. However, there is a failure to incorporate the Brent side of the Kilburn High Road, which I think is a significant oversight, unfortunately.

On that front, I think the particular problem for me is that there are so many common problems that are faced either side of the Kilburn High Road, and as it stands, you of

course have the local authority boundary between the two sides, and I think this, on occasion, creates more problems than it creates benefits. I think there are great examples of successes that we have had where the local authorities have managed to work together, and you can look at examples of that. You can look at the Kilburn Library and you can look at the Brondesbury medical centre, but it is always going to be difficult to co-ordinate public services between two different local authorities, and you see this in terms of things like policing. You see it in terms of bin collections, and ensuring that the street environment is pleasant. You see it in terms of managing anti-social behaviour, and so I think it is key that, as these proposals develop, it should pay due regard to the community links both sides of the Kilburn High Road, and I think that is of critical importance, and what I would like to do today is to make it clear that I support, wholeheartedly, the London Labour proposals for the new boundaries. I think these properly acknowledge the ties and the links between both sides of the Kilburn High Road, and the community which exists overarching that. It is critical that we manage to keep those together, so thank you ever so much for your time today. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very clear. You may want to give us a written version of that? That would be very helpful. Email it through, yes, thank you. Any matters for clarification? No. Well, thank you very much indeed.

I think our next speaker is --- is it Mr Muhammed Butt? Thank you. So, if you would like to come to the --- and introduce yourself by name and address, please.

CLLR BUTT: Okay. My name is Cllr Muhammed Butt. I am the Leader of Brent Council, and my address is 82 Monks Park, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6JQ. I am a resident of Brent, and I just want to start off by saying I totally understand the constraints that the Boundary Commission is working under, but I think the point still needs to be made, especially around the loss of people who are not going to be able to participate in having their vote.

We had Parliament that was called into session to extend the deadline to allow, you know, millions of people to actually come on to the electoral register, and they were used to allow them to have their vote on the EU referendum, and now, those same people are being denied their democratic right to have a say in the options going forward around this review. One of the things that I have had passed back to myself is that a lot of people still seem to be unaware of the boundary changes that are taking place, and the proposals that have been put forward, and that has been made known to myself through some of the Brent Connect forums, which are the forums that Brent Council uses to engage with the residents and stakeholders, and people are still completely unaware of these changes coming through, so the concerns around how do we make sure that we do get wider engagement from residents in this review?

The changes that are being proposed, I think, are not fair upon Brent. At the moment, we have two-and-a-bit constituencies: Brent North, Brent Central, and three wards between Kilburn and Hampstead. The changes going forward will make it even harder for us, because we will have four constituencies, and trying to manage four constituencies will place an even greater burden upon the council, and I think will make it much harder for us to engage with those residents.

Some of those proposals are going to start dividing communities, especially the proposals in the current Brent Central ward, where Tokyngton will be taken out, and we have one of the largest temples in Brent in Stonebridge ward, which is going to be separated and dividing those communities between two, three or even four different constituencies, and we have been working quite hard in order to make sure that all our communities are actually represented and their voices heard.

I am also concerned about the impact on Kilburn, as well, because we have been working quite closely with Camden Council, and especially around the impact around, the changes around, Kilburn High Road, and because we do have the Kilburn High Road, which is the dividing line. Once that is taken away, I do worry about how we will actually continue the changes we have in there around there, as well, and which will further impact on the regeneration of South Kilburn, the impact on some of the regeneration on Wembley, and also Alperton. It is going to divide a lot of those communities and the impact of the regeneration is not being taken into account. We have, potentially, 15,000 homes coming into Wembley alone, another 8000 homes coming into Alperton, and taking into account, you know, the millions of people who are not being counted, all these changes are definitely not being taken into consideration, and I think there will further be a further democratic deficit because of the impact of the EU referendum. We do have 50 MPs being taken out. We also have the Brexit vote, which will potentially take out another layer of politicians, the MEPs, and there is going to be a void, and who will fill that void?

The changes, I think, will have a negative impact upon councils like Brent, and the counter-proposals that have been submitted by the Labour Party are a sensible way forward, which will protect the residents and make sure that we have those cohesive communities that we have all been working towards in the last few years, and considering we have recently had changes in 2010, with Brent Central and Brent South, and the people have just about got used to those changes, I think where we are causing so much confusion for residents and all our communities, considering the many, many changes that we are all facing in our councils at the moment. I will leave it there.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is helpful. Will Brent be submitting a more detailed submission as a council, as a whole, or ---

CLLR BUTT: I think we are looking to, but the chief executive will be coming later on today as well.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, thank you. I would certainly welcome that, so thank you very much indeed. Thank you.

Mr Rashid Zaffur? Is that you, Sir? Lovely. Would you like to come and make your submission? Do you want to wait until then? Okay. Fine. So, I suggest we take a recess now until our next scheduled speaker, which is ---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 12.10.

Time Noted: 12.03 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 12.11 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Welcome. We are reconvening. If you would like to speak from the stand here, and if you could start by just giving us your name and address. You might want to adjust the microphone.

MS TULIP SIDDIQ MP: (Member of Parliament for Hampstead and Kilburn) Thanks very much. I am Tulip Siddiq. I am the Labour Member of Parliament for Hampstead and Kilburn.

Thanks very much for inviting me to speak here today. I do acknowledge from the outset that this is a very difficult job for all of you, and I think you have been very patient to listen to all the views of the public. I should state that I am opposed to the proposals. I think there is a problem in trying to cut the number of public servants and elected representatives, at a time of this country where there is changes to social security, uncertainty surrounding Brexit, and also the problems that we are going to have when we talk about employment, austerity and housing, as well.

I also have a problem with the fact that when we made these proposals, whereas the proposals were made public, the fact is, they were based on Electoral Register from December 2015. Ever since that, the government went on the biggest registration drive to get people to register and say they wanted to vote in the European Union referendum. I feel the voices of two million people will be ignored if we move forward by using the statistics that we have at the moment, but in particular, I would like to focus on the proposals that have been made for Hampstead and Kilburn, which is my constituency, and the biggest worry that I have about the proposals concerning Kilburn.

Now, people talk about Kilburn (Brent), Kilburn (Camden), different sides of the High Road. For me, Kilburn is one area. One area, which is in the top four percent of income deprivation in the whole country, in the top 7.5 percent of deprivation in terms of

employment in the whole country, and this is the area where a third of my casework comes from, overall, and when I talk about casework, I talk about housing casework, education casework, immigration casework. People who are struggling to make ends meet who have to go to foodbanks and who are worrying about where their next meal comes from.

I was a governor for a long time in Granville Nursery, which is in the heart of Kilburn, and there were people who came to school, three-year-old children, who could not concentrate at work because they had not had a meal the night before and had not had anything to eat in the morning, and parents were making the choice between putting on the heating for these children, and serving them breakfast. It is the most deprived area of my constituency. It is an area where, at one point, between one end of the High Road and another end, there were 16 payday lenders and loan sharks. Coupling that with gambling shops, it is an area that takes advantage of vulnerable people, especially vulnerable young men. It is an area which will be devastated by High Speed Rail 2. I am sure you are probably aware of the plans to build a vent shaft in Kilburn (Brent) right next to a school, which I have been fighting for for ages. There will be homes destroyed. There are people who are getting notices about compulsory purchase of their house, and the next minute told, "Actually, you're fine". These are people who have been trying to fight against High Speed Rail 2, which I voted against in Parliament for the last ten years now. It is an area where a lot of school places have been --- there have been problems about school places. People have not been able to get school places. There have been problems in terms of being placed in a school which is near any kind of transport links, so it is an area where we need to think about the future of our children.

Now, this is an area where people came together and decided they wanted to work together, and there are two main forums that I want to mention and pay tribute to. The first is the Kilburn Neighbourhood Forum, where people are finally coming together because they want to work together. It has been something that they have been working on for ages, and it looks like it is getting somewhere. It has people who work together in terms of social links, political links, religious links. They are working together because they want to battle the High Road, as I have said, in terms of payday lenders, loan sharks and gambling shops. They want to make sure that Kilburn Road is cleaned up, in terms of the litter, in terms of the deprivation, in terms of a lot of the street begging that is happening. They want to make sure that the transport links between the stations, which are fairly near each other, but you have to tap in and tap out when you go from one to another, are fixed so that you can use the same tickets and not have to pay twice. They are also the community who are working together to help each other, and when I say "help each other", there is a big area of people who speak English as a second language, and there are certain people who do speak English as a first language, if you like. They are working together to make sure when very difficult letters come from High Speed Rail 2, they can help each other in terms of interpreting,

translation and I pay tribute to Simon Wookey and the others who are trying to do this and help others.

The other forum that I want to pay tribute to is the Interfaith Forum, the Kilburn Interfaith Forum, which has rabbis, priests, people from the different temples, they have imams, all coming together to try and reduce the number of hate crime that has been happening, especially in the aftermath of Brexit, there has been a high incidence of hate crime. They are trying to work together to make sure that this does not become the norm in our area. They are building resilience in the community, they are trying to keep the community together, and I cannot believe the proposals that say there would be some attempt to tear up the Kilburn High Road to make sure these communities do not have the support of each other.

There is also a large network of women, who work together in Kilburn and in the West Hampstead area, and they turn up frequently to the West Hampstead Women's Centre. This is a lifeline for a lot of women, especially because of the latest programme that they are running, that I have been involved with, where they help women get basic qualifications to try and go back to employment, especially if they have taken time off to raise children and then go back again. This is when the community comes together. They go to one Women's Centre. They work together. They work with each other. This is not a community that we should be tearing up.

I also wanted to mention something about Brondesbury Park. It is an area which is in my current constituency and when I was knocking on doors in Brondesbury Park in the lead-up to the election, people were very confused about who their MP actually was, because some people said to me, "We thought it was Sarah Teather". Some people said to me, "We thought it was Glenda Jackson". Some people said to me, "I thought it was Dawn Butler". Someone even said to me, "I thought it was Ken Livingstone who was representing me", which, you know, no comment on Ken, but they thought they were --- now, these are people, because they have had such a change of MP over the years, they do not even want to vote because they feel their vote does not matter. It does not matter who we vote for; we are going to have a change again. If we actually want people to engage, if we want them to be enfranchised, in terms of engaging with the political and democratic process, the last thing we need is another change of MP in this area. There are also people who know where to come when they actually need representation. Once you make people familiar with the way your surgeries are, who you are coming to, and who you get to know, that is the kind of casework that we want to represent. Those are the kind of people that we want to help.

The final thing I should probably say is that the life expectancy in Kilburn is ten years lower than any other part of my constituency. It is an area where people end up dying early because of the conditions that they live in, because of the lack of money they have, and because of the lack of care they have had in their lives. I think the worst

thing we can do is rip up the most vulnerable area in my constituency and show total disregard for the links that they have created over the years. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. It is very helpful. Are you likely to submit something in writing to us?

MS TULIP SIDDIQ MP: I am happy to do so.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be most helpful, yes. Are there any matters for clarification? Right. Thank you very much indeed.

Mr Jay Stoll? Yes. Lovely. If you would like to come forward, Sir, and speak from the rostrum. If you can introduce yourself by way of name and address.

MR STOLL: Jay Stoll, 53 Fortune Green Road. That is in Fortune Green Road ward in Hampstead and Kilburn.

Okay, so, I do not want to speak for ages, but I guess I just have a few general points to make. I am from a specific faith community, the Jewish community, and a lot of my thoughts on these proposals are on how the new boundaries will affect existing points of contact for that community, strands, if you want to call them, of which are far less integrated than others. They know their point of contact. Whatever I think about certain MPs in that area of varying parties, at least those communities currently know who to go to and speak to, and developing that point of contact has been a work in progress for a hell of a long time, and I think these proposals really jeopardise work that has been done, not only in relation to that community's political engagement but also, given what the previous speaker just mentioned about increased hostility at this time, it is important that they are not in any doubt as to where to turn to, and you know, some of these proposals again are --- you could argue on the one hand, they are bringing certain communities together but there is very fragmented relationship within that community between the various groups, and again, they know their points of contact, and just on the point about safety and security, it is no exaggeration to say that the interfaith groups that are set up are a real crutch for those faith groups, and I could not think of a worse time than the next few years, when those existing relationships or newly forming relationships should be disturbed or undermined by geographical changes.

