

Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in London



Contents

	Summary	3
1	What is the Boundary Commission for England?	5
2	Background to the 2018 Review	7
3	Revised proposals for London	13
	The sub-region split	13
	North Thames	15
	South Thames	40
4	How to have your say	59
	Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	61

Summary

Who we are and what we do

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

The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in London reducing by five, to 68. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions¹ – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets

out our analysis of all the responses to our initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region: maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

What are the revised proposals for the London region?

We have revised the composition of 46 of the 68 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 22. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

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

As it has not always been possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual London boroughs, our initial proposals grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposal groupings remain unchanged from those initial proposals, as shown in the table overleaf.

¹ The specified exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
North Thames	45	42
South Thames	28	26

In light of the responses to our initial proposals, we have revised 27 of our initial proposals in the North Thames sub-region, where we have been able to increase the number of existing constituencies retained to four: Hornchurch and Upminster, Ilford South, Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner, and Twickenham. In particular, we have tried to address significant concerns from the local communities in Chingford and Woodford, Walthamstow, Dagenham and Rainham, Enfield and Southgate, and Harrow. In attempting to address issues raised with our proposals for Enfield, our revised proposals split one ward – Brunswick Park – between constituencies. We have made a number of other changes based on the views of local communities.

In the South Thames sub-region we continue to propose that two existing constituencies remain unchanged: Kingston and Surbiton, and Richmond Park. We have made revisions to 19 of our initial proposals in the South Thames sub-region, based on responses to our consultations. In particular, we have addressed concerns raised by local communities in Wimbledon, Mitcham, Clapham Common, Vauxhall, Croydon, Beckenham and Bexley.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: www.bce2018.org.uk.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

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

1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners (two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.²

1.3 Our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

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

² <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

2 Background to the 2018 Review

2.1 There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the London region.

2.2 Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

2.3 The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies ('the Guide'),³ published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

2.6 The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners.

³ Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>

We are confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases, we have made clear that we are looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome. However, we will not be assisted by repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

2.7 The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission,

especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

The rules in the legislation

2.8 The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.9 It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

2.10 In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained just over 5% of the existing constituencies in the London region – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

2.11 Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain six (8%) of the existing 73 constituencies in the London region.

The use of the regions used for European elections

2.12 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the London region. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the Guide and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

2.13 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for the review

Stage one – initial proposals

2.14 We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.⁴ The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

2.15 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 9,200 unique written representations relating to the London region. We also heard more than 250 oral representations at the five public hearings in the London region. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

2.16 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

Stage four – publication of revised proposals

2.17 As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 17 October 2017, we are publishing this report – Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in London – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

⁴ <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>

Stage five – final recommendations

2.18 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

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

3 Revised proposals for London

3.1 In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of three assistant commissioners for the London region – Howard Simmons, Emma Davy and Richard Wald – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:

- Westminster: 17–18 October 2016
- Bromley: 20–21 October 2016
- Harrow: 24–25 October 2016
- Kingston: 27–28 October 2016
- Romford: 31 October–1 November 2016

3.2 We asked the assistant commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the assistant commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are incredibly grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the assistant commissioners have taken to their work.

3.3 What follows in this chapter is:

- a brief recap of our initial proposals
- a description of the counter-proposals put forward during the consultations
- the assistant commissioners’ analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

3.4 A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk. All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

The sub-region split

3.6 In our initial proposals we decided to view London as two sub-regions – North Thames and South Thames – with the number of constituencies for each sub-region being 42 and 26 respectively. We believed that this would provide us with the greatest flexibility in creating a pattern of constituencies across the whole region.

3.7 In formulating our initial proposals, we proposed that no constituency would cross the River Thames. However, one constituency would cross the River Lee between the boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Newham. This is necessary in order to create constituencies that are within the statutory range.

3.8 This split of the region was largely supported and many respondents who put forward alternative proposals for the London region based them on these sub-regions. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended that we retain this configuration for our revised proposals, including a constituency crossing the River Lee.

