

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND**

**PROCEEDINGS**

AT THE

**2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND**

HELD AT

**HAVERING TOWN HALL, MAIN HALL, ROMFORD RM1 3BD**

ON

**MONDAY 31 OCTOBER 2016**

**DAY ONE**

Before:

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

---

Transcribed from audio by W B Gurney & Sons LLP  
83 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0HW  
Telephone Number: 0207 960 6089

---

At 10.00 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the hearing today. This is to listen to the initial proposals from the Boundary Commission for the new constituencies in the London area and for members of the public and others to make representations about their views on that.

My name is Howard Simmons. I am the Assistant Commissioner responsible for chairing the hearing today. I am supported by both my fellow commissioners, Emma Davy and Richard Wald, and by a team of Boundary Commission staff, led by Tim Bowden, who is on my right. Essentially, Tim will in a moment or two explain about the initial proposals and how people can make representations.

The hearing is over two days. Today's is from 10 am 'til 8 pm this evening. Tomorrow is from 9.00 until 5.00. We appear to have quite a busy schedule, quite a large number of people booked in. I should stress that the hearings today are for people to be able to make their representation not for cross-examination and not for challenge. If there are any questions for clarification, if you could please address those through me as the Chair of the session. We have time slots for people.

If others turn up and walk in, as they have done at other hearings, then I will endeavour to make time and room for that, but we can only hold the hearings over two days and we do have to finish at the given times, essentially. I will pass to Tim now to both explain about the Boundary Commission's proposals and to run through some administrative matters as well.

MR BOWDEN: Thank you very much indeed, Howard, and good morning. As Howard has mentioned, my name is Tim Bowden. I am Head of Reviews at the Commission and I am a member of the Commission's Secretariat staff. I am responsible for supporting the Commissioners in their role to recommend new parliamentary constituency boundaries.

At this hearing, I lead the team of staff responsible for ensuring that the hearing runs smoothly. As Howard has already stated, he will chair the hearing itself and it is his responsibility to run the hearing at his discretion and take decisions about speakers, questioners and timings. My team and I are here today to support Howard in carrying out his role, so please do ask any one of us outside of the hearing if you do require any help or assistance.

I would now like to talk about the Commission's initial proposals for the London region which were published on 13 September 2016. The Commission's proposals for this region are for 68 constituencies, a reduction of five. Our proposals leave four of the existing seats unchanged. We used the European electoral regions as a template for the allocation of the 499 constituencies to which England is entitled - that is not

including the two for the Isle of Wight.

This approach is permitted by the legislation and has been supported by previous public consultation. This approach does not prevent anyone from putting forward counter-proposals that include one or more constituencies being split between the regions, but it is likely that compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us to depart from the regional based approach we adopted in formulating our initial proposals.

In considering the composition of each European electoral region, we noted that it might not be possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties. The London region has been allocated 68 constituencies, a reduction of five from the current number, of which our proposals leave four of the 73 existing constituencies unchanged.

As it has not always been possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual London boroughs, we have grouped them into sub-regions. The number of constituencies allocated to each sub-region is determined by the electorate of the combined London borough totals. Of the existing constituencies, we propose to retain one in the borough of Havering, two in the borough of Richmond upon Thames and one in the borough of Kingston upon Thames.

Substantial change is required, however, through London in order to comply with the electoral quota. Consequently, it has been necessary to propose 68 constituencies that cross London boundaries. Of these, 36 contain part of two London boroughs and two contain parts of three or more London boroughs. In order to create 68 constituencies wholly within London, we have proposed one constituency, the Bow and Canning Town constituency, that crosses the River Lea.

We have not proposed any constituencies that cross the River Thames. The statutory rules allow us to take into account local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015. These include both the external boundaries of local councils and their internal boundaries, known as wards. We seek to avoid dividing wards between constituencies, wherever possible.

Wards are well-defined and well-understood units which are generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest. We consider that any division of these units between constituencies would be likely to break local ties, disrupt political party organisations and cause difficulties for electoral registration and returning officers who are responsible for running elections.

It is our view that only in exceptional and compelling circumstances will splitting a ward between constituencies be justified, and our initial proposals do not do so. If an alternative scheme proposes to split wards, strong evidence and justification will need to be provided and the extent of such ward splitting should be kept to a minimum. The scale of change in this review is significant and we look forward to hearing the views of

people at this hearing over the next two days and throughout the rest of the consultation period.

We are consulting on our proposals up and until and including Monday 5 December, so there is still time after today and tomorrow for people to contribute to us still in writing. There are also with us reference copies of the proposals present and they are also available on our website and in a number of places deposited around the region. You can make written representations to us through our consultation at [bce2018.org.uk](http://bce2018.org.uk). That is our website. I do urge everyone to submit written representations to us before the deadline of 5 December.

Finally, I would like to remind all participants that this hearing is part of the public consultation and you will be asked to provide us with your name and address if you make an oral representation. The Commission is legally obliged to take a record of the public hearings and, as you can see, just behind all of you probably to your right we are taking a video of the recording from which we will create a verbatim transcript.

The Commission is required to publish the record of the public hearing along with all written representations for a four-week period during which members of the public have an opportunity to comment on those representations. We expect this period to occur during the Spring of next year. The publication of the hearing records and written representations include certain personal data of those who have made representations. I, therefore, invite all those contributing to read the Commission's Data Protection and Privacy Policy, a copy of which we have with us and is also again available on our website.

Just before passing over to Howard, as Chair, to begin with the hearing, just a few notes. We are currently not expecting a fire alarm today, so, if one does go off, it is real. The exits are either through that door there or the meeting point in the car park at the rear or down through the main entrance to the council chamber and out through the front and it is just the other side of the lawn itself. If you do require the toilet during the day, again, it is just back out through the council chamber and they are all down the corridor opposite.

Finally, if you do have a mobile phone, which I am sure most of us in the room will do, can you please just put it on silent or vibrate. If you do want to take a call, that is fine, but we just ask you to leave the room, please, whilst you do so. Thank you very much indeed for coming today and I now pass over to Howard to chair the hearing. Thank you.

**THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** I believe our first speaker here is Nadia Conway. Would you like to come forward? If you can just start by giving your name and address, please, thank you.

MRS CONWAY: Yes, my name is Nadia Conway. My address is 107 Old Park Avenue, Enfield EN2 6PJ. Thank you for enabling me to speak to you this morning. I came to England as a refugee from Czechoslovakia in 1968 and I have lived in the Southgate constituency since my marriage in 1972.

I believe I have a wide experience of the communities of Enfield in general and of Southgate in particular. My children were educated in primary schools in Southgate and secondary schools in Edmonton, in Latymer School. For many years I ran a business in the borough with workers in all three parliamentary constituencies, Enfield, Southgate and Edmonton. I was subsequently an employee and later director of the local Enterprise Agency, supporting new businesses in the borough.

I was councillor for Trent ward, now Cockfosters, from 1986 to 1994, during which period I was also Vice Chair of the Enfield Community Council and on many other bodies. I was Mayor of Enfield in the year 93/94. I have been a governor of schools, both in Southgate and in Edmonton, where I was Chair of Alma School Governors for many years.

After leaving the council, I became a non-executive director of Chase Farm Hospitals NHS Trust, was Chair of the Trust during its merger with Barnet Hospital and I was grateful to receive the award of MBE in 2009 for services to the National Health Service and the local community.

My reason for attending the Commission is to try and convey to you something of the very real and very different identities of the three components of the London Borough of Enfield, to register my regret and astonishment at the proposal of the Commission to break up the Southgate component of the borough between three Members of Parliament, and to express the very real needs of the borough as a whole to continue to be represented by three Members at Westminster and not to have to mediate with five Members.

I certainly support the Save Our Southgate Group, but what I hope to suggest to you today is something of the genuine commitment of the communities of Southgate, Enfield and Edmonton, both to the areas in which they live and to the borough of Enfield as a whole. I do so in the hope that this will encourage the Commission to make every effort to continue the representation of the borough by three Members of Parliament, as it has for many generations.

I know that submissions have been made to the Commission which will enable this and would meet with its numerical criteria. The proposals of the Conservative Party is one which I believe to be fair to the London Borough of Enfield and to North London as a whole, but I also want to take the opportunity to express something of my experience of these communities, since I feel that these community identities are not to be found in an official publication of statistics but arise from people's everyday lives.

I also believe that the democratic instinct arises from people's feeling for their communities. Parliamentary representation could not be founded on a surer or stronger basis than this and, here, I speak as someone who for the first 18 years of my life lived in a society where such community feelings were ignored or suppressed.

During my mayoral year, I had the opportunity to visit all three parts of the borough and to note both the distinct characteristics and things which unite them. Edmonton is an area with many inner city features including poverty, health issues, a significantly lower life expectancy than other parts of the borough and a high immigrant population, but also a pride in their history and a strong sense of community with a recognisable centre at Edmonton Green and the nearby ancient church of St Andrew.

Enfield North, a constituency ranging from green belt to areas of deprivation, especially in its south-eastern part, but again a community with a sense of belonging and a historic almost market town centre at Enfield Town. Southgate, a more prosperous and modern area, characterised by green spaces but with a significantly older population, but all three share the sense of being Enfieldians. This was very visible in the many borough-wide organisations I met and, indeed, supported with my mayoral charity.

I met with business organisations and leaders, local chambers of commerce and business associations. I was privileged to meet local and Enfield-wide charitable bodies from the local deaf children's society and the local chamber of commerce to friendship clubs, rotaries, women's institutes. I also met with scout and guide groups, boy brigades, churches, Gurdwaras, mosques and synagogues. All these are still active in Enfield today, although some may have joined with larger umbrella organisations.

I particularly recall during my mayoral year a day in the company of Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, in her role as patron of 'London in Bloom', where I had the pleasure of presenting to her the winners of 'Enfield in Bloom', all over Enfield, and the winner on that occasion was the fire station in Southgate. 'Enfield in Bloom' remains a major event in all parts of the borough. Hundreds of thousands of bulbs are planted annually and businesses, organisations and citizens throughout the borough compete for awards.

Another example of community initiative in Enfield, and one extremely dear to my heart and, indeed, one of the beneficiaries of my charity, is the Chicken Shed Theatre Company, a world class initiative in inclusive children's theatre group, bringing together children across the spectrum of abilities and advantage to create a first-class theatre.

This was started in Southgate and based, thanks to the support of Enfield Council, in specially built theatre premises in Cockfosters. Chicken Shed's initial and present support is drawn from families across the borough. Its reputation is such that it has sparked and aided similar initiatives in Africa, Russia and China, but the Boundary

Commission's proposals would place it in Chipping Barnet denting its Enfield identity.

Let me say something about the business I run in Enfield, manufacturing soft toys and using home workers, all of them female and from very many ethnic backgrounds in all parts of the borough. That also gave me an insight into the issues faced by women of all backgrounds in modern urban society and how local communities can provide networks and support that can assist them.

I drew similar conclusions from my long time as Chair of Governors of Alma Primary School in Edmonton, in an area which has one of the highest indices of deprivation in the country and where over 90 per cent of the children were not native English speakers. Arranging reciprocal assembly visits between Alma and Wolfson Hillel, the Jewish primary school in Southgate, where I was also governor, was a notable example of constituency cultural exchange within the borough.

All these experiences have left me with an overwhelming impression of Enfield as a whole, not just its constituent parts. I believe the community of Enfield would view the dismissal and exile of the western fringes of the borough negatively and that it would result in worry and concern to its citizens.

Lastly, I want to draw your attention to the straightforward complication of having five MPs representing a single borough. You have the obvious complexities, expenses and delays of ensuring liaison with council staff, especially as for three of these MPs the majority of the constituency will be outside the borough. In some areas the problem of liaison would become really hair-raising.

Add on, for example, the problems for the council in co-ordinating policing or healthcare strategies for the borough with the support of five MPs. In my role as a non-executive director of the local hospital for 14 years, I also have a worry about health provision, particularly in view of the forthcoming reorganisation and reconfiguration of clinical commissioning groups in North London and how the interface between healthcare and social provision would operate, retaining the support of all MPs representing the borough.

Critically, will the MPs under the proposals representing Bowes ward or Cockfosters ward or even the MP for Finchley and Southgate be really committed to intervene and interact with the council in all matters when their key involvement is with Barnet or Haringey? With the best will in the world, I rather doubt it. I am a bit cynical here, but there you go. I am strongly in favour of retaining the borough as close as possible to its present parliamentary composition.

I am utterly convinced that a proposed dismemberment of Southgate is a profound error. May I leave you with the reminder that Southgate's motto, still on show in Enfield civil centre, is *Ex Glante Quercus* (From the acorn grows an oak). The Commission's

proposal wilfully chopped down that oak and leaves a community in splinters. Thank you

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. That is most helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. That is excellent. There is a written copy which is splendid. Yes, that is great. Chris Philip, would you like to come forward, Sir, and again introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin.

MR PHILIP: (MP for South Croydon) Good morning, Mr Simmons. My name is Chris Philip. I am the Member of Parliament for Croydon South and I am best reached at the House of Commons. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission this morning.

I would like to start by commenting briefly on the current Boundary Commission proposals as they affect Croydon, then comment on the Labour Party's counter-proposal and then talk about some other alternatives. In relation to the Boundary Commission's current proposal, I note that you have paired the boroughs of Bromley and Croydon for the purposes of constructing new parliamentary constituencies. Were you minded to continue with that arrangement, then I think the proposal you have come up with is probably the best and, very possibly, the only configuration you could use in drawing the parliamentary boundaries.

However, I do feel I should say there are some significant, I think, weaknesses with that approach, not least that the communities of Purley in particular and Croham are separated from the rest of Croydon South, in particular Coulsdon, Kenley and Sanderstead, and there has been a long and historic link between Coulsdon and Purley. They used to be in the same urban district council and they consider themselves to be part of the same community. I think that division between Coulsdon and Purley is a very significant weakness of the proposal.

Similarly, the community of Shirley, which is in the current Croydon Central seat, which covers Shirley, Heathfield and Ashburton, is divided by the current Boundary Commission proposal three-ways. I would sort of highlight the fact that there are those weaknesses in the proposal as it is currently constructed.

Commenting now on the Labour proposal, I think presented to you a week or maybe two weeks ago, I have noticed that it proposes to take the two Coulsdon wards, Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West, and place them into a new seat which consists primarily of the London Borough of Sutton, including places like Wandle and Wallington.

I must say I very strongly oppose this proposal because Coulsdon emphatically belongs in Croydon. I have already mentioned that it feels a very strong affinity with Purley and Kenley next door. I can tell you that my constituency house is in Coulsdon. It feels no



affinity whatsoever with places like Wandle, which are probably, I do not know, seven miles away, and Wallington.

As the previous lady said, an MP representing, primarily, a Sutton seat might feel relatively little interest in Coulsdon. I feel very strongly that Coulsdon belongs in Croydon and not in Sutton and I am sure you are going to get quite a few written representations making the same point.

I also note in passing that the Labour proposals split Beddington, which is in Sutton, between Beddington North and Beddington South. I think the clue is in the name there. Clearly, Beddington is one community and their proposals, I suspect for reasons of electoral expediency, split the community of Beddington.

I also note in passing that Selhurst in the north of Croydon has been put into Croydon Central, whereas, in fact, it historically belongs in Croydon North and there are railways and various other pieces of infrastructure which divide Selhurst from the rest of Croydon Central. I would like to put on record my very strong opposition to those proposals.

I understand the Liberal Democrats made a proposal again a week or two ago and, actually in relation to the southern half of Croydon, I think those proposals have a lot of merit. I think you are going to hear from the Conservatives tomorrow an updated proposal or an alternative proposal from them which is sort of 80 per cent the same as the Liberal Democrats' proposal.

Those two proposals, both the Liberal Democrats and the sort of Conservative variant on it, firstly, keep three seats within Bromley, which I must say is what I was rather expecting you to do in the first place because Bromley contains exactly the right population for three constituencies. It maintains Bromley as three seats.

Of course, Croydon does have to cross the borough boundary somewhere because it is the wrong size and I would suggest that the best place to cross borough boundaries is in the north of Croydon and not in the south. I say that, firstly, because the wards are geographically much smaller in the north of Croydon and, because it is a much more urban area community, sort of delineations are much more sort of amorphous. You can drive through it or walk through it and you cannot really tell when you are moving from one community to another, whereas in the south of Croydon you are sort of at the edge of London and the different communities do sort of feel quite distinct.

For example, Coulsdon is very distinct from places like Wallington and Wandle. I think given you have got to cross a borough boundary somewhere, I would suggest that somewhere in the north of Croydon, either going into Merton or Lambeth or a bit of both is the right place to do it, rather than either Bromley to the north-east or Sutton to the south-west.

Specifically, the proposals which you have heard from the Liberal Democrats (and I think will hear again tomorrow) see a new Croydon seat consisting of the following wards: New Addington, Fieldway, Heathfield, Addiscombe, Ashburton, Shirley, Selsdon and Sanderstead, which is within quota obviously; and a seat which largely overlaps in my current seat of Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Purley, Kenley, Croham, Waddon and Fairfield, Fairfield being the town centre of Croydon.

Now those proposals have the advantages of keeping Purley and Coulsdon together. They have the advantage of keeping the Shirley community, which is Shirley, Heathfield and Ashburton, together. They have got those very strong advantages. Those proposals also overlap very considerably with the current constituencies, whereas the current Boundary Commission proposals and the Labour proposal have a great deal of change in them, and I know one of your criteria is trying to minimise disruption.

These proposals are much less disruptive. They have got all of those things going for them. However, that proposal I just outlined does have one weakness which is capable of rectification, and that is that the Sanderstead ward actually really belongs in Croydon South. It considers itself part of the south of the borough. In fact, it thinks of itself as Surrey more than Croydon, if you ask anyone that lives there.

The Fairfield ward which covers Croydon Town Centre has always been in the town centre ward. It is the town centre literally and it has significant affinity with places like Addiscombe which are immediately a really sort of an extension of the town centre. Ideally, what you would do is you would swap Sanderstead and Fairfield in the lists I just read out. However, that would result in Croydon South being about four or five hundred electors too small.

There is a way of rectifying, which is to take one polling district from Selsdon, specifically polling district SB2, and putting it with Sanderstead into Croydon South and Fairfield into the sort of successor central seat and those would both then be the correct size. I realise that offends the principle you read out at the beginning of not breaking ward boundaries; however, I think there are a couple of points in mitigation here.

One is that Croydon ward boundaries are changing anyway. We are just starting a local authority boundary review that will be complete by 2018 and so all of these ward boundaries are going to change anyway. Secondly, polling district SB2 of Selsdon actually is really in Sanderstead anyway. Presumably, it has ended up in Selsdon by some sort of historic accident. But if you ask people who live there where do you live, they would tell you they lived in Sanderstead. They would not say they lived in Selsdon.

From a community point of view that works and it would have the advantage that you would maintain the existing constituencies a little bit more than they are maintained. In the other proposals, you would keep Fairfield in the town centre where it belongs.

The optimal proposal, were you minded to break a ward boundary, would be a Croydon Central seat consisting of New Addington, Fieldway, Heathfield, Addiscombe, Ashburton, Shirley, Selsdon minus polling district SB2, and Fairfield and a Croydon South seat consisting of Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Purley, Kenley, Croham, Waddon, Sanderstead and the polling district SB2 of Selsdon.

I think in their proposals the Lib Dems called these two seats South East and South West, Croydon South East and Croydon South West. I would suggest that to minimise confusion, particularly if you were minded to do that swap I mentioned, so put Fairfield back into Croydon Central and Sanderstead plus SB2 into Croydon South, I would maintain the current constituency names again to avoid confusion.

We get enough confusion already with constituents writing in not sure which constituency they are in. If you change the names, I think that will simply lead to even more confusion and constituencies contacting the wrong MP and all that kind of thing, which actually happens quite a lot already but it would happen even more if the names got jumbled around.

I hope that is a relatively clear and concise set of comments. My overriding feeling is that Coulsdon and Purley do belong together. They have been together for a very long time, as I say, in the old Purley and Coulsdon Urban and District Council which predates even the London Borough of Croydon. They consider themselves part of the same community. They merge into each other and I think separating them would be really a quite substantial mistake.

I am happy to answer any questions should you have any. I will put all of this into a formal written submission. I do not have one with me at the moment, but will make sure I submit it before 5 December. If there are any questions, of course, I would be happy to answer them.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Excellent, thank you very much. That was very helpful and very clear and I welcome the written proposals.

MR PHILIP: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I was going to ask if there are any matters of clarification and you are already there, yes, what would you like to ask?

MR BENNETT: (Labour Party) Richard Bennett, Labour Party. Two quick points. One, is what you just read out going to be the revised Conservative counter-proposal? And, two, if you could just read it out slowly, so I can jot it down for each seat again, so I do not miss any?

MR PHILIP: Well, I will leave the official Conservative spokesman who is sitting there,

Lord Hayward, to make his own submission tomorrow. I am not his spokesman but, naturally, there has been a degree of co-ordination, as you would expect. The first one was just the same as the Lib Dems one that you have heard already. You have got that.

What I really can do just in case, so the Lib Dem one which does not break wards, which is a sort of next second best in my view is New Addington, Fieldway, Heathfield, Addiscombe, Ashburton, Shirley, Selsdon and Sanderstead. That is the South East. Well, that is the sort of central successor seat which they are calling Croydon South East, but it is mostly Croydon Central. Then, the current Croydon South seat, which they are calling Croydon South West, will be Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West; Purley; Kenley; Croham; Waddon and Fairfield, which I suspect you may hear tomorrow.

What I am suggesting is you might tweak that by putting Fairfield back into the Croydon Central successor seat, which the Lib Dems are calling Croydon South East and then putting Sanderstead back into Croydon South along with only polling district SB2 from Selsdon, which is 1,490 electors. By the way, I should have said that polling district SB2 is 1,490 electors.

When you add up the tweak I am proposing, it is within limit, but so is the four ward version. The four-ward version has the disadvantage that it puts Sanderstead, which should be in Croydon South, into Croydon Central and ditto Fairfield. That swap makes a lot more sense in terms of communities, but it does mean you need to move that one polling district but I would suggest it is an orphan polling district anyway.

It is only in Selsdon by sort of geographic accident in any case. If you look at it it should be in Sanderstead anyway, and I rather suspect the local authority boundary commission when they come to re-do the boundaries may well put it back in Sanderstead anyway.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very, very much indeed then. Mr David Burrowes, thank you. If you would like to come forward and again introduce yourself by name and address, please, to start, thank you.

MR BURROWES: (MP for Enfield Southgate) I am speaking as a Member of Parliament for Enfield Southgate for 11 years, but also with experience of 11 year as a local councillor representing the Enfield borough wards of Trent, now Cockfosters and Winchmore Hill and 47 years of my whole life living in Cockfosters, Winchmore Hill and now Southgate. I oppose the Boundary Commission's initial plans which effectively splinter the existing constituency of Enfield Southgate into five constituencies.

My constituency is the most disrupted in North London. The wards of Cockfosters and Bowes become orphaned to constituencies of Barnet and Haringay wards respectively.

The remaining wards of Southgate Green, Southgate and Winchmore Hill become artificially fused to Finchley and Barnet wards. The wards of Grange and Palmers Green lose integral community links to the constituent parts of Enfield Southgate.

I support the Conservative Party's counter-proposals for Enfield which respects Enfield's local authority boundaries, respects local ties and geographical considerations and would, therefore, leave the existing Enfield Southgate constituency, together with the addition of Bush Hill Park ward. It would also be less disruptive in terms of the growth constituencies and new constituencies and would minimise crossing borough boundaries.

Enfield Southgate has good reasons for being retained. It has effectively existed since the boundary changes of 1950 and got its actual name in 1974 when it gained Cockfosters and Hadley Wood. So it is to Cockfosters that we go to first which is the key to Enfield Southgate. Cockfosters ward has historical parochial, commercial, community and geographical links to Enfield Southgate which need to be maintained.

These are historic ties. Cockfosters has been formally part of Enfield since the boundary changes in 1934. Cockfosters grew organically out of Enfield when as early as the 16th century it was an estate granted to the cock, the chief forester of Enfield Chase. Cockfosters found itself standing near the estate's main estate gate and its growth from the end of the 18th century when it was, in many ways, as a service village for Trent Park in Enfield.

Recent boundary changes have grown Cockfosters from the former Trent ward into a more Southgate facing ward reaching into polling districts previously covered by the old Oakwood ward. There are parochial ties. In 1839 Christ Church, Cockfosters was built, financed by the Bevan family of Trent Park in Enfield.

Its parish retains an important significance to this day and is based on Enfield Southgate's boundaries, the Borough of Enfield's boundaries. The close connection between the church and the future development of Trent Park and the need for my representation on this issue as Member of Parliament has highlighted the on-going relevance of Cockfosters' Enfield Southgate history and need for cohesive parliamentary representation.

There are commercial ties. The parade of shops along Cockfosters Road provides a physical and natural barrier between Barnet and Enfield. The main base of activity is Cockfosters underground station, which since its inception in 1933 has along the Piccadilly line developed and defined Enfield Southgate.

There is significant commercial interest in Enfield Southgate stations from Cockfosters to Oakwood to Southgate to Arnos Grove to Bounds Green, all within Enfield Southgate, make an unbreakable case for connected parliamentary representation. There are

community ties. The historic parochial, geographical and transportation focus for Cockfosters is Enfield centric.

You will hear from Chalk Lane area residents' association later today, Friends of Trent Park, Hadley Wood Association, all those associations, those residents' community associations, would be diminished by being a ward orphaned to Chipping Barnet. So what is the difference between Enfield Southgate and the proposed new constituency of Finchley and Southgate?

Let us look at the historic and community ties. Since 1881, the Southgate Local Board of Health and then the Southgate Urban Council has linked postal districts of Southgate, Oakwood, Southgate Green, Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green. That old Southgate borough community cohesion is a current modern day reality in connecting the wards represented by Enfield Southgate and the community groups' interest and representation that you will hear later today.

Enfield Southgate is a constituency linked by public parks, by Trent Park, by Broomfield, by Grovelands and Oakwood, which since the late 19th century have been linked to the old borough of Southgate, called after its open spaces as the, "Queen of the boroughs." These linked open spaces together with the green belt around Trent Park are crucial to Enfield.

They provide the real and natural barrier to the urban sprawl of London and are particularly cherished by residents. They provide space, well-being and cohesion for the local community and also require connected, continued parliamentary representation given the local and national challenges of environmental and development concerns.

By contrast, the Boundary Commission's proposals provide no identifiable historic community or geographical, not least transportation links, between Southgate Wards and Finchley wards. The proposed constituency of Finchley and Southgate imposes barriers of major London roads, not least the North Circular Road which effectively separates communities from each other and splits representation across two boroughs and from three existing constituencies.

The ability of a Member of Parliament to properly represent communities as apart as West Finchley and Winchmore Hill is highly questionable. The Conservative Party counter-proposal for a new Finchley and Muswell Hill constituency is a much better fit. There is a strong case for retaining Grange ward, Palmers Green ward and Bowes ward in Enfield Southgate. Grange, Palmers Green and Bowes all have significant historic community and geographical links to the current wards of Enfield Southgate, which time precludes greater analysis but you will no doubt hear much more of this later today from other speakers.

One example highlights the need for an Enfield Southgate Member of Parliament focused on the needs within the borough of Enfield. Dedicated cycle lanes are being introduced along the A105. It is an Enfield borough project supported by the Mayor of London going through the wards of Bowes, the ward of Palmers Green, the ward of Southgate Green, the wards of Winchmore Hill and Grange.

It has required me as a Member of Parliament to bring residents together, residents' groups together with four public meetings along the route, conducting a local referendum and representations to the Mayor and council: A single parliamentary voice on behalf of the cohesive community of Enfield Southgate. It is, indeed, these transportation links which are at the heart of Enfield Southgate's cohesion.

Historically, in 1871 the Great Northern Railway established the important link between Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green stations. Since 1912 horse-drawn buses have travelled from Southgate to Palmers Green, joined now by cars, along Green Lanes, the A105 and the A111, to be joined this year by cyclists with dedicated cycle lanes.

Local shops along these main arteries of Enfield Southgate provide the lifeblood of our communities. These communities are diverse, including the largest population of Cypriots in the United Kingdom in Enfield Southgate as well as Greeks, Turks, Indians and Poles and others. Together with the local chambers of commerce and business associations, they require an accessible Enfield Southgate voice.

The Conservative Party counter-proposal retains these main arteries of Enfield Southgate, which has the old borough of Southgate as its still beating heart represented by the constituent wards within Enfield Southgate. By contrast, the Boundary Commission's initial plan would rip out Enfield Southgate's heart - in many ways, a Halloween nightmare which we do not need to make a reality in 2020.

Moving onto the next slide, there is though a logical and better counter-proposal. The Conservative Party counter-proposals takes the logical route to grow Enfield Southgate into a constituency within the quota by adding Bush Hill Park. This was, in fact, the recommendation of the last Boundary Commission's revised plans after consultation and considering all the relevant statutory factors. In fact, I can do no better than agree and quote the Boundary Commission in 2012, who said:

"We recommend an Enfield Southgate constituency containing all seven wards of the existing constituency with the addition of one ward, Bush Hill Park from Edmonton. This reflects the boundary of the existing constituency more closely. All the wards are in Enfield."

That is the basic fundamental point of our counter-proposal which keeps all wards in Enfield; keeps three Members of Parliament representing all Enfield's wards; indeed, respects the sixth boundary review revised plans for the Borough of Enfield; and,

therefore, where there is a need for a constituency to be shared across Enfield borough boundaries, it recognises that the local ties there are between Enfield and Haringey and reflects that in the counter-proposal.