Kilburn Faiths Forum is a new initiative, and again, I live in Fortune Green, but I am very close to the communities in West Hampstead as well, and the West End Lane link, so to speak, between there and Kilburn and whatever, is creating --- that geographical bind is creating new relationships between the faith communities, which I really would not --- now is not the right time to jeopardise those, and a geographical change will really undermine that work, and the co-operation with police and whoever else.

In terms of areas beyond the faith stuff, obviously, there are very clear needs in the Kilburn area of this constituency, and for the life of me, I cannot really understand how splitting Kilburn (Camden) and Kilburn (Brent) is positive. If you look at the multiple indices of deprivation, again, I do not really want to tread over ground that the previous speaker said, but the fact is that there are some of the most highly deprived wards in the country and it is the same point about a point of contact. By --- in such a densely populated area, by splitting up the political representation, you are creating havoc with people's welfare. Not you, personally. The plans are creating havoc with people's welfare, and that would be a real shame, and, you know, for obvious reasons again, I guess, back to my first point about communities and how integrated they are, I know a lot of people in that area speak English as a second language, and it is about consistency and representation, and enabling those people to have improved access to services that they need, and these plans, as they stand, I think, would jeopardise them.

The last point I want to make is that I have not been in this area --- I am initially from Manchester, but I have moved into this area now for about four years, and in those four years, I have seen more transport infrastructure plans than I have in my entire lifetime in Manchester, and you might think that is a breath of fresh air. Actually, you have no idea how --- the impact that has on people's lives in terms of, obviously, getting around, and the disruption it creates, but also, more vulnerable groups, either the elderly or the disabled people in terms of using their access routes. Now, the reason I raise this, and not because those plans are going to change depending on where a boundary line is drawn, but again, the point of political representation, if you have got the single biggest transport infrastructure plan this country has seen, going through one main road of a constituency or centring majorly on one clear road to access to and from the various sites, splitting those areas in part is negligent. It is seriously negligent, and without making this a rant about HS2 or any other organisations that are building in the area, it is near on impossible to get answers from them on how they affect your own area and your own patch, and knowing who your MP is in that area, knowing that it is the same MP that affects these various areas and the various segments of the transport link is absolutely essential to even having your voice heard, let alone having the problem solved.

So, to sum all these issues up, to kind of, bring them all together, whether it is tackling hate crime, whether it is issues of deprivation, whether it is issues of access, having an MP across the same areas is absolutely vital, and these plans, as they stand, change the geography of that area to such an extent, because of the density and because of all the acute issues that I raise, that I really fear what the consequences will be if the plans go ahead as possible, so keeping Kilburn, in particular, together will be absolutely vital and not disturbing the current relationships that thread through West Hampstead, Fortune Green, and Kilburn will be integral to making sure that efforts, particularly in interfaith areas of work, are not disturbed and undermined. Thanks.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any matters of clarification? No? Right. That is fine. Thank you very much indeed. That is helpful.

Mr Thomas Gardiner? Yes. Lovely. Thank you. Welcome, and again, name and address to begin. Thank you.

CLLR GARDINER: It is actually Cllr Thomas Gardiner. I represent Kilburn ward on the Camden side of Kilburn High Road. My address for contact purposes is Camden Town Hall, at Judd Street, WC1H 9JE.

I wanted to address you primarily about the proposals as they affect Kilburn. As I said, I represent the Camden side of Kilburn High Road, Kilburn ward; the other side of the High Road is represented by a ward with an identical name, Kilburn ward, and really, Kilburn is a single community. It has been for millennia, actually, right across the broad sweep of history. It is a community that grew up around both a Roman road, the A5, Kilburn High Road, and – as was – Kilburn Abbey, which was there until the Middle Ages, and the river that runs through the area, the variously named Westbourne or Kilburn River, but it has been there as a single community for hundreds of years, and it is really an administrative anomaly that, at points in time, it has been divided between different sets of political representation, different local authorities, and that anomaly, really, drawn from Mediaeval Catholic parish boundaries more than anything practical about the community, so it has been a great boon for us as a community that both sides of Kilburn have been united under single representation since the last boundary review that was implemented. It has been very helpful to have a single MP representing the area, and it has really aided a lot of the work that we do, cross-border.

Kilburn High Road is really the centre of our community. It is certainly not a dividing line. I think that the last couple of speakers have spoken about the high deprivation in the area, and that is very true, that if you look at the two Kilburn wards as compared to any of the wards around them, they have far more in common with each other than they have with any of their neighbouring wards. They are by far the most deprived wards within the wider area. My ward has a ten-year --- I know Tulip Siddiq mentioned life expectancy, but a ten-year lower life expectancy than, say, Belsize ward, which is separated by about five minutes' walk from the border of my ward, which must be one of the most extreme differences in health outcomes anywhere in the country, whereas it has very similar outcomes to the Kilburn (Brent) ward, just across the High Road. As councillors, we do a great deal of cross-border working with the councillors for Kilburn (Brent) ward, especially. We work together in dealing with a lot of issues we have around betting shops and payday lenders, which are a big problem on our High Road, and that work is supported by our MP. We did a lot of work together on planning issues, which I will come to a little bit later, as well, with regard to the community's efforts on those fronts, and on licensing issues, similarly. You know, really, what happens either side of the high road affects the residents equally on the opposite side as it does on the side that it is being decided. We have a common police team on Kilburn High Road, for

both wards. We have similar issues that we are campaigning on to do with transport improvements and really trying to get the improvements that our community needs to have a healthier High Road and a better transport system locally, and really relies on us working closely with the councillors in our neighbouring ward in Brent, and the support of a single MP.

We also have, kind of, on the flip side of transport issues, very similar issues to do with HS2, the High Speed Rail project, where, regardless of the wider issues for the country on it, it is a very significant blight on the ward I represent, with a vent shaft causing demolition of homes and businesses, and years of disruption for my residents, and almost exactly the same issues for the residents that are represented by my counterparts in Kilburn (Brent). They also have a vent shaft. It is also on a housing estate. It will also lead to demolition of community facilities and years of disruption, and so being able to work together cross-border with a single MP assisting us in that work and able to feed into a single MP is really much more useful than anything we would be able to achieve without a single MP, and we do face issues of having different local authorities to deal with, and really, having single representation assists us enormously, with regard to Parliament, where we have to struggle with two different local authorities, otherwise.

I also wanted to mention some of the cross-border matters that affect the community and the local residents. So, the schools that the children in the area go to, there is really very little regard to which local authority they are in. They go to the school that is closest to them, and that is often across the borough boundary, you know. It is so closely knit together that I do not think you would find residents thinking, "I'd better only apply in my borough". They would look to the local schools as they see them, and they definitely see them as being Kilburn schools, not attached to either of the boroughs, and again, having a single MP assists those people in addressing their educational concerns and having the continuity between the two different education authorities. Equally, churches, mosques, synagogues: people do not obey the borough boundaries in terms of where they go to worship. They go to appropriate place of worship for them. We have, in my ward, one of the biggest Shia Muslim mosques in the country, and both sides of the High Road have very large Iranian and other Shia populations, who really find it essential to worship at that mosque. Now, obviously, with divided constituencies, they would still go to worship where they go to worship, but where those places of worship have particular issues that they need political representation on, they are greatly aided by having a single MP who they can go to in order to represent them in Parliament, and there is not, still on the matter of faith, there is an interfaith forum that operates both sides of the High Road, that is really led by community members keen on building the links between the different faiths within the Kilburn area. There is a Kilburn Neighbourhood Planning Forum, which has grown off the back of many years of work by people on both sides of the community. It now has official recognition by both boroughs. I do fear that that work, and it is years of work by residents, supported by us as their councillor, supported by the MP --- I do fear that that work will to a great extent

fall by the wayside if there is a political division, which will make it much harder for them to continue working in the same united way. My biggest concern, as is obvious from what I have said, is to keep the two sides of Kilburn in a single constituency, but I do genuinely think that there is a strong argument that there is a "Greater Kilburn", which encompasses areas like West Hampstead and Fortune Green, and Queens Park. They see themselves differently but many of the residents in those areas would say that they live in Kilburn and certainly in the longer run, they would have been seen as part of a "Greater Kilburn" and it would be helpful for them, although obviously, I do not represent them, so it is not for me to speak for them, but it would be helpful for them to be part of a single represented constituency.

I think that is all I have to say. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That is, again, very helpful. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, can I thank you, and again, I would urge you to make a written submission outlining those points as well.

CLLR GARDINER: I will do my best to do so.

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

Mr Rashid Zaffur?

MR ZAFFUR: Good afternoon. My name is Rashid Zaffur. I live down the Kenton Lane, Harrow. I am the candidate for the Edgware ward. I have a few points. Basically, I want to say, I support the proposal for Harrow Stanmore bringing Belmont into the constituency.

Second is: Edgware ward has been part of the Harrow East since Harrow became a constituency.

My third point is, across borough, Harrow, Barnet constituencies, is as --- the confusion and is not needed.

Fourth is: Edgware Road of Barnet is not connected to Harrow, and it is a very different area, and it is separated by a wide open space.

Fifth is: Stanmore Park, Canons and Belmont area, from the Stanmore community: these links should be kept together.

Number six is: as a Kenton resident, I am very happy to see the unification of Kenton.

Number seven: I support the Conservative Party proposals for the area. That is it. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That was clear and short. Excellent. Thank you very much indeed.

So, I suggest we have a ten-minute recess, just while we sort out what is happening.

Time Noted: 12.38 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 12.46 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene, and Mr Neil Frais? Yes. Please come forward. If you would like to speak from the podium here, and you have the microphone to speak into, and if you could just introduce yourself by name and address at the beginning? Thank you very much.

MR FRAIS: Good afternoon. My name is Neil Frais. I live at Hazeldene Drive in Pinner. I have been a local resident there for over 30 years. I am a property consultant and have an office in Pinner. I was educated in Northwood, at Merchant Taylors'; lived in Stanmore; and when we got married, my first house was in North Harrow, so I have lived in the area virtually all my life. I know the area extremely well, and it is from the community link point of view that I am really here. It is from, you know, to keep the communities together. I have looked at the proposals.

First and foremost, I think I can speak from my experience. My main community role over the years has been at the Northwood and Pinner Liberal Synagogue. That is based in Northwood, but the people who attend that synagogue come from all over the area, and up to recently I was on the board there, and had been for some years, but I have now retired from that.

The community I know very well, really, is the area in Pinner and Hatch End, extending down the Uxbridge Road to where I used to --- where I was brought up, in Stanmore, Harrow Weald and those locations. I particularly think that Pinner, Hatch End, Harrow Weald, Stanmore and those areas along the Uxbridge Road, should really be kept together and as one. I also take the view, when you consider that Harrow Weald edges on to North Harrow, my own view is that North Harrow, also, is a location that should be included in this type of tie-up, but in terms of those communities down the Uxbridge Road, my own view is that they have been interlinked over the years. Stanmore and Harrow Weald have; Hatch End and Pinner have. I mean, Pinner and Hatch End, really, is one community, and if you come out of Hatch End, you are almost in Harrow Weald and then in Stanmore, and when I looked at the map, I thought to myself, well, that has to make sense in terms of keeping that area together. Perhaps I am potentially going over what I have said, but though I have worked in the community, in those areas

for a long, long time, and also from a sports point of view, I have been a football referee and have refereed many games at the Roger Bannister in Hatch End, with teams from all those locations – Pinner, North Harrow, Stanmore, and Harrow Weald – and it is from that particular position that I think that it is right to keep that type of unit together. I also think, in terms of linking up, that road especially, the Uxbridge Road, particularly, is one which really does enhance a constituency, and that is really where I am. There is not a great deal more I can add. It is just I feel quite strongly about it, and from experience of things that I have arranged – bridge clubs, tennis clubs, table tennis clubs, which I have been involved in over the years – that is my considered and definite view.