3.9 Whole region schemes were received from the main political parties including the Conservative Party (BCE-33279), which submitted a further proposal during the secondary consultation (BCE-41084), the Green Party (BCE-27265), the Labour Party (BCE-33244) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274). There were also region-wide proposals from members of the public, notably Aaron Fear (BCE-31954 and BCE-40945), John Bryant (BCE-28336 and BCE-28349), Oliver Raven (BCE-30111 and BCE-39493), Pete Whitehead (BCE-27879), a counter-proposal for the North Thames sub-region only from Jonathan Stansby (BCE-19979), and one from Adam Gray (BCE-16382) whose changes focused mostly on the South Thames sub-region. We also received counter-proposals for local changes that, it was argued, represented the feelings of the community from many Members of Parliament, including Iain Duncan Smith

(BCE-33101) for Chingford and Woodford Green, Jane Ellison (BCE-30714) for Battersea and Chris Philp (BCE-30710) for Croydon South, and members of the public Howard Erdunast (BCE-28714), Paul Soper (BCE-39752) and Augustine Aneke (BCE-39669). It should be noted that the majority of comments and points made were localised, being either constituency specific or even more detailed in terms of particular wards. However, many such detailed comments, though valuable for understanding the strength of feeling about local community ties and suggesting possibilities for the better alignment of wards generally, did not address the statutory rules and electoral quota.

3.10 We received proposals to split wards in 12 constituencies. In the main our assistant commissioners considered that these recommendations provided limited benefit to the wider community, and none of the proposals were ‘exceptional or compelling’ or in any way met this criteria. There was also a scheme to split a ward which would have created an orphan polling district.⁵ However, a scheme developed by our assistant commissioners to split a ward in Barnet would provide a solution to five constituencies in Barnet, Enfield and Haringey, more detail of which will be given below. It should be noted that most of the schemes submitted proposed whole ward solutions.

3.11 Having considered the recommendations of our assistant commissioners, we agree that our revised proposals should be formulated on the same sub-regions as we used for the initial proposals. In the next

⁵ ‘Orphan polling district’ refers to a clear minority of polling districts (usually just one polling district) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of polling districts are from another local authority.

sections of our report, we consider each sub-region in turn, summarising our initial proposals followed by the responses and counter-proposals received, before setting out our revised proposals on the basis of the evidence received and in accordance with the statutory rules for the 2018 Review.

North Thames

3.12 Of the existing 45 constituencies in the North Thames sub-region, 14 are currently within 5% of the permitted electorate range, 25 have electorates that are below the 5% minimum limit and six exceed the maximum limit. Under our initial proposals we retained two existing constituencies in the North Thames sub-region: Hornchurch and Upminster, and Twickenham.

3.13 The main areas of opposition to the initial proposals were in the constituencies of Dagenham and Rainham, Romford, Walthamstow, Chingford and Woodford, Finchley and Southgate, Tottenham, Hampstead and Golders Green, Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner, and Harrow and Stanmore. In seeking to address these issues our assistant commissioners have considered counter-proposals from a wide section of those who have given evidence during the initial and secondary consultations.

3.14 Oliver Raven (BCE-30111) submitted a proposal that included a City of London and Hackney constituency and a Chingford and Edmonton constituency crossing the River Lee in the north. This was a proposal that had proved unpopular during the previous 2013 Review that was subsequently abandoned.

Mr Raven retained just three of our proposed constituencies; our assistant commissioners noted that this proposal would have to be adopted almost in its entirety due to the knock-on effects of changes to individual constituencies. They saw little justification in crossing the River Lee in the north of the sub-region, given the support received elsewhere for keeping the River Lee as a boundary between the Chingford and Edmonton areas, as in the initial proposals. They therefore did not recommend this counter-proposal.

3.15 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) proposed to retain 21 of the proposed constituencies, but did not seek to address the issues of Chingford and Woodford (Bridge ward), or Walthamstow, instead moving Higham Hill and William Morris wards along with Chapel End ward into a Chingford and Walthamstow constituency.

3.16 The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) proposed to retain 19 of the proposed constituencies. In seeking to address the issue of Enfield Southgate, their proposal split the existing Tottenham constituency into two. In their secondary consultation proposal (BCE-41084), they proposed to split Eastbrook ward (polling district MA) from the Dagenham and Rainham constituency, which was supported by the local MPs and members of the public, but created an orphan polling district in Havering Borough. The assistant commissioners could find no ‘compelling and exceptional’ circumstances in this proposal when set against the criteria. However, it should be noted that this region-wide scheme has received widespread support.