In conclusion, I end, as you will hear throughout the day an overwhelming cross-party cross-community Save Our Southgate campaign, and would urge and hope that good sense prevails and the final plan retains and grows Enfield Southgate.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very clear. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. West Streeting, please, thank you very much. If you could again introduce yourself by way of name and address, thank you.

MR STREETING: (MP for Ilford North) Good morning. I am Wes Streeting. I am the Labour Member of Parliament for the Ilford North constituency. My constituency office address is 12A High View Parade, Woodford Avenue, Ilford IG4 5EP. I should also say that I am the current Labour councillor for Aldborough ward in Ilford North and from 2010 to 2014 represented the Chadwell ward in Ilford South, and prior to my election in May 2015 as a Member of Parliament for Ilford North I was the deputy leader of the London borough of Redbridge.

The remarks I want to make today are obviously centred on my constituency but give a broader view on proposals across the London Borough of Redbridge and, obviously, there is a relationship between all of those in any event. I thought the initial proposals of the Boundary Commission had a lot to commend them, but there were a number of important flaws that I think the counter-proposal put in by the Labour Party seek to address.

One of the obvious downsides, and I am sure you will hear this from other representations from Redbridge, was the loss of an Ilford constituency, including Ilford Town Centre. I think that has been received, not just by the political establishment in Redbridge but by the community, as a hammer blow to Ilford Town Centre's identity and strong community links and sense of community in the Ilford South constituency.

One of the things I welcome about the Labour Party's counter-proposal is that it largely keeps my present constituency intact, thus limiting change, as was obviously one of your criteria. So the wards of Aldborough, Barkingside, Clayhall, Fairlop, Fulwell, Hainault and Roding would remain in the Ilford North constituency. They would also include the wards of Chadwell and Seven Kings from the present Ilford South constituency which is, I guess, a case of swings and roundabouts really.

Chadwell and Seven Kings were previously part of the old Ilford North constituency and I am sure, over the years, the iterations will continue to see some changes and wards coming and going, but I think that there are strong links between Chadwell, Seven Kings



and the remainder of the Ilford North constituency, not just the fact that they were part of the Ilford North constituency from 1974 to 1997.

There are lots of common interests between particularly the south-east of my present constituency in the wards of Chadwell and Seven Kings, whether it is some of the common campaigning issues around transport links, for example, along the A12; good ease of access, which I think would be practically useful. The strength of the proposed Ilford North constituencies, of course, as well, all resides within one borough, the London Borough of Redbridge and does not involve splitting any polling districts.

The one personal sadness is that the Labour Party counter-proposal would remove Bridge ward in Woodford Bridge and put it in a wider Chingford and what the Labour Party is calling Chingford and Woodford constituency. On a personal level that is sad because I have done a lot of work in Bridge ward and built links with community groups, schools etc., but

I also recognise that the boundaries cannot be drawn around the personal preferences of present politicians and, actually, I think both the Labour Party's submission and the Conservative Party's submission recognise that the Bridge ward has strong community links with the rest of Woodford on the other side of the tube line.

Although it may sound slightly counterintuitive, the idea there would be a tube line and a common community on both sides of the track, I think that very much is the case for people who live in Woodford and I thought that element of both the Labour Party and Conservative Party counter-proposals were points that were well-made as part of both their respective submissions.

The Labour Party proposal also is strong in I think that it would keep Ilford Town Centre united with a distinctive Ilford South constituency including the wards of Clementswood, Cranbrook, Loxford, Newbury, Snaresbrook and Valentines. Sorry, excluding Snaresbrook, I will come back to that - as well as the wards of Little Ilford and Manor Park which, although just across the borough boundary in Newham, I think for people who live in the south of the borough there may well be a borough boundary but that does not mean much to the sense of community in that part of Redbridge.

There are strong community transport links between those wards in the south of Redbridge and the two wards, Little Ilford and Manor Park proposed from Newham. You will also notice that the Labour Party counter-proposal includes the wards of Snaresbrook and Wanstead, therefore making it an Ilford South and Wanstead constituency.

I think the strength of that proposal is you have two very distinctive towns and town centres, Ilford and Wanstead, both of whom have very strong community identities and would complement each other, not least by virtue of being in the same borough. I think

that really helps in terms of political relationships, the campaigning work across both communities on common issues, particularly around the NHS provision for parts of the borough and I think that there is much to commend that counter-proposal.

In summary, from the point of view of my constituency, I think the strength of the Labour Party counter-proposal is it very much keeps Ilford North's strong community links together, as well as reuniting it with wards that were previously departed at the 1997 General Election, but also most importantly I think for the people of Redbridge would maintain a distinctive Ilford constituency in Ilford South and Wanstead for Ilford Town Centre, and I think that really does mean an awful lot to a lot of people in Redbridge.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful. Will you be making a written submission as well?

MR STREETING: I will be making a written submission, yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Excellent, that is most helpful. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Kay Carter. Again, if you would just introduce yourself by way of name and address, thank you.

MRS CARTER: I am Kay Carter and my address is 44 Grosvenor Road, London N10 2DS. My name is Kay Carter. I have lived in Alexandra Ward in Hornsey & Wood Green for 12 years. I am a governor of a local school. I was church warden for three years of one of the large churches in Muswell Hill. I am a youth leader at a youth group in Muswell Hill for local young people and I am also trustee of a Muswell Hill based charity for people with learning disabilities. So this is very much my community.

I would like to thank the panel for allowing local residents to have the opportunity to speak. Just before I talk about Hornsey & Wood Green, I just want to quickly mention the changes that will result from the current Commission proposals from the dismantling of Enfield Southgate as a constituency. In the recent GLA elections I served as agent for Enfield and Haringey constituency and I am Chairman of the Conservative Party in Hornsey & Wood Green and I campaigned alongside the Conservative candidate for the whole of the Enfield and Haringey borough - the constituency.

Nobody will be more aware than the Commissioners of the complexities of creating meaningful boundaries in very interconnected and densely populated North London, but in the midst of this, Enfield Southgate is a remarkably coherent constituency as it stands. However our borders are changed in North London, it would seem a shame if this was at the expense of a constituency that works particularly well and is congruent with borough boundaries and longstanding transport and community ties.

As a neighbour to Enfield Southgate, the example I would use is the Chicken Shed

Theatre again, which does amazing work with young adults with learning disabilities. As I said, I am a trustee of a charity in Muswell Hill that works with people with learning disabilities and many of the young people that we work with have experience of Chicken Shed and the amazing work that it does. From personal experience, I know that our charity is indivisible from its community and I believe that Chicken Shed is the same, and so just before I talk about Hornsey & Wood Green I just thought I would make that point about Enfield Southgate.

Moving to the specific concerns that affect my constituency of Hornsey & Wood Green, I wanted to start by talking about the Boundary Commission's proposal to include Bowes ward. The problem with this is that it would detach Bowes ward from its Enfield home and include it in a Hornsey & Wood Green that is otherwise entirely Haringey.

I do have really specific concerns about this idea of a single ward sort of floated off into a constituency that otherwise will have a massive Haringey focus. I do not believe that the community and transport links between Bowes and the rest of Hornsey & Wood Green justify this, but it is really the orphaning of the ward as the only Enfield council ward that is specifically concerning.

On the plus side, I hope we are allowed to commend things in the Boundary Commission's proposals and one of the things that I was relieved to see is that the current Boundary Commission proposal preserves the links between Muswell Hill, Crouch End, Alexandra and Fortis Green which are very highly interconnected communities. The transport links between these areas are good. Local services are used very interchangeably by residents.

Muswell Hill and Alexandra, for example, are so interconnected that they share a residents' association. My own experience as a resident, which is really what I am here to give, is that I live in Alexandra ward, the church I attend and that I was a church warden in is in Muswell Hill. When my children were born, my antenatal classes were in Crouch End. I took them to children's groups in Muswell Hill and Crouch End. I am a trustee of a disability charity and, while I live in Alexandra ward, the charity is based in Muswell Hill. One of my fellow trustees lives in Crouch End.

These are just examples from my own personal experience of how very closely related these communities are and I am really glad to see them retained together under the present proposal and I would urge the Boundary Commission to preserve these links going forward. However, I am aware that changes do have to be made and the boundaries cannot stay exactly as they are.

On that understanding, I would like to commend the counter-proposal put forward by the Conservative Party. While they do involve creating a mixed borough board in Finchley and Muswell Hill, it avoids the situation of having a single orphaned ward. You would have two substantial representations from both boroughs in that constituency. I think

the Conservative counter-proposals are also sensitive to existing community links, particularly I would say with Coppetts.

I think Coppetts is geographically sort of grouped around in that sort of Muswell Hill Fortis Green, Alexandra geographical patch, but all the other links are also quite striking. Both Alexandra and Coppetts have their own neighbourhood amenities, but Muswell Hill is the sort of town centre really for these areas. It is a magnet for shoppers.

By the same token, Coppetts is where the supermarket is where I do my big shop and others in Muswell Hill. They do act as interconnected communities. Of course, transport links are very strong there, so Muswell Hill, Alexandra, Fortis Green and also Highgate use the main bus routes, 43, 134, into the centre of London. Moving with the Conservative proposals to the links between Finchley and the Highgate and Muswell Hill area, and again there are some strong community links which would pit these two communities naturally together.

East Finchley is the local tube station for Fortis Green residents and residents in East Finchley are regular users of Muswell Hill amenities. Again, I would draw anecdotal evidence from my own experience. The local church I attend, many congregation members are from Finchley. There is a particular mingling when it comes to education and the school places between Finchley and Muswell Hill, with pupils from Muswell Hill and Alexandra attending schools such as the Wren in Woodhouse ward; and pupils from Finchley attending Muswell Hill schools such as St James, the Church of England primary, and Fortismere secondary schools.

For these reasons I do believe that the Conservative counter-proposals do work along the lines of a natural affinity between the Finchley wards and the wards surrounding Muswell Hill. In conclusion, I think given that changes do have to be made, the Conservative counter-proposals tread the dedicated line between preserving and strengthening genuine existing community links with transport links, amenity links and particularly ties created through community organisations without creating single orphaned wards that will surely end up as poor relations in terms of representation. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). No, thank you. Are you likely to make a written submission or present a copy of what you have just ---

MRS CARTER: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be most helpful, thank you very much indeed. Andrew Rosindell. Would you like to come forward, Sir, and introduce yourself by way of name and address, thank you.

MR ROSINDELL: (MP for Romford) Good morning, Sir. First of all, can I just welcome you and everyone here to the Romford constituency. I am the Member of Parliament for this constituency and have been for nearly 16 years, but I have also been an elected councillor here in this very chamber for 12 years prior to that - so 27 years of elected representation. I was also born in the area that we are talking about in Rush Green, which is currently in the Eastbrook ward and I have lived in this community my entire life and so I understand it better than most, I would hope.

My address I think for the purposes you require it is Margaret Thatcher House, 85 Weston Road, Romford RM1 3LS. I have put everything in a document which I have just presented to you, but also I have produced four different maps to illustrate the point that I would like to make today. There is one very simple point that I would like to make to you, Sir, and that is this.

The Boundary Commission's proposals are absolutely correct in their assessment that the seven existing wards within Romford should remain within the Romford parliamentary constituency. They are also completely correct in identifying that the Eastbrook ward (which is the southerly ward there on the map) should be the geographical area where new electors should come from. Clearly, Romford is just slightly outside the lower limit and, therefore, needs extra electors.

What I am contending today is that there is no logic, no requirement to bring in the whole of the Eastbrook ward and I am going to demonstrate why that is in a few moments. Eastbrook ward is very much a divided ward. There are two completely separate sections to it. The northern section is known as Rush Green and that is part of Romford. It is an integrated part of Romford. It always has been.

People that live in that area have Romford addresses. They use Romford local services. They consider themselves to be part of Romford. That is one polling district, the MA polling district. In between the MA polling district, you then have a huge swathe of green open space and that is called, "the Dagenham corridor."

If you look at the map that I have presented you with here, this illustrates the division between the two communities and the green Dagenham corridor running right through the middle that is the geographical boundary, and on the other side is the MB and MC polling districts. That is purely 100 per cent part of Dagenham. It has always been part of Dagenham. It is absolutely integrated into part of the Dagenham community. It has only ever been represented by Dagenham or Dagenham and Rainham Members of Parliament.

What I am proposing today is that, exceptionally, because there are compelling reasons in terms of community links, in terms of geography, in terms of accessibility (and I will come on to some of those points in a moment), why I think in this one case it would be

absolutely right and logical and very sensible, certainly very popular in both the Romford and the Dagenham areas, if there was that sensible split between the northern polling district, the MA, into the Romford constituency, which would ensure that the Romford constituency had the right numbers; equally, so the other two polling districts remaining in their natural community within Dagenham, but equally not changing the criteria that the Boundary Commission sets.

It would not put Dagenham and Rainham over the numbers. It would be self-contained. It would absolutely fit with all the criteria without any disruption to neighbouring constituencies. Also, it would be less change and I know that the Boundary Commission are quite keen to ensure that there is minimal change to electors and constituencies to avoid confusion and bewilderment. Certainly, if you say to people in places like Oxlow Lane in Dagenham that they are suddenly under Romford, they are going to be bewildered by that as they have always been part of Dagenham.

Equally so, people that live in Rush Green will expect to be part of Romford. They, in fact, already come to me thinking I am their local MP. So you have less change. Only 3,807 electors, that is only just over 5 per cent of the electorate, would need to change under any proposal. The Boundary Commission, however, their proposal would mean 7,226 electors having to change. That is getting on to 10 per cent of the electorate of the constituency, so almost half the amount of change is needed.

Equally so, it would be good for the Dagenham and Rainham constituency because they would have less change as well. They would keep the natural parts of Dagenham, the MB and MC polling districts. They would have a far less of a change as well and in total only 3,409 electors would need to change into the Romford constituency compared to 7,226 on the current Boundary Commission's proposals.

It is quite obvious that the Rush Green polling district, MA, is part of Romford. It shares Rush Green community facilities such as the school, the library and the shopping parade. The other side of the Rush Green which is in the Brooklands ward, in the Romford constituency, has the Post Office, the church, the community centre. It is all one area and I think for as long as I have been the MP for the area people have been rather puzzled as to why that clear, geographically defined area is not all under one constituency with one elected voice in the UK Parliament.

This is a great opportunity for the Boundary Commission to put right this anomaly which has existed for so long. Rush Green people have Romford addresses. Their nearest town is Romford. Their nearest train station is Romford. Their local newspaper is the Romford Recorder. They are geographically, historically and socially integrated into the Romford town area. This is a chance for the Boundary Commission to rectify this and, once for all, put it right.

By way of information on this, I looked into it, Sir, and the reason why this strange

boundary exists is historic farmland going back hundreds of years. The old farmland fences existed at the backs of these roads and nobody thought to amend it considering the huge developments that have taken place since. Farmland is completely irrelevant to the housing developments that now exist. What exists are proper roads.

You have ludicrous situations such as Gorse Way, where you go up to number 87 and that is under the Romford constituency; 89 which is literally next to it along the same line, not even across the road, suddenly turns into Dagenham because that is where the old farmland fencing used to be. Similarly with Lilac Gardens, it goes up to 32 but on 34 it is in Dagenham. One of the most ludicrous examples is Horace Avenue where I have to go into Horace Avenue all the way round until I get to number 72, have to go into the Dagenham constituency, get to 72 then I am in my constituency between 72 and 86.

These absurd anomalies can be rectified by a simple change, keeping the MA polling district into Romford whilst retaining the MB and MC in Dagenham and Rainham. Only that the most stupid example is the Romford YMCA which is a big block on Roneo Corner in my constituency. The boundary runs through the building, literally through the building. Some bedrooms are within the Romford constituency. Other bedrooms are in the Dagenham and Rainham constituency.

This is a nonsense. It has gone on for many years and this is the first time we have got the chance to put it right, once and for all. You go to Dagenham constituency, if you have the Boundary Commission's proposals, Sir, I have to say that there will be some bewilderment I believe that suddenly the Dagenham Police Station will be in Romford. The Dagenham Football Club will be in Romford.

The Dagenham East underground station will be in Romford, yet the Dagenham fire station, Dagenham Post Office, the civic centre and the Dagenham Heathway underground will remain in Dagenham. It is quite straightforward: All the Dagenham bits can stay in Dagenham without any disruption and any serious change, but the community ties are absolutely correct and would fit naturally with local people.

The geographical considerations, I referred to this map that I have presented. The clear boundaries, the Eastbrook End Country Park, the Eastbrook End Cemetery and the Chase Nature Reserve, through the Dagenham corridor. You have a sensible geographical boundary. I have coloured in the different colours. The blue bits are the Romford bits, the yellow bits are Dagenham and the green lung of the Dagenham Corridor which is a natural geographical boundary.

Then, we come on to accessibility and transport, and I know that is another criteria the Boundary Commission are quite keen on. There is another map that I have given you, that is the final map, which demonstrates how, by the Boundary Commission's proposals, you are going to cut parts of Dagenham off and people will have to go through Romford in order to get back into Dagenham. The main artery is the A112 that

runs from the southern end of Dagenham right up to the northern end, which is where the civic centre is.

If you look at the map, under the Boundary Commission's proposals people coming from the south end of Dagenham would have to go up the A112 into the Romford constituency, through Romford constituency, then out the other end into the northern part of Dagenham where many of the local community facilities are located: Another completely pointless anomaly which the Boundary Commission does not need to do.

Equally so, the underground, well that is going to be interesting because you will be travelling along the District Line. You will be in Dagenham Heathway underground, that is in Dagenham and Rainham, you will then arrive at Dagenham East underground and that will be in Romford according to the Boundary Commission. Then, once you leave Dagenham East, you will be back in Dagenham and Rainham because you will go to Elm Park. Again, both road and railway underground links will be broken by having this anomaly.

Of course, as I have stated before, the Boundary Commission can rectify this very easily and it can be done simply by leaving the MB and MC polling districts in the Dagenham and Rainham seat whilst moving the one Romford Rush Green polling district into its rightful home which is the Romford parliamentary constituency. Another advantage is that the two constituencies would be more even.

The Romford constituency would have 74,760, and Dagenham and Rainham 76,432. That would be only 1,678 electors disparity compared to the Boundary Commission's proposals which would be 5,166 electors disparity. There is a massive advantage there in far fewer people having to suddenly change MPs, change constituencies and find themselves left in this very strange situation not of their making.

If I may conclude, Sir, I think I have presented the case as best I can but just to reiterate the key points one final time. I do fully accept the Boundary Commission prefer not to split electoral wards unless there are any exceptional and compelling circumstances. However, I submit very strongly that today in my documents, in what I have said, I have demonstrated solid evidence to show how local ties would be significantly cut across if the Dagenham East area MB and MC polling districts were taken out of the Dagenham and Rainham constituency and divided from the established Dagenham community.

I also believe that the case I have made for Rush Green to be reunited as one community within Romford is equally as compelling and will prove to be a popular decision throughout the area. The Boundary Commission will also satisfy literally all of its own criteria in full by accepting this revised proposal. Electoral numbers work and would be more equal between constituencies, community ties strengthened not broken, local identities would be protected and restored with Dagenham East remaining in Dagenham and Rush Green being wholly included within Romford. Boundaries would



be based on logical, geographical divides as demonstrated with the map.

Finally, Sir, there would be much less change, avoiding confusion and instability for the very constituents that MPs are elected to serve. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed and thank you for the maps which are most helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed.

MR ROSINDELL: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can I call Sue Connelly forward, please? Welcome and if you can just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please, thank you.

MRS CONNELLY: Thank you very much. My name is Sue Connelly and I am a resident of Eastbrook ward. My address is 39 Horace Avenue, Rush Green, Romford, Essex. Although I am in the Dagenham and Rainham constituency, which is extremely confusing especially for the people who live there why we are under Dagenham and Rainham, we have actually got the same RM7 postcode as the Brooklands part of Romford.

We are totally separate and, as the MP said, separated by the Chase Country Park and the Central Park as well. There is a whole green corridor which separates us towards Romford rather than Dagenham and Rainham. I have come here today to ask that just the MA part of Eastbrook, which is where I have lived for the last 35 years, be moved into Romford because it is a more natural ally.

At the moment, we are a split community. Eight houses down the end of my road, as the MP said, belong to Romford. I am Dagenham and Rainham. It just does not make sense. What we need to do is pull this whole group together so that we can work as one unit in that area. I think Andrew has said pretty much all that I was going to say. I was just going to add 'ditto', actually, to all that he said.

As I say, I have been a resident there for 35 years and my address is RM7 0UP, Romford, Essex, and not Dagenham Essex as in the MB and MC areas of Eastbrook. I think that the second half of this will be handed over to Roger Ramsey, the leader of the council. He has agreed to split this with me but, as I say, everything that the MP previously said we thoroughly back in the MA area. Okay, thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for that. Any questions at all? (No response). Thank you then. Cllr Roger Ramsey, I believe, now, thank you.

CLLR RAMSEY: Yes, Sir, thank you for the opportunity of speaking briefly on this subject. I am Cllr Roger Ramsey of the Town Hall, here, Romford and I am Leader of the Council. I have been a councillor in Havering for 35 years. The essence of my comment today is to support what has been said by Andrew Rosindell.

Obviously, I know the area very well and I have to say that it has always been something of an anomaly that the Romford part of the Eastbrook ward was included within the Barking and Dagenham boundaries rather than those of Havering. On a borough boundary review it was, in fact, submitted by this council that the Romford part of Eastbrook ward should be moved into Havering because of the local connection of that part and the fact it is part of the Rush Green area, which is really within the Romford area.

On that occasion, the proposal by the council was not accepted because the population numbers for Barking and Dagenham were found to be too low in comparison with those of Havering, but the justification for the inclusion of the Rush Green part of Eastbrook in Romford was not, in fact, rejected. It was simply the numbers which meant that it was not included.

Ideally, from a local authority point of view we would obviously prefer coterminosity because when one has an MP exulting the points that a borough wishes to put forward to governments, then there is a difficulty if there is a conflict of interest between two boroughs.

In our case, there is a conflict of interest with Barking and Dagenham in the sense that we feel very strongly that our grant funding is much less per head of the population than in Barking and Dagenham. I think they receive some three times more per head of the population than we do in Havering and our constant theme of representations to the Government is that we should have fairer funding.

When you have an MP who has a foot in each borough it dilutes the ability of the MP to be able to put forward the case on behalf of a particular local authority. Ideally, we would prefer coterminosity. However, having recognised that the criteria which have been set for this review make that difficult if not impossible,

I have to say that I do support what has been said by Andrew Rosindell in relation to the incorporation of the MA polling district in the Romford constituency rather than the remainder of Eastbrook ward. I understand that that it is not necessarily a favoured option by the Boundary Commission, but in these exceptional circumstances I think it does warrant serious consideration.

As has been said, the Rush Green part of Eastbrook is very much regarded by local residents as being within the Romford area and everything they do I think focuses into Romford, the centre of which is not very far away from the northern part of the ward;

whereas the other part of the ward, the Dagenham part of the ward, separated by, as has been said, the Dagenham Corridor, is very much an integral part of Dagenham and many of the main features of life in Dagenham are in that particular part of the ward.

It really will be rather strange, I think, for many of the residents to regard themselves as being within Romford constituency from that part of the ward. I will not repeat everything that has been said by Andrew Rosindell. I have heard all he has said and I think I agree with everything really for the reasons I have mentioned to you. If I can be of any further assistance, I will happily do so.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, that is most helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much. We are going to recess now until 11.50, so it is a comfort break and a chance for people to stretch their legs. Thank you very much.

After a short break

Time noted: 12.06 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene. I apologise if we are slightly later than planned. We were having some difficulties with the IT, as people probably noticed, and we have quite a big presentation to take in just a minute. Can I call our next scheduled speaker, which is Mr Philip Creasy, please. Would you like to come forward, Sir, to sit down there where the microphone is and if you could introduce yourself by way of name and address.

MR CREASY: Hello. I am Philip Creasy. I live in Walthamstow. Do you want the full address? 7 Howard Road E17 4SH. I have lived in Walthamstow since 1999 and I wish to comment on the proposals as they affect Walthamstow. In case I run out of time (though it sounds like it is quite flexible), I would like to say at the start that I do have objections to the current proposals as they affect Walthamstow.

I believe they would be alleviated by the adoption of the counter-proposal that has been submitted by the London Regional Labour Party at the hearing in Westminster a couple of weeks ago. These, obviously, have the merit of meeting the complex needs' requirements of the statutory electorate range for the whole of the London area.

I should also state I am a member of the Labour Party but my concerns here are not party political. They are about the viability of a vital and longstanding community, whatever political representation it has. I am very pleased to see that the Boundary Commission proposals do keep Walthamstow as a constituency.

Walthamstow has a very strong community identity and sense of place. It is in the Domesday Book. There is a reference there. It is sort of half included in the name of the borough, Waltham Forest. In terms of community facilities, we have a town square

with a large outdoor screen that is a focal point for community activity; for example, for our reception for our Olympic medallist, Lutalo Muhammad, for live relays like Covent Garden opera, and you get a crowd of people sat round.

There are lots of named buildings and places: Walthamstow Central station, Walthamstow Queen's Road, Walthamstow Town Square, Walthamstow Marshes, Walthamstow Market. I could go on. It is a cultural hub with a very strong cultural identity. There is a Walthamstow Film Festival, the Walthamstow Arts Trail, the Stow Music Festival. It has got cinemas. It has got the William Morris Gallery, a really important national resource for people interested in William Morris. Walthamstow Assembly Hall, an international orchestral recording venue. We have blogs: Walthamstow Dad, Walthamstow Scene, Walthamstow Tourist Board, even Mattresses of Walthamstow.

In the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, the GLA document, Walthamstow is listed as the only major town centre in the borough of Waltham Forest. That is what I mean by saying Walthamstow has a very strong sense of community and sense of place. I understand that, amongst other things, the Commission is committed to recognising the importance of existing constituency boundaries, local authority boundaries and local community ties wherever it can.

I have to say I am disappointed that its proposals cut off two of the current Walthamstow wards, Chapel End and Wood Street, and transfer them to other constituencies. In so doing, to some extent the Commission actually defies its own commitments to those three principles. Under the proposals, Chapel End ward would be transferred to Chingford. To get to Chingford from Chapel End, basically, you have to cross the North Circular which is a six-lane motorway by another name.

In about 1992 the Crooked Billet Underpass was built, so the whole dual carriageway streams quite uninterrupted through the ward right through to the M11. Crossing it on foot, you have got to negotiate a network of subways and passages that very few people like to use. It needs a car or a bus. The Commission itself reported in 2011: "We are in no doubt that the North Circular Road divides rather than links the communities on either side of it."

Around 95 per cent of the population of Chapel End ward is on the south side of the North Circular; that is to say, on the Walthamstow side not the Chingford side. Wood Street ward would be transferred to the new Leytonstone and Wanstead constituency. Wood Street sits between Hoe Street ward in Walthamstow and Snaresbrook ward, which currently is in Leyton and Wanstead. However, the boundary with Snaresbrook and Wood Street lies entirely within Epping Forest and is uninhabited on the Wood Street side.

Any residents walking to Snaresbrook from Wood Street would spend at least 20

minutes walking through the forest. By forest, it is not just a place on a map, it is trees and it is quite dense and muddy footpaths. Yes, there are roads as well but for a lot of people that would be the way they would go. As far as Wood Street ward is concerned, more than 98 per cent of the ward population actually lies to the west of Woodford New Road, which is still further away from Snaresbrook. The majority of that population is in an area traditionally known as Walthamstow Village, the very heart of Walthamstow.

The Commission's proposal includes running a constituency boundary along a footpath that is actually no more than two metres wide. Walthamstow, as well as the other characteristics I have referred to, is a hub for shopping, business, culture and, above all, for transport. It is actually very well-connected. If you live in Chapel End you go to Walthamstow for the bus or shops. You do not go to Chingford. If in Wood Street, similarly, you go to Walthamstow. You would not go to Wanstead or Leytonstone or Snaresbrook.

There is an overground rail link direct from Wood Street station to Walthamstow Central. There are buses. There are no buses that go direct to Snaresbrook easily or to Wanstead or to Leytonstone. As secretary of the local Labour Party, I have spoken to quite a few local members who are affected by this.

For example, Ruth in Chapel End mentions a community organisation in Wood Street called Significant Seams that does tapestry. She is part of the Women's Institute, which is in Wood Street and the Folk Club. Shaun, also in Wood Street, refers to a very tangible sense of community, having known his neighbours for years. Walthamstow is their home, he says, not Leytonstone and Wanstead, their first house. They are getting married at William Morris Gallery and a reception afterwards at the community hub in Walthamstow Village. I do not know the date, so I cannot quite you all!

This is just an idea of the sort of things that residents in those two wards feel about their ties which are to Walthamstow and not to either Chingford, in the case of Chapel End, or to Leytonstone and Wanstead or Snaresbrook. Walthamstow would still exist whatever boundary changes take place, but it needs the coherent representation in Parliament of a single MP. Many structural issues where a decision is taken by parliament, quite separate from local council decisions, have a direct bearing on our whole community, so issues such as housing and schools and health.

The argument is, therefore, that a single voice to represent the community in Walthamstow is absolutely key. The London Regional Labour Party counter-proposals keep Walthamstow as it is. It adds in the neighbouring Forest ward, which is just across Lea Bridge Road. Okay, it is an A road but it is one you can cross. There is an island in the middle. There are no subways.