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

Right, ladies and gentlemen, then I suggest we now recess for the lunch period and we will reassemble at 2.00 pm. We have speakers booked throughout the afternoon, so thank you.

Time Noted: 12.52 pm

After the luncheon adjournment

Time Noted: 2.00 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We reconvene for this afternoon's session, and we have speakers here, and I think the first one is Carolyn Downs? Lovely. If you would like to come forward. If you could introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin, please. Thank you.

MS DOWNS: My name is Carolyn Downs. I am the Chief Executive of Brent Council and the Acting Returning Officer for the London Borough of Brent. We are based at the Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley. I will start.

I am the Acting Returning Officer for the London Borough of Brent in which there are currently two whole constituencies and three remaining wards, which are part of the Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. The majority of that constituency is in the London Borough of Camden, whose Acting Returning Officer is responsible for the conduct of Parliamentary elections there.

After many years in which three constituencies were wholly contained within Brent, there have been two general elections under the current arrangements. It is fair to say that many lessons were learned in 2010 about collaborating with a neighbouring borough, which contributed to the success of the 2015 election. Nevertheless, the

growing complexity of modern elections brings increased risks and potential for error. Where an election is spread over more than one local authority, the risk and the need to manage that risk is significantly increased. Whereas my local authority currently has one cross-boundary constituency, the Boundary Commission's initial proposals divide Brent into four constituencies, which merge wards in Brent with those in three of our neighbours, two constituencies in Harrow and one each in Westminster and Hammersmith and Fulham. I will be the Acting Returning Officer for two of those constituencies while my colleagues in Westminster and in Harrow will be in charge of the other two.

My major concern is the increased level of planning that the proposed changes will impose upon myself and my election team, in collaboration with colleagues in our neighbouring authorities. Cross-boundary elections require significant additional planning and administration, both for the Returning Officer and the respective electoral services offices in each authority. Every Returning Officer will plan an election so that the experience for each voter is essentially the same in whichever polling station or part of the country they vote in. Nevertheless, preparations will differ from authority to authority according to local custom and practice, and each Returning Officer must ensure that in each cross-boundary constituency, there is a complete consistency and understanding in each local authority on how the election is to be administered. The cross-boundary arrangement creates potential for confusion and uncertainty, not only for administrators, but for electors and candidates in a variety of ways. I will summarise most important areas where we think these will arise.

The elector should be foremost in our minds when we make our election plans. We know from experience that cross-boundary elections every five years cause confusion for electors, who question why, living in one local authority, they are sent election correspondence from a neighbouring borough. On that point, postal votes are issued by the Acting Returning Officer's local authority. On occasions, electors will ask for a replacement due to the original being lost or spoilt. When this occurs close to the date of the poll, the elector will have to collect the replacement from the electoral services office. The two local authorities will have to make clear to electors which local authority office they need to attend. It is already an issue dealing with that within a single borough. It is essential that candidates and their agents are clear about responsibility for the conduct of the election and who to contact in either borough for information. Careful planning between Returning Officers will be required to demonstrate that their authorities are working in a co-ordinated manner. We currently do that well for two. We will have to do it for four.

Similarly, when candidate nominations include subscribers from each local authority, there will need to be an agreement on how they are to be properly checked. Agreement has to be reached between the authorities on the booking of polling stations, the appointment of staff to work in them, how premises and staff are to be paid, and the expenditure accounted for to the government. All polling station staff attend a training

session prior to the poll. The venues for, and the content of, that training, will have to be decided but it will be necessary to ensure that all staff fully understand the nature of the constituency and where the responsibility lies. Delivery of equipment to polling stations is an important element of the preparation for the poll, and returning officers will have to determine how this is to be carried out across the two authorities. This applies equally to the provision of election stationery to polling staff. We will now have to do this for four, not two.

There will need to be an agreement on how data, especially for poll card and postal votes, is securely transferred between local authorities. Given the original registration application deadlines in the election timetable, this data transfer will occur on a number of occasions to ensure that election communications reach the elector as early as possible. Careful co-ordination with contractors, in particular print suppliers and software houses, will be very necessary. Where local authorities use different database software, their data may be in a different format, causing potential issues for the printers.

Of the greatest concern, the next general election, 2020, is currently set to be held as the same day as the Greater London Mayoral and Assembly elections, which require their own level of cross-boundary working and collaboration with the GLA. I am Acting Returning Officer for both Harrow and Brent using the borough boundaries. If these elections are held on the same day, they will place a virtually impossible burden on my staff. The Association of Electoral Administrators recently published a report on the experience of its members, who had to manage elections in May and the referendum in June. The report is entitled "Pushed to the Absolute Limit". I do not understand how we will be able to successfully hold both elections on one day, particularly with the increased cross-boundary level of working.

So, in summary, I acknowledge that it is inevitable that some constituencies will straddle local authority boundaries. However, the degree to which this is now proposed proposes a serious additional layer of risk to the successful conduct of future elections. Recognition of local government boundaries is one of the criteria which the Boundary Commission states that it is bound to take note of, yet 38 of the 68 proposed new constituencies take in parts of more than one London borough. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Can I just check if there are any matters for clarification? No? Thank you, and you will let us have, as you say, a form of the --- Yes.

MS DOWNS: We will email it to you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is tremendous. Thank you. Also, I think your Leader gave some evidence this morning.

MS DOWNS: He did.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Verbally, and when I said, would he submit that in writing, he suggested that the chief executive might co-ordinate something that would come in.

MS DOWNS: Did he?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Strangely, but yes. Peter? Would you like to come forward? Thank you very much, and I think you know the score about introducing yourself.

CLLR GOLDS: I fear to say I have heard a lot, and I am going to try and speak as quickly as possible because I have got a lot to say.

My name is Peter Golds and I live at 112 Langbourne Place, London E14 3WW. For the period of 1973 to 1989, I was the full-time Conservative Party agent, firstly in Brent, between 1973 and 1982, and later, Hampstead and Highgate, between 1983 and 1989. I was intimately involved in forming the Conservative Associations in the revised Brent constituencies, prior to the 1974 elections, and the revised Hampstead and Highgate constituency in 1983.

In 1979, I was the Conservative agent for London North West European constituency, covering the Boroughs of Brent, Harrow and most of Barnet. For eight years, I served as a councillor in the London Borough of Brent. I retain a strong connection in the area. My parents-in-law live in Stanmore and I have campaigned for candidates in this area, who are personal friends, in general elections, particularly for Bob Blackman and Mike Freer, as well as for candidates in local elections.

I am an elected officeholder within the London Conservative Party, which is the reason for my speaking today. I would expand further in my written submission but wish today to highlight the following.

A number of issues raised at the hearings concern local government and the delivery of services by local authorities. However the parliamentary boundaries change, the boroughs will remain and councillors will deliver services within their authorities. Members of Parliament act in a consultative and representational manner, but cannot take executive decisions that are delegated to the local authority. Indeed, the Localism Act is designed to empower community and local involvement down to the lowest level, and I think we have had too many contributions that imagine Members of Parliament have some superior power in this.

Regarding the specific constituencies, I support the Conservative amendments to the Harrow and Stanmore constituency. Uniquely, Harrow was the only municipal borough

in over 120 London authorities to remain a stand-alone in the reorganisation of 1964. The authority had two parliamentary constituencies between 1945 and 1950, and 1983 to 2010. Between 1950 and 1983, it was allocated three constituencies, and from 2010 it has had two constituencies, with a number of the most western wards conjoined with Hillingdon. In all that time, the pattern was somewhat regular, so, for example, Roxbourne ward, which we heard a lot about yesterday, was attached to Pinner in the old Harrow West constituency. My parents-in-law live in Stanmore, in the Canons ward. I regularly visit them. Canons, Stanmore Park and Belmont are known locally as Stanmore. There are many social, cultural and religious connections, with the churches, synagogues, temples and indeed the local Islamic centre all containing the Stanmore name and all located within this one area, Marsh Lane and Kenton Lane, which border Belmont ward, link the area to the main Uxbridge Road, which is a major link westwards from Watling Street through Stanmore and Harrow Weald to Hatch End, which we are delighted will be coming in the constituency. The H12 and 340 buses connect Stanmore Station. The terminus of the Jubilee Line and on Uxbridge Road to Harrow Weald and Hatch End.

My parents-in-law recently celebrated a significant anniversary and the family booked a restaurant accessible to friends and family. This was in Hatch End, which they, their neighbours and friends regard as a recreational area adjoining and connected to Stanmore. I can find no good reason whatsoever, and indeed Carolyn Downs said it far more emphatically than I could ever do, of where we are already having to cross boroughs, this extraordinary proposal to suddenly put Edgware into Barnet, creating yet another unnecessary cross-borough constituency. Although Brent and Harrow have had wards named Kenton for over 80 years on either side of the Kenton Road, Edgware only became a Harrow ward name in the most recent local government boundary changes. The suggestion is unnecessarily illogical. We welcome the Commission's proposal for a cross-borough Kenton constituency. As Kenton Road itself unites rather than divides, and there are many connections across the boundary. Others have mentioned them but I could briefly talk about them.

I support the Conservative proposal for a slight amendment to bring the cross-borough Kenton ward, Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill wards, which were until the late 1970s a single ward called Hill and Greenhill, Northwick Park, which of course includes Northwick Park Hospital, and the cross-borough Queensbury wards together into a single constituency. There are numerous links across this boundary, including parish churches, school catchment areas, doctors' surgeries. We have proposed a constituency to be called Wembley and Neasden, which is contained wholly within the London Borough of Brent, and I think that is extremely important. Four wards – Alperton, Sudbury, Tokyngton and Central – form the core of the once Wembley South constituency, which lasted between 1945 to 1974. This includes Wembley town centre, the Civic Centre and the world-famous Wembley Stadium. This will be conjoined with the Preston and Barn Hill wards, which will course part of Wembley, and have remained in a single constituency since 1945, and the Welsh Harp, Dudden Hill and Dollis Hill

wards. Welsh Harp was the first ward in Brent to bridge the former borough boundaries of Wembley and Willesden, and it links with both Chalkhill, Tokyngton, and Dudden Hill and Dollis Hill. There are connecting transport links, including the Jubilee Line connecting Wembley Park, Neasden and Dollis Hill to Stanmore, Westminster and Waterloo. The redevelopment site of the Wembley Industrial Park is bringing homes and jobs, and the amended communications in our proposed constituency unites communities within the single borough. For some 20 years, I lived and worked in what will be, if approved, this constituency in the Wembley Park Drive in the present Tokyngton ward, and this will be a merger of linked communities.

This is also the area most immediately affected by arrangements for stadium events, and if anything, a Member of Parliament could be required; it is negotiation when you have big events at the Wembley stadium. Over 50 years ago, Harry Plowman, the then town clerk of Oxford, was appointed to approve the boundaries of the London Boroughs of Middlesex. None was at the time more controversial than the merger between Wembley and Willesden. Mr Plowman, in recommending the merger of Wembley and Willesden, noted that what geographically connected the two former boroughs and in paragraph 170 of his report expected the new borough would become “a very effective unit”. Mr Plowman would not have envisaged the scale of development, which has now erased many of those former boundaries. This includes the rise, fall and rebirth of Chalkhill, now complete with a superstore. Ikea and Tesco on the North Circular Road, and the wholesale redevelopment of the former industrial estate, itself the site of the 1924 Exhibition. Our proposed constituency builds on this and brings together communities.

The Hampstead constituency has remained untouched by successive Boundary Commissions between 1885 and 1974, when a handful of electors were added to Upper Park Road. In 1983, the constituency extended across Hampstead Heath and was joined by Highgate Ward, and renamed Hampstead and Highgate. This was a successful constituency for 27 years. There are numerous connections between both areas, and indeed, the local newspaper, universally regarded as the finest local paper in the country, is called the “Hampstead and Highgate Express”.