3.17 In their response, the Labour Party (BCE-33244) retained five proposed constituencies and, as with the Conservative Party proposal, they addressed the issue of Enfield Southgate by splitting Tottenham into two. While there was some support for certain elements of the Labour Party's counter-proposals, there was much criticism for its proposed Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham constituencies (in our initial proposals the former had been coterminous with the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the latter contained almost all the wards of the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham).

3.18 Pete Whitehead (BCE-27879) retained 23 of the proposed constituencies in the North Thames sub-region and provided a solution for the Chingford, Woodford and Walthamstow issue. Mr Whitehead focused the majority of his changes in the South Thames sub-region.

3.19 John Bryant (BCE-28336) in his scheme for North Thames retained 19 of the proposed constituencies and the two existing seats of Hornchurch and Upminster, and Twickenham. This counter-proposal divided the sub-regions into sections that were self-contained, so each section may be adopted or rejected and cause no knock-on effects to an adjacent section.

3.20 While our assistant commissioners acknowledged the merits of the proposals submitted by the many respondents, they recommended that we adopt as the base for our revised proposals in the North Thames sub-region John Bryant's scheme, though they recommended a number of amendments to this. In general this

counter-proposal retains constituencies nearer to the pattern of the existing constituencies and we have been able to incorporate local schemes from a wide section of respondents to satisfy issues at a local level. John Bryant further gives regard to the submissions put forward by the Conservative, Labour and the Liberal Democrat parties and is supported by others.

3.21 As mentioned previously, the assistant commissioners recommend retaining the River Lee as a natural boundary in the north of its course in London, and thus were able to recommend to us 11 constituencies to the east in the boroughs of Barking and Dagenham, Havering, Newham, Redbridge, and Waltham Forest, as we did in our initial proposals. We agree with these overall recommendations.

East London

3.22 There was strong opposition to some of the changes made in the 11 constituencies in this area. In our initial proposals the Hornchurch and Upminster constituency (78,064) was within 5% of the permitted electorate range and was unchanged from the existing constituency. However, we noted that Barry Welch (BCE-17393) and a small number of respondents in the Elm Park ward (Dagenham and Rainham constituency) proposed that it should be added to the Hornchurch and Upminster constituency. Mr Welch stated: 'I strongly disagree with the proposals for Elm Park. Elm Park is part of Havering and the revised boundary should restore that geographical & political association. Elm Park has strong links with Hornchurch & Upminster in many

social, economic & political aspects and the revised boundary should encompass the whole of Elm Park in that constituency ... the current & proposed constituency boundary hinders efforts to regenerate the centre, retain business & encourage new enterprise, particularly as there are opposing political sides with different motivations. Please reconsider these proposals, the whole of Elm Park should be with Hornchurch & Upminster.' This counter-proposal, if adopted, would take the constituency outside the permitted electorate range (87,570) and a ward would need to be removed to bring the constituency back within range.

3.23 As the existing Romford constituency falls below the permitted electorate range the initial proposals brought it within range through the addition of the Eastbrook ward from the Dagenham and Rainham constituency. There was strong opposition to this change as it was felt that the residents would be at a disadvantage; for example, Lesley Morgan (BCE-21673) stated: 'I believe Eastbrook ward is a poor match for the Romford constituency since it would require the Romford MP to deal with two borough councils and two police forces. And since Eastbrook would be the only LBBD ward we would easily get the short end of the straw in terms of the MP's attention.'

3.24 Further evidence was received regarding the Eastbrook ward, a proposal put forward by Andrew Blake-Herbert, Chief Executive of Havering Borough Council (BCE-29368); Members of Parliament for both constituencies – John Cruddas (BCE-25997) and Andrew Rosindell (BCE-38789); the Conservative

Party (BCE-41084, second consultation); Roger Ramsey, Havering Councillor (BCE-32226); and many Eastbrook ward respondents sought to split Eastbrook ward, by including polling district MA (known as Rush Green, in the Romford constituency). Mr Blake-Herbert stated: 'However, we believe that there are reasons for limiting the changes, by dividing Eastbrook Ward using existing Polling Districts to ensure that the areas of Eastbrook that are integral to the town of Dagenham, remain part of the Dagenham & Rainham BC. We therefore suggest only including the northern part of the Eastbrook Ward which forms the southern section of the Rush Green community and is integral to the town of Romford. We therefore propose that the MA Polling District (Rush Green) is transferred to the Romford BC, whilst the MB and MC Polling Districts (Dagenham East), remain within the existing Dagenham & Rainham BC.'