The electorate would be 71,280, which is comfortably above the minimum of 71,031. Existing boundaries and community ties would be retained as would the relationship of

the borough and constituency for all its wards. Snaresbrook and a number of other wards in the Leytonstone and Wanstead constituency are not in the borough of Waltham Forest. They are in the borough of Redbridge. The Labour Party counter-proposal makes much more sense within those three principles. I think that is it. That is enough from me.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That was eloquently put, thank you. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed, Sir. I think our next speaker is David Lammy. You have a presentation as well, which I think is going to go on the screen. As usual, if you just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please, thank you.

MR LAMMY: (MP for Tottenham) Thank you very much indeed. I am very pleased to be here today. Today, I am obviously speaking as the Member of Parliament for Tottenham, but I am speaking as someone who grew up in my constituency and have lived there all my life and about a community that I am very very proud to represent and serve.

Can I begin by thanking the Boundary Commission for the work that you have put in to your initial proposals, published on 13 September this year, under what I know are very challenging constraints composed by the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011. I welcome your initial proposals which maintain the integrity of the current constituency boundaries of Tottenham with the addition of one extra Haringay ward, Stroud Green.

I strongly welcome your initial proposals because they would ensure that Haringey as a borough is able to maintain two complete constituencies within its borders, with just one out of the borough arrangement where our neighbouring constituency, Hornsey & Wood Green, would be combined with Bowes ward which has had a long-shared history with the Wood Green area of the London borough of Haringey.

I understand that your initial proposals would give the predicted electorate of the proposed new constituency of 74,648 voters which would be almost exactly in between the 71,031 and the 78,507 statutory limits. I note that under the legislation the additional factors which you may take into account as you think fit, that are the special geographical considerations of the area, that is its size, shape and accessibility, the local government boundaries as they exist, boundaries of existing constituencies and any local ties that would be broken by the constituencies and the inconvenience to any changes.

Now your initial proposals for Tottenham are strongly welcomed because they maintain and facilitate clear lines of representation between MPs, ward councillors and London Assembly Members. They assist, of course, in the practical implementation of electoral processes and for all those reasons I am aware that the local authority support your

existing plans.

Let me just go on, because Tottenham is an area which has a long and proud history and its existence as a separate independent community was first documented back in 1086, nearly a thousand years ago. Tottenham's history stretches further back into the past, as it is believed to have grown up along the path of the Roman road, or the A10 which we now call it today.

In the north there has always been a hard border with Edmonton. Right back to the Domesday Book entry of 1086, Edmonton and Tottenham were separate communities with independent histories. In the east, the River Lea, the ancient boundary between the counties of Middlesex and Essex. In the south, the boundary follows the path of Craven Park Road, the new river constructed in 1613, and Seven Sisters Road, and there is a hard boundary which separates the inner London Borough of Hackney and the outer London Borough of Haringey.

It continues past Finsbury Park to Manor House where Hackney and Islington meet, two communities which have much more in common particularly in the area which we now know as the Finsbury Park area. In the west, the boundary that now exists between Tottenham, Hornsey & Wood Green largely follows the path of the East Coast Main Line, but this has not always been the case as Wood Green was, in fact, until 1888, so roughly 90 per cent of Tottenham's documented history, part of Tottenham too. Tottenham's long, proud and independent history then is recorded in literature, in old proverbs and is marked in its street architecture.

Perhaps the best illustration of how long Tottenham has been independent and just how closely its boundaries have existed with the constituency and the integrity over a hundred years is this 1619 map of Tottenham. If you look at the map, it is striking how the boundaries that mark the north, south and east are the same as they are today. It is only the north-west area of Wood Green that appears different, but the map reminds us that for a long time it too was part of Tottenham.

It is interesting in thinking about Tottenham, and looking to the west of the borough, that what is now called Alexandra Park (and is, of course, the place of Alexandra Palace) was once called Tottenham Woods, so distinctive was the Tottenham area in the London Borough of Haringey. I, therefore, ask you to take the history of these borders into account as a compelling reason why the social cohesion and fabric of this community is what it is and has existed for a considerable time as one of the oldest parts of our life here in our capital city.

In thinking then of the local ties that have been established since time immemorial, that would be broken if counter-proposals to split Tottenham in half were approved and also the inconvenience that this would cause. It is obviously important for me to remind the Boundary Commission how important it is that this once prosperous and always vibrant

community fell into decline at exactly the same time that the borough of Tottenham lost its independence and the municipal focus shifted from Tottenham Town Hall to Wood Green with the birth of the London Borough of Haringey in 1965. Community ties were broken with catastrophic results and I fear what will happen if these precious ties were broken further.

I come here to remind, I suppose, the Boundary Commission that Tottenham is a community which has seen not just one but two riots in a generation. Sir Stuart Lipton was appointed by Boris Johnson in the wake of the last riots to chair an independent panel of experts to advise on how to ensure that the riots which started in Tottenham and spread across the country in 2011 would never happen again.

Sir Stuart found that since the council's move to Wood Green, Tottenham has suffered from a government perception that it was too difficult to handle. Money had been spent, initiatives had come and gone but little had changed, even in the wake of the 2011 riots. As Sir Stuart and his team drafted their report, a civil servant they interviewed commented that they did not consider it the Government's job to solve Tottenham's problems.

Who will have the political mandate to take up fully the role of championing the area in the context of Haringey's wider concerns, as Sir Stuart put it, if Tottenham just becomes an addendum to either Edmonton or Hackney and loses its seat in Parliament, as counter-proposals which have been submitted would suggest? We have seen what happened to Tottenham when it has lost its independence as a municipality in and of its own right in the 1960s.

It was a key recommendation of Sir Stuart that Haringey Council really needs to focus on the east of the borough as a whole. Of course, at this major time of regeneration it would be problematic if that constituency were split in half. We know that Tottenham is a community that is rich but we also know that we have significant problems, particularly with gangs.

It is important just to emphasise that our gang rivalries largely stem with a gang based in the north of Tottenham, the Northumberland Park Boys, fighting with Edmonton gangs and those have been in the news again this year. Also the 'Tottenham Mandem', another gang, based largely at the Broadwater Farm area of Tottenham, fighting with gangs in Hackney and gangs in Wood Green.

The very serious nature of this, which has played out on our screens in knife crime, gun crime, we have had guns going off in the last few months aplenty in the Tottenham and Wood Green area, this is very very real to the people that live there and the gang concerns that might be created is something that I would want to remind the Boundary Commission about, particularly with these new constituencies. It is now five years since the last riots and the community has done a lot to heal itself with the stellar efforts of the



church, of organisations such as Hope in Tottenham, building excellent community ties between our richer wards - that is St Ann's, Seven Sisters and Haringey - and the most deprived wards.

Two examples of this are St Ann's Church in the heart, working in the Tiverton Estate and also working in the Broadwater Farm Estate - fantastic initiatives. But even with our community's current efforts from across the constituency, I remind the Boundary Commission that Tottenham is already one of the least well-off constituencies in the country.

It is already suffering. Tottenham Green ward is the top 4 per cent of the most deprived in the country. White Hart Lane is the top 3 per cent of the most deprived in the country. Northumberland Park is in the top 1.5 per cent of the most deprived in the country.

In order to break the cycle of recommendation we need new infrastructure, we need new homes, we need jobs, we need leisure facilities, we need new opportunities for our residents and we hope, finally, that the £1 billion investment, the new jobs and the new homes that are coming to the area might deal with that.

We are also conscious as well that our football club are an important driver in that regeneration, recognised all over the world, and is investing in a 61,000 seat stadium, 589 new homes, a thousand new jobs, a new hotel, a medical centre, a museum for Tottenham's heritage and their plans are predicated to bring in an extra £19.4 million into the area.

It would be a huge concern - and I think the football club are writing to the Boundary Commission - if they found themselves in a constituency called Edmonton. I remind the Boundary Commission lightly of the football club's rivals. Only a year after moving from Woolwich Arsenal to Highbury in 1914 they were renamed Arsenal for the very reason that they were moved. You can understand that Tottenham Hotspur Football Club are hoping not to find themselves renamed Edmonton in the near future.

I would ask you to take these arguments into consideration under Schedule 2 Section 5.1(d) and (e). I cannot stress strongly enough how devastating it would be to split Tottenham across the middle, just as this investment, the regen money particularly, is coming in.

Now I am aware of the Conservative Party's plans to divide Tottenham and create an Edmonton and Tottenham Hale constituency in the north-east and a wealthier Hornsey & Wood Green constituency in the south-west. I have to say I strongly oppose the Conservative Party's proposals because under these plans not only does Tottenham lose its independence and status to become an addendum to Edmonton as Tottenham Hale, but it also creates a seat in the north which is even more deprived than Tottenham

currently is. This would again be a disaster under all of the Schedule 2 Section 5.1 grounds.

Under the Conservative Party proposals to join Tottenham's wards of Northumberland Park, White Hart Lane and Bruce Grove with Edmonton's - Edmonton Green, Upper Edmonton and Lower Edmonton, Haselbury and Jubilee ward - the average of all the wards goes from being in the top 8 per cent of the country to being in the top 6 per cent of the country's most deprived. This creates a much larger area of deprivation where many vulnerable people are concentrated. It would need huge amounts of resources to deal with it and I just underline the history of Tottenham as it is.

We should step very very carefully before creating such a seat. It would be sort of negligent, frankly, for me as a local MP if I did not make that point in the strongest terms. It creates problems between existing rivalries that exist between Tottenham and Edmonton and Hackney, as I have pointed out. The area along the Roman road known as the boundary area has been that since 1086.

I would ask the Boundary Commission to think very carefully at crossing that North Circular Road boundary. At least in terms of the Conservative's plans for the new seat of Hornsey & Wood Green, there is a shared history as since 1965 Wood Green has been the municipal focus of Haringey.

Tottenham residents are used to getting on the bus to Wood Green to visit the cinema. They do their shopping and attend the council's offices there. But under the Conservative's counter-proposals there is a problematic lack of focus on Tottenham. Its name is conspicuously missing from the Conservative Party's planned Hornsey & Wood Green constituency, as if Tottenham does not matter despite comprising half of the ten wards that are planned.

This leads me onto the Labour Party's counter-proposals to split Tottenham in half and divide communities. The Labour Party recognised this. They say that they recognised that their proposals divide communities in Edmonton and Tottenham, as well as Crouch End, from Hornsey and Highgate. On balance, however, we believe that the consequences of the Commission's proposals to include part of Hackney in a seat with part of Islington is a much more disruptive proposal than are made in the rest of North London which breaks ties more seriously.

Much as I tried to sort of support that, I simply cannot. It seems to me that Islington and Hackney were always part, and if you look back at the history, they were always part of the Ossultone Hundred, the Anglo Saxon administrative unit which formed the jurisdictional area of occasional courts which later became county courts.

Tottenham has never been within this ancient administrative area. It had far greater ties with Middlesex. In 1633 the Ossultone Hundred was split into four divisions as the

population of London grew and the Finsbury division joined together large areas of what we now know as Islington and Stoke Newington. The boundaries of Finsbury division of the Ossultone Hundred as in 1819 and 1899 are visible on this map. Most of the areas shaded grey became the parliamentary constituency of Finsbury in 1832, which is now almost a forgotten name, and contrary to the Labour Party's arguments I have not been able to find a reference of tensions between the communities of Islington and Stoke Newington. Increasingly, however, there is a lot of good feeling between Stoke Newington and Hackney and Stoke Newington and Islington.

When the first attempt was made to join Stoke Newington and Hackney together in 1855, Parliament had to separate the boroughs, again, leaving Stoke Newington, the smallest independent London borough until it was finally joined successfully with Hackney, as one borough in 1965.

Just as Stoke Newington which is now in Hackney and large areas of Islington have a shared history, Tottenham has always been entirely independent of Hackney with the border between that area and that border being between an inner London area and an outer London area, always running along the course since 1613 between the New River and the Seven Sisters Road.

Today the housing stock in Islington and Stoke Newington and Hackney remain largely similar. The community ties are largely similar. Actually, some people cannot distinguish between one side of the N1 postcode which is in Islington, and the other side of the N1 postcode which is in Hackney.

I cannot see why great disruption would occur between the communities of Finsbury and Stoke Newington if their interests were combined in a Finsbury Park and Stoke Newington seat as you have suggested in your initial proposals and why then those proposals are more of a disaster than the proposals to cut Tottenham in half. All I can perhaps see is a more affluent community is one that should not be cut and a poorer community should be.

For that reason, I want to make it absolutely clear that just because the people of Stoke Newington and Islington have money, that is not a reason for them to be able to make representations about dividing that community, which has always had close ties but instead splitting a community that has existed since the Domesday period in London. I put that in the absolutely strongest terms.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are you drawing to a conclusion?

MR LAMMY: I am drawing to a conclusion. Under Labour's plans, the Tottenham North and Edmonton seat would be a super-deprived constituency where instead of the average ward within the constituency being in the top 8 per cent it would be in the top 5 per cent. The proposal was rejected back in 1975 and I would encourage the

Boundary Commission to do that again.

The Labour's proposed constituency would be comprised of the Tottenham wards of Northumberland Park, the top 1.5 per cent; White Hart Lane, the top 3 per cent of the most deprived; Tottenham Green, the top 4 per cent of the most deprived; Tottenham Hale and Bruce Grove, top 5 per cent; and West Green the top 9 per cent; the Edmonton wards of Green, the top 3 per cent; and Upper Edmonton of top 6 per cent; and Haselbury top 10 per cent.

For all of those reasons, I have come here to put in the strongest terms - I know representations that the Boundary Commission has heard from others and will hear again from others - that the Tottenham constituency for very very significant and important reasons, I think that the judgment of the Boundary Commission has been right and the Boundary Commission should maintain the judgment that it has reached. Thank you very much indeed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Great, thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Zena Brabazon. Welcome, and if you would you like to take one of the comfortable seats and just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please.

CLLR BRABAZON: (St Ann's) My name is Zena Brabazon. I am an elected Haringey councillor representing Haringay ward. I previously also represented St Ann's ward. I live in Tottenham. I live in Tottenham Hale ward. I am also chair of governors of a Tottenham primary school, Seven Sisters, which is in St Ann's ward, and a governor at Roland Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre which is in White Hart Lane.

I have lived in Tottenham for well over 30 years and I would like to say that my own home is precisely five minutes' walk from where the epicentre of the riots in 2011 occurred, so I can talk from the heart about living in Tottenham, commitment to Tottenham and what Tottenham means to me both as a resident and as a councillor. I would just like to say, first of all, that I am really in support of the Boundary Commission's recommendations for Tottenham because Stroud Green ward would fit very well within the Tottenham constituency.

Finsbury Park is itself in Haringay ward. It is a Tottenham park and is governed within the Tottenham constituency and, as I said, I represent in my ward, Finsbury Park suffers and has always suffered from being affected by three boroughs: Islington, Hackney and Haringey. The ward, Stroud Green, is in the Hornsey & Wood Green constituency, which causes a few problems when you are discussing issues around the park. It would be much more coherent and would lend itself to much better governance if Stroud Green were within the Tottenham constituency.

From a very parochial point of view I want to thank the Boundary Commission for that

recommendation. Haringay ward is located on the edge of the Tottenham constituency, but fits well within the constituency boundary like with the main road, Green Lanes, running parallel to the Tottenham High Road. There is a real sense that these two main roads, these main arteries, combine to give Tottenham a sense of coherence.

My own experience as a resident and as a councillor is that Tottenham is a really discreet area that people feel very much residents of this community. I know that living there, being in a residents' association and being actively involved for many years in local politics and in local community activities.

The sense of community spirit which people have always had, which has been enhanced since the 2011 riots, and I would draw your attention to the comments from Sir Stuart Lipton when he did his report about the riots where he also pointed to the importance of developing the community cohesion within the area and that were Tottenham to be invested in and seen as a discreet area that it would, in fact, benefit.

We have seen the disbenefits of Tottenham being split up. Tottenham High Road was almost destroyed by the retail move to Wood Green when Shopping City opened. The governance of Tottenham was affected by the move of the civic functions to Wood Green. What has held us together as a community, and I can speak very much from the heart on this, is having one MP for our area.

I think as a resident and as a councillor having an MP representing the Tottenham area - and following on from what David Lammy said about the historic stuff - has made a massive impact and was hugely important for the area both certainly after the 2011 riots, and certainly we can see from the previous riots in 1985 the importance of having discreet political representation.

One word about Edmonton. The A10, as David said, goes from the City of London down to Edmonton. There is no synergy. I know that is a bit of a political word but there is no synergy, no link really, between Edmonton and Tottenham. These are very different areas and it is certainly my view that having a string of deeply deprived wards together will not assist in improving the economy and the social cohesion within our communities.

We have heard about the issues with the gangs. This is all true. We also know that having a string of very deprived wards will not do much for drawing in political support and it would make the development of the area and representation very difficult, especially since it would cross two boroughs. Currently, Haringey and St Ann's wards are on the up. Seven Sisters ward contributes to that and we are able now in Tottenham to see a way forward.

I would ask that the Boundary Commission sticks to its own position of retaining Tottenham as one discreet parliamentary constituency where we can have in

Parliament an advocate for an area which has been disadvantaged for many years, has certainly suffered from disinvestment, has suffered from political disinvestment, but which with an MP who advocated so brilliantly after the riot we saw the impact and importance of that political representation. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. Yes, Revd Nims Obunge. If you would like to come forward and make yourself comfortable and just introduce yourself.

REVD OBUNGE: Good afternoon or good day. My name is Revd Nims Obunge. I am a local minister in Tottenham. I have been a pastor for over 25 years in Tottenham and I bought my family home initially there about 26 years ago or thereabouts. I thought I had a speech but I decided not to have a speech, but I came to make a plea.

A number of years ago my church, which was situated in a cinema, old cinema on Bruce Grove, was very vibrant, very active, but outside the church walls there were challenges. I remember speaking to the police borough commander. His name was Stephen James. He invited me to a meeting. In that meeting he brought out knives, guns, and other weapons that were on our streets and he told me of the challenge that existed between some of the young men in Hackney and some of the young men in Tottenham.

I eventually got involved with trying to address this issue and the first challenge I had was addressing a mother of a young lad called Tyrone Rowe. Tyrone got killed in a very crude fashion, based on gang tensions in the community and coming from across the borders. If I was to sit here and try to, without being overdramatic, tell you how many young men or women I have buried as a result of gang violence, I do not think I would be able to say it will be my ten fingers or ten toes: Maybe more, much more.

The issue that Tottenham has got right now is we have come to a place where we are beginning to get to grasps with some of the challenges. To divide Tottenham in the time of its healing is like opening a wound that has not yet fully healed. I was there on the day of the riots. I saw the tension in the community. I was there the day after. I walked with the MP.

Let me state for the record, I am not a Labour member and I am not a Conservative member. As a matter of fact, by the special grace of God I am a Deputy Lieutenant for the Royal Family for Greater London, so I have no leanings to any political party. My passion is I am here on behalf of the people of Tottenham and not so much on behalf of any political party.

I welcome the position that the Boundary Commission had initially put forward where Tottenham was going to stay united. I am concerned that any division will challenge the

work we have been doing for so many years. There was a charity I started called the Peace Alliance and the Peace Alliance was a partnership of the faith community, statutory organisations, voluntary organisations, young people and schools.

We all came together in Tottenham saying we need to work together for the peace of our community. As we did that work, the work cascaded into all of Haringey and eventually we started something called the Haringey Week of Peace, which eventually went into the London Week of Peace. So, from Tottenham, a small seed, a small idea became an oak tree for our city.

I would say it is important I note that my church has relocated and we are in the Tottenham Town Hall. That is where our office is. I had my office send me an image just before I came here because it just dawned on me it might be useful to let you know what is written in the Town Hall.

The crest in the town hall when Tottenham first became a municipal council states something to the effect, and let me just read that to you if you do not mind, Tottenham Urban District Council, it says, "Steadfast in difficulties." That is what it says, the Tottenham Urban District Council, "Steadfast in difficulties." That is the crest right there. I can email that to you guys later on, if you do not mind. Then, later on when Tottenham became a borough, the crest says, "Do well and doubt not." So, first, we have survived two riots and now we are trying to do well and doubt not, albeit we are now Haringey.

We have a history in Tottenham and to take away the wealth of our history and that spirit to fight adversity with resilience, that spirit to challenge the difficulties we have had over the years when now the churches and the faith communities are coming together. We started the multi-faith forum and it was about churches and non-Christian organisations coming together and saying: Let us work together for the peace and harmony of our community.

I happen to be a governor of the College of Haringey, Enfield and North East London and, there again, we have tried to make sure that we address some of the tensions. In a governors' meeting recently we talked about the tension with some of the young folks in Edmonton. What we are trying to do is to ensure that we are able to make a significant difference in the lives of those in Tottenham, supporting them and not allowing their fear - and let me address that fear.

I started a programme called 'Within the Peace Alliance'. We called it the EX-IT programme and we used the word exit as an EX-IT. They were young men who had been in prison and we were trying to say, "You can come out of your ex-offending behaviour." But a lot of those young men from the EX-IT programme were scared of going into certain boundaries, certain areas. The issue was when they did go they were unprotected. It may not be real to some of us but it is real to those young people. Their lives were put in danger.

Now we are trying to build Tottenham and not force folks to start having to cross boundaries. They will get there, but they are not there yet. I would appeal to the Commission to understand that we have a new beginning for Tottenham. A lot of investment has come in. The churches and the communities are working together and what is a new beginning following the last riots could possibly end up as a bad ending. I think we should be conscious of that.

I think we should also be conscious of the fact that we have such depravity in our community and we have a voice in the House of Parliament that is fighting for us. I would ask that whoever our MP is - and it just so occurs that the present MP spoke to yourselves and has been a champion for Tottenham - I would expect any MP, him or any other, to be a champion for the people of Tottenham.

My plea, as I wrap up with no speech and my speech cancelled, is simply this, Sirs: Reconsider any other option that says Tottenham should be divided. It will not be good for Tottenham. The riots reflected that it was not good for London and the riots reflected it was not good for the UK. We do not want tension in our communities. Let us try and build what has already started. A process of healing has begun. Let us not destroy that healing process by suddenly creating division when we are trying to build on unity. I thank you for your attention.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters arising? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Julie Davies, yes. Welcome and make yourself comfortable and just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please.

MRS DAVIES: My name is Julie Davies and I live at 53 Clifton Road, which is in St Ann's ward in the London Borough of Tottenham. Thank you for agreeing to hear my representations. I am here on behalf of 2,300 members of the National Union of Teachers in Haringey. I am the Branch Secretary of the NUT.

On a rough calculation, we have got about 1,600 members who either live or work in the Tottenham postcodes. I have been resident in Tottenham for 33 years. I have taught at four Tottenham schools and I have served on three school governing bodies in Tottenham. I am a member of my local Safer Neighbourhoods Panel since when it was set up.

I would like to say, as the other Tottenham speakers have said, that the Commission's initial proposals to preserve Tottenham as a constituency and to add in Stroud Green make very very good sense and are very welcome. In many ways, Stroud Green is a Tottenham ward. Its schools are very much part of the local family of schools and all of the proposed Tottenham wards would still fall within the borough boundary, which is, I understand, important. It would bring in a more affluent ward into Tottenham, but not



one with a Hornsey & Wood Green profile that is wildly at odds with the rest of Tottenham.

I should also say that I am an active member of one of the two political parties which have put up counter-proposals. The Labour proposal has not been widely shared and I do not believe that there was widespread consultation. The Commission's own proposals have had much more publicity and I think a lot of people that I am aware of in Tottenham believe that Tottenham will be left intact in the boundary reorganisation.

Paragraph 5.4.9 of the Labour submission recognises that Edmonton and Tottenham will suffer if the parties' recommendations are followed, but they sort of airily dismiss the damage done to two working class black and minority ethnic communities, offering instead a rather vague willingness to consider proposals which might restore ties. That is what it says. They put no argument in favour of their proposals really at all. They are simply reconfiguring numbers.

I believe that if the counter-proposals were more widely available and that people were more aware of them, I think there would be anger and shock in the community. I make my submission on the basis that the Boundary Commission is not charged with creating or shoring up safe seats for anybody or getting involved in the perhaps increasingly tawdry side of elected representation.

I am here to try to make a case for my community and its right to a strong, single voice in Parliament. I am here because I am also worried that party politics or personality politics could end up in the neglect of Tottenham's interests. Although there is a great deal of loyalty to David Lammy, as there was to his predecessor, Bernie Grant, this is about Tottenham as a distinct community of residents who feel entitled to a voice for Tottenham in Parliament.

The Labour Party and the Conservative Party, for that matter, do not just want to take a couple of wards away or add a couple of others. They are actually proposing to hack Tottenham into two pieces and do away with it for reasons presumably related to internal party considerations. It is quite extraordinary.

I do not know how widely Tottenham residents are aware of the counter-proposals and, as I have already said, I do not think the local Labour Party has been consulted (and I am actually the Vice Chair of the Tottenham CLP), but for a community already profoundly mistrustful of party politics this is extremely controversial and actually could be seen as disrespectful.

Many previous attempts to regenerate Tottenham have largely failed. That is in Sir Stuart Lipton's report. However, now there are lots of parts of Tottenham which are regenerating by themselves or with Government and council intervention. It is not happening perfectly but it is beginning to happen. The constituency is beginning to

change.

There are, of course, critics of some of the things currently happening, but there were undeniably times in the past when too many of our wards suffered huge deprivation and when there were too few residents who had prospects and opportunities. More affordable housing and good housing stock improved schools. Great parks and facilities have recently drawn in more residents with regular employment and aspirations which are gradually benefiting a constituency which is wealthy culturally and historically, but which has not been prosperous for many years.

Tottenham's reputation is beginning to improve as young families priced out of other parts of the capital have moved in and recognised what a great place it is. This natural regeneration on the western edge of the constituency is complemented by direct intervention in the east and north with Government and council funded projects which were a direct consequence of the 2011 riots.

Many of the references of the Lipton Report are still in their very early stages, for example, wholesale estate improvements, but the report's recommendations are a road map that we all agreed to follow to address very serious concerns. He has written to you to describe the decision to abolish the seat as perverse.

The report's very clear conclusions are that Tottenham's problems when they have surfaced have been generated by municipal and government neglect after decision-making powers were moved to Wood Green, council functions stripped from the High Road and under governments which have not taken an active interest in Tottenham until trouble flares up.

The proposals of the Labour and Conservative Parties both create constituencies of increased deprivation, crossing boundaries which are very real in the minds of many residents. There are keen rivalries, as others have said, between Tottenham gangs and those in Wood Green, Hackney and Edmonton. There is no current collaboration between schools or community organisations across borough boundaries.

The relationships which work within Tottenham and which residents depend upon would take many years to build in these new constituencies at precisely the wrong time. To give an example, Tottenham schools have their own network learning community, sharing resources and expertise. Although they are physically close to schools in Hackney or Edmonton in some cases, and as an example Devonshire Hill School is only about 200 yards from Wilbury in Edmonton, but there is no collaboration with the schools and most Edmonton schools are on the other side of the North Circular.

I just point out in passing a teachers' trade union point of view, that Enfield teachers are paid outer London pay whereas teachers in Tottenham would be paid inner London pay. This is having schools collaborate under those circumstances with very different

professional backgrounds. The North Circular is also a significant obstacle to that kind of collaboration which has grown up very well in the last five to ten years. These schools' loyalties and their networks are within Tottenham rather than within Haringey.

We have got church schools, special schools, academies, primaries, secondaries and nurseries and they have clustered together as Tottenham schools with results across the borough which are now the best ever this year and far exceeding statistical neighbours across the country and across the capital. Just as we are beginning to feel that we are getting somewhere, we find ourselves facing abolition.

I wanted to say a word about the borough. Haringey has existed since 1965 and in many ways is a really artificial construct. Some of the wards in the far west of the borough could be a million miles from wards in Tottenham. Tottenham, far more than Hornsey & Wood Green, is a real place with a real sense of identity and a long history. Now I know there are smaller neighbourhoods and smaller communities in Hornsey & Wood Green, like Crouch End or Muswell Hill, but Tottenham is comparatively a bigger place with a big sense of self-worth, which is not always shared by the world outside Tottenham.

This has led to conflict. Tottenham is one place. It is a community and even residents who hanker for a more salubrious postcode would not deny this. The troubled parts of Tottenham's history have brought the community together, particularly since the 2011 riots. The role of a single independent minded MP has each time been crucial in restoring calm, co-ordinating responses and rebuilding trust.

I recognise that parliamentary seats within borough boundaries are a rarity in London, but Tottenham has always existed within a borough boundary and changing it now would be seen as extremely destabilising. Five London seats are being abolished out of the current 73. If one of them turns out to be Tottenham, that will be a huge snub, an insult to the community.

Stuart Lipton's report offers clear evidence of the consequences of Tottenham's marginalisation in the past and calls for a fully co-ordinated response to bring the community back to the prosperity it once enjoyed. He says Tottenham needs to be run as Tottenham once again. How can this very reasonable recommendation be delivered if the community is split in two?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Can I just clarify, when you started off you said you were the secretary for the teachers union.

MRS DAVIES: For Haringey NUT.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Were you speaking on behalf of the union? So your presentation actually has the support and endorsement of the ---

MRS DAVIES: It does, the Committee of the local NUT.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, that is helpful. And can we have a copy of your submission, please?

MRS DAVIES: Yes, I will send it in.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any matters for clarification? Would you like to speak once the microphone reaches you.

MR BENNETT: Just to clarify, Chair, my name is Richard Bennett. I am from the Labour Party. The consultation process for the Labour Party's proposals was, indeed, detailed. It involved several meetings with stakeholders, including all Members of Parliament, constituency Labour Parties and a variety of other different elected officials within the region representing all the different strands of the regional party and it involved the circulation of multiple proposals. I just wanted to correct the record from the speaker, what the speaker referred to.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for the clarification. Well, thank you very much for your submission. Neil Blundell, thank you. If you would like to come forward. Again, just introduce yourself by name and address, please, at the beginning.