In 2010, Highgate was moved back to Holborn and St Pancras, and wards were added to Hampstead from Brent. My experience would be this is a far less successful merger than Highgate. Roads to the west of Kilburn High Road tend to move east-west, while those to the east are north-south in focus. The Commission proposed to retain Hampstead as it has existed since 1885, and as a core, and return the Highgate ward and include Childs Hill and Garden Suburb. We support this, as it brings all of Hampstead Heath into a single constituency, and we heard eloquently last week, when talking of Mitcham, of how essential it is that areas such as, say, Mitcham Common and, indeed, Clapham Common and, we think, Hampstead Heath, should be a single focus in a constituency. Hampstead Lane and Hampstead Way are in Childs Hill and Garden Suburb wards. Garden Suburb is better known, geographically and

communally, as Hampstead Garden Suburb. Hampstead Golf Course adjoins the Hampstead Heath extension. Both are in the Garden Suburb ward. The addition of these three wards to Hampstead brings interlinked communities together. The boundary between Camden, Fortune Green ward, and Barnet Childs Hill ward, is extremely indistinct in places. There are, for example, two adjoining street places. Street plate names in Ranulf Road, NW2. It is outside Number 17. One says "Borough of Hampstead, Ranulf Road", and the other says "London Borough of Barnet, Ranulf Road". Until the mid-1990s, the boundary between Childs Hill and Fortune Green passed directly through a block of flats called Vernon Court, with one unfortunate resident paying council tax for his kitchen and bathroom to one authority, and for his bedroom and living room to a second authority, so the suggestion that Childs Hill and Fortune Green are not indistinct is, let us say, up there with the fairies.

The road and bus links favour this merger. We have heard about shopping links. Finchley Road, with its massive Waitrose and Sainsbury's superstores, are a link, and it should be noted that Brent Cross are proposing to spend £40 million on refreshing their centre, hopefully to revive Westfield. Under the Localism Act 2011, we note there is a cross-borough Neighbourhood Planning Forum covering part, and only part, of Kilburn, and this is significant, because the South Kilburn area, which includes the largest amount of social housing in Kilburn, is excluded from this neighbourhood planning forum, but this again is a local authority matter, and as I said earlier, is designed to ensure that local decision-making is devolved downwards to local people and local authorities. Quite specifically, it is a matter for the local authority and not for the Member of Parliament, as this is a local, not national, government initiative.

I should add that we reject, and I think most people will reject, the idea of suddenly dismembering Hampstead to split it aside into two completely unrelated constituencies, of which have never been before, and of course, create a further cross-borough constituency in Brent, of which the Chief Executive spoke about.

We support the boundaries of the proposed Holborn and St Pancras constituency, but as it does not include Holborn but does include the Islington wards of Junction and St George's, which are part of Tufnell Park, we would propose that the constituency should therefore be renamed Camden Town and Tufnell Park.

Quickly, I return to Willesden and North Hammersmith. We are proposing that there should be six wards of Willesden join four wards of North Hammersmith – not one, four – to create a proposed constituency of Willesden and North Hammersmith, and I heard this morning it is difficult to walk to, but the 220 bus does travel across both linking parts, so it would not be difficult to follow the 220 bus route. Again, this is a proposal retaining existing communities and linking them together, albeit in new parliamentary constituencies. I will, of course, be writing, expanding on these points.

May I conclude on one matter by saying it is a disservice to Members of Parliament of any political party to suggest that they would neglect any part of a cross-borough constituency. My experience of MPs with these constituencies is that they work across the board. In addition, the modern social media would damage the reputation and electoral prospects of a member who was seen to be indolent and disrespect any part of their constituency. I currently live in a constituency that was a cross-borough constituency. My local Member of Parliament is not at the same Party as I am. Let it be assured, were we to have discovered that he was neglecting part of Newham in favour of Tower Hamlets or Tower Hamlets in favour of Newham, the leaflet would have whirred off the photocopier.

I would conclude by saying that although my Member of Parliament is of a different political party, when he represented Poplar and Canning Town, he gave valiant service to both constituencies.

Thank you very much. Here is a copy of my speech, and I completed it with a minute to spare, and I apologise to everybody listening I spoke so quickly. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. It was a virtuoso performance, but I will read the paper at leisure. I do not know if there are any matters of --- no? Right. Thank you.

Mr Ravinder Walia? Yes. Lovely. Would you like to come forward and speak, and if you could just start by introducing yourself by name and address, please?

MR WALIA: Okay. My name is Ravinder Walia. I just, basically, am not going to take up ten minutes, hopefully. I would like to speak about your constituency that you propose as number 57, and having looked at what you have put forward and what the Labour Party has done for, and the Conservatives, I would just like to make a few points on a personal level as an individual who lives in that constituency, rather than that.

I understand the basic argument to make sure that all constituencies are roughly equal size, but what I would argue is, when you are considering this, please take into the following consideration, and having looked at it, I do actually feel the North Harrow and Northwood constituency put forward by the Labour Party meets my concern best.

What, for me, as an individual who lives there, is the constituency must have an identity rather than something that has been put up on a bureaucrat's desk, draw a line here, draw a line there. Coming from an Indian origin, I know the dangers when someone sits in Clive House and draws a line through somewhere with disregard to what happens to people there, so it is important that the constituency has an identity, and also the constituency is roughly the same sort of socioeconomic factor, because the worst thing you want as your MP, is somebody, I think one of the parties, I cannot remember which one it is, proposed, you have, for want of a better word, an affluent area and a socially

deprived area at the bottom, and it creates problems – we have seen those before – when you have the same MP trying to represent two diverse opinions. Yes, they will do a good job, they will do their best, but it is very difficult for the MP to argue so dramatically against --- regardless of what party they are, against something that might be better for one side than the other side, so therefore, it must be something equal, and also, it must be something that a community can feel in there.

I live in Pinner, and the good thing about the proposed constituency of North Harrow and Northwood is, my children went to school and they stayed in the school area, Nower Hill, which a lot of people do go to, and the sort of thing there, and to go to a part of the constituency which has no meaning whatsoever, it is not very, very --- Because all your friends and all your social peers live in that area, and to divide them, I think it is important to keep it together. Historically, there has been a lot more connection between Pinner, where I live, and Hatch End, historically and socially, and what have you, and it will be absurd, in my view, to try and break those up. Someone, a gentleman I do not know, I missed his speech, was talking about the communications link, which is vital that you are able to get around the communications easily. In the proposed one, you have a number bus called H12, this is something you might be familiar with, that goes right through the constituency, and you are able to basically get anywhere in the constituency and have a thing. Yes, we want diversity but we also want some, sort of similarities, so people have something in common rather than a hotchpotch, or wards or what-have-you, put together. Sorry, I am not used to these sort of public speaking, sort of ---

Basically, all I say is, bear in mind local people's views, and not give it some sort of name no one's ever heard of, or some sort of name that happened in the past, like, not in our London area, but something like Rutland or Wessex, where no one has, unless you have done history, you have no idea what it means. Actually, just keep it something that is relevant to the people, has a community link, people identify with it, and is roughly the same area. That is all I want to say. Unless you have got any questions. I am not sure how these things work.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine, and ---

MR WALIA: And I have not got any speeches that I can give to you, just, basically, so --
-

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, that is fine. We have recorded what you said, and you spoke eloquently, and I think you made a number of key points about the community cohesion, and understanding and identity, so thank you for that. Are there any matters of ---? Well, thank you very much indeed.

Is Kanta Mistry present? Oh, yes. Right. Would you like to come and speak? Thank you very much, and yes, if you would just introduce yourself by your name and address, please. Thank you.

CLLR MISTRY: (Conservative) Thank you. I am Kanta Mistry. I live at 81 Winchester Avenue in Kingsbury, north-west London. I am here representing --- I am also --- in several capacities. I am Chairman of the Brent North Conservative Association. I am also a former local councillor for Brent Queensbury ward. Also, currently, Chair of the Roe Green Junior School, and a former member of the governing body at the Village School as well, in Brent, and also, currently, I am the secretary to the Friends of Eton Grove Park in Queensbury, which represents all the residents between Brent and Harrow, and across all the wards, in fact, and we have had several events getting people, over 1000 and 1500 people together.

So, anyway, I am just here on one proposal, the Commission proposal for Kenton seat. At the moment, what the Boundary Commission is proposing is that Harrow is Queensbury, Edgware, Kenton East, Kenton West, and Belmont, and from Brent side, you have got Queensbury, Kenton, Fryent and Barnhill. My proposal for the Conservatives supporting the alternative is not very much different, but to bring in the community cohesion part of the situation, I propose Harrow keep Queensbury, Kenton East, Kenton West, and Greenhill and Harrow-on-the-Hill, and from Brent side, Kenton, Queensbury, Northwick Park and Preston, and I would like to put to the Commission the strong geographical links between Kenton East and both Queensbury wards of Brent and Harrow, and ensure that long established community links are not split, nor destroyed, and I really do believe in community cohesion across both the boroughs.

The proposal I am making to support the Conservative proposal is that the Kenton ward is based along the whole length of Kenton Road, which has strong geographical links between east and both Queensbury wards. The residents at both ends of Kenton Road, from Queensbury end and the Northwick Park and Harrow-on-the-Hill end, enjoy the facilities all along the Kenton Road, especially the Sainsbury's superstore, all the different multicultural fruit and veg shops, and restaurants and bars and café. The Kenton wards, Northwick Park, Greenhill and Harrow-on-the-Hill wards, all directly adjoin the Kenton Road. As Greenhill is the next ward on the Kenton Road to Kenton West, and is the opposite side of Kenton Road to Northwick Park, followed by Harrow-on-the-Hill, these all form a natural community of interest and makes logical sense, so these communities are joined up. Northwick Park Hospital will be a focal point of the Kenton constituency and this is really important as the hospital for this part of the world, for this part of north-west London, is a key establishment for medical services.

Preston ward has the major part of the ward as the South Kenton Estate and looks to the Kenton wards for all its community facilities and shops. I know, because I work there and I used to travel up. So I believe that Preston ward is there for a natural fit, for

the Kenton wards. Now, the alternative --- our alternative proposal will provide the strong links in transport for commuters. The Jubilee Line links Queensbury and Kingsbury, which are effectively the two Queensbury wards, and commuters at the present have a convenient and efficient connection to the Metropolitan Line at Wembley Park in both directions, north to Harrow-on-the-Hill and south to the city and the West End. The Metropolitan Line links Preston Road, Northwick Park, and Harrow-on-the-Hill stations. This very effectively links Preston, Northwick Park, and Harrow-on-the-Hill. It is really important, these links. Furthermore, the Bakerloo Line links South Kenton, just up the road, to Kenton, and combines Preston and Kenton wards, and I really do believe that transportation links between the --- for the Kenton proposal is very important, almost vital.

I have lived in Queensbury for over 38 years and so in terms of schools, I would like to point out to the Commission that Claremont High, Kingsbury High, and St Gregory's Secondary Schools take in children from a wide area across the Brent and Harrow Kenton areas, and this has created a natural communities and developed lots of joint cultural and sporting events, and this is one of the areas that you actually come to for all kinds of events here, it does not matter what denomination, what ethnic minority community, religion, shape, size, you are. Your focal point of all the communities. Now, we enjoy a lot of places of worship. There are a number of religious institutions that cover the Brent and Harrow links in this area, namely Kenton Temple for Hindus, All Saints Catholic Church, Kenton Baptist Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, and the Kenton Synagogues, all provide services for worshippers from all over the area. Now, St Luke's Hospice is based on the Kenton Road, and this provides a service across the wider Kenton area, and the hospice is easily accessible by bus from the Queensbury and Kingsbury area, and is also walking distance for most families, and same applies from Northwick Park, Harrow-on-the-Hill and Greenhill end, to the hospice.