3.25 In the initial proposals the Dagenham and Rainham constituency lost the Eastbrook ward to the Romford constituency, and was brought within range by the addition of Valence and Alibon wards. There was some support for this, for example from Christina Freeman (BCE-18018) who stated: 'I welcome the inclusion of two new wards to Dagenham and Rainham, especially since both wards were previously part of the constituency. However, the loss of Eastbrook ward seems a bit strange and is a concern.' Councillor Mick McCarthy (BCE-18218), further commented: 'I believe Eastbrook ward should stay in Dagenham and Rainham and Elm Park ward should go into Romford. Having been a councillor and known a number of MPs I am aware of

the casework that requires councillor and council engagement. At present Romford MP only has to deal with Havering Council and I think that makes it efficient for himself and his staff to deal with because they are only dealing with one council.'

3.26 John Bryant's (BCE-28336) counter-proposal also suggested 'that the Chadwell Heath ward is a more natural addition to a Romford seat, than Eastbrook ward and the result is more compact seats with a shorter, straighter boundary between them'. This proposal was supported by Adam Gray (BCE-16382), who stated: 'I propose that Chadwell Heath ward be transferred to Romford, and that Eastbrook ward – which is intrinsically part of Dagenham, albeit on the border of Romford Town – be swapped. Aside from creating a far more cohesive constituency boundary for Dagenham & Rainham, Chadwell Heath is going to be isolated wherever it is located: it is a remote (for London) community with few transport links in or out. Nonetheless, the ward is accessible from Romford via the A12 Eastern Avenue.'

3.27 Our assistant commissioners – following consideration of the evidence presented – agreed that the Eastbrook ward be brought back into the Dagenham and Rainham constituency. The assistant commissioners advised us that they did not judge that there was compelling or exceptional evidence to justify the splitting of Eastbrook ward and therefore do not support the proposal that polling district MA (Rush Green) should be allocated to the Romford constituency. They further support the addition of the Chadwell Heath ward to the Romford constituency to bring

it within 5% of the permitted electorate range. We accept their recommendations for Dagenham and Rainham, Romford, and Hornchurch and Upminster.

3.28 Turning to our initial proposals for the constituencies of Chingford and Woodford Green, Walthamstow, Leytonstone and Wanstead, and Ilford North, these are a complex, inter-related set of proposals. In our initial proposals, Ilford North retained six wards from the existing constituency and gained three wards from the Ilford South constituency to bring it into range. There was significant opposition to this as Ilford North and Ilford South are viewed as the 'capital' of Redbridge Borough. Clifford Harris (BCE-34266) among other respondents stated: 'Ilford is a large distinct place that is served well by being split into two constituencies (Ilford North and South). It is the capital of LB Redbridge.' This was further reinforced by the representation of John Bryant (BCE-32650) on day one of the Romford public hearing: '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.'

3.29 There has also been strong opposition to the continued inclusion of the Bridge and Roding wards in the Ilford North constituency; a counter-proposal at the Romford public hearing by Iain

Duncan Smith MP (BCE-33101) suggested that the Bridge ward should be in the Chingford and Woodford constituency. Diana Turpin (BCE-19719) felt that 'it would be better for the Bridge Ward residents to be reunited with the community of Woodford and come into a new Chingford and Woodford Parliamentary Constituency. Geographically, and more significantly, community wise, this makes more sense.' This was a view reflected by other residents.

3.30 In our revised proposal Ilford North retains seven of the wards from the existing constituency and gains Snaresbrook and Wanstead wards from the existing Leyton and Wanstead constituency, losing Bridge ward to the Chingford and Woodford constituency. A name change of Ilford North and Wanstead is proposed for this new constituency.