MR BLUNDELL: It is Neil Blundell. I live at 8 Beaulieu Gardens in Winchmore Hill, London N21 2HR and I am here representing myself just as a member of the public. I am very interested trying to maintain the constituency of Enfield Southgate, which may seem peculiar to you because I actually sit about 20 yards outside it and I find myself actually sitting in the constituency of Edmonton at the present time within the Bush Hill Park ward.

My submission is that, as a Winchmore Hill resident and one for the last 19 years, as someone very committed to the area that I live in, I am very keen to see myself returning back to the constituency that Bush Hill Park ward should be in, which is Enfield Southgate. I thought I would just explore that a little bit with you if you would not mind this morning, so that you understand. I have lived in Winchmore Hill for the last 19 years, 16 years of which I lived in the Enfield Southgate constituency.

I moved three years ago a few hundred yards to Beaulieu Gardens which sits between the Paulin Ground, which is Winchmore Hill Cricket Club, and Green Lanes - in fact, less than 50 yards from the original Conservative Party office that Michael Portillo inhabited when he was MP and which I think would be right on the boundary as well if, indeed, it still existed. Unfortunately, it does not. It was demolished and is now a healthcare centre.

My wife's family, including her father, have lived in the area and live in Enfield Southgate constituency. My father-in-law actually, since he was born in 1933, was born in the constituency. I would describe it as a village community. Winchmore Hill has a wonderful green. It is encapsulated by London. It is very much part of the Southgate area and we live there because of the community feel that it has.

In fact, I was quite opposed to living in London when I first got married, but my wife persuaded me on the basis of the very clear community that existed in Winchmore Hill. That community as part of my life has translated as follows. My children went to the local Church of England school. My wife is now a teacher at that school in year 3, St Paul's Church of England School. That school is less than five minutes' walk from my house and sits within the constituency of Enfield Southgate.

My ties to the church was that we were members of the St Paul's Church in the Enfield Southgate constituency for some 18 years, moving to St Andrew's in Southgate a year ago because we followed the curate from St Paul's who became vicar there and my daughter is an organist there. Both my children play sports and do extracurricular activities, all of which, we have discovered yesterday when I analysed it, are within the constituency of Enfield Southgate.

We cannot think of the last occasion that we travelled through or to Edmonton. In fact, the A10 is a boundary much like a wall and never the twain meet, so to speak. We never go there. We have no need to go there and, in fact, we have never met either the previous MP, Andy Love, or our current MP, nor have we actually seen them participate in anything associated with Bush Hill Park ward.

It is not a party-political issue though, because I knew very well Stephen Twigg MP when he was Enfield Southgate MP and, indeed, I was asked to attend a couple of his advisory committees in Parliament, which I did. He also helped me bring in residents' parking for the area of Winchmore Hill.

Since David Burrowes MP has been our local MP, I have got to know him on a whole host of matters and, indeed, virtually everything I do would not impact, in any event, on the MPs for Edmonton. They would always impact on issues associated with Enfield Southgate and, in particular, David Burrowes.

Yesterday, I went out in my local area, within about a hundred yards of my house, so to houses within Edmonton constituency but sitting very plainly in central Winchmore Hill, and I managed to speak to five residents, two of which thought that David Burrowes was their MP and that they sat within Enfield Southgate. Two did know and they both said that they would much prefer to be in Enfield Southgate constituency, and when I asked them when they were last in Edmonton neither could recall.

In one final house, just to make things fair, was an elderly resident. He said they

remembered the wonderful days when Winchmore Hill was part of the borough of Southgate prior to its inclusion in the London Borough of Enfield. They felt things had gone downhill since then and that it was just another road to ruin as far as they were concerned. But they did agree that David Burrowes MP was an extremely effective MP, as Stephen Twigg had been before him, and that any issues that they had actually revolved around those two MPs rather than anyone associated with Edmonton. Just to sum up, we do not believe we have anything in common with Edmonton whatsoever, either socially, economically, or even, when you look at the map, geographically.

Our whole focus for our life is very much facing towards Southgate and Winchmore Hill and we have a community which is much better placed being represented by an MP that understands the issues associated with our community and is not a community, therefore, divided in the way that it is at the moment.

I believe that my house did sit in Enfield Southgate constituency for many years. It only probably moved across, the boundaries, I could not find the exact date, but potentially in the last ten to 15 years, so I would very much ask that Bush Hill Park ward be reinstated to Enfield Southgate and that Enfield Southgate is kept and maintained. It is, as I say, part of that traditional borough of Southgate community and it needs its MP to reflect its needs and wishes. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for making the time to come and make that presentation. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Paul Canal, would you like to come forward, Sir.

MR CANAL: My name is Paul Canal. I live at 40 Deynecourt Gardens E11 2BU. I am here wearing a number of hats today. I am councillor for Bridge ward which features in your proposals. I am a governor of a school in Bridge ward. I also am a member of the ward police panel for that part of the Borough of Redbridge, for Bridge ward. Historically (and I am taking you back slightly), this was, of course, the seat of the late great Winston Churchill, the seat of Woodford, and it was rent asunder by the 1997 changes which split part of Woodford away from the other part of Woodford.

It has been the view of my constituents since then that that was not to be welcomed and they wanted to be brought back together and they have made a number of representations to us about whether we could help to put them within the same constituency. I commend the Commission for the work they have done in creating, not just for London but for the country, constituencies that do not involve split wards and we think that is absolutely right.

Our counter-proposal is to move Bridge into Chingford and Woodford Green and thereby re-join Bridge to that part of the old Woodford seat. The pupils at our school are drawn from the two different seats in your proposals. That would mean they would all

come from the same seat. My constituents, most of them, use the Woodford tube station that would sit within the unified seat, whereas currently that is actually right on the boundary. Similarly, Chapel End has currently been put in Woodford Green.

It really is linked historically and in practical terms to the Walthamstow seat. People go there to shop. They go there to use the tube station. They do not look towards the north of the borough. They look towards the south. With regard to Cann Hall, I used to live near Cann Hall and in a previous life was a governor of a primary school around there. Cann Hall sits on the Leytonstone High Road which runs from Stratford up to the Green Man roundabout.

That is not just a communication link for the ward itself. It is where people gather. They come to that area to shop. They come to that area to go to places of worship and, indeed, their children go to school in the area too. They do not look towards the other side and Cann Hall is to their mind and my mind as well, Sir, part of Leytonstone and it fits better as part of Leytonstone. Indeed, it is very hard to get from Cann Hall ward to Walthamstow because of the nature of the historical bus links.

I turn as well to the ward of Valentines. It is the view of those I have spoken to within the borough of Redbridge, and my view, Sir, that Valentines ward is separated from the rest of the seat that you are proposing by the A 406, perhaps the busiest A road in the country and by the River Roding, and it is highly unlikely that anybody in Valentines ward would meet any other constituents of that particular seat.

It is separated physically and, indeed, those living in Valentines ward, which is linked to Valentines Park, as you may be aware, would use the Gants Hill tube station to get to and from work or perhaps the Ilford railway station, but they actually would not venture into the seat you are proposing. In fact, it is very hard to get to it from there because of the barriers I am describing.

If you were to accept this suggestion of moving Bridge ward into the Chingford and Woodford Green seat, you are unifying a not just historical seat but a real community that meets and worships and shops together, as we speak. If you take Valentines and put it into the changed Ilford North seat, once again that sits within a natural community. I have talked briefly about Cann Hall being on Leytonstone High Road and being a part of Leytonstone.

It is my view that, once again, it is a natural community based around shopping and places of worship and places of education. Chapel End, as I have said before, sits better in Walthamstow. If we almost rotate this clock and move those four wards around, you are creating more natural communities within more natural boundaries and you are doing it at the same time by maintaining the integrity of being within the parameters of the numbers you are requiring. That, Sir, concludes my submission.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That is very helpful indeed. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. Joe Tsouvani, would you like to come forward, Sir? Just the usual drill, name and address, thank you.

MR TSOUVANI: My name is Joseph Tsouvani. My address is 4 Branscombe Gardens, Winchmore Hill N21 3BN. I am also here wearing a number of hats. I am a local businessman in the area. I have a coffee shop just next door to Southgate underground station. I am also an executive committee member of the Southgate District Civic Trust. We have a civic voice. I am not officially representing them. We are going to put in a written kind of submission. I am also on the committee of the Southgate Chamber of Trade. I have official authority from the President Vic Smith to represent the Southgate Chamber of Trade.

As a local businessman and resident within the existing constituency, I know full well that the Boundary Commission's proposals will make it a nightmare to deal with any local issues, issues that may affect our lives as residents or businesses, especially as a local shopkeeper. Our businesses and livelihoods depend heavily upon decisions made regarding the local area which are currently made with the help of councillors and MPs in Enfield.

We are fully aware of how crucial local knowledge and respect of the local history and heritage can be when making these decisions. Ever since the 1850s when Southgate and Edmonton were first joined, and then in the 1890s when the urban district council was formed, Finchley was never a part of Southgate.

In 1933 Southgate was granted a Charter of Incorporation and became a municipal borough. This borough included Southgate itself and neighbouring areas, including Palmers Green. The town hall once stood in Palmers Green, a town of which Southgate has had its solid historical connection with.

Finchley, again, has historically never been a part of or connected to Southgate in this way. The name Southgate itself derived from the Southgate to Enfield Chase which once stood opposite what is now Southgate underground station, proving the link between Enfield and Southgate to be a long standing historical bond. The King used to use this gate to make his way into his hunting ground at Enfield Chase, hence the name of the road.

All of this highlights the intrinsic link between Southgate and the rest of Enfield to the north and, therefore, Southgate must stay a part of Enfield Southgate. Our business, a coffee bar, which is also the current winner of the Federation of Small Businesses Enfield Business of the Year award, represents the community and respects the local heritage. We are named after a heroic member of the community throughout the early 1900s, Claud W. Dennis, who was once the president of the chamber of commerce and developed much of Southgate throughout the years of existence of the municipal



borough of Southgate.

It was our local knowledge and respect of the community which earned us this success. Separating the constituency into several directions would show a total disregard and disrespect to years of community building and bonding to get to where local people like Claud W. Dennis and ourselves took years to form and establish.

Local amenity space, Grovelands Park is a 92-acre park which sits in the middle of the constituency and connects Southgate, Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill with entrances to this local amenity space spread over three different postcodes. This is a park enjoyed by the community for over 100 years and sits at the heart of Enfield Southgate featuring an outdoor gym, coffee shop and boating lake, as well as a pitch and putt. This is a very sociable and priceless space which connects the community, sitting perfectly within the Enfield Southgate constituency boundaries where the community socialise and network together.

The new proposal would be set to tear this park apart when removing Palmers Green from the current constituency boundary. The current boundary fits well with local groups, community groups, the London Borough of Enfield and boundary lines. Many local community groups have, in fact, been formed over the last 100 years based upon the boundary that is made up of much of what is now our current constituency. We would happily welcome positive boundary changes but the existing proposals make no sense to us.

You would effectively be removing the beating heart out of our community and create a sense of alienation upon all of the areas that would be adopted by the new constituencies. Our businesses and communities have built up a strong relationship with our Member of Parliament and local community and we all know what a positive and vast difference it can make when the Member of Parliament has experience and local knowledge.

The new boundary proposals would mean introducing new MPs into areas where the MPs have little or no experience within the new boundaries. Having an MP in the local community who understands local history and heritage plays a big factor for residents and business owners like myself. It was due to David Burrowes MP's local knowledge and access to the community and voices of our community to gain support which helped sway multimillion pound developer Berkeley Homes to include a museum within the main residence of the grounds of Trent Park where the Sasoon Rothschild family once resided.

Being joined into the Finchley ward would mean if local businessmen would want to have a say regarding an important issue happening in their local area, we would potentially have to deal with up to five MPs just to be heard. If there was a major issue just yards away from our premises, then we would have to get additional MPs involved

and several councillors to help resolve this issue.

Small community groups, commerce groups and civic voices who have built up their infrastructure and local knowledge network around their specific constituencies already struggle with the amount of members and finances and will now have the additional burden of having to lose members due to the boundary change and suffer financially and operationally to recruit new members and take years and years of research to get to know their new constituencies.

Local parish churches such as St Monica's Church and School, which I attended, has historically been within one constituency. With the new boundary proposals, the school and the church would be within two different constituencies, creating administrative chaos with regards to pupil selection, marketing and infrastructure of these establishments and many others in similar situations.

Most of these parish schools in all types of religions, rely on their pupils being within a certain radius of their place of worship and their place of worship does not necessarily have to be in the same location as the school. Having these in two different constituencies could cause numerous untold issues. This would mean these places of worship would have to communicate their ideas with up to five MPs, when having to potentially deal with three is already a burden.

There are many local businesses who depend on schools for their trade and disrupting a school's plans would almost definitely disrupt a small business nearby. Any changes made to our local town centres have a vast effect on our local shops and a butterfly effect on all of the surrounding shops throughout the borough. At the moment, we have three Members of Parliament in our area that we can go to get help for borough-wide issues. With the new boundary proposals we would have up to five.

Local businessmen like myself have built up a network and community infrastructure around the current constituency boundaries which marry well with our existing local authority boundaries at the moment. We have got our current local MPs and local councillors and we have been working with them for years and they themselves are very familiar with the historical and community connection between neighbouring towns and constituency boundaries.

We are local businesses and for us this is about history, community, time and cost, and if we are to collaborate with these local MPs and councillors with the new proposals we will all have to start again from scratch. We businesses are all struggling for time and to keep afloat as it is. We are too stretched for time to keep our businesses running smoothly and introducing new boundary changes would mean additional time, cost and administration when collaborating with these local MPs and councillors when trying to improve or enhance our local area.

An example of this is when Southgate Chamber of Trade organises frequent street festivals which is an amazing thing for the local commerce and the community. Organising these events is already a drain on resources for us in the Southgate Chamber of Trade and business owners and adding up to five MPs to deal with would cause chaos and, to be frank, may result in the loss of these festivals as we business owners do not have additional time to deal with communicating with even more MPs and local groups and associations.

The boundary proposals seem not to take into account the reality and human aspect of our constituency which help mould our society. We are not just members. We are members of a popular area with a great historical significance and strong community links built up over a long period of time. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Great, thanks very much. Sorry, just to clarify, I think you said at the beginning that the Civic Trust will be writing in shortly once they have considered their full position?

MR TSOUVANI: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: But you are representing the Southgate Chamber of Trade?

MR TSOUVANI: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is most helpful, thanks. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Gavin Barwell. Welcome.

MR BARWELL: (MP for Croydon Central) Thank you for this opportunity to give evidence. I should say at the outset I do not envy you your job. I am giving evidence as the Member of Parliament for Croydon Central for the last six and a half years and as a councillor for the Coulsdon ward for 12 years before that and, most importantly, as someone who has lived in the London Borough of Croydon all my life.

The thing I would say at the outset is it is quite difficult to respond to these proposals because, clearly, the decisions the Commission takes in one part of London have a knock-on effect. I would start by saying if the Commission believes it is necessary to link Croydon with Bromley, as you have done in your provisional proposals, then I agree that those provisional proposals are basically the only way of configuring the remaining wards in Croydon without crossing ward boundaries, which you appear not to have done anywhere else around the country. However, they do have some drawbacks.

There are certain communities that are split. The community of Shirley, which has three wards that cover it, is actually split between three different constituencies in your draft

proposals and Coulsdon in the Croydon South constituency is split from Purley and those two have always been together. They also involve very significant change from the current constituency boundary. The new Croydon Central seat would only include three of the eight wards that are currently in the Croydon Central constituency.

The representations that I want to make to you today are that, if you are minded to reconsider the link with Bromley --- if you are not minded to do that, I accept you have really done it the only way it can be done, but if you were minded to reconsider the link with Bromley I believe that a link with Lambeth would make more sense in that it would provide an opportunity to bring the community of Crystal Palace closer together in one parliamentary constituency.

Really, what I wanted to do today was to make some points if you were minded to rethink that link about which wards in Croydon, in my knowledge of the place, fit together in any proposal. My starting point would be that there is a very strong case that the three wards that make up the community of Shirley, which are Ashburton, Heathfield and Shirley, should be in the same seat.

The Commission's current proposal would involve a constituency boundary running down the Wycombe ward, which is the centre of that community. If you take the Heathfield ward, for example, Shirley High School, Shirley Windmill, Shirley Inn would all not be in the same constituency as the Shirley ward. The Spring Park residents' association, which is the longstanding residents' association for the southern bit of Shirley, would be split across the constituency boundary as well.

I think there is a very strong case for bringing those three wards together in one constituency. There is also a strong case for the Heathfield ward and Selsdon and Ballards ward being in the same seat because the southern part of the Heathfield ward, the northern part is Shirley, the Southern part which is Addington Village, Forestdale and Monks Hill, looks to Selsdon District Centre as its local centre. That is not the case with the current constituency boundaries and that is something that there is the potential to put right here. A previous recommendation of the Commission in the previous Parliament would have achieved that.

My third point would be that the Addiscombe and Ashburton wards go together because the community of Addiscombe sits between those two wards. The district centre runs along a road called Lower Addiscombe Road and about half of it is in the Addiscombe ward and half of it is in the Ashburton ward. The Addiscombe tram stop, which is about as close as you can get to the centre of that community, actually sits on the ward boundary between those two wards. The Ashburton ward contains the Addiscombe and Shirley Park residents' association.

The difficulty the Commission has got in that area of Croydon is that the Ashburton and Heathfield wards, basically, both cover two communities. Ashburton covers both

Addiscombe, and Shirley and Heathfield covers Shirley and then communities the other side of Shirley Hills that look to Selsdon.

If you take those three points together, there is a strong case for a seat that comprises Addiscombe, Ashburton, Shirley, Heathfield, Selsdon and Ballards and that would then also have to include, because of the geography, Fieldway and New Addington. That gives you seven wards plus one other ward.

The logical one in terms of the minimum disruption to existing boundaries is Fairfield, but if the Commission were to do that it would leave the new Croydon South seat too small. It can be achieved if the Commission is prepared to split across ward boundaries. If you took a polling district from Selsdon and Ballards and put it into the new Croydon South, you would achieve the requisite electoral numbers.

If you are not prepared to do that, then the Liberal Democrats' submission which has Sanderstead as the eighth ward is the best way to do it. In the south of the borough where I used to be a councillor, the Commission's initial proposals split Coulsdon and Purley and these two communities have always been in the same seat and there is a very strong case that they should continue to be so.

As I said, I used to represent the Coulsdon West ward, and actually the name of that ward is quite misleading because it contains a significant chunk of Purley, people that live in the CR8 postcode. Purley fire station, for example, is in the Coulsdon West ward. The Purley and Woodcote residents' association area includes quite a large chunk of the Coulsdon West ward.

I would argue very strongly that keeping the communities of Purley and Coulsdon together should be an objective for the Commission. There is also a strong argument that Croham and Waddon wards should be linked with Coulsdon and Purley because they sit either side of the valley that runs from Croydon Town Centre south through Purley and Coulsdon with the A23 and the London to Brighton railway running right down the centre of that valley.

Certainly, people in the Southern part of the Waddon ward would regard themselves as living in Purley. Those two arguments make a strong case for a Croydon South seat that comprises the two Coulsdon wards, Kenley, Purley, Croham and Waddon, and then again logically the best fit there would be Sanderstead but it does not work in terms of the numbers.

I just repeat the point, if you were prepared to cross PD boundaries there is a way of making that work, but, if you insist on having whole wards, logic would take you to the Lib Dems' submission which puts Fairfield ward with those areas. In the north-east of the borough there is a very strong case that the two wards that make up the community of South Norwood, which are South Norwood and Woodside ward, should be in the

same seats. They are not at present and your initial proposals puts that right and I believe that that should be retained in any subsequent proposal.

Again, just to illustrate that point, South Norwood Country Park, South Norwood Primary School, South Norwood Leisure Centre are all in the Woodside ward, demonstrating that that sits with South Norwood, and the South Norwood residents' association area also covers that.

My final point relates to the north of the borough and I would argue that the three wards that make up the heart of North Croydon which are Bensham Manor, Selhurst and Thornton Heath, should be in the same seat. The Labour counter-proposal that is before you puts Selhurst ward in with a selection of wards, most of which are in the current Croydon Central seat and there is no community connection there whatsoever.

Actually, if you take the boundary between the Addiscombe ward and Selhurst ward, that is impossible to cross, all along that boundary, either by car or even on foot because you, basically, have a major rail junction where you have got the West Croydon to Norwood junction railway crossing over the main London to Brighton mail line, so it is a completely impermeable boundary.

Finally, I would argue that if you keep those three wards together, Bensham Manor, Selhurst and Thornton Heath, their natural fit would be with Woodside and South Norwood. For example, the football ground, Selhurst Park, sits right on the boundary of Selhurst and South Norwood. Just to finally reiterate the connection of Selhurst with Thornton Heath, the ward boundary actually goes right up to the properties on the end of Thornton Heath High Street, so there is a very strong natural connection there.

In summary, whilst I do not envy you your task and I have tried to leave some latitude in terms of the detail, it seems to me that naturally in Croydon there is a community that runs up the A23 and the London to Brighton railway, Coulsdon, Purley, Waddon, Croham.

There is a community that sits to the east and south-east of the town centre, the places of Addiscombe, Shirley and Selsdon, and there is a natural community to the north of the borough. I would strongly say that if you were prepared to reconsider the link with Bromley, those are the natural communities that you should seek to reflect in your proposals.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that. That is helpful. It would also be helpful if you could submit that in a written form as well.

MR BARWELL: I would be very happy to do that on my return to the office.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is great. Thank you very much.

Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed.

MR BARWELL: Thank you for the opportunity.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will recess now until 2.30, a lunch break, thank you.

After the luncheon adjournment

Time noted: 2.38 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, we reconvene. Apologies for being slightly late. We have several speakers in the room, I think. First, if I call David Whitter. If you would like to come forward, Sir. If you would just introduce yourself by way of your name and address and then, when you feel comfortable, please commence.

MR WHITTER: My name is David Whitter. I live at 65 The Chine, London N21 2EE. I am Chairman of one of the local residents' association. It is the Winchmore Hill. I am not too well today and so I apologise if I falter.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, take your time, please.

MR WHITTER: We work in very close association with the other local residential associations and, indeed, just recently we have helped to set up another one to represent other members that were not covered by an association. The associations, as I said, work very very closely with one another and it would be a shame for us to see a break-up of how the system is currently working.

Would you excuse me, I have got it on my phone what I was about to say, so I am impressed by myself. As I see it now, the counter-proposals that have been put forward, which are for retaining the three constituencies within Enfield, seem to me to make greater sense. Enfield has a very large range in its population from the high end of the wealth factor to the bottom end, and with three MPs representing the borough it would, in fact, give us a far greater strength. I really have very little to say.

As I said, I gather a counter-proposal has been placed before you and that seems to me, having spoken to the people concerned, to make it far more suitable and easier for the residents' associations to keep in contact with various governing bodies. That is really all I have to say.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is absolutely fine. So, in summary, you are opposing the Boundary Commission's initial proposals?

MR WHITTER: Indeed, Sir, yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And speaking in favour of the counter-proposals that seek to keep three constituencies in the borough?

MR WHITTER: Very much so, yes, it would be very much in our favour.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine, thank you very much indeed, and thank you for making the effort to come and give evidence. Any need for clarifications? (No response). No, I think people are content. Thank you very much indeed. I think our next speaker is Nicholas Denys.

MR DENYS: My name is Nick Denys. I live in Eastcoat, 29 St Lawrence Drive, Pinner HA5 2RW. I am a local councillor for Eastcoat and East Ruislip. I am also Chairman of the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner Conservative Association, which is Nick Hurd's current seat.

I wanted to talk about numbers 38 and 57 that you had on the map out there. Essentially that is the Uxbridge, Ruislip, Pinner type area. I wanted to essentially counter the proposals that you have made already. In doing that, I wanted to draw out a couple of key points.

Firstly, in your original proposals one of the things that you do, especially with the Uxbridge seat, which I think is number 38, is that you add a couple of Ealing wards into it. I am a chairman of an association of a split ward. Two-thirds of my ward is in Hillingdon and a third is in Harrow.

I completely understand that, because the primacy of the numbers, you have to go across borough boundaries, but in my personal experience I think limiting that to the minimum possible is preferable because the administration of such an association, the administration of local politics essentially is a lot more complicated and a lot more complicated because people tend to have their outlooks based quite a lot on the borough because the borough makes a lot of decisions about what happens.

How we have managed it is, really, by having one association but operating in two parts, really, because that is the most sensible way to operate, but we still have tensions within that. I would say, ideally, in whatever you do to save the hair of people like myself, please limit the constituencies to as few boundaries as possible. I know you are going to cross over.

I was on holiday in Cornwall when you proposed the whole map for England and there was massive outcry there because of Cornwall and Devon. I know occasionally you have to because of the numbers, but I think the plan and I have in the map over there



for you is the best plan for keeping only for two of the boundaries consistently in Hillingdon and only one crossing over, and that one is ours and we are used to dealing with it. That is my first major point.

My second major point is I want to talk really about the sort of cultural aspects and, essentially, how people look and the movements of people. Within the area you have Uxbridge and essentially that is Uxbridge North, Uxbridge South, Brunel and a bit of Hillingdon East. Now as a core that has to be kept together because Uxbridge North and Uxbridge South, essentially, are one area and Uxbridge South contains the civic centre on the boundary.

Then you have Northwood which contains, obviously, the Northwood area right at the top, part of Northwood Hills and part of Harefield really where the houses are, because Harefield looks massive but actually most of it is farmland and so it is not actually that big. Then, you have Ruislip which is West Ruislip, Manor, South Ruislip a bit of Cavendish and a bit of Eastcoat and East Ruislip. Then, you have Eastcoat, which obviously a bit of it is in East Ruislip but the rest of it is in Pinner where I live. I am in the Pinner side. Then, Northwood Hills, also half of it, as I said, was Northwood and half of it is in Pinner.

In order to create a situation where the bulk are together as much as possible, the best thing to possibly do is to put West Ruislip, Manor, South Ruislip together; to put Northwood, Harefield, Northwood Hills and Eastcoat and East Ruislip together; keep Eastcoat with Pinner, Pinner South, Rayners Lane. Because as an Eastcoat person I am in Hillingdon but I will go to Pinner. I go to Pinner Park with my little girl all the time. We shop in Pinner. It is closer. We also actually shop mainly in Harrow on the Hill even. We look inwards towards London rather than outwards towards Ruislip and Uxbridge and that seems to work.

If you put all those things together, the sort of idea, keeping a minimal amount of changes outside the borough boundaries plus the sort of the movements of people of where they are, the proposal I have given to you over there I think is the best proposal for the sort of Hillingdon area.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, that is helpful. I am still just puzzling my way through it, because I am following the arrows and things. It does not immediately communicate itself to me. Are you able to put your suggestion into a written form and submit that as evidence?

MR DENYS: Yes, of course.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If you could, that would be really helpful because I think that would be a way of interpreting. I get the gist of what you are saying, but I think just to get the fine detail and get the grain of it it would be helpful to

do that.

MR DENYS: Yes, no, very happy to do that.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be splendid. Any matters for clarification? (No response). No content, thank you very much indeed then. I think next we have Cllr Lynn Hale. Welcome, and again if you could just introduce yourself by way of name and address.

CLLR HALE: (Sanderstead) Thank you very much. My name is Lynn Hale. I live at 19 Blacksmith Hill, South Croydon in Surrey CR2 9AZ. Can I say good afternoon to you and thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you. I would like to speak about the proposed changes to the parliamentary boundaries affecting Croydon Central and Croydon South in particular and I have got a spare copy for you to save you from taking some notes.

I live in Sanderstead ward in Croydon South and have represented that ward on Croydon Council since 1998. I was born and raised in Selsdon ward, now known as Selsdon and Ballards ward, which is immediately adjacent to Sanderstead. I also work for the Member of Parliament for Croydon South and have managed the constituency case work in that office since 2002.

If the Commission believes it is necessary to link Croydon with Bromley, then I agree that its draft proposals for Croydon are the only possible proposal that does not involve crossing ward boundaries. That would be fine, but there are a number of weaknesses in it that I am concerned about that would divide certain communities. For example, Purley, Croham and Waddon are split from Coulsdon, Kenley and Sanderstead when I feel they all belong together, and Shirley is split in three when Ashburton, Heathfield and Shirley really belong together in one community.

They also involve significant change from the current constituency boundaries. For example, the new Croydon Central seat contains only three of the eight wards in the current Croydon Central seat and the new Croydon South seat only five of the eight wards from the current Croydon South. Whatever proposal the Commission comes up with, I do believe there is a very strong case that the three wards that make up the community of Shirley, that is Ashburton, Heathfield and Shirley, should be in the same seat.

The Commission's current proposal would involve the constituency boundary running down the Wycombe Road, which is the centre of that community, and this is also true of the Labour counter-proposal which is of concern. There is a strong case for Heathfield and Selsdon and Ballards wards being in the same seat since the southern part of Heathfield ward, comprised of Addington, Forestdale and Monks Hill, look to Selsdon as their local centre.

These two points make a strong argument, I hope, for a Croydon seat, comprising Ashburton, Shirley, Heathfield, Fieldway, New Addington and Selsdon and Ballards, plus two other wards. The logical wards in terms of minimum disruption to existing constituency boundaries would be Addiscombe and Fairfield. This, of course, would leave the new Croydon South too small unless the Commission is prepared to look at crossing ward boundaries.