Now, bus routes, as I said earlier, are vital and an important ingredient to our alternative proposal. Kenton ward has excellent bus facilities, such as the 114, which connects Queensbury, Kenton, Harrow and towards Northwick Park, and we also have the 183. Not brilliant on bus services but roughly, I know, because I have travelled on these, and I also know the 204 literally joins Preston from Wembley Hill Road at the top, where the Preston ward begins, Kenton through to Kingsbury, down Kingsbury Road and along Stag Lane and into Queensbury, all joined-up thinking, in my view. Now, buses such as H3, H10, H19, which I have travelled on, requires just one change to connect towards Queensbury from Harrow-on-the-Hill. Again, this is quite good, because you stop off, and you, you know, people meet, and it is all joined up by community work and community thinking.

May I also point out to the Boundary Commission all the strong links, community links, between Fryent, Barn Hill, and Welsh Harp? Now, these wards enjoy excellent joint facilities in easy access to the Asda superstore, the Lidl discount store is easily accessible from Barn Hill, Welsh Harp and Fryent. The library facilities at Brent Civic

Centre, the Ark Academy, Elvin Ark Academy, formerly called the Copland High School, along Wembley Road. Now, all these schools take children from across all these wards, which I have just said, Barn Hill, Fryent and Welsh Harp, and they are all within walking distance or a short bus ride. Now, currently, the residents already form communities with and through the various places of worship, including Wembley and Ealing Mosques for people of Muslim faith, including Ealing Road, Wembley Hindu Temple and the Neasden Temple for Hindu faith residents, and for all the Christian faiths, there are various. We have the English Martyrs Roman Catholic Church, the Wembley Church of Christ, St Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, I think you have got the Park Lane Methodist Church, which is not far from Barnhill, and the Wembley Christian Church, which is accessible by Barnhill, and Welsh Harp and Fryent residents, walking distance or short bus ride. It is a fact that Kingsbury Road is a natural boundary between Fryent and Queensbury. Therefore I am proposing that Fryent and Barn Hill are placed in the Wembley and Neasden constituency, and in fact, Northwick Park and Preston remain part of the Kenton constituency for the reasons that I have just been talking about earlier on.

I used to personally work at Copland High School, now the Elvin Ark Academy on Wembley Road, in Wembley, for more than 23 years, just up till about two-and-a-half years ago, and during these years, I saw really, really strong community links between Wembley Central, Alperton, Sudbury and Tokyngton. Now, religious ties, I have already mentioned earlier on, and during my experience, during --- that school, at Copland High School, all the children of all the multi faiths used to come together to enjoy all the different festivals and cultural activities such as the school assemblies, which I think is really important, actually, especially when you look at the diverse community of Brent and Harrow, and during these assemblies, the children had an opportunity to showcase the best of their origins, their foods, their culture, their clothes, and it really did bring a sense of togetherness. Now, this, I believe, in my opinion, brought out and developed all the competitive natures in kids, because kids love saying, "I'm the best at this", or "I'm the best at that", you know, and I think you just brings them and makes them into good mature adults as well. At the school at Copland, we used to organise joint fashion shows across other schools, school facilities were open to all the communities, so again, parents came and met each other. Now, most of the children, which is really, again, important, I keep going on about the buses and trains, and the transport --- most of the children travel by the school bus or walk from these areas, and I think, sometimes, the free school bus pass is not a good idea. It makes them lazy. They walk to two or three bus stops when they should be really walking, actually, but there again, that is my personal opinion, but the school facility, the school buses, and the transport facilities are there.

I have, like I said, lived in the area for over 38 years. I also lived in Kilburn. I feel very passionate about what I have just explained to you, why I support the whole of the Kenton ward constituency with the two ward changes, and also it does not really impact very much to the Boundary Commission's proposal in that it keeps the communities

together, we can still keep the Kenton name together, and we are very much in line with what the Boundary Commission are thinking as well.

Now, I just wanted to say, thank you for giving me this opportunity to put my alternative proposal forward to the Commission. Thank you. I have got a few draft notes, if you would like to have a copy. (Same handed.)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That would be helpful, yes. No, splendid, thank you very much indeed. That is most helpful. Now, any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

Is Aghileh --- oh. Brilliant. Right. Would you like to come forward? Thank you, and if you would just introduce yourself by name and address, please? Thank you.

DR DJAFARI MARBINI: So, my name is Aghileh Djafari Marbini. I am a member of the public and as you can see, quite heavily pregnant, but this is quite important.

So, I am here in particular around the issue of Marlborough ward, and the connection with Stanmore or the connection with Harrow. So, I am very much talking in a personal capacity, so the majority of the points I will be raising are issues around my family and how Harrow works. So, about two years ago --- so, I have been based in Harrow with my parents for the past 20 years, but then I moved to South Hampstead with my husband and about three years ago, we went to the US, and then we moved back to Harrow, particularly to be based in Harrow.

We rented for a while in the Harrow-on-the-Hill/South Harrow area in Ford Close, but we were looking to buy a house to be specifically to be part of the Harrow community, so we both use the St George's and St Anne's and Harrow and Wealdstone shops very regularly, on a regular basis. My husband and I both work in town, close to Euston, so we both use, frequently, Harrow and Wealdstone station, and Harrow-on-the-Hill station, so both of these. We see ourselves more of Harrow community people, and our transport links are completely towards Harrow. I use the mental health service in Bentley House, which is in Harrow and Wealdstone. As a family, we use Northwick Park Hospital frequently. My three-and-a-half year-old son has an ultrasound appointment on 3 November, as it happens, at Northwick Park Hospital. That is our local hospital. That is what we see it as. We use the bus route 186 at Borrowdale Avenue. It is always towards Harrow. We hardly --- in fact, I cannot remember the last time we went towards Stanmore. Although geographically it looks as if, you know, it might look to people as if Stanmore is really close to us, but we actually see ourselves as part of Harrow community and it would be quite sad for us if, all of a sudden, all of the services that we use are part of a different arrangement to where we live.

The GP surgery that we use is GP Direct in West Harrow, and that, I mean, I really do not know how --- what would work out in terms of the CCG, and whether, you know, this

would impact the CCG arrangements and whether, you know, that would mean --- this commission would mean that this provider would be a different provider or not, I do not know about that. Also, we are a part-Muslim, part-Anglican household so I use, my son and I, use the Harrow Central Mosque, which is right in the middle of Harrow, and my husband uses the St Mary's Church of England Church on the Hill, so that is how we are connected to the Hill.

Just generally, I would like to say that yes, I mean, I cannot be --- we have moved halfway across the world and, you know, from South Hampstead to be part of Harrow community, and all of our neighbours, as far as --- and I have been paying attention, actually, to the movements, and because I have just come off on maternity leave and I have been asking our neighbours about what services to use, how often do they go to Stanmore. At least three or four neighbours around us, I do not know anyone who goes to Stanmore for shopping, or their GP. Most of the people --- in particular, GP practices are based in Harrow, so this is my main point about why I would like Marlborough to very much remain with the Harrow side. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That was very clear. Thank you very much indeed. Any matters for clarification? No? In which case, thank you ever so much. That is great.

Come forward and again, introduce yourself, please, by name and address.

MR KERR: Good afternoon. My name is Allan Kerr. I live in the current constituency of Hampstead and Kilburn. I live at 189 Goldhurst Terrace, NW6. I would like to speak about the new boundary that is proposed to be put down Kilburn High Road.

I am speaking in a personal capacity and as a local resident. I have lived in the area for nearly 40 years, 20 years of which I have lived very near Kilburn High Road, so I would describe Kilburn as my local community, and I want to express my concern about the proposal to divide Kilburn High Road in two with the new boundary, and I think there are three points I would like to make, to try and put the case for retaining the current Brent wards. The earlier speaker put it more eloquently than I can when he spoke about the importance of identity and social mix in the community, but I would like to steal those words and say that they are extremely important.

Now, firstly, I see Kilburn High Road as my local town centre. I and my friends, and residents we use the shops, the restaurants, the cinema, the library, on both sides of the road. We have three large supermarkets, we have Sainsbury's, Marks and Spencer, and Lidl, so that, for us, is the focal point. Those shops represent the focal point for the Kilburn community. We have a local newspaper, the Kilburn Times; the articles in the Kilburn Times are about activities on both sides of Kilburn High Road, so it defines Kilburn community.

Secondly, we have a large number of community organisations, in fact, well over a hundred, but let me just point five in your direction. First of all, there is the London Irish Centre, which the local Irish community use. That is the local Irish community from both sides of Kilburn High Road. We do have a neighbourhood forum. Again, that neighbourhood forum draws on public from both sides of Kilburn High Road. We have two large local churches. Both those churches, the congregations, again, come from both sides of Kilburn High Road. We have Kilburn Football Club and membership of Kilburn Football Club is again drawn from both sides of the High Road. They are very keen to become in the Premier League. That is something to look forward to in the future, like Leicester, and then finally, there is of course the Kilburn Older People's Partnership, which draws on older residents like myself, so you will see that the Kilburn organisation, the community organisations, are all focused around Kilburn High Road, and we see that as our, if you like, village centre.

Finally, there are the demographic similarities. If you look at property prices in the Brent ward, and property prices in the Camden ward, they are broadly similar in their profile. The median income on both sides is roughly £34,000 and finally, the largest ethnic community are the Irish, who again live on both sides. For those reasons, I think it is inappropriate to have the new boundary down the centre of Kilburn High Road, and I would very much like to see the retention of the Brent wards in the new constituency, if that is possible. I would like to make a technical point, if I may, and that is to say that I understand that, from reading some of the background papers, that boundary changes should adhere as much as possible to the current boundaries, so it would be appropriate to incorporate the Brent wards rather than the Barnet ones in meeting this criteria.

Finally, could I just mention Childs Hill, where as a young man, I did live for five years, so I was a part of the local community there, and I struggle to understand the, sort of, contiguous community that could possibly exist between the Camden wards and Hampstead Garden Suburb. I see Hampstead Garden Suburb and the Childs Hill ward having more of a focal point around Golders Green. Again, they have a large supermarket, they have a theatre, so for those reasons, I would like first to argue that the boundary down Kilburn High Road is inappropriate and secondly to say again that perhaps Childs Hill and Hampstead Garden Suburb are not a natural part of the new constituency. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any matters for clarification? Would you hold on just one second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the 2011 Census, the Kilburn ward had a 50 percent BME population, so just a clarification of the fact that it is a majority Irish population, but the Census results just do not return that, and we can provide that information for you, for the Commission.

MR KERR: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. Thank you very much. The points were clearly made. Thank you.

CLLR RUTTER: I am Lisa Rutter, and have been Conservative Brunswick Park ward councillor since May 2006, and Mayor of the London Borough of Barnet 2011-12. The proposed Chipping Barnet boundary changes are going to split Brunswick Park ward and East Barnet ward from each other into different constituencies. I believe this is wrong, as historically, Brunswick Park ward and East Barnet ward have always been connected. A couple of years ago, the East Barnet Residents' Association raised an issue about the preservation of the trees in Russell Lane, which is in Brunswick Park ward. This raised a number of other issues, and working with the Hendon Library archives, and Friern Barnet Local Historical Society, and local historians, I organised an information board to be installed in Russell Lane to commemorate the history of the area, which includes East Barnet and Brunswick Park ward. The information board shows builders involved in the construction of the Gallants Farm estate in 1935-36. In fact, Gallants Farm Road stretches between Brunswick Park ward and East Barnet ward. The East Barnet Residents' Association is a very active association, dealing with the interests of East Barnet and Brunswick Park ward residents. We also share East Barnet and Brunswick Park issues at Safer Neighbourhood Team ward panel meetings. Brunswick Park ward is part of the parish of East Barnet. The St Mary the Virgin Church of the East Barnet parish is located in Brunswick Park ward. The East Barnet parish straddles between East Barnet and Brunswick Park, proving our close association with East Barnet for many years. Brunswick Park ward also has an overlapping school catchment area in Churchill School, while Monkfrith School catchment stops at the present constituency boundary. In turn, East Barnet cannot be separated from High Barnet or Oakley wards. Residents consider themselves to be part of New Barnet, which covers all three wards.