3.31 In our initial proposals the Ilford South constituency had been divided across four proposed constituencies: Barking, Forest Gate and Loxford, Ilford North, and Leytonstone and Wanstead. There was great opposition to this from respondents such as Zahrah Awaleh (BCE-23005) who stated: 'I live in Ilford South and I am very worried about the effects this change in constituency boundaries will have on my family and the wider community. It appears that Ilford South will be dissected and added to several constituencies in order to meet the government target. However, this will fragment old communities and confuse local people, as well as divide schools and other public services up as a consequence since we will be divided into four boroughs. I think the proposal is unfair

and frankly ridiculous, because it draws lines right through established and tight-knit communities.' There was, however, also some support for our proposals, from respondents such as Anoushka Vachha (BCE-15358), who stated: 'I think the changes in boundaries in the local area seem positive with a good mix of backgrounds and political leanings. I think it's great that areas like Cranbrook are not just lumped together as South Ilford. Ilford is such a large and diverse area and I think breaking it up a bit is a good thing. As someone who lives in Cranbrook I feel like I am closer to amenities in Wanstead and use them more often than Ilford and feel like this creates more of a connection. Currently areas within Ilford and outside are very divided and I'd like to see that bridge.'

3.32 There was no opposition from respondents within the existing Barking constituency to the initial proposals to move Goodmayes and Mayfield wards to the proposed Barking constituency; most opposition came from the Ilford South ward respondents not wishing to be in a Barking constituency. However, there was support from Gary Cattley (BCE-15892) who welcomed the change: 'Excellent piece of work if I may say, I have no problems with your suggestion for Barking and Dagenham, and agree with your general approach across the country.' Our assistant commissioners recommended that the existing Barking constituency loses Valence and Alibon wards and gains Beckton and Royal Docks wards to bring it into the permitted electorate range.

3.33 In response to the initial proposals there was also opposition to the Leytonstone and Wanstead constituency, to which we had added the Forest, Leytonstone, and Wood Street wards. Ruth Lukom (BCE-19833) was representative of many respondents, stating: ‘I wish to object to the proposed changes to the Walthamstow constituency. Wood Street is an integral part of the borough.’

3.34 The initial proposals for the Walthamstow constituency also received significant opposition due to the loss of Chapel End and Wood Street wards. The main opposition to the Chapel End ward being moved to the proposed Chingford and Woodford constituency was that it is the location of the Waltham Forest Town Hall. Many respondents agreed with Barbara de Lacy (BCE-35828), who said: ‘Chapel End should remain within Waltham Forest. Chapel End’s identity is defined by its vicinity to the Town Hall, the College, Lloyd Park/William Morris Gallery — all very much Walthamstow landmarks.’

3.35 The Labour Party (BCE-33244), John Bryant (BCE-28336) and Pete Whitehead (BCE-27879) also gave support to this campaign. Their counter-proposals returned both Chapel End and Wood Street wards to the Walthamstow constituency. This was brought into the permitted electorate range by the addition of Forest ward from the existing Leyton and Wanstead constituency, for which there was some support from Alex Hughes (BCE-18985) and other respondents. Mr Hughes stated: ‘I propose that Walthamstow retains the constituency in its current form, but with the addition of Forest ward. This would make nine wards

in all, giving an electorate of 71,280 (against the minimum requirement of 71,031).’ Jane Duran (BCE-25789) stated: ‘While I would personally prefer to keep Forest ward (where I have lived for over twenty years) in the same constituency as Grove Green, Leyton and Leytonstone it is clear that would be unacceptable due to the tight numbers that the Commission has to work within and — within those parameters — it is probably the most reasonable ward to move into Walthamstow.’

3.36 In the initial proposals the Chingford and Woodford Green constituency retained its existing wards and was brought into the permitted electorate range by the addition of Chapel End ward from the Walthamstow constituency. There was a campaign to bring Bridge ward from the existing Ilford North constituency into the proposed Chingford and Woodford constituency. Iain Duncan Smith MP (BCE-33101) submitted a proposal for changes to the four constituencies of Chingford and Woodford Green, Walthamstow, Leytonstone and Wanstead, and Ilford North.

3.37 Mr Duncan Smith, in his evidence at the Romford public hearing, stated: ‘The proposals that I am making today would, I believe, reunite the community of Woodford which has essentially been a community together for about 150 years. There is an annual Woodford Festival. Strong Woodford community groups already exist. There is one local newspaper title which is also circulated in the Woodford area. Most of the Bridge ward lies west of the River Roding and the M11 corridor, but there are good road links via Chigwell Road, Snakes Lane East and the A1009 Broadmead Road. The

275 bus service runs through four wards in the suggested constituency, linking Bridge ward to Monkham's ward, Hatch Lane ward, and Hale End and Highams Park ward. The W14 and 549 services link Bridge ward with Church ward. So, extensive links. The eastern part of Bridge ward is separated from the adjoining Redbridge wards by Claybury Park and the adjoining sports fields.'