In the south of the borough, the Commission's initial proposals splits Coulsdon and Purley. These two communities have always been in the same seat and there is a very strong case that they should continue to be, I suggest. I will expand on this a little further on. There is also a strong argument that Croham and Waddon wards should both be with Coulsdon and Purley since they sit either side of the valley that runs from Croydon Town Centre through Purley to Coulsdon with the A23 and with the London to Brighton railway running through.

People living in the southern part of Waddon ward would regard themselves as living in Purley. Putting the two Coulsdon wards into Sutton strikes me as somewhat illogical as the areas have nothing in common and I believe that any suggestion of splitting the community in Beddington into two would be unacceptably divisive in this area.

In essence, I support the proposals for Croydon Central and Croydon South, which I understand have been put forward setting out just these points by the Liberal Democrats and I am advised that an updated Conservative proposal which largely mirrors this is due to be submitted to your good selves within the next day or two. This arrangement very much preserves a significant proportion of the current structure of the constituencies which I believe is important. I am sure that constituents would very much appreciate this and it will undoubtedly prevent a lot of potential disruption and confusion.

Constituents can sometimes be very distressed when they call their MP's office and we always like to give a caller the opportunity to say what it is that is troubling them before asking them to confirm their home address to ensure that they have contacted the correct MP's office. It does not happen very often at the moment, but sometimes they have called us in error and we then have to very gently ask them to call their own MP's office and, clearly, with very upsetting matters this is a very difficult thing for someone to have to do as it often involves them getting quite upset all over again. I would say that it is vital to keep constituency changes to a minimum.

If the Commission is not minded to look at splitting ward boundaries, then the Lib Dems' proposal would be the best arrangement and I would support a proposal that Fairfield go into Croydon South and Sanderstead moves into Croydon Central as this would be the best workable option.

However, if a little flexibility here could be allowed then it could put Sanderstead back in

Croydon South and Fairfield back into Croydon Central. If I may just expand on three particular points: Why I would like to see Fairfield staying in Croydon Central; how a slight tweaking could mean that Sanderstead ward could stay in Croydon South, possibly with the addition of one Selsdon and Ballards polling district, SB2, which would keep the seat within the size guidelines; and, thirdly, why I think it is important that Coulsdon stays with Purley in Croydon South.

Firstly, keeping Fairfield in Croydon Central. The MP for Croydon Central has historically worked very hard in Croydon Town Centre, which is located in the Fairfield ward. It is the heart of Croydon in a number of ways and, as such, it should be in the centre of things in Croydon and hence within Croydon Central parliamentary seat. Fairfield ward hosts East Croydon station through which 72,000 people pass through every day, many of whom are Croydon Central constituents.

It is the centre of Croydon business and through the hardworking Croydon Business Improvement District is delivering great improvements to the town centre, which is also located in Fairfield ward. The centre of Croydon is also home to the highly-recognised Croydon Tech City. It is home to a number of government and large corporate offices and it is the cultural epicentre of Croydon, as well as being home to many restaurants, bars and the newly opened Boxpark at East Croydon.

The Croydon Central MP has always worked closely with the contributors to Croydon's economy and I believe that it is important that this opportunity continues. It, therefore, make a lot of sense to me to have Fairfield ward, the heart of Croydon borough, in Croydon Central constituency. Moving on to my second point, to retain Sanderstead ward in Croydon South with the possible addition of SB2, my reasons for this are that many residents have lived in Sanderstead for very many years having moved into the area with growing families. It is a very stable residential area.

Whilst some residents have downsized to retirement living, they have stayed in the ward and I am frequently asked if we can have more retirement accommodation, so high is the demand from older residents who just want to be able to stay in Sanderstead. Many are highly knowledgeable about and fiercely loyal of their Croydon South constituency. At its southern-most edge, Sanderstead ward borders Surrey and is very much in the leafy south of the borough, so moving it into Croydon Central with its much more urban feel would, I believe, be rather awkward.

Sanderstead very much allies itself with its neighbouring wards of Kenley and Coulsdon East, in terms of its green and open nature and, in fact, Sanderstead parish was part of Coulsdon and Purley Urban District Council between 1915 and 1965. However, I do recognise the need to balance the number of constituents within each constituency and, hence, I wonder whether you would consider a small variation which would move polling district 2 in Selsdon and Ballards ward into Croydon South while the rest of Selsdon and Ballards ward would move into Croydon Central.

I can appreciate the importance of retaining ward boundaries within constituencies; however, I do believe there are a number of reasons why this might be acceptable in this particular case. Firstly, as I am sure you are aware, the current ward boundaries are all currently under review in the London Borough of Croydon ward boundary review anyway. The current ward boundaries between Sanderstead, Croham and Selsdon and Ballards ward may, in fact, change. It will not actually affect many residents within the greater scheme of things, thus keeping things to a minimum. Thirdly, many people living in SB2 think they live in Sanderstead anyway and the residents living there tend to look to Sanderstead to access community services.

I actually lived in SB2 for about five years and our neighbours and everybody living nearby as families we all sent our children to Ridgeway Primary school, which is close by and is located in Sanderstead ward. Quite a number of homes back onto the current Sanderstead ward boundary such as those along Norfolk Avenue back in Church Way and Sanderstead and Sanderstead Plantation, and so shifting the parliamentary boundary slightly eastwards would be very straightforward. Thirdly, I am opposed to any proposal which would move Coulsdon out of Croydon South. Coulsdon has always been strongly linked with Purley and, as already referenced in my comments about retaining Sanderstead in Croydon South, there is much history linking Coulsdon with Sanderstead.

The ties between these areas is demonstrated throughout history. Coulsdon and Purley Urban District was a local government district in North East Surrey from 1915 to 1965 and its office were centred in Purley. In 1915 the electoral wards included Coulsdon, Kenley, Purley and Sanderstead and in 1937 they included Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Kenley, Purley and Sanderstead.

Finally, I would like to see the names of Croydon South and Croydon Central retained. Croydon Central is exactly what it says it is: Centred in Croydon and people living south of the centre know that they live in Croydon South. Once again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you and I will be very pleased to leave a copy of my submission for you in case that is helpful.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, and it would be most helpful if you did and so thank you for that. Just to check, are there any matters of clarification? (No response). No, which is great. I think our next speaker is Cllr Jas Attwal. If you could come forward, Sir. If you sit in the seat where the microphone is and just introduce yourself by way of name and address at the beginning, thank you.

CLLR ATTWAL: (Redbridge) Thank you. My name is Cllr Jas Attwal from Redbridge Council. I am here to speak on behalf of Ilford South which is proposed to disappear under the new agreement, under the boundaries redrawing. I think the reasons for me being here, having lived there as part of the community for nearly 50 years now I think

the proposed changes do not take into account the community feel, the community build, even the business districts.

Under the proposals, the town centre itself, which is the biggest town centre in the whole of Redbridge, will effectively go to three different constituencies and this will be a tragic loss of identity which, if you look at Loxford ward or Clementswood ward, that will be on the extreme left of the new Forest Gate and Loxford ward, which would have nothing in common with any of the communities on the extreme west.

It seems to be a very wide, very long ward and certainly, with the separation of the two wards in the east there, it will be a detriment to those residents living there and certainly any future prospective MP would struggle to make the connection with the local community.

Similarly, when you look at the Leytonstone and Wanstead ward which is proposed and certainly looking at Cranbrook, Valentines wards etc., these wards again have no resemblance to something like Wood Street, which would be in Waltham Forest at the moment.

Certainly, what I would like to sort of represent here is for some common-sense really to prevail because taking a town centre and almost splitting it into three different constituencies certainly would make it very very difficult. What I would propose, and certainly what I have come here, is to look at retaining Ilford South and certainly mixing it in.

What I would say is Cranbrook ward, Snaresbrook ward, Wanstead ward, Clementswood ward, Loxford, Newbury, Valentines, all these seven wards would still come from Redbridge but certainly mixing them with Manor Park and Little Ilford makes complete sense because the community feel Manor Park and Little Ilford is just on the other side and their main town centre would actually be Ilford.

What we are doing is all the communities living around the hub, the business district, the train line station, the new Elizabeth line, certainly everything that I have read in the boundary review, whether it is done nationally or locally, signifies and points to the fact that we should have an Ilford South ward which resembles all the way around Ilford with the many wards.

We are not taking into account any prospective internal boundaries but, that is a fact of life, that is also happening. Under the current proposal we will have a proposed town centre ward which would then be going into three different constituencies and that really is sort of untenable going into the future.

I have seen the figures that you are not looking into any prospective boundary changes, but really should one ward be split into three different constituencies is something which

you will have to look into and may have to take a backward step and say, well, actually, we will need to look at it a little bit further because that is very close to becoming the new boundary in Redbridge.

My whole sort of reason for being here today is to just try and appeal that Ilford South, with certainly seven of the wards from Ilford and two from Newham, would form a new ward with roughly 77,000 residents. Just doing the maths: 77,065 residents, which would keep the community feel in and around the capital of Redbridge, in and around a local town centre, in and around the business district and all the community hubs.

I think it makes great sense to have all the wards around Ilford Town Centre together. Certainly, under the proposed changes, as I said earlier, there is no correlation between what is in Ilford or what is in Waltham Forest, Walthamstow and what is in West Ham, because West Ham on the extreme west of Forest Gate and Loxford will not really take into account the needs of the current residents in and around Loxford and Clementswood.

That is my whole sort of basis. I think it is a case which you may have heard before, but certainly it makes complete sense to me that Ilford being a very big town centre has its own identity, has its own infrastructure, has its own business district bid team and certainly deserves to have an MP of its own rather than having three different MPs sharing it across from different areas.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very clear. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. I think our next speaker has arrived, it is Andreas Nicolaides. If you would like to come forward, Sir, and if you would come and sit down here. If you would just start by giving us your name and address and then go into your presentation.

MR NICOLAIDES: My name is Andreas Nicolaides. My address is 26 Bawtry Road, Whetstone London N20 0ST. I am a born and bred Barnet resident. I have been a local school governor and I am also a deputy chair of Chipping Barnet Conservative Association.

I am here to speak in support of the proposals that will be put forward by Enfield residents to save Southgate as a parliamentary constituency and for the amended proposals for Chipping Barnet that will give a Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill seat the wards of High Barnet, Totteridge, Arkley, Underhill, Mill Hill, East Barnet and Brunswick Park.

The initial proposals would see Chipping Barnet lose Coppetts ward and Brunswick Park ward and gain Mill Hill and Cockfosters. They do contain some good ideas. Mill Hill is a village like Totteridge or Arkley, very unlike the rest of Hendon, and to include it in Chipping Barnet is logical.

Having stood as a council candidate in the Coppetts ward, I know from experience that much of the ward, particularly the part south of the North Circular, just does not consider itself tied to Barnet. There are historic links between Colney Hatch and Muswell Hill and with the whole ward and Finchley. Although linking the area up with West Finchley makes sense, the Boundary Commission's proposals would also add up parts of Southgate.

I am not certain that there is a substantial connection between these two communities, and for much of Coppetts ward it would make sense to link instead with the Muswell Hill wards in the borough of Haringey where, indeed, some residents in the southern part of the ward already think they live. Tying in Coppetts with Muswell Hill makes sense, as this proposal would also allow the Southgate wards to return to Southgate. I do not think there can be a strong argument against it.

The proposal to move Brunswick Park ward makes less sense. I know the area well and, whilst some parts are linked with Southgate, the ward has stronger ties with East Barnet, even without taking into account that unlike with Coppetts there are no strong ties to justify removing the ward from its borough.

Equally, Cockfosters ward has ties to one particular area of East Barnet. It has far stronger links to the rest of Southgate. Instead of having an orphaned Enfield ward, Cockfosters, in the Chipping Barnet seat, it would be more logical to swap with Brunswick Park and have each remain in a seat where they have stronger ties, along with other wards in their own borough.

Cockfosters ward shares a high street with one section of East Barnet ward. Maybe a quarter of that ward would consider themselves as living in or near Cockfosters. I do not believe any Cockfosters' residents would see themselves as living in Barnet. Even the small numbers in Hadley Wood would probably identify as a separate community as close to Potters Bar as to High Barnet.

A resident in Cockfosters would find it easier to drive to the shops in Southgate than to anywhere in Barnet, to take the tube down the Piccadilly Line rather than a bus or a series of buses to Barnet. I do not believe there is a strong enough argument to justify splitting off Cockfosters from the rest of Enfield when an alternative proposal exists and I would like to support that proposal.

In terms of representation, residents are better served by an MP who can act on behalf of one clearly defined community with its own issues and needs rather than trying to represent a mishmash of very different areas in different boroughs. Enfield Southgate should be allowed to remain as a constituency rather than being split into five.

In particular, as a member of the Greek Cypriot community, I know the amount of work



David Burrowes, along with my local MP, Teresa Villiers, has done for us. With the best will in the world, it is hard to imagine that five MPs, each with a minority interest in Southgate, would be able to do the same. When it comes to local council issues, or to any issues such as policing which are administered on borough lines, the residents of Southgate stand to lose out as they will be in a minority interest.

For these reasons, I am supporting the Conservative Party proposals to give a Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill seat the wards of Mill Hill, High Barnet, Totteridge, Arkley, Underhill, East Barnet and Brunswick Park, and as a North Londoner and a North London Conservative the Conservative Party proposals to give the wards of Bowes, Bush Hill Park, Cockfosters, Grange, Palmers Green, Southgate, Southgate Green, and Winchmore Hill to a Southgate parliamentary constituency and keep Southgate together. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Do you want to leave us a copy of what you have done?

MR NICOLAIDES: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be very helpful. Can I just check, any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much. We have speakers scheduled but they have not arrived yet and so I suggest we have a ten-minute break, thank you.

After a short break

Time noted: 3.53 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we are reconvened and I think the next speaker is Louise Mitchell. If you would like to sit yourself down there and make yourself comfortable. If you would just introduce yourself by way of your name and address to begin and then go into your presentation.

CLLR MITCHELL: (Chapel End) I am Louise Mitchell of 40 Cazenove Road, Walthamstow E17 4NP. Thank you very much for letting me speak today. I am also representing my fellow councillors, Paul Douglas, and Steve Terry, also of Chapel End ward in Walthamstow.

I am speaking today both as a local councillor and as someone who has been a resident of Chapel End for over a decade. I am extremely dismayed at the proposal to move Chapel End from Walthamstow constituency to Chingford and Woodford Green. I would like to propose an alternative, namely that Walthamstow retains the constituency in its current form but with the addition of Forest ward. This would make nine wards in total, giving an electorate of 71,280, against the minimum requirement of just over

71,000.

As you can see from the maps, the ward of Chapel End is split by the A406, the North Circular road, but almost 90 per cent of the residents live to the south of the North Circular in Walthamstow. The North Circular is a motorway in all but name as it passes through Waltham Forest and there is little, if any, connection between the two sides of the road. Chapel End has many local ties to Walthamstow which would suffer if the current proposal is accepted.

As a Chapel End resident, I feel I live in Walthamstow and part of Walthamstow's community and use services and facilities within Walthamstow. For example, transport, Walthamstow is a destination. In the morning rush hour there is far more traffic, buses, cars and bikes travelling towards Walthamstow for its underground and overground connections than in any other direction.

The recently established night tube also ends in Walthamstow on the Victoria line. Schools. The majority of children in Chapel End attend schools in the North Circular and, if asked, they and their parents would say they attend schools in Walthamstow. Healthcare. Like most residents of Chapel End I am registered with a GP surgery inside the North Circular and travel to Whips Cross University Hospital for A&E or consultant treatment.

Leisure. Most residents of Chapel End, like myself, use facilities in Walthamstow, whether it is the libraries, the parks, the cinema, the award-winning William Morris Gallery, the YMCA, the museums or the newly opened Feelgood Leisure Centre. Shopping. Like most Chapel End residents, I tend to shop in Walthamstow Mall, the Hoe Street, the village, or in the famous Walthamstow Market.

Finally, community. Walthamstow has a burgeoning sense of community in which Chapel End residents play a full part and I try to join in myself. For example, there were 22 separate venues in Chapel End for the 2015 E17 Art Trail, all of which were inside the North Circular.

As a Chapel End councillor, I consider the North Circular forms an effective barrier to areas of the new constituency from the majority of Chapel End. We believe that as almost 90 per cent of Chapel End residents live inside the North Circular, by far the majority of residents within Chapel End consider themselves to be residents of Walthamstow and not Chingford.

As councillors, we have put together a short survey which we have released via our Twitter account and Facebook pages which local residents are contributing to say where they see their centres of population and the services that they use and we will obviously put forward those results as they come back as part of our more formal consultation process.

The results. As I have said, people consider that they live in Walthamstow. They do not consider that they live in any part of Chingford and Woodford Green. The public transport links are not there. There just is no connection between Chapel End, the majority of it, as it sits on one side of the North Circular and the rest of the proposed constituency. There is very little cross-over for people.

While we are not denying that Chingford and Woodford Green also has transport links, schools, healthcare, leisure and shopping facilities and a community, it is not a community that Chapel End is a part of. It just is not. Chapel End is part of Walthamstow and belongs to the Walthamstow constituency. I urge you to consider the proposal to keep that constituency as it is with the addition of Forest ward to meet the new requirement of the minimum number of voters. Thank you. That is what I came to say.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, that is helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you, and are you going to leave us a copy of what you just said?

CLLR MITCHELL: Can I email it in, is that okay?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, that would be perfect, yes, if you would.

CLLR MITCHELL: Obviously, we would like to put together a more formal response which will take into account some of the residents' feedback as well.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, the Facebook and things like that, yes. That will be good, that will be very good. Yes, please do. Mr John Bryant. You are scheduled to speak later, would you like to speak now?

MR BRYANT: If it is all right with everyone?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, I am sure we would be delighted. If you would like to come and take a seat in the hot seat, as they say, and if you would just introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin, please.

MR BRYANT: My name is John Bryant and I live at 20 Wilton Square, London N1 3DL, which is in the borough of Islington. However, I have got some more general interest in these proposals and I have been following the process with great attention.

I do not actually have any specific proposals in relation to the constituency proposed for myself in Islington, which think is eminently reasonable, but I do want to put forward (and I shall be presenting this as a formal submission to the Commission) a number of

changes in the proposals north of the river and I have divided these into five groups because each of these groups of changes can be accepted by itself. They do not have knock-on implications for one another, and so if you like the first set but you did not like the second set you do not have to take them as a package deal.

Essentially, what I have tried to do is to increase the number of constituencies across North and West London that lie wholly within a single borough. I have tried to improve the manageability and coherence of certain seats and I have tried to maintain the many positive features of the Boundary Commission's scheme including its complete avoidance of ward splits and I would like to make it clear that I am not here to condemn the Boundary Commission. I think they have done a very interesting job in challenging circumstances, so I am trying but I do think that there is considerable scope for improvement.

These changes affect various different parts of North, West and East London and I am not going to go through the whole thing because I have only ten minutes and I cannot possibly do that in the time. I will just say very briefly that I am suggesting that there are seven seats in the North West London area that should be comprehensively rejigged, if I can put it that way, in order to reduce the number of borough boundaries and in order to avoid doing things like putting a boundary straight through the middle of Southall High Street, which you do at the moment.

There are some more limited adjustments in the Finchley Barnet area which again are about trying to get the whole of Finchley into a Finchley and Southgate seat and also about trying to avoid breaking the links between Hendon and Mill Hill, which the Commission proposes to do. Another limited package of changes in the Westminster area which are essentially about trying to create a coherent Paddington seat in the Westminster area, which I think would be much stronger than the rather messy and awkward Queen's Park and Regent's Park seat that the Commission has proposed.

I want to focus on the East London area because that is where we are. The biggest single package of changes I am proposing are in the inner East London area. I want absolutely to endorse the proposal which I believe I am right in saying has been made by both the Conservative and Labour Parties and by the previous speaker that Chapel End ward is an integral part of Walthamstow and should remain within it.

It is much more appropriate to reinforce the Chingford and Wood Green seat with the Bridge ward of Redbridge, which would also have the merit of meaning that that seat would then include the majority of the town of Woodford. It would not be so badly divided as it currently is. I think that the Labour Party proposal of simply adding Forest ward to Walthamstow makes eminent sense and I also want to support the Labour Party's proposal for what they call a Leyton and Stratford constituency, consisting of the southern part of Waltham Forest and the north-western part of Newham.

Incidentally, just in case anyone thinks I am a Labour apparatchik since I just supported three of their seats, I would like to say I do not hold any brief for the Labour Party. It is immaterial to what we are saying but I am not a Labour voter and, if you look at my proposals in North West London, I have endorsed the Conservative proposal in that area. I am trying to be non-partisan about this.

I have made a number of suggestions that are not the same as the Labour Party's in the rest of East London. I have tried to make seats more compact. I have also tried to avoid so much change from the existing boundaries. I have tried to make sure that we keep recognisable East Ham seats and a recognisable Barking seat that does not protrude into Redbridge.

A key element of these proposals is that the existing Ilford South seat can actually be left completely unchanged and I think that is quite a positive thing because Ilford South, as it stands at the moment, is beautifully defined by the Redbridge boundary and the A12 and the River Roding. It is within quota. One would suggest that this is the kind of seat that ought to be left unaltered if that is possible and my plan does achieve this.

Essentially, that is the strategy I have adopted, which I am very happy to answer any questions or points concerning and I have set out in this paper the proposed seats that would be created so that it can be seen that they are all within the statutory limits that are laid down under the relevant legislation.

It is a particular point of the scheme in this area that, of the nine seats, five are within a single borough, compared with four in the BCE proposals; Redbridge is divided between only three seats, whereas the Commission's proposals divide it between five; it has two seats wholly within Redbridge rather than one; the Walthamstow and East Ham seats are subject to far less disruption than in the Boundary Commission's scheme; and existing ties in North Newham are not disrupted in the way that the Commission has done by proposing a Forest Gate and Oxford seat. I have kept the links between Forest Gate and West Ham, Manor House and East Ham and, as I say, I have kept the Ilford South East. On the whole, I feel I have kept communities much better together than in the BCE proposal in this area.

Finally, between the Dagenham and Rainham and Romford seats, I have proposed an exchange of wards between those two seats because if you look at the map as proposed by the Boundary Commission the Dagenham and Rainham seat is of an extremely awkward and convoluted configuration. I am proposing that two wards should be exchanged that will make both the Romford and the Dagenham seats much more compact and I think will improve both constituencies. That is what I am putting forward. Oh, and a few name changes as well.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, thank you. It is rather a lot to try and take in and absorb as you can appreciate and the scale of it is excellent. That is what

we need. It is broad ranging. A couple of questions just to clarify. You are speaking entirely on your own behalf then?

MR BRYANT: I am speaking as a member of the public.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just a member of the public?

MR BRYANT: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And if I was to put to you, well, where are the flaws in your proposals?

MR BRYANT: You mean, the seats I do not feel quite so comfortable about?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR BRYANT: I have put the Beckton and Royal Docks wards of Newham into a seat with Barking, where I accept the communications are not clear. I should perhaps have added that there are maps at the back of my proposals, so you can see what I have in mind there. It is not an ideal linkage but I think it is worth it because, again, it allows you to keep the Ilford South seat unchanged. It allows you to keep Redbridge divided between only three constituencies rather than five. Although I am not pretending that this is an ideal arrangement, I think it is definitely better overall.

I think I would have to say that on the other side of London, the Harrow South and Kenton seat that I am proposing is noticeably long and thin, but there are good road communications across it and I think I have kept the various communities in that area linked together rather better than in the Commission's proposals and I have reduced the number of seats that cross boundaries. Any plan represents a series of compromises, as indeed does the Boundary Commission's, and with all due respect - as I say, I am not here to rubbish the Boundary Commission's plan because I think a lot of it is really good - in these areas I think my compromises are better than your compromises, with respect.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, that is helpful, thank you. I appreciate, you have obviously put a lot of effort into preparing this and so that is very helpful to us. It does need to be carefully studied which I shall certainly do. Are there any matters for clarification immediately? (No response). In which case, can I thank you very much. Mr Robert Straker, would you like to come forward, Sir? If you could just introduce yourself by way of name and address, please.

MR STRAKER: My name is Robert Straker. I live in Beckenham, which is South East London, 71 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham, Kent BR3 1NR. I missed the opportunity of getting into the Boundary Commission review in the London Borough of Bromley

Town Hall because I was away, but I wanted to come here to support the Boundary Commission's view regarding the constituency of Beckenham.

Very briefly, the Crystal Palace ward was always part of Surrey. Crystal Palace was part of Norwood, the Great North Wood, which was part of Surrey. Beckenham has always been part of Kent. Crystal Palace has an SE19 postcode. Beckenham has a Beckenham postcode. I am very happy with what you are doing there because I think there is a natural boundary between the Crystal Palace Park and the Penge and Cator Park boundary. There is a natural boundary there plus a railway line that runs along the bottom of the road all the way through from Annerley all the way through into Norwood Junction, which was also part of Surrey.

The natural boundary between West Wickham and Shirley is an old boundary. Shirley used to be part of the Ravensbourne constituency in part of Bromley. Shirley was always part of Kent. There was a natural boundary between the Shirley Hills and the dual carriageway that runs alongside the Trinity Independent School which runs into the centre of Croydon. There was a natural boundary there. Many of the shops and, indeed, the church recognises the basis between West Wickham and Shirley because they always talk about West Wickham and Shirley as being part of the same unit.

Just an interesting point, when my sister was married she went to live in West Wickham, which is only, she tells me, 44 years ago and her telephone number was Spring Park 1458. Spring Park is the ward that we are talking about in Shirley which was always part of West Wickham and Shirley. It was that until the creation I think of the GLC. So I am here to support strongly the Boundary Commission's proposals for the constituency of Beckenham.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. That is a helpful endorsement for the initial proposals. Are there any matters of clarification? (No response). In which case, can I thank you very much indeed for making the effort to come, Sir. We will now take a break until 4.40 when our next scheduled speaker is due, thank you.

After a short break

Time noted: 4.45 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reconvene. We have a number of speakers now, which is good. I think the next one to call to make a presentation, Judith Margaret Holt. Hello and welcome. If you would just introduce yourself by way of your name and address, please.

MISS HOLT: My name is Miss Judith Margaret Holt and I live at 1 Ferguson Court, Gidea Park, Romford RM2 6RJ and I have come here today as a resident of Romford. I

am also a local teacher here as well, so I live and work in Romford. As I said, my name is Judith Holt and I have come to the hearing this afternoon to speak about the proposed changes to the Romford parliamentary constituency. I do so as a long-time resident of and worker in Romford.

I was born in Romford. I have lived in Gidea Park in Romford for 18 years and I have been a teacher at a local prep school for 21 years, so I know the local area extremely well. I understand that the number of constituencies in Greater London need to be reduced and that the plan of the Boundary Commission is to move Eastbrook ward from the Dagenham and Rainham constituency into the Romford constituency.

On the whole, I think this makes sense because I notice on your website you say that when you are planning changes you do try and retain existing constituencies as far as possible and by moving just Eastbrook ward there would not be much change for either Romford or Dagenham and Rainham. I would also agree that it is sensible, largely, to use local government wards as the building blocks for constituencies because they are all political boundaries.

However, geographically and in terms of the local community, the Eastbrook ward boundary simply does not make sense because the community of Rush Green is cut right in half. When Greater London was formed in 1965, I think it was, in the Rush Green area they used some rather antiquated and obscure boundaries, so you have the very odd situation that the northern half of Rush Green was put into the London borough of Havering and the southern part was put into the London Borough of Barking Dagenham.

As I said, I have lived in Havering all my life and I know the area very well and, by and large, the London borough boundaries were placed where there were natural gaps, where there were natural green spaces of countryside. For example, between Upminster and Brentwood, Upminster is in the London borough of Havering, Brentwood is in Essex and there is sort of countryside between those two areas. But Rush Green has just never made sense.

The London borough boundary between Havering and Barking Dagenham is extremely artificial. It does not take the local communities into account at all. It splits Rush Green in two, putting the southern half with Dagenham East, with which it has got practically nothing in common. If you ask anyone in Rush Green, "Where do you live?", they will say Romford. They will not say Dagenham. The same with Dagenham East. It is Dagenham. It is not part of Romford.

It would have been much more sensible, I think, to have had the boundary through Central Park and Eastbrook End Country Park. I have got a map that I will hand in with my submission showing that you have got the postal boundary, the RM7 postal boundary, through those two parks. It would have made much more sense to put the



borough boundary there. I do not know why it was not.

We have got this rather strange situation. It is really an absolutely anomaly in Rush Green. The London borough boundaries cuts the community in half and, not only that, leads to a number of almost ridiculous situations in the community of Rush Green. For example, the parish church, St Augustine's, is in Havering but Rush Green Primary School is in Barking and Dagenham and the main medical centre in Rush Green is also in Barking and Dagenham.

Because Rush Green primary school is in Barking and Dagenham there have been incidents, I have heard, of children who live in the Havering part, their parents have not been able to get them into Rush Green Primary School, which is their nearest school because they do not live in Barking and Dagenham. They do not live in the right borough. They live in Havering.

The boundary is not even a simple boundary in Rush Green. It does not even, say, cut Rush Green Road in half. It actually cuts into the side roads off Rush Green Road. You have got the very odd situation in, say, Gorse Way, one side of the road is in Barking and Dagenham. The other side of the road is in Havering. One side of the road has got John Cruddas as their MP. The other side of the road has got Andrew Rosindell.

You have got that situation in a couple of the roads: Lilac Gardens and Horace Avenue. It just does not make sense that the person who lives opposite you, if they have a problem they go to one MP and, just because you are a couple of yards the other way, you have to go to another MP. It really just does not make sense.