Whilst parts of Brunswick Park have links to Southgate, this is not the case for the whole ward, and certainly not the case for East Barnet village. There is also a natural geographical dividing line between Brunswick Park ward and the Southgate constituency, at present, with main roads, Waterfall Road, Chase Side and an overground portion of the Tube line. This is not the case for the Commission's proposed boundary. The North London Business Park, currently the administrative centre for Barnet Council, is also situated in Brunswick Park ward. It is a known local landmark and local employer and it would be natural for it to remain part of a Barnet constituency, and for me to be able to work with the Barnet MP.

As a local councillor, I have found it productive to work on cross-borough issues with my colleagues on the council and with an MP representing Barnet wards. I run a charity called Dementia Club UK, and have been setting up dementia clubs to support those with dementia and their families across the Borough, and it has been helpful to

approach companies for sponsorship as a Barnet councillor in a Barnet constituency supported by a Barnet MP.

It is important for me that Brunswick Park remains with its neighbours in Chipping Barnet with the Chipping Barnet constituency wholly inside the Borough of Barnet. It is therefore in my view important that the Brunswick Park and East Barnet wards remain together and in the Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any matters for clarification? Is it possible to have a copy of your paper?

David Douglas, would you like to come now? Yes, we have got a gap, so that would be great.

MR DOUGLAS: David Douglas, Conservative agent for Hampstead and Kilburn Conservatives, speaking on behalf of the support of the Hampstead and Kilburn, and Holborn --- sorry, Hampstead and Golders Green, Holborn and St Pancras, and Queen's Park and Regent's Park, and Cities of London and Westminster constituencies. I would like to just stick to the Hampstead and the Queen's Park ones when I am speaking, give the whole lot to you, because of length of time.

Hampstead has been the basis of a constituency since 1885, first as Hampstead and then as Hampstead and Highgate, and now as Hampstead and Kilburn. At its core has been the seven wards of the London Borough of Camden: Belsize, Fortune Green, Frognal and Fitzjohns, Hampstead Town, Kilburn, Swiss Cottage, and West Hampstead. We strongly support the Commission's proposals to preserve a single seat covering this community.

The area is almost coterminous with the former Borough of Hampstead. The former borough has retained its common identity and often feels distant from Camden Town Hall, although the old Metropolitan Borough of Hampstead is not quite large enough to support one MP, we wish to support the Commission in keeping it united and linking it with the communities with which it has strong links.

Only since 2010 has Hampstead been included in a seat with three wards from the London Borough of Brent. This has been an anomalous union, comprising two separate communities in one constituency. The two sections are divided by the A5, a major artery out of London that separates the boroughs. While both sides of the road are called Kilburn, the busy nature of the A5 means that they have developed into separate identities, with the communities looking away from the A5, not to it as a focal point. In Brent, Salisbury Road, in the Queen's Park ward has become the community focal point, as is dealt with in our submission later on. Unusually for such a small geographical area, Kilburn has two libraries, one on either side of the road. If it was a single community, there would be one. Local newspapers reflect the community that

Hampstead and Golders Green shares. The constituency closely follows the area covered by the Hampstead and Highgate Express, which reports on stories from Kilburn High Road as far as Highgate Village and the suburb. The "Ham and High" does not publish stories from the Brent side of Kilburn. Its sister paper, the Brent and Kilburn Times, does not publish stories from the Camden side of Kilburn. The other newspapers that cover the Hampstead and Kilburn seat is the Camden New Journal. This covers no stories from the Brent side of the road. Together, these publications ensure that there is a single demos across Golders Green, in a way that Hampstead and Kilburn lacks.

Alternative proposals for Hampstead have been circulated. These include splitting the old Borough of Hampstead in half, placing Belsize and Hampstead Town in one seat and Frognal, Swiss Cottage and West Hampstead wards in a seat that extends deep into Brent. It would significantly dilute the voice Hampstead has in parliament. Moreover, it would cut Hampstead Village in half, via a route that is predominantly composed of residential roads. The border would be a north-south line, running from the West Heath down various roads to King Henry's Road, all of these small residential roads being no wider than one lane in each direction. The community's proposals avoid cutting this community in half.

Although only covering half the old Borough of Hampstead, the NW3 post district is one of the strongest identities of any postal district in the country. It is synonymous with Hampstead. It comprises the whole of Frognal and Fitzjohns, Belsize, and Hampstead Town, with large parts of Swiss Cottage. Dividing this up would undermine the natural identifier and confuse residents. Hampstead is blessed by a large number of amenity groups, including the Belsize Residents' Association, and the Heath and Hampstead Society, which have members across all three NW3 wards. People see themselves as Hampstead residents first and would be appalled at being split in half. The NW6 wards of the old Borough of Hampstead, Fortune Green, Kilburn and West Hampstead, and parts of Swiss Cottage, identify more as part, or a sister area, to Hampstead than they do to the London Borough of Camden. The location name West Hampstead, covering most of West Hampstead, Fortune Green and South Hampstead, covers most of Swiss Cottage. The names of community institutions: the Hampstead School is in Fortune Green ward, Hampstead Cemetery crosses the Fortune Green-Childs Hill border. Both Hampstead Synagogue and Hampstead Cricket Club are in the middle of West Hampstead. While the former Borough of Hampstead is a natural community, the most logistical extension of this would be to include the wards of similar characteristics: the Barnet ward of Childs Hill, and Hampstead Garden Suburb ward, and the Highgate ward of Camden, unite the communities based around Hampstead Heath. The major civic group for the area is the Heath and Hampstead Society, which draws members from across the new proposed constituency. Many national papers and local papers often refer to Hampstead Garden Suburb as Hampstead, which reflects an identity leading southwards to Hampstead Heath.

The Childs Hill border with Fortune Green and Frognal is a very soft border, comprising of residential streets, several residential roads cut seamlessly across it. Oak Grove, Ranulf Road, Platt's Lane and the West Heath Road. The Camden-owned Westcroft Estate crosses the border between at Fortune Green and Childs Hill, and has tenants in both boroughs. The southern half of Childs Hill looks naturally to West Hampstead, and the Hampstead School is metres from the Childs Hill border, and it is the main school for Childs Hill. The western part of Childs Hill is known as Cricklewood, as is the western third of Fortune Green ward. The proposed boundaries would give Cricklewood a stronger and more unified voice.

While the northernmost ward of the proposed constituency is called Garden Suburb, the area is properly and legally known as Hampstead Garden Suburb, indicating its close ties to Hampstead. The southern half of Hampstead Garden Suburb is identified by the Hampstead Heath extension and the Hampstead Golf Course. The names, which demonstrate its historical connection to Hampstead --- the main transport links from the suburb to central London are through the Northern Line. The bus routes run either through Hampstead Village or through Swiss Cottage via Finchley Road, which has meant that the main community and commercial links are to Hampstead Heath, Hampstead in the south, not Finchley to the north. Finchley is situated on the other side of the North Circular, a major urban highway that provides a hard boundary and is followed by the suburb for some length. Two areas, north of Hampstead, North End and Spaniards, are divided between Barnet Childs Hill ward and Suburb ward, respectively.

The Hampstead Town parts are separated from the rest of the ward by the Heath, but the area on both sides of it is considered part of Hampstead. You would unite them under these proposals. Highgate has long-standing links with Hampstead. It shares the local paper, the "Ham and High", and together, Hampstead and Highgate --- Hampstead Town cover the heath properly in its entirety, with the Hampstead Garden Suburb covering the northern extension of the Heath. They were also part of the Hampstead and Highgate constituency for 27 years from 1983 to 2010. We therefore believe Highgate is the most natural extension of a Hampstead-based constituency. We support the Commission for the appropriate reasons. We would, however, recommend that the name of the seat be changed, because we feel that it is anomalous to have Golders Green in a seat when Golders Green itself is proposed to go into a Hendon constituency. We would therefore recommend that the constituency be named Hampstead and the Garden Suburb. This would clearly indicate there is a larger area, not just Hampstead, and it would not confuse the residents of Golders Green.

Regarding Queen's Park and Regent's Park, we support the Commission's proposals to include the Brent wards of Queen's Park and Kilburn from Hampstead and Kilburn into a new seat of Queen's Park and Regent's Park. Queen's Park in Brent and Queen's Park in Westminster share many similarities, such as they are only distinguishable by the otherwise use of an apostrophe. The current border between Queen's Park in Brent

and Westminster is the easily crossed Kilburn Lane, which is just one-lane traffic in each direction. Kilburn Lane terminates at Queen's Park tube, which is a major transport hub for both Queen's Park ward and much of Brent's Kilburn ward. The Queen's Park farmers' market, and Salisbury Road, located in Queen's Park, have become the major shopping focus for Westminster's Queens Park ward as well. Kilburn ward in Brent is made of two different sections. The northern three polling districts identify with Queen's Park. Most of the residents see Salisbury Road in Queen's Park as their main shopping centre. It contains the Kilburn Library, Kilburn Police Station, the farmers' market, and Queen's Park Station on the Bakerloo line, which is the main transport hub for the area. These features draw them naturally away from the Kilburn High Road. The southern half of Brent's Kilburn ward is the South Kilburn, or Carlton Vale, estate. They are geographically and economically tied to the West Kilburn area, which is currently situated in Westminster, in the Harrow Road ward. Its southern point is at Shirland Road, where the Malvern Road shopping parade meets Shirland Road. This is a natural focal point. There are no direct bus links from this area to Hampstead itself. This area would be much better serviced by an MP who is able to concentrate on the needs of the area, and not, as currently, a salient point cut off from the current constituency.

Finally, as the summary, we believe that the Commission has produced seats that are better suited to represent the communities in the area that are covered by the present constituencies of Hampstead and Kilburn, and Holborn St Pancras. It has been our primary aim to keep one seat centred on the long-identifiable communities of Hampstead, and one of Camden Town, as possible. The Commission has retained these community ties and expanded them to include areas with strong links to the new constituency. The Queen's Park, Kilburn, Brent and Brondesbury and Holborn and Covent Garden wards all have strong communities in the new seats, with which the Commission proposes.

We propose that the names of the two constituencies be changed to reflect the modern community identification. In place of Golders Green, we propose Hampstead and the Garden Suburb, and in place of Holborn and St Pancras, we propose Camden and Tufnell Park. We are pleased to support the Boundary Commission's proposals.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. It is very helpful. I think you said you are giving me the --- That is fantastic. (Same handed.) Lovely. Thank you. That is very helpful indeed. Any matters for clarification? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I understand your point about Golders Green. Could you clarify which council ward Golders Green Tube station is in?

MR DOUGLAS: Golders Green Tube station is in the Childs Hill ward.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you. That is extremely helpful, having these points elucidated in this way. Thank you. Right. Do we have another speaker?

Our next booked speaker is 3.50 pm, so I suggest we adjourn for a period till that time. Thank you.

Time Noted: 3.03 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 3.50 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen. We will reconvene this afternoon's session, and we have a speaker. It is Mr Jaggs, I believe. If you would like to come forward, Sir, and if you speak from here, and if by way of introduction ---

MR JAGGS: Was there not a lady before me? She has left?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. No, that is fine. She was, but I ---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, she left the room.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, you ---

MR JAGGS: I do not want her to miss her turn.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No. All right. Fine. How polite. Chivalry is not dead. That is marvellous. All right. So, would you like to come forward? Yes. Smashing, and if you would just introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin, please. Thank you.

MS KUMARAN: Hi. I am Uma Kumaran, a resident of Harrow for 30 years; first lived in Rayners Lane for the first 18, then Pinner. I am actually in between postcodes. So, at the moment, I am at HA5 3SH, but I have just re-registered in HA4, so I do not know if it will come up in Hillingdon. Do you need my whole address? 2 Westerley Court, HA4 6QL. Thanks.

So, a resident of Harrow for 30 years; just moved to Hillingdon, but not far from Rayners Lane, where I first am, and I was the 2015 Parliamentary candidate in Harrow East; also, political advisor for the Local Government Association, so I am quite familiar with councils and boundaries.

I am here speaking from a community perspective, having lived in Harrow, first Rayners Lane and then Pinner, and still in Harrow East. I think the current boundary proposals are counter to how the community is currently made up. Primarily, actually, I would focus on the schools and amenities in some of these areas.