3.38 Mr Duncan Smith's proposal is in line with the proposed changes that John Bryant has made to the Chingford and Woodford Green constituency and is supported by the Labour Party and Pete Whitehead. This proposal can be facilitated following the return of the Chapel End ward to the Walthamstow constituency.

3.39 In considering the evidence received regarding these constituencies, the assistant commissioners noted in particular the opposition to the removal of the Ilford South constituency, and the arguments that showed the break in local ties in the Walthamstow and Woodford areas. While acknowledging that it is necessary to lose a constituency across East London, they were persuaded by the strength of feeling shown, and arguments relating to communities that were voiced at the Romford hearing in particular, that changes were necessary to the initial proposals.

3.40 They advised us that the counter-proposal put forward by Iain Duncan Smith MP, supported by, or contiguous with, those of other respondents, is the most appropriate in this area. It has the benefit of reinstating the broken local ties in Walthamstow and

Woodford in particular, while providing a better fit to existing constituencies. The recommendations also fit with those for the constituencies to the east and south, as proposed by John Bryant. We therefore accept the recommendations for Chingford and Woodford, Walthamstow, Ilford North and Wanstead, and Ilford South.

3.41 In our initial proposals the East Ham constituency retained seven wards, lost Manor Park, Little Ilford and Green Street East wards, and gained Custom House and Plaistow South wards from the existing West Ham constituency. Very few comments were made about these changes by East Ham constituents but K Khambhaita (BCE-19489) commented: 'I think the proposals are justified and reflect changes in London regards population, public services and delivery of these. I am in agreement with the changes and don't think there will be tangible negative effects for me to endure as a result.' Based on the representations received our assistant commissioners recommended that East Ham retains eight of its original wards and gains Green Street West ward and loses the Royal Docks and Beckton wards to bring it within the permitted electorate range. They also proposed that Barking constituency gains Beckton and Royal Docks wards from the existing East Ham constituency, and is renamed Barking and Beckton. We agree.

3.42 In our initial proposals the West Ham constituency was distributed across three proposed constituencies. There was objection to this change, particularly the separating of the four wards of Plaistow South, Plaistow North, Custom House and Canning Town South, with the latter

two wards being seen as a tight-knit community. Emily Knight (BCE-24933) stated: 'I am a resident of Canning Town South ward and I have stood for council in Custom House ward (in both 2010 and 2014). The communities of Custom House, and Canning Town South are inextricably intertwined in terms of school catchment areas, and the use of local health services, for example I use a GP in Custom House ward along with most other residents in the immediate area in my part of Canning Town South ward.' Ms Knight further went on to say: 'The boundary between Canning Town South and Custom House wards was largely drawn up as a boundary of convenience during the last local government boundary review. There is little or no discernible difference between the two wards at ground level, especially between the area of Canning Town South ward south of A13 and north of the DLR line. These communities are so linked it would have a highly negative effect on residents in both wards if they were in different Parliamentary constituencies represented by different Members of Parliament.'

3.43 The remaining West Ham wards of Plaistow North, Plaistow South, Canning Town North, Canning Town South, and Custom House will be kept together; there has been support for this configuration as cited before by Emily Knight. The revised constituency will retain the five wards from the existing West Ham constituency as above and add six wards from the existing Poplar and Limehouse constituency. This configuration will create a cross-borough constituency between Tower Hamlets and Newham Boroughs, which will also cross the River Lee at this point. The

revised constituency is well served with good road links via the Barking Road and the A1020 (Lower Lee Crossing). The assistant commissioners proposed to name this revised constituency Poplar and Canning Town. We accept all these recommendations from our assistant commissioners. The revised proposals for the remainder of Tower Hamlets are discussed later in this report.

North London

3.44 In the north of this sub-region, there was significant opposition received to the initial proposals for the Enfield Southgate constituency. Enfield Borough Council covers three constituencies, all of which fall below the permitted electorate range, meaning that extensive change would need to be undertaken to bring the constituencies within the permitted electorate range while ensuring that no constituency crossed the River Lee at this point.