As I have mentioned before, you have got this situation, you have got half of Rush Green not in the same ward as the rest of Rush Green and it is with part of Dagenham East. Again, they are two completely separate communities and they are separated by the Country Park, so geographically they are separate as well.

What my suggestion would be is just to move the Rush Green part of Eastbrook ward, i.e. the polling district MA, into the Romford constituency and leave the Dagenham East part of Eastbrook ward, i.e. the polling districts MB and MC, in the Dagenham and Rainham constituency.

The main reasons, I have outlined some of them but just to sum up, this would be geographically correct. You would unite the whole of the community of Rush Green under the same Member of Parliament who would be Andrew Rosindell MP and then Dagenham East would remain part of Dagenham and Rainham under John Cruddas MP.

That also fits in with the point the Boundary Commission make that we try to have regards to geographical factors when sorting out the changes in constituencies. Also,

number crunching, the numbers fit. If you move the MA polling district, there are 3,807 electors. If you move that, that will give the Romford constituency the right new number of constituents within the Boundary Commission limits, 74,760.

By leaving the other two polling districts within Dagenham and Rainham and then just having the Rush Green move out of Dagenham and Rainham, they will still have the same number, which again is about 76,500. Also, there will be minimal disruption. It will not be a question of sort of chopping up one constituency and moving several wards and making another constituency. It would just be this one polling district. The people who are in the MA polling district of Eastbrook ward, the Rush Green area, they will just fairly seamlessly move into the Romford constituency which most of them believe they are part of anyway.

It would be much easier for the constituents. There would be a minimum amount of moving, a minimum amount of confusion and again it fits in with what the Boundary Commission say you try to retain existing constituencies wherever possible. I would urge the Boundary Commission to accept this much easier and much more logical proposal rather than moving the whole of Eastbrook ward out into the Romford constituency, just to move in the polling district MA, the Rush Green area, into the Romford constituency to reunite it with the rest of Rush Green and to keep the polling districts MB and MC, Dagenham East, in Dagenham and Rainham, which they are also part of.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is great, thank you. I think you said you were going to give us the submission and a map?

MISS HOLT: Yes, I have. I have copied what I have written, yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is brilliant, thank you. Can I just clarify, you are speaking very much as a resident who lives and works in the borough?

MISS HOLT: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: But you are not speaking on behalf of any organisation or group, residents' association or anything like that at all?

MISS HOLT: No, no, no. I am sorry, that is my teachers' badge in case you were wondering.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, no, that is fine, great.

MISS HOLT: As I said, I am very much a local person, born in Romford and I have lived my whole life in Havering and so I, am obviously, very interested to see what is going to happen.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, can I ask a question?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Two things. Microphone and if you can address it through the Chair, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry, if I could just ask through the Chair. Would it not be logical for the concerns of the witness to be addressed by moving the borough boundary as opposed to the constituency boundary? Is this not really a representation about the borough boundary is in the wrong place rather than the constituency boundary is in the wrong place?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Well, it is an interesting observation. I think it actually probably applies in both respects, does it not? Because I think you are making the point in relation to the constituency but, in fact, should this be something that the Local Government Boundary Commission took up, it would obviously address that anomaly as well.

MISS HOLT: Well, possibly, but obviously I did not think that was really the concern here. Actually, with the constituencies, you cannot move the boroughs, can you? But possibly, but obviously this is sort of --- I have done it with the constituency slant rather than the borough slant.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. It is just showing what a wide interest we take in things really, thank you very much indeed. Is Mrs Helen Alterman here? (No response). Cllr Edward Smith, thank you. If you would care to sit there and if you would introduce yourself again by name and address, please, to commence, thank you.

CLLR SMITH: (Southgate) Good evening. My name is Cllr Edward Smith. I live in 25 Arundel Gardens, Winchmore Hill, Enfield. I have lived in Winchmore Hill for 30 years and I have been a councillor in the Southgate ward for over 17 years. Until recently I was a governor at Southgate School, the largest comprehensive in the area. I am also currently chairman of the Enfield Southgate Conservative Association.

I am speaking tonight to oppose the Boundary Commission's proposals to abolish the Enfield Southgate parliamentary constituency. I think there are two main considerations here. Does Enfield Southgate constitute an authentic community where most of the inhabitants share common interests and would suffer if the Commission's proposals went ahead?

The second main issue is whether the proposals significantly reduce parliamentary

representation for that community? I firmly believe the answer to both these questions is yes. To an outsider it might appear that Enfield is one of the many anonymous suburban boroughs on the outskirts of London, largely indistinguishable from each other.

The reality is that Enfield has become a major urban centre in terms of population and is currently larger than Newcastle or Coventry. Owing to the influx of new residents and the high birth-rate, its population is expanding rapidly and it is predicted to rise to 342,000 by 2025 and would probably be of a similar size by then to Leicester which is, as you know, one of the largest cities in the country. This is one single borough. The council and three MPs in the area are, I would say, struggling to cope with the pressures that this level of population growth creates. I will come back to some of the issues that result from that.

Historically, and unlike adjacent boroughs, Enfield is comprised of three distinct areas with different characteristics and this remains unchanged to this day. The A10 runs north-south and is locally recognised as the natural boundary between Enfield Southgate and Edmonton. Edmonton, like Tottenham to the south, expanded during the 19th century to house the workforce needed by the industries that sprang up alongside the River Lea which separates eastern Enfield from Waltham Forest.

Its housing stock, originally Victorian terraces, has over the years been interspersed with council housing, including large numbers of tower blocks. It has one of the largest concentrations of manufacturing industry in London but is also recognised by the Government as being one of the most deprived areas in the country.

Enfield North, on the other hand, was until relatively recently a mainly rural area with large swathes of farmland located in the green belt which covers about a third of the borough. Since the War, a great deal of mixed tenure housing has been developed in the far north-eastern part of Enfield around Enfield Wash and Enfield Lock near the M25, giving the area a more urban feel. It also includes, of course, the northern part of the market town of Enfield. Coming to Enfield Southgate, we believe it is also a distinct entity with its own character.

The first stretch of what is now the Great Northern half of the branch line from Kings Cross came up through Palmers Green, Winchmore Hill and Grange Park before the First World War and led to the residential development of these areas with some of the highest quality arts and crafts housing in London. The extension between the wars of the Piccadilly line to Cockfosters that runs through the constituency created a new wave of development of comfortable and attractive semi-detached suburban housing stretching northwards on both sides of the new underground line.

In addition to these railway lines, the A111 stretches from the North Circular to the M25, providing a spine running through the constituency connecting Palmers Green,

Southgate and Cockfosters. The other main north-south road, Green Lanes or the A105, runs up through Bowes Park, Palmers Green, Winchmore Hill and onwards to Enfield Town.

Enfield Southgate is blessed with several beautiful parks and golf courses. It has a large number of active Residents in Parks' groups, many of whom have spoken today. They make it their business to protect and conserve the areas in which they live. There are fewer such groups in the rest of the borough. The character of Enfield Southgate is not based on ethnicity. The constituency is one of the most diverse in the country. The white British population is probably about 40 per cent now, with large percentages of Greek and Greek Cypriot, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot and Indian populations.

The socio-economic classification of the area shows that Enfield Southgate has a substantially higher proportion of people in managerial groups compared with the rest of Enfield. It also has a higher average household income and a relatively low number of people claiming out of work benefits. It is the very model of a liberal, aspirational and economically successful area.

The Boundary Commission's proposals to combine Southgate, Southgate Green and Winchmore Hill wards with four wards in Finchley and one in Barnet would bring together areas with little or no historical or geographical connection. The Southgate and Finchley areas would be divided almost in half by the Great Northern Welwyn City branch railway which would cut across the centre of the new constituency as opposed to running through it.

Moreover, the Finchley ward part of the new proposals would be split in two by the North Circular Road, which is not a spine road but a very busy motorway. This is a thoroughly bad idea and will effectively dismember the area and its community links. I would like to turn now to the question of parliamentary representation.

As I mentioned before, Enfield as a whole is growing rapidly in population terms. The Boundary Commission is seeking to reduce parliamentary representation in the borough. This is not sensible in the circumstances. It would disenfranchise the people of Enfield Southgate who see themselves as a coherent and successful community, dividing the wards between several adjacent constituencies where in every case they would be a minority interest struggling with other areas to have their voices heard.

A recent example shows how important this is. Enfield Council is seeking to introduce cycle lanes long the A105, one of the main thoroughfares in Enfield Southgate. Whatever views, this proposal has been very controversial. The local MP has led a campaign to ensure that local views are taken into account by the council, by running his own referendum and holding public meetings etc.

Under the Commission's new arrangements, the likelihood of any of the resulting MPs

taking such a close interest in this subject is low because they would naturally have other competing priorities. The point I would like to finish on is that Enfield requires and deserves three parliamentary constituencies and these should reflect the natural geographical and community links in the borough and between the boroughs.

The national Conservative and Labour Party counter-proposals recognise this fact. They differ in detail, naturally, but they strongly favour retaining the status quo, while achieving the voters' targets required by legislation. They are not being backward looking or simply partisan, but they understand Enfield has three constituent parts and each part should be represented in Parliament. I hope the Commission will take these views into account and adopt the counter-proposals proposed by the Conservative Party. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Could I just clarify, you are speaking as a ward councillor and resident in that instance?

CLLR SMITH: I am speaking as a ward councillor, resident and Chairman of the Enfield Southgate Conservative Association.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: And is the council proposing to make a formal submission as the council or not?

CLLR SMITH: I believe they are.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: They are, okay. That is really helpful, thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? Sorry, there is one. Sir, could you just hang on a second, there is ---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, that is fine. It is more to you than to ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Oh, it is to me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just so that you are aware, there was meant to be a PowerPoint with that one so that you can look at that in your further submissions and I have got some paperwork to submit to you as well for that.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that clarification, yes. Is Cllr Anne-Marie Pearce present? Yes, would you like to come forward and just give your name and address, please?

CLLR PEARCE: (Enfield) Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Cllr Anne-Marie Pearce, 3 Langley Row, Hadley Highstone EN5 4PB. As a Cockfosters resident and member of the Enfield Southgate Conservative Association for 45 years, as well as being a councillor in the London Borough of Enfield for 31 years, I feel

well-acquainted with local issues to speak on the topic of these proposed boundary changes and the effect they will have on the local community.

In my opinion, the Boundary Commission's proposals are not beneficial to the constituents of the Cockfosters ward. I believe that the counter-proposal for North London submitted by the Conservative Party (copied at the end of this submission as Appendix A) would better serve the needs of Enfield and would better respect community links.

Since these preposterous proposals have come about, I have had many residents from various parts of the borough inform me that they are not impressed as they would feel that they would be cut off from their representative, the Member of Parliament for Enfield Southgate. Residents of Cockfosters do not want an MP who does not have their interests as members of the London Borough of Enfield at the forefront of what they do or the knowledge and position in Enfield to best represent them on local key issues.

It is also crucial that a ward's elected local councillor and MP work together in harmony. Therefore, it does not make sense to have one's ward councillors working exclusively with the London Borough Of Enfield while the MP works nearer exclusively with another borough, the London Borough of Barnet. It is not the London Borough of Barnet that collects our bins or administers Trent Park or charges our business rates. It is the London Borough of Enfield. For this reason, we need strong representation like we have now from an MP who deals exclusively with Enfield Council.

A key example which illustrates why Cockfosters MP must have a majority interest in Enfield's health: Throughout my life I have specialised in the health needs of the people of Enfield Southgate area. At this present moment in time our health services are strained. These services are administered by Enfield's Clinical Commissioning Group and, therefore, it makes no sense whatsoever to have an MP with a majority interest in Barnet representing an Enfield ward.

If these changes were to come about, it would mean that my residents would potentially have further afield to travel for their health needs and, in some cases, may not be able to obtain an appointment with doctors or local hospitals. Enfield Southgate is a particularly unique area and very well supported by the infrastructure that has driven the community's development.

The Piccadilly Line of the underground and Cockfosters Road are two main key routes that link Cockfosters to Southgate and bind the community together. Historically, Cockfosters had strong links to Enfield Chase to the north-east, which was originally a royal hunting ground; therefore, moving Cockfosters into Chipping Barnet completely discards our history and would disrupt the heritage of the area.

In terms of culture, Cockfosters is intrinsically linked to Southgate. I am a founder member of the Chicken Shed which has significant support from the communities from Southgate and Enfield predominantly. For all the above reasons, I think it is abundantly clear that Enfield Southgate needs to remain as a single constituency and that Cockfosters must be part of the arrangement. I, therefore, support the Conservatives and my proposal outlined in Appendix A, which outlines the plan for Enfield Southgate which absorbs Bush Hill Park. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). Right, thank you. And if we can have a copy of what you have just said with a map, you mentioned, thank you. Oh, there, we have got it, lovely, thank you very much indeed. Yes, that is great. That is marvellous, thank you. Helen Osman.

MRS OSMAN: While the presentation is getting set up, I will just explain, apologies, I have got a sore throat so my voice is a bit croaky and so I will not be speaking for very long. I will just explain a little bit about me. My name is Helen Osman. I am not a member of the Conservative Party.

In fact, I am a member of the Lib Dems and have been since the formation of the SGP, so I am looking at it from a different political perspective. I come from a career in marketing and now I run a big local community website called n21.com. It is about the Winchmore Hill postcode which, in essence, links, two important wards. In essence, Winchmore Hill is predominantly made up of two wards, a population of about just under 10,000 households, a population of about 23,000 or 24,000 people in the last census.

We have two wards. We have Grange ward to the north and Winchmore Hill ward to the south of N21. Now under the current proposals it is intended that Grange ward will move to the new Enfield ward and Winchmore Hill ward will basically be amalgamated into the Finchley ward. In essence, we are starting to disconnect two very similar wards. They have similar demographics.

There is a lot of movement between the two wards. Both of them are on the Hertford North line into Enfield Town, so they have a large number of people actually working in town and so they have a great deal of similarity between the two wards. Of course, they are sitting in the borough of Enfield and, certainly from the time that I have been involved in campaigning and community marketing, a lot of the time we have been working very closely together with people in the two wards to address local campaigns.

If I just take you through two key ones and I think, in essence, having two town halls would make things very very different because it is very important for the campaigners and community teams and also charities to get to know the people who are basically the officers and the councillors who actually work out of one town hall. I think it will be a major disadvantage to actually have to deal with two town halls. I am just going to give



you two examples.

Back in 2011 we had what has been called the "Great Grange Park Massacre." Network Rail came along and, basically, took down hundreds of mature trees and created an absolute --- well, they devastated the local area, and through very active campaigns we worked with Enfield Council and also Network Rail to repair this. I took a picture today. You cannot see it very well, but you will see we have lost our trees but do have a new wildlife habitat here. I think this would have been a lot harder to have done if we had not worked very closely with our sitting MP but also with Enfield Council and having an MP who really understood the local area.

Finally, my second case is a current one. We are currently at the moment have been selected as one of the winning wards for the Cycle Enfield Mini Holland scheme. The first route is the A105 Green Lanes, which actually goes right through the two wards of Grange and Winchmore Hill. It is having a major impact on the area. We have a large campaign. We are fighting a legal campaign.

Again, actually managing this campaign would have been impossible without the help of our MP, who at the end of last year actually held a referendum which we believe was a much more accurate reflection of local opinion because, instead of having an online survey which was open to the world and his wife, this was a referendum delivered to people's houses in the wards, Grange and Winchmore Hill, and close to the route.

We believe again it was a much better way of running opinion. Again, it has been vital for us to work very closely with our MP on this one scheme. That is, in essence, really what I wanted to say. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is helpful, thank you very much indeed. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. John Jewson. If you would like to come forward, Sir? Again, introduce yourself by name and address to begin, thank you.

MR JEWSON: Good afternoon. My name is John Jewson. I have got no notes to give you. I am a member of FERAA, which is Federation of Enfield Residents & Allied Associations, which means that all the residents' associations in Enfield when they have got a problem they come to us and we sit down and we do our best to sort the situation out with MPs and councillors.

I saw the idea that was going to be put forward and, I have got to be honest with you, we spoke to a number of our residents and there were a lot of people with deep concerns because, as has been stated before here, you could be talking not just to one MP but you could be talking to five MPs.

At least in Edmonton we have got one in Edmonton we can talk to if it is over there. In

Southgate, we have got one piece person, and if you go further across it will be Joan Ryan at the present time. Now we know who they are. We have got one thing we have got to remember with this, and this is the way I look at it: Community. This is a big word, community. To have people to sit round a table knowing what they are talking about around this.

So if you spread an MP out to other areas, and I am not just talking about Enfield now, you spread them across the other side, and we say the North Circular Road, you spread them out somewhere else, contact is lost, and this is the one thing we do not want. We do not want contact lost.

I appreciate we have got to have the number of people each MP has got to have, but with the situation we have at the moment, especially in Enfield with the number of people that are coming into Enfield and the number of building and all the rest of it is going to be, we can roughly calculate what was going to be in the future.

Now Edmonton is definitely going to have quite a few people down in Meridian Water. A lot of buildings are going there. You can also roughly calculate what you have got at this present time in Enfield, the number of people there. I appreciate there could be some building going on on the green belt, but we have got a good idea of what we are going to have in the future.

To split this up could cause quite a few problems, especially with people like myself and other people who have then got to try and get to talk to not one MP but two MPs, then three MPs, then try and get back to a member who has come to us and say: Well, look, I know this MP said something to us but this one has not.

As far as I am concerned, we have really got to look at this in the present scheme that there is in Enfield, as far as I am concerned, is not going to work, especially the five MPs that you have actually got there. I have had a look at the idea at the moment that has been put forward where there is a line roughly down the A10, where the other side of it will be the Edmonton side and further back will be some of the Enfield Highway.

Back on the left-hand side you have then got whoever is going to be the MP for the rest of it, which will be Grange ward, Bush Hill Park, Southgate Ward. You have then got the other MP who will take further down Enfield Highway and that will be going along roughly the Ridgeway and all the rest of it. We now know what we are dealing with.

Actually, as I said, the community needs to be stabilised in this situation and people like myself and other people have got to try and sort this situation. To try and talk to five MPs, I am sorry, is going to be quite a deal and, as far as I am concerned, this particular proposal, what I have seen, I am afraid it is flawed.

I appreciate in ten years' time we could be talking round saying that the population has changed, but I think we have got a rough idea of the population at the moment the way it is going and we could sort it out at the moment and the proposal which I have actually seen from the new proposal, I will not go into that, I have seen it at the moment where the A10 is like a cross-over and then you have got the other bit there. I think this could work. We could actually work with this. But the present one that you are putting in, I am sorry, gentlemen, as far as I am concerned, it is going to be hard work for myself and other colleagues in the residents' association to try and work. Thank you very much indeed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: No, that is helpful and very clear in terms of the difficulties it throws up for you. Are there any matters of clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much Sir. Is Alex Hinds ready to go? Would you like to come forward, Sir? If you would like to take the seat with the microphone and start your presentation by name and address, please, just to commence, thank you.

MR HINDS: Okay, thank you, Chair. My name is Alex Hinds of 73 Gordon Road, Ilford, Essex, IG1 1SL. I just want to say a few things in my capacity as a member of the public and as a resident of the London Borough of Redbridge. I am disappointed by the proposals to break apart the Ilford South constituency. It is a long-established constituency with a strong sense of community identity.

In particular, Goodmayes and Mayfield, where I live, residents naturally see themselves as part of the Ilford community and the current arrangements as they are now reflect this. The BC proposals would separate Goodmayes and Mayfield from adjoining Redbridge wards. Goodmayes and Mayfield wards are also very different to wards in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.

For example, in Goodmayes the communities look north towards Seven Kings. The High Road unites Goodmayes and Seven Kings with its shopping facilities and places of worship. there is a parish church, there is a mosque and there is also a Sikh Gurdwara temple there as well. There is also Goodmayes Park which divides residents in Goodmayes from Becontree which looks east towards Dagenham.

In Mayfield, Longbridge Road, the A124, forms a clear barrier between communities. There are no obvious facilities or places of interest along this road which could unite residents on either side. The Commission will also note that it is the local authority boundary between Redbridge and Barking and Dagenham boroughs. The proposals for Barking constituency would include very different communities in a constituency which does not look towards each other, but they look away.

Just moving on to the actual constituency name of Barking, it does not reflect the Goodmayes and Mayfield communities from Redbridge. Residents will feel isolated if they are included in a constituency which does not reflect the name of their main area,

which is Ilford. Goodmayes and Mayfield make up the majority of the current Ilford South constituency and residents, including myself, have long understood and recognised this name.

If we were to be included in the proposed wards in Barking and Dagenham, I propose the constituency be renamed to Barking and Ilford South to reflect those residents from Redbridge. There is currently an Ilford North proposed which is still in existence. If there is an Ilford North, it is only fair to see Ilford South appear in the name especially as it has been recognised for so long. It would give Goodmayes and Mayfield residents a sense of inclusion rather than being seen as leftovers from the break-up of the Ilford South constituency.

I am now going to move on to the proposals for the proposed Forest Gate and Loxford constituency. I do not support these proposals for two reasons. Firstly, you have the North Circular, the A406, and the River Roding. They are clear and definable boundaries between Redbridge and Newham. The proposed constituency may be the best solution.

I do understand why it has been proposed. It is, obviously, to balance the numbers because Redbridge is far too big for two constituencies, but it results in Clementswood and Loxford residents being isolated from Newham borough wards by, of course, the North Circular Road and the river. I have noted there is only possible way in which a Member of Parliament could access Clementswood and Loxford, which is via Romford Road going under the North Circular.

There is an exit and entrance junction to the A406 here, which is notorious for traffic jams as drivers come off the North Circular or pass through on their way to Ilford and then Manor Park, Forest Gate and then onto Stratford. I believe this arrangement would not be popular with residents from Clementswood and Loxford.

Despite this, there might be one small positive to this constituency arrangements. You do have Little Ilford residents in Newham. They do look towards the town centre in Ilford for shopping facilities via the Romford Road. Residents in Little Ilford are also closer to Ilford Station where there are more frequent trains in the mornings and the evenings.

I do accept that the North Circular or the river are not complete barriers in this area. However, I would ask the BC to think about these arrangements. Although any changes here would likely result in significant modifications elsewhere in Newham and in Redbridge, I do obviously accept that, if there is a viable alternative the BC should consider using the North Circular and River Roding as the constituency boundary as it currently is now.

Lastly, just turning towards the constituency name, it does not take into account Manor

Park which is a large residential area in the middle of the proposed constituency. I am sure all of us will note that Crossrail is passing through Manor Park in 2018, very shortly. The area will become more significant and a sought-after place to live. I do not understand why Forest Gate is reflected in the name but Manor Park is not.

Manor Park is a well-understood name. It is a large area. It has a train station. It has many unique facilities which people know and it should be reflected in that constituency name. Going back to the constituency again, if no alternative is found to include Clementswood and Loxford wards in a different constituency, so if you are going to leave it as it is, then I propose the name is called Forest Gate, Manor Park and Loxford.

This would give Manor Park the recognition it deserves, especially as I have just spoken about Crossrail and also, of course, the demand for property which will probably ensue as that happens. It would also reflect the communities in Redbridge who have joined with the wards in Newham. That is it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Great, thanks, that was very clear. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed for that. David Conway.

MR CONWAY: My name is David Conway. My address is 107 Old Park Avenue, Enfield, which literally is in Grange ward in Southgate. As you will see from the first slide I was a councillor for the London Borough of Enfield for 18 years and chairman of many of the Council's Committees. I was Deputy Leader of the Council. I am presently Vice Chairman of Enfield Southgate Conservative Association.

I am going to attempt to present with my other hat on as a social historian - I am an honorary research fellow at University College - not from the perspective of local politics. My case is fundamentally that the boundaries of Enfield Southgate, which have remained similar for over a century, demand particular attention because, as I will demonstrate, local communities grew into these boundaries as opposed to the more usual situation of imposition of boundaries according to existing communities.

I will be referring to the Commission's criteria of local ties, geography, transport and relevant infrastructure, including transport and facility locations. This means, in my submission, the present division between three parliamentary constituencies is peculiarly appropriate for the London Borough of Enfield as a whole and the proposed division of Enfield Southgate between three constituencies is peculiarly inappropriate. Community and local ties in Southgate developed on the basis of local infrastructure.

The proposals of the Boundary Commission override these ties almost entirely. Moreover, they rip out the focal areas of Southgate communities and transfer them to a new constituencies with which they have minimal connection, a new constituency which by the way, apart from arithmetic, seems to me to fail on every one of the Commission's

criteria. Furthermore, the proposals take no account of the strong ties of the connections of the other Enfield Southgate wards with this focus which is being removed.

The proposal I support for Enfield Southgate itself is the addition to the present constituency of Bush Hill Park ward which meets the numbers criterion and was, indeed, proposed by the Boundary Commission in 2012, as I understand it. It also, I think, provides the most acceptable answers to the issues I will be discussing. The proposal is consistent with at least one existing alternative proposal for North London, which you see on the right there, which is that of the Conservative Party. Their proposal involves the extension of Edmonton South wards and deals with the knock-on effects throughout the North Central London sub-region.

Before I move on to the next slide, I would ask you just to bear in mind the shape of Enfield Southgate as you see it there. What you see in dark green there in the field on the right is the Edmonton Hundred of Middlesex, the top four sections, which has been in existence since the time of the Domesday Book and the Southgate part of that which was defined in the 19th century I think as part of the poor laws as the dark green shape there which you see as very similar to the shape which we have today.

The region looks east and it still does today, as I will show. If you look at the kink in the side of Southgate constituency there on the left-hand side, the western side, which is the same as today's Enfield Southgate western boundary, that is an indication of a division which has been there since the Domesday Book of 1086. The outline of the borough has been more or less consistent since 1881.

The urban district of Southgate was created in 1894. If you look at the Ordnance Survey map which is on there you will see that most of Southgate is still empty. It is defined by the south and west boundaries of the absent Enfield Chase, the Royal Chase, which other speakers have referred to during today. We have Chase Side, the name of the road which goes down the western boundary; Southgate; Cockfosters; the Head Forester's house; West Lodge; Old Park in Grange ward, which is where I live on Old Park Ridings, which is where the game was reared for the monarchy and so forth.

On the right centre of the Ordnance Survey map, you see the first stage of what became the Hertford Loop line. The part from Wood Green to Enfield, now Enfield Chase, was completed in 1871. What you see there is entirely within the boundary of Enfield Southgate as it is now and as we would propose it. It was extended north from 1905 onwards. That provided a swathe of late Victorian and Edwardian housing.

At the extreme right on the map is the Lea Valley line, Ashburton, Enfield Town; and on the left of the map is the Great Northern line, which is now Thameslink and Great Northern which has always lain to the west of Southgate. The Piccadilly Line extension was opened in 1932/33. You can see the aerial black and white photographs at the top

taken before the construction. You can see the land at that time was virtually empty. You will have copies of this presentation.

I wanted to mention here particularly the four Charles Holden stations which were built on the northern extension. They are masterpieces of 1930s architecture. They are iconic and become the signature of Southgate. They are one of the things which unifies the constituency. The consequence of the way in which Southgate has developed is that all the new suburbs, the Edwardian suburb rising from the Hertford line, the 1930s suburb rising from the Piccadilly extension were and have remained oriented to a north-south geographical axis, to Southgate itself and to Enfield.

This map shows how the Boundary Commission proposals, which are in purple, contradict the natural links of connection to Enfield Southgate, crossing all the north-south lines, the railway lines, and the roads; whereas the counter-proposal more closely reflects the railways, the A10 and the main roads in the west of the constituency.

You will see in the slightly darker shade of green there is Bush Hill Park which we propose should be added to Enfield Southgate, so that Bush Hill Park and Palmers Green which the Commission would relegate to Edmonton are on the west of the A10 and that is entirely appropriate.

Palmers Green is the location of the former town hall of Southgate. It has always been regarded as part of Southgate. Bush Hill Park Conservation Area, in fact, spreads over into Grange ward because of the consistency of the architecture there. This is one Southgate community which I just wanted to illustrate.

It shows some aspects of the Jewish community in Enfield Southgate which I chose because I myself am Jewish. I am sure members of other local communities could tell similar stories. Jews need to live close to their synagogues. It is forbidden to drive on Sabbaths or festivals. There is a quorum of ten members for a service, so Jews tend to live close together. Here, you see the five synagogues in the constituency which are the circles or the egg-shaped blobs there. The Wolfson Hillel Jewish primary school, which is shown as a star just near to Southgate itself.

The Jewish community lives across the constituency and favours doing its shopping in Southgate or Cockfosters, where there is a very good delicatessen - which I can recommend - and you can certainly see how the proposals would dislocate the local Jewish community. Incidentally, the synagogue in the south end Bowes ward is Brownlow Road, which was built in 1938, so it is part of the expansion of the Jewish community out of the old east end and that was a forerunner of that. Incidentally, there are major Jewish cemeteries in both Enfield North and Edmonton and one just north of the borough across the M25. This is an example of a community within Enfield or Enfield Southgate.

Having made some comments about the cohesion of Enfield Southgate, I want to say something about the incoherence of the proposed Finchley and Southgate. I say this with some experience because I was born and brought up in Finchley and I lived since my marriage in 1972 in Southgate. I can honestly say there are virtually no connections between these two very distinct communities.

People in Finchley, if they are looking outside their area to do shopping, would never dream of going to Southgate and vice versa. In fact, I myself have no memory of ever being in Southgate until we bought a flat there in Avenue Road on our marriage. As you will see from the map, the only major artery connecting the two communities, the North Circular, runs along the south border of the new constituency and offers no opportunities for stopping off. Interestingly, the only other connection is the 125 bus which runs along the north boundary towards Totteridge, then leaves the constituency to go towards Totteridge and then goes south down to Finchley Central.