So, as it stands, the proposals divide along school boundary lines where people have moved to, so if they have siblings, if parents have children who have siblings in schools, it actually takes them out of catchment areas for certain schools. In Pinner, where we have just lived, we have a medical centre, Pinner Medical Centre, which is linked to many of the residents there, which would be removed and moved into another boundary. I do not think that is practical at the moment. Where I am, or where I was, on Pinner Hill Road, is already out of the catchment for that medical centre. It is less than a mile away, and it was already out of the catchment, so if that shifts any further, I am not sure what will happen for residents there.

Hatch End, Pinner, Pinner South, Northwood, is generally clustered together. I would say those are the links that people mostly use. There is the H12 bus route that runs along that stretch, takes you into Stanmore and connects into Harrow Weald and Wealdstone. Rayners Lane, again, is very much part of, as it stands, Harrow West. Harrow is already an interesting borough, I would say, because if you lived in Harrow, you know where South Harrow is, you know where West Harrow is, you do not particularly know what Harrow East is. It does not --- colloquially, you do not mention Harrow East. You either say Stanmore, so it does make sense that there is a Stanmore section, now, being discussed, but removing some of the traditional parts of Harrow West and moving it into there demographically does not make sense either, for people who are moving to either be close to their families for certain schools, or for medical facilities or else. In terms of local amenities, Hatch End has got the Harrow Arts Centre, which is a really integral part of Harrow. That is where I first learned to swim, when I was in primary school, so it is a big part of the heritage of the borough. I would strongly suggest keeping that and Hatch End and Pinner all within the same remit. It makes a lot of sense for lots of the locals. The current proposal --- I know there is a counter-proposal at the moment for South Harrow and Sudbury, which to me, makes sense in terms of having lived around there but also having door-knocked and things like that. It does make sense. Residents see themselves as that same area. They see the people living there as their neighbours. If you break it up into --- if you move Sudbury back into Brent, I do not think that will divide Harrow as fairly as I think is practical either.

I think South Harrow and Sudbury constituency makes a lot of sense as well, in terms of Northwick Park Hospital, which is the primary hospital that serves Harrow and Brent at the moment. It is actually coming under Brent, but most people in Harrow would not be able to tell you that. They would probably assume it is in the Borough of Harrow itself, so in terms of that being another amenity that services the whole borough, I would take that into consideration.

There are other local services as well, like there is Harrow town centre, which is linked by bus routes and by travel routes for people that live in and around the area. It is also well connected by the Tube and the Metropolitan Line, and the centre of Harrow is undergoing regeneration at the moment, which --- I think a lot of people are moving to be here, or to be around their friends and family, and again, dividing that up would not make too much sense.

In terms of council services, at the moment, Harrow is already divided into Hillingdon. The London Borough of Harrow and actually, along here, Brent as well, so people already understand who their councils are, who their councillors are, who provides their services, their bin collections, et cetera. I think breaking the borough up in non-traditional boundary lines would further confuse residents and also disrupt services, and I do not think people need that disruption. We have already had boundary changes along here, and I do not think it would be particularly helpful, so I would support a new proposal of South Harrow and Sudbury constituency, or Sudbury base. I think the new proposals for Stanmore and Harrow East seem okay, but I think the breaking up of Harrow West as it stands does not make too much sense, just in terms of community, and where people would naturally think certain wards and boundaries fall. Certainly if you have been a long-time resident, if you look at some of these proposals, they do not really make too much sense. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes? You are going to introduce yourself, are you not?

MS LUMLEY: Yes. Sure. My name is Lizzie Lumley, from the Conservative Party. Just to be very clear, as the Labour parliamentary candidate for Harrow East in 2015, I just want to be --- just to clarify that you support breaking it up into four different seats under the Labour Party proposals?

MS KUMARAN: I do not think that the way the Labour Party have --- yes, as it is, but I think it does actually make sense, because Kenton is currently divided into Brent Kenton and Harrow Kenton. Lots of residents living there do not entirely understand what is what, and they do not know why one half of the road is Brent and one half is Harrow. It would make more sense to put the Kentons together, in my opinion.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you very much indeed. That is very helpful. Thanks. Now, would you like to come forward and speak now, Sir? Thank you.

MR JAGGS: Thomas Jaggs, and as a resident, making representation regarding the proposed constituency number 54, Queen's Park and Regent's Park. 27A Victoria Road, Kilburn, London NW6 6SX.

Perhaps, learning from the previous speaker, a long-term resident of the Brent locality, coming on to the discussion that the new constituency will have 11 wards, only two of which are Brent, and the rest will be Westminster, so that is a change. As a long-term resident, all my life in NW6, I have had, in the same two addresses, three different constituencies, so I am currently Hampstead and Kilburn, under Labour, which was a tightly fought election, I think, with Tulip Siddiq, and then before that, it was Glenda Jackson, and then it changed before that to being Brent East, although we were in the southern part of the Brent borough, so it is big changes in my lifetime. The current iteration spans Kilburn High Road, which I will try and point to. It is the A5 from Marble Arch, Hyde Park, going up Maida Vale, Kilburn High Road, and on the east side is Camden and on the west side here is Brent, and the current borough spans that boundary from Queen's Park, or from Kensal Rise, all the way across to Camden and West Hampstead, and Hampstead proper (indicating). So, as anyone would know, perhaps the A5 is blighted by traffic and betting shops, and chicken shops, and it is a boundary line and I think it has suffered in the past from that, the two boroughs not, perhaps, in proper dialogue. Currently we have an MP that spans that area; even had an office on the High Road, so that profile has raised the profile of the area, and there is work to try and improve it as a neighbourhood area.

The new changes, looking at the map, again, taking Queen's Park as far as Kensal Rise, NW10, almost, and then zoom right across to Zone 1, in Baker Street, Madame Tussauds. So I do not think, back to the previous speaker, in the mental space of myself and my neighbours, I do not consider myself to be someone who lives in Regent's Park, let alone, you know, Madame Tussauds' doorstep. Admittedly, the Tube will take you on the Bakerloo Line, so the southern tip, I will point again, Paddington is written there, come across the Marylebone Road, you go past Marylebone station, which is excluded from the boundary area. Madame Tussauds is written there, and that is Baker Street station. Admittedly, a quarter of the territory is taken up by Regent's Park, which is unoccupied by --- you know, it is not lived in, and then we have got St John's Wood, Maida Vale. As I said, the marked area of Queen's Park and Kilburn, which is being, sort of, taken from, you know, inner suburb Zone 2, joined in with affluent, maybe, but certainly central London, so the point I raise before is that there are 11 wards, only two of which are Brent, so I do not know what kind of attention Brent will receive in the new arrangement, so I am contrary to the proposal and I think I am probably happy with the existing.

I am not aware of --- as the previous speaker mentioned, there are other proposals. I have not seen them, so I cannot really speak to those, but as a resident, I think the current proposal is not mentally a community I think of, or my neighbours think of, in as far as people in Queen's Park do not even think people south of the railway line are part of Queen's Park. There is already a division there of being, sort of, inner suburbs rather than inner city, and if I thought about the catchment areas of schools, I would have thought there is not a big bleed from Regent's Park and Baker Street to Queen's Park. I will concede that the major hospital, St Mary's, does come within Paddington and does

serve that area, but the new proposals, you know, disconnect us from across the A5, across Kilburn High Road, South Hampstead and --- I use facilities in Camden, libraries and so on, and obviously, as it happens, another affinity is that Regent's --- Queen's Park is maintained by the City of London authority, or Corporation, and so is Regent's -- - so is Hampstead Heath, and there will be, you know, social use of those two spaces, there is some affinity in that regard. So, as I see it, there are 11 wards, the majority in Westminster, yet 25 percent of the population in Kilburn and Queen's Park; that quarter of the population are in a different borough, in Brent. I am not sure how a newly elected Member of Parliament would represent the Brent aspect as well as a 50-50 split that we have at the moment with Kilburn being in Brent and Hampstead being in Camden borough. So, that is what I wanted to raise. Thank you very much for your time.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is clearly put, in terms of your concerns. Are there any matters arising for clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed.

Margery Hancock? Lovely. Would you like to come forward? If you would just like to introduce yourself by name and address, please.

MRS HANCOCK: Okay. Thank you. I am Margery Hancock, and it is 14 Barrow Point Avenue in Pinner.

I live in central Pinner, five minutes from the shopping area and the bus routes, and I am unhappy with the suggestion that Pinner and Hatch End should be in separate constituencies, as they are very much part of the one community.

This is Hatch End, there, and it looks like a nice square as it is, but actually, I have lived in my house for 38 years and during that time, I have shopped, used businesses in Hatch End, eaten in its restaurants, gone to the Arts Centre to yoga classes there, and further along the Uxbridge Road (indicating). I often walk or take the H12 bus to or from Hatch End station. I belong to a Pinner Women's Group, with many members in Hatch End, and I understand that any five-year-old living in my road would have to go to school, the primary school, in Hatch End. Those who live in Hatch End do feel part of Pinner. They come to Pinner to shop, to use the Pinner Medical Centre and other services, and they belong to Pinner organisations. So, in contrast, I have no sense of community with those wards in the south of the borough, which are West Ruislip, Manor, and Cavendish. I do not have any links there, and I hardly ever go to those areas. There is not very much in terms of public transport links to these areas from Pinner, and it seems unlikely that people living there would come to Pinner or feel that they have common cause with us.

The proposed boundary means that Pinner, Pinner South and Rayners Lane wards are placed in a constituency, all the rest of which is in the Borough of Hillingdon, and it is thus dominated by Hillingdon, and perhaps Hillingdon's interests. Harrow residents

account for under a third of the constituency, and I find that rather alienating. Now, I understand that you do not want just negative comments and would prefer some constructive suggestions, and for me, the Labour alternative proposals are preferable, because this would mean I belong to a constituency, Harrow North and Northwood, the majority of which is in the Borough of Harrow, and the area covered by the proposed Harrow North and Northwood constituency encompasses wards in which both my children went to FE college, Harrow College and Stanmore College, and they both travelled there by the H12 bus. There is a logic to Northwood and the northern part of Harrow being linked as a constituency, as there is a main arterial road, the Uxbridge Road, that runs from one end to the other, and it facilitates travel throughout it, and links the various elements, meaning, for example, that all parts of the constituency should be able to reach the Arts Centre within 15 to 20 minutes by car, outside of rush hour. The H12 bus route links Pinner and Stanmore through Harrow Weald, and there are bus links to Northwood via the H11 and to some extent the H13, and of course, the Met Line runs from Pinner to Northwood and Northwood Hills. Although Northwood is in Hillingdon, linking Pinner and Northwood makes sense if some sort of cross-borough constituency is essential. We have been in the same constituency since 2010, and it is relevant to me, because I travel through Northwood a couple of days a week, and I was a patient at the hospital there, Mount Vernon, for several years.

Turning briefly to a proposed adjacent constituency, it does seem strange to have Harrow-on-the-Hill ward and the two wards to the west of this, Roxbourne and Roxeth, linked with central Wembley and Alperton, with which I do not believe there is any sense of community, and one part will look to Harrow and another to Wembley, which is rather linking in with what the previous speaker was talking about, a sense of identity.

The Labour proposal to link most of the existing Harrow West constituency with a neighbouring part of North Brent appears, to me, to be a much better --- reflect community links. While the other elements of the Labour proposals are not so relevant to me, they appear to represent sensible and relatively cohesive groups of wards, and I do think it is unfortunate that any constituency has to encompass elements of more than one local authority, but it appears inevitable, if the driving force is the size of the electorate at a particular point in time.

I think all of us are concerned by the low turnout at elections, and it seems to me, for voting to be relevant, people have to have a sense of identity with the constituency in which they are voting. So, in conclusion, I hope you will give serious consideration to the Labour proposals, as they seem to me to produce groups of wards which most closely reflect community and transport links, and I feel that being in a constituency with Hatch End, Northwood and Stanmore better reflects the community in which I live than being linked to Ruislip Manor and West Ruislip.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you. That is helpful. Are there any matters of clarification? No? In which case, thank you very much indeed for your submission.