3.45 In the initial proposals the Enfield North constituency retained all its existing wards and was brought within the permitted electorate range by the addition of Grange ward from the existing Enfield Southgate constituency. There has been significant support for this aspect of the initial proposals, as it is believed that the whole of Enfield town centre should be in one constituency. For example, Councillor Lee David-Sanders (BCE-19365) stated: 'I completely support the Boundary Commission's proposals for a new Enfield constituency which includes Grange ward into the current Enfield North parliamentary seat. By including Grange ward, this reunites Enfield Town into one

parliamentary constituency. The current boundary cuts Enfield Town in half and divides the community and the shopping centre of the borough'. Many respondents echoed this point of view.

3.46 In the initial proposals the Edmonton constituency retained all its wards from the existing constituency and was brought into the permitted electorate range with the addition of Palmers Green ward from the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency. There was opposition to the addition of this ward as it was felt that the A10 Great Cambridge Road created a boundary to the east of the ward. Stephen Butters (BCE-26815) echoed the views of many respondents: 'Palmers Green is an integral part of the Palmers Green and Southgate area of Enfield and should be kept with Southgate wards. In my view it will be possible and fair to retain the Enfield, Southgate constituency with minor adjustments to meet the quota.' There was further opposition to the Bush Hill Park ward being retained in the Edmonton constituency. David Burrowes (BCE-40723), the then Member of Parliament for Enfield, Southgate, stated that 'Bush Hill Park ward should be moved into Enfield, Southgate'. Mr Burrowes further went on to say that 'the A10 acts as a significant barrier to Bush Hill Park residents but the A105 is the main thoroughfare which is used and links Bush Hill Park with neighbouring Enfield, Southgate wards of Winchmore Hill, Palmers Green and Grange.'

3.47 There has been support for the initial proposals for the Tottenham constituency, which retained its existing composition with the addition of Stroud Green ward to bring it within the permitted electorate

range. David Lammy (BCE-27611), Member of Parliament for Tottenham, was in full support of this new configuration including the addition of Stroud Green ward, stating: 'I welcome your initial proposals which maintain the integrity of the current constituency boundaries of Tottenham with the addition of one extra Haringey Ward, Stroud Green'. Sir Stuart Lipton (BCE-31339), also supported the proposals, underlining the importance of keeping the Tottenham wards together and not dividing Haringey Borough into multiple constituencies. He stated: 'With complex problems, including the highest level of temporary accommodation in London, a transient population, failed estates, some of the highest levels of unemployment in London, a high level of crime, the lack of a town centre focus and a breakdown in relationships between the community and police ... it is vitally important that the integrity of Tottenham as a constituency is maintained.'

3.48 However, there was also opposition to the specific inclusion of the Stroud Green ward. Lloyd Stacey (BCE-27284) and other respondents put forward the case against this on the basis of the man-made barrier of the East Coast Main Line: 'Please don't move the Stroud Green ward to the Tottenham constituency as it makes no logical sense. A seven track railway divides the two with only one road & one footbridge.' Steve Bethell (BCE-29740) also supported this view: 'I appreciate the difficulty of the task faced by the commission but while the proposal to move Stroud Green Ward into Tottenham keeps the constituency within the borough of Haringey it seems to ignore the real physical barrier of the railway which makes

the people of Stroud Green associate more naturally with Crouch End and Hornsey than with Tottenham because of the lack of connecting roads or paths between them across the railway.'

3.49 Further counter-proposals were received that suggested transferring the Woodside ward, from the existing Hornsey and Wood Green constituency, into the Tottenham constituency. Resident Paul Soper (BCE-39752) stated: 'It would make far more sense as I have suggested in my own separate submission for one of the Wood Green wards to be transferred to Tottenham – most logically Woodside Ward, this is not merely in a geographic sense contiguous with Tottenham as a borough, the main road that runs through the centre of Woodside ward is called White Hart Lane from which Tottenham Hotspur's identity is taken.' With this configuration the Stroud Green ward is returned to the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency, which brings it within the permitted electorate range following the loss of the Woodside ward.