This is a constituency which fits the 125 bus route but virtually nothing else. All the rail links cut across the constituency from north to south so the east-west alignment of this constituency makes no sense at all. Transport for London agrees. This is from their website. You can check it. If you want to go from Arnos Grove, which is halfway down, it is in the centre in the south to Finchley Central which is at the west end of the proposed constituency, you have to take, ludicrously, a bus north to Totteridge and Whetstone station and then take the Northern Line south.

If you want to go from Winchmore Hill, which is at the top right of the proposed new constituency, you have to take the train north to Enfield Chase and then get a bus to High Barnet station which again is in Chipping Barnet outside the borough and then get the tube train going south. These bus spiders, which again you can look at, indicate clearly the orientation of people traffic for the west side of the constituency eastwards and southwards, that is connecting with other parts of Enfield rather than towards Barnet.

The one on the left is for Cockfosters, the one on the right is for Oakwood and so do these. This is the one for Southgate. The one on the right is for Winchmore Hill. Overwhelmingly the connections are within the existing borough of Southgate with just a few, a couple of outriders: The 125 going towards East Finchley, a couple of buses going to Barnet Hospital.

If you do the reverse and check the bus spiders for locations in the proposed Finchley and Southgate constituency for Finchley Central and East Finchley, for example, you will again see that virtually none of the traffic that goes there is directed towards Southgate. There is no reality in a Finchley Southgate constituency.

I have not touched in my presentation on the many service and organisation discontinuities which the dissolution of Enfield Southgate will bring about. I am sure that



other speakers are speaking and have spoken on these issues. I have tried to sketch out some of the historical, structural and community reasons why the integrity for the Enfield Southgate is real and important to its residents and why the present proposals if arithmetically satisfactory, are not socially coherent in terms of geography, history or common interests.

I strongly believe that community links are integral to the belief and trust of an electorate in choosing a representative for their area and that the dispersion of these feelings detracts from the democratic process. It is certainly true that unlike the communities in Tottenham we heard about earlier today, Southgate communities have never demonstrated their solidarity by rioting, but I earnestly trust that the Commission will not hold this against them. I believe that the alternative proposals you have received reflect far more closely than your own preliminary proposals the community of Enfield Southgate and that they allow integrity to the borough of Enfield. I, therefore, urge the Commission to take these perspectives into account in revising the proposals which you will eventually submit. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. That was very interesting. You say you are giving us a copy of the presentation?

MR CONWAY: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Lovely, thank you very much. Oh, we have got a copy. Brilliant, thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification at all? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Is Mr Beyzade here? Lovely. If you would like to come forward, please, and take your seat at the front and introduce yourself by way of name and address, please.

MR BEYZADE: Thank you very much. Hello, good afternoon. My name is Beyzade Beyzade. I live at 575Aa Green Lanes, Palmers Green, London N13 4EB. My profession is a solicitor and barrister. I just want to address the Commission today on the impact of the proposals, particularly in terms of Palmers Green, the area where I reside. I will also touch a bit upon Winchmore Hill.

The reason I am going to do that is because I actually live on the boundary between Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill. I have lived in the Palmers Green area all my life. I use Palmers Green High Street on a regular basis. I use Palmers Green station to commute to work every day. I work primarily in the Chancery Lane area in the Royal Courts of Justice.

Having said that, I have got very strong ties to my local community. I went recently to the Palmers Green Festival. I go to the Talkies cinema. I am very much in touch with the local population of Palmers Green. I also visit the Palmers Green mosque, as I do identify myself as a Muslim. Many Muslims from the local area do tend to use Palmers

Green mosque also.

Politically, I have also been quite active in the Palmers Green area, so I am aware of the views of local residents. In addition, I have spoken to a number of local businesses on Palmers Green High Street in relation to various issues. I think what is really important is that the Commission considers the impact on both local businesses and local people in terms of its proposals.

Taking, first, the impact on local residents of Palmers Green, I think at best what can be said is that the local residents will face a great deal of inconvenience in terms of having to travel to Finchley in order to meet their local MP and get any issues resolved. At worst, however, the people who have suffered the most from the proposals are some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Elderly people will suffer, such as my parents. My dad is in his 70s. My mother is in her late 60s. My mother is disabled. My father has limited mobility. I think my father would struggle to get to Finchley using public transport, and I think my mother would find it nigh on impossible to do so. If you asked the question how would my mother as a disabled person get to the Finchley area to see her MP, well, let us look at this from a practical perspective. She lives on Eaton Park Road in Palmers Green, N13. She will have to get a W9 bus. She will have to get onto a W9 bus. The W9 bus is not wheelchair accessible, so you cannot fit a wheelchair onto it.

The only way for a disabled person to get to Finchley would be to get onto the 329 bus to get to Palmers Green triangle, to get another bus, a 121 bus, to get to Southgate station, to get a third bus from Southgate station to go towards Finchley on the 125, which is not the best of buses because it only goes through certain routes in the Finchley area. My concern is that a disabled person would have to get three or four buses in order to be able to go and commute to go and see their local MP. I think that is wholly unrealistic as an expectation.

I might take that point a little bit further and put my legal hat on for a second. Thinking about our duties under the Equality Act, being disabled is a protective characteristic and I think it is really important that the Boundary Commission considers whether or not its proposals will be discriminatory against disabled residents. I think requiring disabled residents to take three or four buses just to go and see their local MP will have a disproportionate impact on disabled residents. It is something that will be very difficult to justify, indeed, under the Equality Act.

I will not dwell on this point too much because no doubt the Commission will obtain its legal advice in relation to the changes as they are proposed. What I would also like to point out is that there is a marked cultural difference between the Finchley and the Palmers Green community and I emphasise the word "Palmers Green Community" because Palmers Green has a number of features about it in terms of its history, in

terms of Broomfield House, in terms of Southgate Town Hall, in terms of the community getting together for regular events that are organised and in terms of its buildings infrastructure.

I think the culture and the make-up of Palmers Green is extremely different to Finchley, so you cannot seek to confuse the two or conflate the two. I also want to touch upon Winchmore Hill. My experience upon Winchmore Hill is I am a governor at Winchmore Hill School. I have been a governor there for over four years. I am also a member of the Patient Participation Group at the Woodberry Surgery, 1 Woodberry Avenue. I am also a member of the Winchmore Hill Residents' association.

Again, what I would like to emphasise is that the local demographic from Winchmore Hill is very distant and different from the demographic of Finchley. I think that if you look at the current proposals they will increase the distance between the local people and their MP. Already, we are suffering a democratic deficit in politics and already people are finding it quite difficult to be able to keep up to speed with what is going on with the current political climate, both locally and nationally.

What we are trying to do is, obviously, put out ways of making things easier for people in order to keep in touch with politics and to be engaged. If you are creating further distance between people and their MP, then this will no doubt exacerbate the problem in terms of the democratic deficit within politics. I feel that residents will feel increasingly isolated from politics if the current proposals proceed as proposed. I feel that, at least indirectly, one of the effects of the Commission's proposals will be to create a localised democratic deficit.

I also want to mention that my business has offices in Finchley. It is on the High Road at the Brentano suite. What I would like to state is that Finchley is a completely different area in comparison to Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill. Finchley has a different character, a different culture and a different history. In summary, I would like to say that Finchley, Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill are absolutely worlds apart and Southgate and Finchley are worlds apart.

I would urge the Commission to consider my points and to revise its proposals in a manner which does not cause so much disruption to Enfield Southgate and its community. I wholeheartedly support the proposal there will be minimal change, perhaps with simply Bush Hill Park ward only joining the Enfield Southgate constituency, so as to ensure minimal disruption and to ensure that there is minimal inconvenience to our population, including some of its most vulnerable members. Unless I can assist the Commission further, that completes my submissions.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That was very clear and I understand the points. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. Do we have Cllr Ertan Hurer? If you would like to come

forward, Sir?

CLLR HURER: (Winchmore Hill) I have a PowerPoint presentation, Sir. I am councillor for Winchmore Hill Ward in Enfield Southgate. I have been a councillor since 2012. Sorry, it is 2002 - I am doing myself out of ten years there!

As the next slide shows, I have extensive links with Enfield Southgate as a borough. My office has been in Palmers Green since 1994. I was educated in Bowes ward in the 1970s. I live in Bush Hill Park, but in Winchmore Hill, and that is one of the quirks of our Enfield Southgate. I am a school governor in Highfield Primary School in Winchmore Hill and my family own a well-known restaurant in Palmers Green called The Pilgrim's Rest, which was often frequented by people like Tony Blackburn when they used to go in what was the Intimate Theatre.

I have a deep knowledge and understanding of Enfield Southgate, but I also have links with Barnet. I lived in Barnet for around eight years; two years in Arkley and six years in High Barnet, which is within the Chipping Barnet ward, and I was also educated for around seven years in Friern Barnet and in Woodhouse, Finchley. So I do have an understanding of the Barnet area as well. I also have links with Haringey.

I lived in Bounds Green for 19 years and my primary school was in Bounds Green as well, so I have an understanding of the cultures, the people, the area, the architecture and the businesses. I have also held posts in Edmonton. I have been Chairman of the Edmonton Conservative Association. I have held various deputy chairman posts in the Association as well.

I just want to emphasise all this because, hopefully, you will understand that the comments that I am going to make tonight are with an understanding of the area and a deep knowledge of the communities and who it serves and that Barnet and Haringey are totally different to Enfield Southgate and, indeed, Edmonton.

Thankfully, Sir, London is not a divided capital. There are no check points or restrictions on movement, but that is not to say that there are deep differences between areas. As previous speakers have mentioned, Finchley is totally different to Palmers Green. It is totally different to Winchmore Hill, and Palmers Green is totally different to Edmonton.

My focus is Palmers Green and Edmonton in my presentation to begin with. If we start with the residents' association, there are two main residents' associations in Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green. The first is the Fox Lane and District Residents' association. I believe there is a copy for you so I do not need to read this out in full, but it is a very hardworking and popular residents' association. It has 530 households as its members.

At present, this residents' association is serviced by one Member of Parliament, the Member of Parliament for Enfield Southgate being David Burrowes, but a large part of the residents' association also covers Palmers Green. If we divide that up, you will have one residents' association having to be looked after by two MPs. The issue is that Palmers Green will just form the rump of the Edmonton Tottenham constituency as it is proposed. We have experience of MPs tending to ignore, possibly, the wards on their periphery.

Under the Conservative Party's proposal, this residents' association would continue to be represented by one Member of Parliament because Palmers Green would remain part of Enfield Southgate and the only addition would be Bush Hill Park. The other residents' association is right in the heart of Winchmore Hill, the Winchmore Hill Residents' association. Again, it covers quite a large area and, at present, it has two Members of Parliament covering it, which are Edmonton and Enfield Southgate; but, as hopefully you will see from the slide, this residents' association covers Grange, Bush Hill Park, Palmers Green and Southgate wards.

Under the proposal by the Boundary Commission, the Grange part of the residents' association, which is under Enfield Southgate, would be covered by the new MP for Enfield. The Bush Hill Park, currently Edmonton, would continue to be Edmonton. The Palmers Green part would move from Enfield Southgate to Edmonton. The Winchmore Hill part would go from Enfield Southgate to Finchley and Southgate.

The Southgate wards would go from Enfield and Southgate to Finchley and Southgate. So you are dividing up a residents' association and they would not receive the attention that it currently gets from our current MP who attends, without fail, every quarterly meeting.

Now under the Conservative Party's proposals all these wards would fall within the Winchmore Hill Residents' association area as, I said previously, would the Fox Lane and District. So there is a symmetry and there is a nice fit to the residents' associations working in Enfield Southgate.

If I can move on to Palmers Green itself, Palmers Green, the architecture, the signs welcoming you into Palmers Green are the same as they are in Winchmore Hill, in Southgate, Southgate Green. The architecture and the designs and the roads are all very similar. The iconic landmarks of Palmers Green are different to Edmonton, different to Finchley.

You have the Fox pub, a well-known pub in the area, it would go to Edmonton; the Palmers Green Library would go to Edmonton; the Southgate Town Hall, the birthplace of Enfield Southgate, would go to Edmonton. All these areas which have got strong, clear architectural community transport links to the rest of Enfield Southgate would be detached from how it has developed over the years.

This is just a brief history of Palmers Green. I am sure you have heard history all day, but it dates back to the 13th century. It is an old area and like most of Enfield Southgate it was originally a village. Enfield Southgate grew when all these villages merged together and formed the distinctive nature. Around the turn of the century, there was a building expansion around the 19th and early 20th century.

A lot of the architecture in Enfield Southgate is as a result of this building expansion and likewise in Finchley and likewise in Edmonton, but at different times. The architecture is quite different and the transport links have grown as a result of the different stages of development. The transport links within Enfield Southgate tend to be north to south with very little going from east to west or west to east. Palmers Green, as I just touched upon, is not part of Edmonton.

These are the Conservative Party's proposals. The area in the slightly darker green is Bush Hill Park. There is a nice symmetry, as my predecessors here have spoken, to the new proposed ward. The A10 in yellow goes from north to south. There is a dividing point between Palmers Green and Edmonton. There is only one underpass between a three mile stretch, so there is only one link that the community can use if they are walking to go from Palmers Green to Edmonton. It is a six-lane road, three lanes northwards and three lanes southwards. It is an artificial border. That is not very clear but I am sure the printout is better.

Essentially, that is an aerial view of the A10 and how it divides the community. What is also important to note is the A406, since it has been improved there are a greater number of both pedestrian and vehicular crossings between Palmers Green and Bowes. The connection between Palmers Green and Bowes has improved since the A406 improvements but there are no such connections across the A10. As I just said, there is one underpass in a three mile stretch. It is almost impossible for the communities to have regular links with each other and, as a result, they have sort of evolved separately.

If I can just touch here upon why Edmonton and Tottenham does make sense. I am a Tottenham fan, Sir. Do not hold it against me! I regularly go to the matches and because of parking restrictions I usually walk from close to home. It is a long walk, I live in Bush Hill Park but Winchmore Hill, and I walk down to Tottenham. When you walk through from Edmonton through to Tottenham it flows. The architecture is similar. The communities are very similar. There is no discernible change between the Hertford Road which runs down that stretch.

The only boundary, the only time you know you are entering into Enfield from Tottenham is this arch. That is the only time where there is some sort of inclination you are passing from one to another. Otherwise, there is very little difference and the communities mix and merge quite well with each other. I am sure that, again, the proposals put forward by the Conservative Party, taking the top part of Tottenham into

Edmonton, actually does make sense, but taking Bush Hill Park and adding it onto Enfield Southgate also makes sense.

I believe that if we join these two communities, because they mix so well with each other, there will be synergies in improving the area, an enlarged Tottenham Edmonton area. The communities will be better served by having that rather than Palmers Green added onto it, which I think would be a diversion because the communities are so different. The links do not exist.

Now the driving force behind any changes should also be does it improve local democracy, both nationally and locally? I do not believe the Boundary Commission's current proposals do not improve local democracy or national democracy in Palmers Green. I assist our Member of Parliament in his monthly surgeries in Palmers Green and most of the issues raised are to do with the local authority. He deals with the issues he can and I assist with the issues I can. That is not really possible if you have an MP sort of detached from the Palmers Green area.

It serves us well because of the links that Palmers Green has with the rest of Enfield Southgate. People find it very convenient. It is very easy to get to the surgeries. If Palmers Green is detached, that movement across the A10 is very difficult. Unless you have vehicular access, it is very hard for someone, especially disabled or elderly, to access their Member of Parliament. I think it is important that we keep Palmers Green within Enfield Southgate.

As for some local residents, as you can see David is very angry. You know, do not make him angry. In his own words, and I will read this out because he has asked me to read this out on his behalf. Mr Didcot has been a resident of Palmers Green for 42 years, "I moved here as a young lad from Edmonton and this area has been a part of Enfield Southgate for as long as I remember. It certainly is not part of Edmonton. This area has nothing in common with Edmonton and has evolved its own distinctive community and culture. Our distinctive feel would start to disappear if we were absorbed into an area where we have nothing in common with."

The A10 is like a border. I was born on the other side of the A10 and like me and a lot of friends moved into Palmers Green from Edmonton because of its distinct nature. Now there are thousands of Mr Didcots in Palmers Green, please do not make them angry by moving them to Edmonton, Sir. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, thank you for an informative and amusing presentation. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). No, you are happy, right, thank you very much indeed. Erin Celebi. If you could come forward then. Welcome and if you would just start by your name and address, please, just for the record, thank you.

CLLR CELEBI: (Bush Hill Park) I would just like to say good evening to everybody. I am Cllr Erin Celebi. I am a Bush Hill Park ward councillor and I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak today. My address, I usually give the London borough of Enfield but I will give you my actual address. I live in Shrubbery Gardens in Winchmore Hill, N21 2QT and my door number is 2A.

My presentation is about why Bush Hill Park should become part of an enlarged Enfield Southgate. I am going to be a bit more concise because previously people have already spoken about the reasons why Bush Hill Park should be part of Enfield Southgate, but by way of background I would like to elaborate on my links with Enfield Southgate and Bush Hill Park.

As you can see up there, we have the map of Enfield Southgate and Bush Hill Park is the green section to the right. I live in Winchmore Hill and have done so for 20 years. I have brought up my family there and know these areas very well. My husband and I have run a business in Edmonton for 16 years and I had bought my first house in Edmonton where our married life began.

I am also a councillor who represents the residents of Bush Hill Park ward which consists of the postcodes EN1 and N21. I therefore, believe, that I am well-qualified to elaborate on why Bush Hill Park ward is a more natural fit with Enfield Southgate constituency, as opposed to the Edmonton constituency as it stands now. Bush Hill Park was also a historic parish of Enfield. I am not aware if the Commission has a knowledge of that.

Can I start by speaking about the residents' associations? There are two residents' associations representing the Bush Hill Park ward. The Bush Hill Park Residents' association and the Winchmore Hill Residents' association. The Bush Hill Park Residents' association covers the EN1 postcodes within the ward, and the Winchmore Hill Residents' association covers the N21 postcodes within the ward. EN1, for those who are not aware, is the Bush Hill area and N21 represents the area of Winchmore Hill.

Currently, one MP covers the area represented by the Bush Hill Park Residents' association, Edmonton, but two MPs cover the area represented by the Winchmore Hill Residents' association: Edmonton and Enfield Southgate. The current MP for Edmonton has not attended any meetings of the Winchmore Hill Residents' association since being elected in 2014. The previous MP for Edmonton did not attend any of the meetings during the entire term of office, and that was 15 years.

Under the Conservative Party's proposal one MP would represent the areas covered by both, the Winchmore Hill Residents' association and the Bush Hill Park Residents' association if Bush Hill Park ward was taken into Enfield Southgate. May I turn to the links between Enfield Southgate and Bush Hill Park. Bush Hill Park forms part of the



convergent point between the wards of Grange Park Winchmore Hill and Bush Hill Park. I live just off Green Lanes, Winchmore Hill, within the Enfield Southgate Ward.

When I cross the road on Green Lanes, I am in Bush Hill Park ward. When I turn left on Green Lanes, I am in Grange Park ward. This forms a convergence between the three wards as it is now. No wonder many Bush Hill Park residents that I speak to every day believe that they live in Enfield Southgate and not in the Edmonton constituency. The Boundary Commission's proposals would divide this area further, as Bush Hill Park would remain in Edmonton; Grange Park would form part of a new Enfield constituency; and Winchmore Hill would form part of a new Finchley and Southgate constituency. This dilutes local democracy since the three MPs that would be overlooking each of these wards, under these circumstances, would not appreciate our local communities.

Under the Conservative Party's proposal there would be one MP representing the Grange Park, Winchmore Hill and Bush Hill Park wards. This slide shows the Boundary Commission's sixth review. Under the Boundary Commission's sixth review, Bush Hill Park ward would be incorporated into an enlarged Enfield Southgate.

The Boundary Commission had acknowledged that Bush Hill Park ward would be best served as part of Enfield Southgate in its last review, so why does the current Boundary Commission want to demolish Enfield Southgate by pulling it apart into four constituencies? It seems that this has been done purely as a mathematical exercise and not one that recognises our local communities.

Finally, why should Bush Hill Park form part of Enfield Southgate? Bush Hill Park is isolated from the rest of Edmonton by the A10 and I think my colleague here touched on that earlier, so I am going to go into all the ins and outs. This forms a natural border between Enfield Southgate and Edmonton where the demographics are markedly different.

Many Bush Hill Park residents believe that they already live in the parliamentary constituency of Enfield Southgate. The architecture within the Bush Hill Park ward merges seamlessly into the wards of Grange Park and Winchmore Hill, as one of the previous slides showed. There are no physical barriers between the areas of Bush Hill Park, Grange Park and Winchmore Hill. They are almost one extended part of each other.

For example, and these are very short examples because I do not want to bore you with trains etc., as you have heard all the ins and outs of those. For example, Winchmore Hill Library and Winchmore Hill shops and the Winchmore Hill train station are very much used by the Bush Hill Park ward residents. I do hope my presentation this evening highlights the main point why Bush Hill Park ward should form part of an enlarged Enfield Southgate.

Can we get back to slide 2 because I want to make a point of this, because it is very clear? The map shown in slide 2 clearly highlights the natural fit of the ward into the Enfield Southgate constituency.

I would urge the Boundary Commission not to dismantle Enfield Southgate which will severely damage our local democracy, but to support the Conservative Party's proposals which I believe will enhance local democracy where the three MPs representing the Enfield borough can work more efficiently with the local councillors and the local council. That is the end of my presentation. I would like to thank you all for listening to this very important issue this evening. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is very helpful again. Are there any matters for clarification? Yes, there is a matter for clarification.

MR BENNETT: Richard Bennett, Labour Party. Just quickly, Chair, I would like to clarify that the current Member of Parliament was elected in 2015. The previous Member of Parliament was a Member of Parliament for 18 years and I believe resided in the Bush Hill Park ward of the current Edmonton constituency and still does. Just quickly, I am also unsure what the purpose of the slide, which I think is the second one from the end, which I believe look like either projected results or, indeed, results which -  
--

LORD HAYWARD: (Conservative Party) It was taken off the Boundary Commission's website. It was not doctored in any way. That was as presented in the ---

MR BENNETT: What, the Commission has the political breakdown of wards?

LORD HAYWARD: Yes, of certain wards, yes.

MR BENNETT: I would be advised if you could check that, Chair.

CLLR CELEBI: I just thought it would make it clear how the Boundary Commission supported Bush Hill Park going into Enfield Southgate previously and I thought that would be helpful. That is all.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you and we will clarify that. There is another point for clarification.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a further point of clarification on that to my Labour friend sitting over there. That is not the data for this time around anyway. That is historic data.

CLLR CELEBI: No, it was previous data.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that is all data taken from the previous review, okay.

MR BENNETT: I am not sure whether that is --- I would like to see where the link is for where that is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, I will try and find one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is fine. Well, thank you very much indeed for the presentation, thank you.

CLLR CELEBI: Yes, you are right, it was 18 years, my mistake. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Philip Redman. Mr Redman, would you like to come forward and do your presentation? Just make yourself comfortable and if you would just introduce yourself by way of name and address before you begin, that would be most helpful.

MR REDMAN: Mr Chairman, my name is Philip Redman. I have been a resident of Cockfosters for 35 years and I am deeply disturbed at this proposal, which I feel that the young lady who has just spoken has dealt with most adequately.

CLLR CELEBI: Thank you very much.

MR REDMAN: As regard to the whole set-up, if I may say, if you look back into history (and it is not a bad thing to do on these occasions), when the Emperor Napoleon set up the Confederation of the Rhine, which was a confederation of German princelings and small states, he ignored history and it did not work and it did not last.

There is great difference here because we have the opportunity to object. This is what I firmly believe we should do and I would encourage all people to object. I have been mostly concerned with local matters. I am concerned with Trent Park, which is a beautiful open park at Cockfosters. It is a magnificent place, but it gets threatened by all kinds of events which the Town Council in its wisdom wishes to use to bolster up its finances and they have produced attendances of 12,500 people which, in a broad country area as we are and a very restricted road system, is jolly awkward.

We have such things as what we call locally the Black Horse Tower. The black horse, which is the symbol of a bank, has dominated the skyline of Cockfosters for many years. It is now proposed to double that in size, in width, to add further storeys and a very considerable occupation on the ground side. This is a matter of great concern to us because the whole thing has been started off without any traffic consensus. No traffic study has been put into the thing and it has hit us at just the time when that is exactly what we need to sort out the traffic problems that we have got at the present.

To see this commercial development wishing to be in full swing and put its own imposition on this scene is a great deal to put up with. Well, we have our local stalwarts of our police and our hospital and our renowned Cockfosters underground station, which some people say is the end of the Cockfosters line. I do deny that. It is the beginning, and from there it leads to everywhere else.

I particularly stand here in support of our Member of Parliament, David Burrowes, on the basis that he has served this community faithfully for many years. He is born and bred here and is thoroughly conversant with the requirements of the area. To substitute that with the possible vague care of a body which is far more concerned with its own local affairs is a poor exchange and I, in common with many other people in Cockfosters and the area, earnestly want to see David Burrowes retained as our Member of Parliament together with his constituency, please, which looks as though it is going to be wiped off the map, which is an entirely unsupportable article. These are my proposals, Mr Chairman, my pleadings on behalf of our affairs as they at present stand and as we would wish them to continue. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). Well, I think the voice of Cockfosters has heard that, thank you very much indeed. I think we will have a ten-minute break now, just so we can revive ourselves and then our next scheduled speaker should be you. Thank you.

After a short break

Time noted: 6.42 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, shall we reconvene. I think we have a number of speakers ready to come forward. Can I call Mr Mark Mansfield, please? If you would like to come and sit where the microphone is please and if you would introduce yourself by way of name and address to commence.

MR MANSFIELD: My name is Mark Mansfield. My address is number 30 Cheyne Walk, Grange Park N21 1DA. As I say, good evening. My name is Mark Mansfield and I am addressing you with regard to the Boundary Commission's proposed boundary change for the current Enfield Southgate constituency.

I am sitting here not just in my capacity as a representative of the Grange Park Residents' association but, equally, and if not more importantly, as a life-long passionate member of the close community that is made up of Palmers Green, Winchmore Hill, Grange Park and Southgate. My main concern is the breaking up of the Enfield Southgate constituency which will have a detrimental effect on this area.

Currently, the London postcodes of N13, N14 and N21 have, for many years, been

represented as a single entity, and although each area has its own identity it is abundantly clear that each of these areas share unquestionable synergies. The Commission's proposal is to split the constituency as follows: Cockfosters to Barnet; Grange to North Enfield; Palmers Green to Edmonton; Winchmore Hill, Southgate and Southgate Green to Finchley; and Bowes to Hornsey & Wood Green.

The area was essentially put on the map over a hundred years ago with the Hertford Loop extension of the Great Northern electric railway with the stations of Bowes Park, Palmers Green, Winchmore Hill, Grange Park and Enfield Chase representing the most northerly London stations. These stations were recently subject to some aggressive work on the railway banks, work that created a great deal of hurt and upset. But this burden was ultimately shared and the issues resolved, as the individual wards were able to come together under a single constituency and be heard as a single voice.

Not only does the constituency have the railways but it also has the tube, with the Piccadilly Line which sweeps through the north-east of the borough with beautiful art deco structures of Southgate, Oakwood and Cockfosters designed by Charles Holden. Again, this was a northern extension of the line in 1933. With the railway and the underground being clear examples of how the area has grown up as one and been treated as its own entity, this is another untenable reason not to split the constituency.

Indeed, the proposed boundary changes would mean seeking counsel from two new constituencies for the underground and four new constituencies for the railway, in the event that any representation should be required by the wards with any issues with these stations that may arise. A real concern is that these constituencies currently have no relation to the stations with which they will serve.

Education is also incredibly important with many good schools in the constituency that parents want their children to go to. As well as many local people who aspire to remain in the area, it also attracts many professional couples looking for a good quality environment to bring up their family. All these people want to give their children the best start in life.

St Paul's Church of England School in Winchmore Hill provides an excellent example of how a school fits within the constituency. This is a faith school and part of the entry criteria is that families have a faith and regularly attend church. The St Paul's, the three main churches of St Paul's in Winchmore Hill, St John's in Palmers Green and St Peter's in Grange Park, again splitting out the wards would mean that the church would be represented by a different constituency. Each church would be represented by a different constituency and will disrupt the harmony and collective feel of the community.

With regard to the residents' associations, which is dear to my heart, Winchmore Hill and Grange Park Residents' associations have worked together, most recently with the historic Fancy Fair and the Christmas St Nick festivals, and these residents'

associations have been in existence for upwards of 40 years. These associations will suddenly be placed into separate constituencies which will lose all continuity and cohesive representation. Likewise, with the associations of Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill which also share many common issues and similar requirements.

It must also be mentioned that the east-west movement of people across North London has always proved difficult. With the proposed changes to the boundary, this will not only continue to be a challenge but add anxiety to the residents of Winchmore Hill and Southgate wards who will need to travel to Finchley to access their MP. This will particularly impact older residents who rely on public transport communications which are and will continue to be inadequate.

Unfortunately, it is a group of people who rarely use social and other electronic media, and that is normally by choice, and choose more traditional methods of communication. Again, the challenges faced by Winchmore Hill and Southgate wards will be completely mirrored by the proposed integration of the Palmers Green ward into the Edmonton constituency.