Anthony Molloy? Would you come forward, Sir? Thank you, and again, if you can introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin?

MR MOLLOY: Hello. Anthony Molloy, 47 Dyne Road, NW6 7XG, and I am from Hampstead and Kilburn Constituency Labour Party, Kilburn Brent branch.

In many ways, I find this constituency more coherent than the current Hampstead and Kilburn, and I am just going to talk about a little small detail, which concerns, I guess, the top, the north, the northernmost point. I think we have got the constituency boundary coming straight down Kilburn High Road, there (indicating). Despite what all the estate agents have done to try and wipe out Kilburn in the last 30 years, for example, in estate agents' maps, Kilburn barely exists; Queen's Park comes up to West Hampstead on one side and Maida Vale on the other, but believe me, Kilburn does exist. Yes, it is a community and it is quite a consistent and coherent one, and it is a community that would be completely split in two, or at least two-thirds, one-third, if you take the boundary down Kilburn High Road. All I am proposing is that you take the boundary at West End Lane. The demographic changes quite sharply, but where it changes, basically between posh and not so posh, but basically, where it changes is at West End Lane, not Kilburn High Road, and I just find it would be a much more coherent constituency if instead, the boundary went up to West End Lane, came down along Abbey Road, and up Belsize Road. That would include what we call the community. That would reunite what we call the community of Kilburn.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed, then. Can I just check if anyone wants to clarify any matters at all? In which case, thank you very much. That is helpful.

We will just have a few moments' adjournment while we wait for the next speaker, who has arrived, apparently.

Are you --- would you like to go on now? We will wait. So, we are fine. We are just going to carry on and wait for a few moments.

Time Noted: 4.15 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 4.17 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. So, we will reconvene, then. If you would like to come to the stand and introduce yourself. If you could give us your name and address to begin with, and then give your presentation. Okay? Thank you.

MS ISABELLE RAHMAN: My name is Isabelle Rahman. I live in South Harrow, and it is 8 Brook Avenue. I just wanted to speak about the proposal for the boundary changes. The proposal is that Wembley should be linked with Harrow-on-the-Hill. It takes three constituencies away from Harrow West, which is the constituency I currently live in. I do not think --- Harrow should stay as a unified location, because South Harrow is linked to Harrow-on-the-Hill. If you want to travel from South Harrow to Harrow, you always have to go via Harrow to get anywhere, so to separate these, I do not think is a good proposal.

Wembley and Harrow-on-the-Hill is geographically quite diverse. You are taking in elements of Brent and Harrow, which I am not sure are, kind of, like places, because Wembley has its own unique challenges, and Harrow has its unique challenges as well. I believe that Harrow should stay as much as the way it is, with Harrow West and elements of Harrow. Current: 67,427 voters in Harrow West. That just requires 7000 more, so would there not be a case of latching on a constituency that is nearer Harrow rather than something in Brent? So, there is also a link for Harrow and South Harrow staying together. You have a Tamil community that straddles both South Harrow and Sudbury. Wembley is, kind of, too remote. I work in Wembley as well, and live in South Harrow. It requires a journey for me to get to work, so having all of those elements in one borough, I do not think would work, because I think they are just too different and it is too big. While constituency-wise, I think it is fine, but in terms of geography, I think it is just too big. The Tory proposal is to link Harrow and Stanmore. I think that is an artificial one to benefit the Tories. I am not sure whether that works, in terms of constituency. I think, in my opinion, it is far better for South Harrow and Sudbury to stay together. It is near. You can actually walk from South Harrow to Sudbury, so in terms of closeness, I think that would be far better, and also, if the proposal to link Wembley and Harrow-on-the-Hill takes in two boroughs, so you would be dealing with two lots of administration, both Harrow and the Borough of Brent, which again, would have its own complications and its own problems, I believe, so I think there should be a re-looking at it to make it, the new constituency, to be as much --- to remain for Harrow West to remain more or less how it is, so that the integrity of Harrow stays as it is. I think that is it.

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

Our last registered speaker is due at 4.50 pm so I suggest we adjourn until that time, unless anyone comes through the door in the meantime. Thank you.

Time Noted: 4:21 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 4.47 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen. We will reconvene for our last speaker for this evening. Mr Boardman, if you would like to come forward and speak? Yes, from the lectern, please. No, that is fine, and if you start by introducing by way of your name and address.

MR BOARDMAN: Okay. I am Jack Boardman. I live at 29 Briardale Gardens, NW3 7PN, where I have lived for about 20 years, 22 years, and I am a member of the local neighbourhood forum, the Redfrog Forum.

So, I thought I would first talk about some of the Boundary Commission's current proposals for a Hampstead and Golders Green seat. So, I note that this includes two wards from Barnet, and I think there are a number of issues around the wards it includes. I mean, if you look at somewhere like Hampstead Garden Suburb, that is certainly, in many ways, an Outer London seat, rather than what is in Hampstead and Kilburn currently, which are generally quite Inner London wards. Some of that Hampstead suburb is, for example, mostly car users. There is about 1.24 cars per household, as I discovered, having a little look today, which is far, far more than you would expect anywhere else in the current constituency or indeed in the new constituency.

Wards like Hampstead Garden Suburb and Childs Hill are really, sort of, based around Golders Green as a community hub, which certainly nowhere else in the current constituency or indeed in the proposed constituency are focused around. There is a natural barrier, I believe, in terms of the Heath between Hampstead, you know, Hampstead town and from --- to some extent, certainly Highgate and Hampstead Garden Suburb ward, which I think is quite a sensible way to divide the constituency, and that to try and unite them over such a large natural barrier would not be advisable or sensible, or certainly would raise questions about the, sort of, unification of the communities.

I mean, I think Hampstead Garden Suburb is a more problematic addition than Childs Hill is, but I do --- obviously if one were to take out the Garden Suburb, it would leave Childs Hill as an orphan ward, and I know the Commission is keen to avoid those --- I was also then going to move on to what is happening to Kilburn in the current proposals. Obviously, I mean, I spend a fair amount of time in Kilburn. I mean, I live, I suppose, more around the Finchley Road, but if you are going for relaxation, Kilburn is a good place to go. You know, lots of restaurants and a large and vibrant community.

I think there is a very definite unified community in Kilburn, across both boroughs. I mean, in terms of the population, demographics, if you look at, you know, two Kilburn wards, for example, they are almost identical, almost exactly identical in terms of things like median household income. I believe they are both, sort of, around £34,000. All the things, like deprivation --- I mean, they have so many of the same characteristics, and, I mean, if you look at the population, I believe, according to the latest census, that the two countries outside of the UK where they each had the largest amount of people who had moved into Kilburn --- sorry, the country outside the UK which has had the most people who have moved into Kilburn, and all of Kilburn --- this is applicable to Kilburn (Brent), Kilburn (Camden), I believe Queen's Park, certainly West Hampstead and Fortune Green, is Ireland. There is, I still believe, a --- perhaps not as large as it once was, but there is a --- it has one of the larger Irish communities in London, I would say, and that is hopefully what, you know, the census data shows.

I believe that the Kilburn High Road is a more natural, sort of, community to unify, rather than trying to bring in wards across the Heath, across such a, you know, geographical boundary when one could go and get similar communities, communities who consider themselves to be part of, you know, a united Kilburn community into the same constituency and, you know, giving them the same representation.

I do want to --- I am sure there will have been a lot of conversation about Hampstead, and I mean, I --- you know, I have lived in Hampstead, in Frognal Fitz, so to what extent that is --- that would always be considered part of Hampstead is perhaps debated by some people there, and I would not want to venture comment, but I am --- you know, I would not want to see bits of Hampstead split up, but I mean, given the way that the boundary proposals do, sort of, quite severely restrict the Commission, I would say that arguments made around the needs of the old Borough of Hampstead perhaps may not have as much, sort of, purchase as they once did, because if you look at what happened in the last boundary changes, bits of what were the old Borough of Hampstead --- so you are talking about Southend ward, Adelaide ward, which were, sort of, wards in Camden before --- wards in what became Camden, but considered part of Hampstead Borough, were amalgamated into other wards, which now sit in the Holborn and St Pancras constituency. So, there are bits already of the old Hampstead borough in a constituency which is not Hampstead, and to pretend that we have to, sort of, keep this old borough united when it has already been --- bits of it have already gone to other places, would be, you know, somewhat perplexing.

I think there is also --- there are some points around transport links as well. I know the Commission is quite keen to consider transport links, and I would say there is probably four, sort of, hubs, you know, whether it is community hubs or transport hubs, in the current constituency. I see that to be, sort of, Haverstock Hill, where you have ---- which is, sort of, a community hub for areas like Hampstead and Belsize, where you have stations like Hampstead and Belsize Park, which are on the Northern Line, and that then goes down into places like Haverstock. Chalk Farm is the next station after

Belsize Park, for example, then Camden Town, et cetera, whereas Swiss Cottage, I mean, parts of West Hampstead and Fortune Green and speaking as somebody who has lived just off the Finchley Road for 22 years, and knows the area quite well, I would say that, to a large extent, Frognaal Fitz is --- sort of, uses the Finchley Road, Finchley Road station, and the road itself, as a transport link and a community hub, and obviously, Finchley Road is on the Jubilee Line and if you look, sort of, westwards as it were, on the Jubilee Line, you would find West Hampstead, which is also another hub in the community. West Hampstead ward, Fortune Green ward and Kilburn (Camden), and then, further on the Jubilee Line, you would have the, sort of, Kilburn High Road hub, and Kilburn Station, and, sort of, you know, Brondesbury Park, to some extent Queen's Park, Kilburn (Brent), the Kilburn (Camden) and the end bits of Fortune Green a bit, I suppose, and the Kilburn High Road, so I think there is a, sort of, a way of looking at the, you know, separate communities and the amalgamation on the basis of where they use as a community hub, I think that may be --- I will just check. I am afraid I have dropped my --- I rather scrawled my points. I did have them printed out but I have managed to lose that. That may be it, although I am happy to ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. Thank you very much indeed. I will just check if there are any points for clarification. No? In which case, thank you very much indeed, and thank you for coming a bit earlier.

I think we have no other scheduled speakers for this session, so I will call it to a close, and thank you for your attendance, and some of you I will doubtless see shortly in Kingston. Travel safely.

End of hearing

Time Noted: 4.56 pm

B

MRS BANTON..... 27, 28
MR BOARDMAN..... 72
CLLR BUTT 33, 34

C

CLLR CHARALAMBOUS..... 18, 20
CLLR HENSON..... 29

D

MR DOUGLAS 60, 63
MS DOWNS..... 44, 46, 47

E

DR EMMANUEL..... 24

F

MR FRAIS 43

G

CLLR GARDINER..... 40, 42
MR GARELICK.....14, 15, 17, 20
CLLR GOLDS..... 47

H

MRS HALAI..... 20
MRS HANCOCK 68
MR HARVEY 23, 24
CLLR HENSON..... 29,31
MRS HENSON 28, 29

J

MR JAGGS 64, 66

K

MS KUMARAN 64, 66
MR KERR..... 57, 59

L

MS LUMLEY 31, 66

M

CLLR MACLEOD-CULLINANE 10, 14, 15
DR MARBINI 56
CLLR MILLER9, 10, 13, 14
CLLR MISTRY 53
MR MOLLOY 70

N

CLLR NERVA 21

R

MR SHANIN RAHMAN 26
MRS ZAZMA RAHMAN 25
MS ISABELLE RAHMAN..... 71
CLLR RUTTER 59

S

MS TULIP SIDDIQ MP 35, 38
STOLL 38

T

CLLR TATTUM 2
MR TESSIER 2
THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER ...2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35,
38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74
MR GARETH THOMAS MP 3, 7, 8

U

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER.....8, 17, 35, 58, 63, 64

W

MR WALIA 51, 52

Y

CLLR YARDE 31

Z

MR ZAFFUR 42