Finally, as with most problems, there are always solutions and I firmly believe that we can keep the Enfield Southgate constituency by bringing in the ward of Bush Hill Park, a ward that has for some time been misrepresented by its current constituency. Many of the residents of Bush Hill Park have an N21 postcode and, therefore, have very similar values. Bringing in Bush Hill Park to Enfield Southgate will keep the constituency with the one MP and within the bounds of one local authority while satisfying the aims and objectives of the Boundary Commission's task.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. That is clear. Are there any matters of clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Linda Miller. Welcome and make yourself comfortable and, as I say, just introduce yourself by way of name and address to begin, please.

MS MILLER: I am Linda Miller. I live at 43 Raleigh Road EN2 6UD. Just out of interest, it is one of the two oldest houses on the road that was built when one of the local large landed estates was broken up in 1854.

I would like to start by saying that I agree absolutely with the principle of having equal size constituencies, but in Enfield the proposal is to split up Enfield Southgate and add small sections of it to constituencies that, in the main, would comprise of voters in Barnet, Finchley or Haringey. I believe that voters' interests will not be best served by requiring MPs to split their focus of attention across different boroughs with different policies. This would inevitably mean that residents in the borough with the smaller number of voters would lose out, and this would be Enfield in each of those cases.

We need our MP to be focused on what is going on in our town hall, not splitting his or

her attention across two different boroughs. I live in Enfield town, pretty much slap bang in the middle of the borough, and under the current proposals my section of Enfield, Enfield Southgate, would be joined to the wards up to the north-west of the borough to form the new constituency of Enfield. That would be the constituency that would be based entirely in Enfield.

You might well ask: Why should I be worried about these proposals that primarily affect voters to the southern end of Enfield Southgate? To answer this, I would like to talk a little bit tonight about the reasoning that took place where myself and June Weenan, my neighbour, who is also here today, decided in 2015 to set up a residents' association (there was not one in our area previously). We did that in order to help residents address some local issues that were affecting us at the time. That is the area of our residents' association. You can see we sit right in the middle of Enfield but, actually, at the northern-most edge of the Enfield Southgate constituency at that point.

A key issue for June and myself from the outset was where the boundaries for the association should be drawn. You can see that from that horizontal line just above our area that is the actual end of the Enfield Southgate constituency and it is also the end of our local authority ward and that runs along the middle of our main shopping street, Church Street. That is set 1 of the boundaries, but we then had to decide where else to set the boundaries for the new residents' association.

Our local authority ward ends just about where would be the 3 o'clock prong of that circle sits, and so that is the second boundary. Then, we needed to decide where to draw the boundary to the west and to the south where we were not constrained by the constrictions of the various constituencies. In deciding our territory, we considered which areas we had the most issues in common with. We were looking at things like transport links, community issues such as shops and amenities, and it was immediately clear to us that our natural hinterland lay to the south not to the north-west.

Under the proposals as they currently stand we will be grouped in with those areas that lie up to the north, broadly to the north-west rather than to the south. If you look at this slight expansion you will see that our area sits along the A105, which is one of the two main arterial roads running through the borough. To the west, Town Park and the New River provide a natural boundary to our scope.

Beyond these geographical features up to the north-west there are a couple of minor shopping areas, but neither of those are as extensive as those in Enfield Town, Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green that you have heard so much of this afternoon and tonight. There are large areas of suburban residential properties and, beyond that, rural countryside and the M25. We could see no common issues that would lead us to want to extend our membership boundary further to the north-west, but when we looked southwards along the A105 it was clear that many of the issues that concerned us were the same issues to those that concerned the other residents' associations located along

the A105.

When we considered all of these issues together, and I admit these are issues that you have already heard mentioned several times already, the geography, the types of community, our common and disparate transport issues, we found that the natural boundaries and links for our residents and, therefore, for our association ran to the south along the A105. These considerations underlay our decision to constrain the boundaries of our association to these geographical features to the east, west and north, in part due to existing political boundaries but primarily because of the community interest and socio-demographic considerations.

For that reason, you can see that our residents' association extends southwards toward Bush Hill Park, Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green. Were we ever to consider extending the boundaries of the residents' association --- not that we are considering such a land grab --- it would, in fact, be to extend further to the south where we would join up with Bush Hill and Private Road Residents' associations.

I would like now to turn to one of the local issues that our current MP, David Burrowes has helped us with over the past year or so. He has been helping us try to avoid problems that a proposed road reengineering scheme will cause for residents along the A105 and for residents in the roads that we represent. This may seem a minor point, but this road is central to much of local residents commuting, shopping and community events.

One of the most popular bus routes in this area connects Palmers Green to Enfield Town. To us, it just does not make sense to have the constituency split up so that this main artery through the borough ended up being represented by three different MPs. We, therefore, commend the alternative proposals put forward by the borough's Conservatives, which is to add Bush Hill Park to the current constituency, which is a simpler and, in my view, more sensible way of bringing the number of voters up to the required level.

I know from working with Bush Hill Park Residents' association that their issues are very close to the issues that affect residents in my area. I work with them also within my role as a member of the Enfield Transport User Group. Also, I am, like John Jewson, a member of the Enfield Federation of Residents and Allied Associations. Indeed, in recognition of the similarities and overlaps between the issues and purposes between Bush Hill and Enfield town residents, we co-opted a member of the Bush Hill Park Residents' association to the Enfield Town Residents' association Committee to ensure we had a joined-up approach and we shared information regarding our common interests.

We did this precisely because our interests overlapped to such an extent with those of residents along this route. Our membership are similar. Our primary transport routes



are the same. Our communities are similar. For this reason, we need joined-up thinking and action along this route. To return to the current proposals that have been put forward by the Boundary Commission, I recently polled our residents' association on their views on the proposed boundary changes and the great majority, over 90 per cent, opposed the proposals as they currently stand.

Whilst people did acknowledge the need to bring about more equitable distribution of voters to MPs, we know the damage that was done. We have heard some illusions to history tonight and so, in like vein, I will say we know the damage that was done by the infamous 1885 Berlin conference in dividing up Africa and arbitrarily drawing up borders that exist and cause problems to this day.

Well, that was then; this is now. There is no excuse, I would argue, for adopting the same approach to carving up London boroughs. We need to take account of the culture and the similarities and the common purpose. I have previously outlined what those socioeconomic, culture and transport issues our residents are aware of and which we use in understanding the similarities and alliances within and across the borough.

I would, therefore, urge you to reconsider these plans and would strongly urge you to adopt, instead, the alternative proposals put forward by Mr Burrowes. The fact that these were the basis for an earlier Boundary Commission's proposal suggests that they are worthy of consideration. I hope you will revise your proposals in line with this alternative plan. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Is Dr Ali Demirbag here? Just by way of introduction if you would start with your name and address, thank you.

DR DEMIRBAG: Thank you very much for the opportunity. My name is Ali Demirbag. I am a medical doctor. I am chair of ITSEB, Turkish-speaking health professionals in the UK, and we have been working in the community for locals, trying to solve their issues with the NHS. Also, we are working with doctors and nurses and their progress in the UK and in Turkey. Also, I am resident in Winchmore Hill. My office is 7 Francesca Court, Uvedale Road EN2 6HG.

This proposal is affecting me as a resident and also I am talking on behalf of our community as well. The reason I am opposing this proposal is I do not believe it is going to suit for Enfield purposes and Enfield's future. Enfield is a unique town and, most importantly, 170 different languages and dialects are being spoken in the borough. It has fantastic history and also there are a number of challenges because of changing demography and we are facing those challenges daily in education and healthcare.

I am going to give a number of examples what sort of challenges we are facing in

healthcare in detail. Before I come to that issue, as a resident if I give you my daily routine it is going to explain why Enfield Southgate should exist and Bush Hill should be part of Southgate. When I drive my car, if I have to go to the centre of London I drive my car to Southgate tube station, five minutes, and I park my car and I take Southgate tube station. I register the doctor's surgery in Enfield. This is where I live. This is where is my livelihood.

Also, when I drive towards Enfield Southgate tube station I am able to pop in my local MP's office. In this proposal I do not know where is going to be Finchley MP's office. I know about Finchley. I have a friend who has a restaurant called Durum. Very interestingly, whenever I choose to go to that Finchley restaurant I always get that question from friends who are going to come with us, "If you are going to travel that far, how about going to Angel, Upper Street Or central London?" This is the perception I am getting. Also, I should be charging that Durum restaurant for that advert as well!

In my daily life I do not have any single activity for Finchley. If I have to go to Finchley, it should be one yearly, an unusual reason. Why is that important for the Turkish-speaking community? Because the Turkish-speaking community have an issue of accessibility. They have a difficulty to access NHS. They have a difficulty to access local government. They have access to MPs.

Reducing the number of MPs and also putting the distance between existing location to another location I do not think it is going to help them to get contact with their local MPs and also engage with the democracy in the UK. I checked the existing proposal and I could not see any reasonable justification, apart from getting the average 75,000 target figure. There is no local connection.

The Turkish-speaking community contributes almost £7 billion annually to the UK economy in different sectors and they settled mostly in Enfield and Haringey. There is a clear connection between those two boroughs, but definitely not with Finchley I would clearly say. There are a number of business owners whom I know in Haringey. They are living in Edmonton, but Edmonton and Haringey has some sort of connection and easy transport as well.

Similarly, there is no transport from like one bus to from Enfield to Finchley. I think you need to change two or three different public transports. If you are going to come to the health issues in Enfield, Enfield has a stat that no other borough has. Life expectancy differences between 1.6 miles are all nearly ten years. Diabetes is 17 per cent higher in Turkish-speaking communities. The Turkish-speaking community is the second largest community in Enfield. Those are special measures that need to be take care of with special reaction.

By reducing MPs and dispatching the areas I do not think it is going to be helpful. At the moment, in Enfield NHS GP appointments are around two or three weeks. With local

MP's pressure, they are making progress but, again, reducing MPs is not going to be helpful. An Edmonton-Haringey connection is through the A10 road and I know already the 144, 444 and 34, those buses are running every six or seven minutes and they can go to Haringey in 30 minutes. This is the connection between Edmonton and Haringey.

The reason I am giving that counter-proposal is suggesting part of Edmonton, some of the wards can connect with the Haringey boundaries. I am going to give my speech and some of the stats here about the local ethnic details. I personally, and also on behalf of the part of the groups probably they are on the way, we are supporting the Conservative Party's counter-proposal which respects Enfield's local authority boundaries and local ties. I guess it has been mentioned previously, or it is going to be some of the local members, they are able to give more historical and geographical ties between the Southgate and Enfield area.

What is important is we have been facing massive issues and I brought our journals. We have been fighting with gangs and drugs and smoking and also a number of healthcare issues like cancers. We need proper representation from the Government side. Again, Chase Farm Hospital has been downgraded in the area. It has been prepared on the table. It has been consulted on the ground. It has not been taking our voice into account. Now the community is paying the price.

My feeling is if our voice has not been heard in the future, not only Turkish-speaking communities but other ethnic minorities are going to be much more invisible. I choose invisible words on purpose because in 2005 there is a research which shows the Turkish-speaking community is invisible in the UK. Despite their contribution to the country, because their skin colour is close to white, but when they come to the public service they are not able to get the service because of the language barrier.

It is not subjective. It is objective proof and we need to make it sure Enfield has enough representation. Thank you very much. I am going to share our journal, if it is going to be useful for you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much and, yes, I would be most interested in seeing the journal. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you very much indeed. Mr Ergin Balli, if you would like to come forward, Sir, and take the hot seat, so to speak. Welcome. If you would like to introduce yourself by name and address to begin and then go into your presentation.

MR BALLI: My name is you Ergin Balli. I live at 11 Crawley Road, Enfield EN1 2ND. I am a solicitor by profession. I want to say a few things about the proposed changes which are going to reduce the number of my local MPs - I consider them all to be my local MPs - from three to two. I do not think, given the issues there are in Enfield, that three into two will fit.

I do not think that by splitting up Enfield Southgate and overloading other boroughs, other constituencies, it is going to help the residents of Enfield, of which I am one. We have acute issues relating to healthcare and gang violence. Those are just two examples where all three of the local MPs have worked together to raise the profile of those issues in Parliament and that has actually achieved something for the residents of Enfield.

I think shifting Enfield Southgate, the seat of Enfield Southgate, to Finchley is going to have a very detrimental effect on everybody else that is living within Enfield, whether you come within the Edmonton region or this new Enfield North region that is going to be defined. I think that the change which is simply based on numbers and trying to equalise constituencies is not the correct approach to adopt. I think it is slightly ill-conceived.

I also am very concerned about how these numbers have been arrived at, given the stories that I have read and the people that I have heard, the MPs that I have heard speak through the media about the extra millions of people that have not been taken into account in the proposed changes and how those have come about. I am not convinced as an individual that these changes are going to be accurate, in any event, and are going to achieve the objectives that have been set out for the Commission.

I do not think there has been a proper consultation on the proposed changes. Although we are here today, I am not sure that events like this are being held widely enough and are being publicised far enough. I think more people should be encouraged to speak and take part if a consultation like this is to be considered as thorough. I would like to come on to where I live, which is Bush Hill Park in Enfield.

Presently, we come within the Edmonton sort of constituency but I think that is an anomaly. I think, really, that Bush Hill Park is westward looking towards the Enfield Southgate constituency. Most of the amenities that are used by the residents of Bush Hill Park are accessed to the west like shopping facilities and transport facilities. We have got the A10, which is a substantial barrier between Bush Hill Park where I live and Edmonton.

Again, as a proposal if you are looking at tinkering with boundaries for constituencies I am not sure that the one that you have proposed would be correct for Bush Hill Park in any event. If there is an opportunity to change the boundaries, then it should reflect the fact that Bush Hill Park is westward looking rather than eastward looking. Then, joining Bush Hill Park onto this other monstrous constituency that you are going to create is not going to help us either.

That is, basically, as much as I would like to say. Again, I am concerned about the democratic deficit that is going to be created by removing an MP. That is as much as I can say today.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you very much indeed. Well, I would urge you to write in and encourage others to write in too. Remember, the consultation lasts until 5 December and so there is an opportunity for people to make their views felt. I think we have heard quite a bit tonight about Enfield and Southgate and so we are getting the message slowly, but do encourage others to make their views as well. Thank you very much. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. The next speaker is here, but I think we will have two minutes while he makes up his mind about coming into the room. Okay, thank you.

After a short break

Time noted: 7.23 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, ladies and gentlemen, shall we reconvene. I think our next speaker is Mr Alex Georgiou. Would you like to come forward, Sir, and take the seat down here with the microphone. If you would start by just introducing yourself by way of name and address, please?

CLLR GEORGIU: (Southgate Green) I have some documents if I could give them to you afterwards. Hello. My name is Alessandro Georgiou. My address is 310 Bowes Road N11 1AT. Firstly, may I thank you, the representatives from the Boundary Commission, for giving me the time to explain why I disagree with the initial proposals and endorse the proposals put forward by the Conservative Party for the parliamentary constituency of Enfield Southgate.

As mentioned before, my name is Alessandro Georgiou and I am a councillor for Southgate Green ward in the London Borough of Enfield, a ward which is in the parliamentary constituency of Enfield Southgate. I was born and have lived in Enfield for my entire life. I was born in Chase Farm Hospital, which is within the Enfield North constituency. I lived with my parents for the first six years of my life in the Edmonton constituency and have lived and currently live in the Enfield Southgate constituency since 1997. It is safe to say I am a true Enfield boy.

My arguments against the current proposals will be broken down into three parts. The first is my view as a ward councillor. The second is as a councillor fighting for better schools in Enfield. The third is as someone who represents a large minority of Greek Cypriot residents.

All residents that I have spoken to so far at either residents' association meetings or, as a result of conducting ward work, are resolutely opposed to the idea of the Enfield Southgate constituency being broken up, particularly with the thought of the ward being represented by a Member of Parliament who will have their time consumed by issues within another London borough, the London Borough of Barnet.

The ward I represent currently borders two of the proposed wards for the new Finchley and Southgate constituency, namely Brunswick and Coppetts wards, both of which are within the London Borough of Barnet. However, Southgate Green ward also borders Bowes, Palmers Green, Southgate and Winchmore Hill wards, all of which are within the London Borough of Enfield.

The reason I mention this is because of the fact that the issues that affect my ward are broadly similar to the surrounding Enfield wards and not to those that are in the London Borough of Barnet. To the north of my ward there is a good standard of living and it is relatively affluent, and to the south a significant amount of poverty. The same can be said of the other Enfield wards that border Southgate Green.

So far, MPs from both the Conservative and Labour Parties have managed to collectively pool any issues that arise from within these areas and have effectively been able to manage their time to deal with them due to their similarities. The same cannot be said of the Barnet wards that are proposed to be merged with Enfield Southgate. Their concerns and issues are not as equally confined to certain areas and are far more spread. This would deprive my residents of a Member of Parliament that can be active within their communities and, instead, having their time significantly reduced by an increased workload.

The current proposals for the Enfield Southgate constituency would mean issues, which currently can be dealt with by one Member of Parliament, would have to be managed by five. This seems illogical and unjust for my residents, the residents of Southgate Green ward. Furthermore, the transport links between Southgate Green ward and the rest of Enfield Southgate constituency are excellent. Whether this be the A406 North Circular, bus routes or underground links along the Piccadilly line and new Southgate station.

If the MP for the proposed Finchley and Southgate seat wishes to hold a surgery in Finchley, the elderly residents and those that do not have access to a personal car in Southgate Green will find it increasingly difficult to attend, considering past and current surgeries have only been a short tube or bus ride away. Indeed, most residents will find the changes more difficult. For example, Arnos Grove is in Southgate Green ward, the underground station, and the only two underground stations that would be brought into the constituency will be the West Finchley and Finchley Central underground stations.

From Arnos Grove to West Finchley is 47 minutes, and to Finchley Central 48 minutes on the underground, whereas the current underground stations within Enfield Southgate are on the same Piccadilly line and Southgate, Oakwood and Cockfosters underground stations are all respectively one, two and three stops away from Arnos Grove.

Finally on this point, there is a positive level of community engagement as a result of the current Enfield Southgate wards being represented by one Member of Parliament. In

the Southgate Green ward there are numerous well attended and well publicised events that occur in the two parks within the ward, Arnos and Broomfield Park, parks which also border the other Enfield Southgate wards.

This community cohesion is undoubtedly enhanced by the current wards mentioned being represented by one Member of Parliament. Educational provision, placement and transport are all well-established and accessible within Enfield Southgate currently. As of today, there are 30 schools within the Enfield Southgate constituency, most of which are under the umbrella of the Enfield local education authority. These schools are treated as part of Enfield, but if the proposed boundaries go ahead we will have a mixed level of representation which will be detrimental to the schools and the pupils themselves.

Currently, an MP for Enfield Southgate can lobby the council and government for improvements to the local schools within the constituency, collectively using this large number of schools to get better results and outcomes. However, if the current schools represented by one Member of Parliament are represented by five that champion for their causes will be weakened.

Furthermore, four of the proposed Members of Parliament will have interests in other boroughs. Our children will have less representation to the local authority because the dedicated work of one MP will be diluted across borough boundaries, therefore harming the political clout that existing schools currently have.

Lastly, all schools currently within Enfield Southgate have exceptional transport links with an MP that may not be able to travel by car, being able to easily travel to any school within the current constituency. The transport links between Enfield Southgate schools and Barnet schools, however, are extremely poor. This would make an MP seeking to travel between schools for meetings and events increasingly difficult.

I am certain the current schools within Enfield Southgate want one Member of Parliament fighting their cause and representing their interests which currently work remarkably well. 10 per cent of Southgate Green ward, the ward that I represent, currently consists of those that are of Greek Cypriot origin. In fact, there is a large minority Greek Cypriot population concentrated within Enfield Southgate. One problem with the proposed boundary changes is they will no longer have a conduit for having one cohesive voice within the wider community and in Westminster.

So far, the last three Members of Parliament from different political backgrounds for Enfield Southgate have taken up the Cypriot community's cause and has fought for their interests. Examples of these interests could be a Member of Parliament lobbying for a solution to the Cyprus problem, with many refugees from the conflict in 1974 living in Enfield Southgate, or even the campaign to stop Greek GCSEs and A-Levels from being cut, as has happened in both of those examples. So far, the Greek Cypriot

community has been well-represented in Enfield, but if the proposed boundary changes go ahead be under no doubt that this will be at risk.

For the reasons I have mentioned, I believe both as a ward councillor and as a resident of Enfield Southgate that the current proposals are inadequate and will do more harm than good. The most sensible solution would be to keep the current Enfield Southgate constituency together, whilst adding Bush Hill Park ward which has historic links with Enfield Southgate.

Enfield Southgate is one community. They should have one Member of Parliament to fight for them and for the constituency as it currently stands. As an Enfield Southgate boy, it would break my heart to see that community damaged in any way. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case thank you. Are you leaving us a copy of your ---

CLLR GEORGIU: I will leave you a copy.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, that would be very helpful, thank you. Is Cllr Terry Neville here?

CLLR NEVILLE: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Would you like to come forward, Sir; and, again, just introduction by way of name and address, please?

CLLR NEVILLE: Good evening. My name is Terrence Neville formerly, but Terry as I am generally referred to. My address is 32 Elmscott Gardens, which is N21 2BP. That is in the Grange ward of the Enfield Southgate constituency. I am an elected councillor in Enfield, have been so for 30 years, and I am currently serving my current stint as leader of the Conservative group in Enfield for a second time. I also ought to add that I have actually lived in the borough for around 46 years and so I am very familiar with it and different parts of it.

I am actually here to oppose the proposals that the Commission has made. I think I will do that, Sir, as briefly as possible because I know you have had a very long day and I am sure you will be glad to make tracks. In short, I think no one argues about the figures that you have proposed. That is the statutory reason, in the main, for this review. I submit that the counter-proposal that is before you achieves the same figures, broadly speaking.

If that is right, it seems to me that you then have to look at other aspects and you have, in particular, to look at the guidance that the Commission has set itself or the



Government has set for it as to matters which are relevant for consideration. There are three of them that I think concern what I have to say briefly: The boundaries of the existing constituency; local government boundaries themselves, that is to say the borough boundary for Enfield; and, thirdly, any ties that are broken by the proposal.

There is no doubt about it that the proposal, as it stands at the moment, would effectively destroy the Enfield Southgate constituency as we know it today. It would go in three directions, basically, and it would cease to have that cohesive part which we know as the constituency. I think everyone has agreed that the borough is large. It is too large to contain the constituencies all within its borough, given the figures that have been set as the appropriate parameters; but we contend that in so far as if you need to link with anybody else, as it were, you need to link in the direction that has already been achieved for democratic purposes.

If one talks about the mayoral seats, they link naturally with Enfield and Haringey. Therefore, we say that any link that is to be made should be made in that direction rather than over towards Barnet. Indeed, I think the proposals in part do, in fact, achieve that in linking parts of Edmonton, or, in fact, most of all of Edmonton with the three wards in Tottenham and so that, to an extent, can be achieved.

I think the things I want to say briefly is the local government boundary. The local government boundary is set for the foreseeable future. The result of these proposals would mean that the borough council, pressed as it is, as most borough councils are these days, would have to interact with five MPs. That is quite a difficult task in many ways, but leave that aside because I am sure the borough council would ultimately cope with that, the fact of the matter is that most MPs will tell you that at least 80 per cent of their mail concerns local authority issues.

That gives you some sense of the size of the potential problem. It is not difficult to see that problem from the council perspective, actually, in interacting with these five MPs, but perhaps more particularly we ought to look at the effect it has on the constituents. Will they know, for example, to whom to go because they know that they are in the borough of Enfield, just about?

One says that advisedly, but people are not too familiar where they are and what their local authorities are. Generally speaking, will they know the position if they have got different parliamentary constituencies, which ones are they in? Yes, over time, most will become familiar but in the short-term they will not, and the short-term could be short to medium, in fact. You get to a position where you have broken down the clarity of representation. That is very important in terms of democracy and ensuring proper representation as we go forward.

My colleague, Alessandro, has mentioned the education points. I will not go beyond that, save to say that, generally speaking, most people within a borough which is

recognised --- and historically Southgate obviously was a borough and many people still see it that way. You would be surprised how many people still talk 50 years on about Old Enfield and Old Southgate. There are these very close and very clear demarked boundaries in people's minds and that is quite important in my view.

Now the Commission does pray in aid, as it were, better accessibility being formed within a constituency by, for example, putting Palmers Green in with Edmonton. I think I would slightly take issue with that for the reasons that Alex has enumerated but also, of course, it is a fact that the A111 is a road that runs straight through that area and down into Palmers Green. It goes right from Southgate, the tip of Southgate in the north, right the way through.

I am not really sure that there is that perceived gain in terms of transport, given that most people use either cars or buses and both of those serve that 111. Add to that the fact that the main route between Moorgate and Hertford North takes in four wards. There are stations in each of four Southgate wards.

Likewise, with the main Piccadilly Line, and so I would not put too much weight on that from the Commission's perspective. Grange ward is where I live. It is a very different ward to the Enfield North area to which it is proposed to go under these proposals, as, I have to say, is Southgate, Winchmore Hill and Southgate Green. I think if anyone walking around the borough looking at the make-up of the housing and then crossing over into these areas, it is very visible that you are in a different area. There is not that natural link that you might find in other parts of outer London.

I would say if you cross from the Southgate area, or what we know as the Southgate area, into the area that is known as Brunswick Park, for example, or Coppetts, it is quite a different make-up. You would be visibly aware that you were in a different area, and so it is with Grange. Grange simply does not fit with any part of the present Enfield North. It is a different kind of make-up altogether and I would invite you to say that, for that reason, it should not form part of the final proposals.

Just by way of emphasis, you simply look at the house styles, you look at the make-up, the general layout and the roads tend to be wider in the Southgate area than they do in the old Enfield, what is the Enfield North, the old Enfield borough. That is a matter of fact and a visible record, effectively.

Again, local ties with history. The ward of Southgate Green contains the original south gate that entered into Southgate. It is there for us all to see. There is a lot of history in the London Borough of Enfield generally and a good deal of it within the Southgate area. That too needs to be preserved by keeping this cohesive area.

In conclusion, I simply say to you, where I started really, that I think that we can, through what we have submitted as a counter-proposal, achieve exactly what the Commission

and the Government need to achieve in terms of numbers of people represented by an MP in any one constituency without creating this, what I would have to say, is almost a sort of form of mayhem really in breaking up what is a very well established and long established --- I mean, Southgate you can chase back to 1894 in terms of formal political boundaries and, of course, most recently the 1950 redistribution created the constituency more or less in its present form, changed in 1974 slightly but, broadly speaking, different name but same place.

For all of those reasons, I ask the Commission to very seriously consider these proposals. Consider plainly much has been said today by my colleagues and various people from the community. I ask you to consider all of that and, in the light of what you have heard, what you will see, what you will get from, I am sure, further written representations, and I would ask you to actually reconsider and opt for our proposal which we have submitted. Thank you very much indeed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for the summation and overview. That is very helpful. Are there any matters for clarification? (No response). In which case, thank you. We have two further scheduled speakers this evening but I do not think they have arrived, unless there is anyone in the room who wants to speak, is there? If you have not spoken here is your opportunity (No response). In which case, we will adjourn for five minutes and wait for the last two speakers. Thank you.

After a short break

Time noted: 7.55 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, just to reconvene to say we have been waiting for our last two speakers. We have tried to call them and have not been able to contact them. They were due here some 20 minutes ago. It is now 5 to 8. Since they have not responded, I propose to close the proceedings. Good night all. Sleep well.

Adjourned until 9.00 am on Tuesday 1 November 2016

**A**

CLLR ATTWAL, 61

**B**

MR BALLI, 107  
MR GAVIN BARWELL MP, 51, 54, 55  
MR BENNETT, 11, 44, 98, 99  
MR BEYZADE, 89  
MR BLUNDELL, 44  
MR BOWDEN, 2  
CLLR BRABAZON, 36  
MR BRYANT, 67, 70  
MR DAVID BURROWES MP, 12

**C**

MR CANAL, 46  
MRS CARTER, 18, 20  
CLLR CELEBI, 95, 98, 99  
MRS CONNELLY, 25  
MRS CONWAY, 5, 85, 89  
MR CREASY, 27

**D**

MRS DAVIES, 40, 43, 44  
DR DEMIRBAG, 105  
MR DENYS, 56, 57, 58

**G**

CLLR GEORGIU, 109, 112

**H**

CLLR HALE, 58  
MR HINDS, 83  
MISS HOLT, 71, 74, 75  
CLLR HURER, 92

**J**

MR JEWSON, 81

**L**

MR DAVID LAMMY MP, 30, 35  
LORD HAYWARD, 98

## **M**

MR MANSFIELD, 100  
MS MILLER, 102  
CLLR MITCHELL, 65, 67

## **N**

CLLR NEVILLE, 112  
MR NICOLAIDES, 63, 65

## **O**

REVD OBUNGE, 38  
MRS OSMAN, 80

## **P**

CLLR PEARCE, 78  
MR CHRIS PHILIP MP, 8, 11

## **R**

CLLR RAMSEY, 25  
MR REDMAN, 99  
MR ANDREW ROSINDELL MP, 21, 25

## **S**

CLLR SMITH, 75, 78  
MR STRAKER, 70  
MR WES STREETING MP, 16, 18

## **T**

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, 2, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 30, 35, 36, 38, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 51, 54, 55, 56,  
57, 58, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81, 83, 85, 89, 91, 95, 98, 99, 100, 102, 105, 107, 109, 112, 115  
MR TSOUVANI, 48, 51

## **U**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER, 75, 78, 98, 99

## **W**

MR WHITTER, 55, 56