3.50 In the initial proposals the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency retained nine of its existing wards and lost Stroud Green ward to the proposed Tottenham constituency. This proposal was met with considerable opposition as detailed above. The Bowes ward was added to the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency from the existing Enfield Southgate constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. There was some support for this, from Catherine Johnstone (BCE-21061): 'I fully support the aspect of the proposal to move Bowes Park ward from Enfield Southgate to Hornsey and Wood Green. Bowes Park

lies entirely to the south of the A406, which forms a natural barrier. It is cut off from Southgate and all other parts of the Enfield Southgate constituency, and there is no sense at all of being part of the constituency. Most people who live in Bowes Park travel southwards for work or leisure. I have lived here for ten years but go to other parts of the constituency such as Southgate or Cockfosters maybe two or three times a year at most ... It seems logical and proper that Bowes Park is included in a constituency with these areas. In addition, about half of the Bowes Park ward lies in Haringey council area, with only the northern part (where I live) in Enfield council area. This only adds to the disconnect of being remote from the Parliamentary constituency, as well as being cut off from the local authority area. If Bowes Park ward was in the Hornsey and Wood Green constituency, it might lead to changes at the local authority level as well. Although this may not be a consideration for the Boundary Commission, it is relevant to me and is another reason I support this change.' However, there was also opposition from Marilyn Arnott (BCE-23072) and other respondents who supported her view: 'I strongly oppose the boundary changes proposed for Bowes Ward, currently positioned within the Enfield Southgate constituency.' Ms Arnott further commented that 'Bowes Ward fits logically into Enfield Southgate with which it has strong historical, social, medical and transport links. These link us together as a strongly cohesive community and it is this which would be so badly damaged should we be reallocated in the manner proposed.'

3.51 In the initial proposals the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency was divided across five constituencies with Bowes, Cockfosters, Grange, and Palmers Green wards included in neighbouring constituencies. The remaining wards were placed in a proposed Finchley and Southgate constituency. There was some support for this, for example from Andrew Gilbert (BCE-33922), who stated: ‘I welcome the proposals. The Jewish community in Southgate feels very connected to Finchley and often less to Enfield and Edmonton. I think the other changes make good sense too. The sooner, the better!’ However, as mentioned earlier, there was also significant opposition to this, and three campaigns under the name ‘Save Our Southgate’ (BCE-33248, BCE-33205 and BCE-33257) were submitted and supported by the then Member of Parliament for Enfield Southgate, David Burrowes (BCE-40723). The counter-proposal from the Conservative Party (BCE-33279) was similar to the Labour Party (BCE-33244) proposal for this area, and provided a solution for the issue of Enfield, Southgate by returning Enfield Southgate to the existing constituency, with the addition of the Bush Hill Park ward, but creating an Edmonton and Tottenham Hale constituency.

3.52 Further opposition to the removal of the Cockfosters ward from the Enfield, Southgate constituency was received from the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, the Member of Parliament for Chipping Barnet, Theresa Villiers (BCE-39893), and many residents. Ms Villiers stated: ‘The sheer volume of replies from Southgate residents asking to remain as one community is very significant. The voice

from the residents of Cockfosters is clear: they do not want to become part of a predominantly Barnet parliamentary seat. The easy solution to this is the simple ‘swap’ of Brunswick Park and Cockfosters back to their respective boroughs.’

3.53 In the initial proposals the Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency retained five wards from the existing Chipping Barnet constituency, lost Brunswick Park and Coppetts wards to the proposed Finchley and Southgate constituency, and gained Cockfosters and Mill Hill wards. There was opposition to the Mill Hill ward being placed in the proposed Chipping Barnet and Mill Hill constituency. Richard Logue (BCE-26996) stated: ‘On behalf of the Mill Hill Residents Association I wish to object to Mill Hill ward being made part of the Chipping Barnet constituency. Mill Hill has almost no physical link with Chipping Barnet other than the green space between Mill Hill and Arkley. We have no direct public transport link with the Chipping Barnet constituency and if these proposals are implemented the two Mill Hill wards (Mill Hill and Hale) will be in different constituencies.’

3.54 The assistant commissioners considered the arguments and counter-proposals for this area. They noted, in particular, the significant opposition to the initial proposals for Enfield Southgate, which would see the existing constituency split five ways, and the Borough of Enfield being split between five new constituencies. They were persuaded by the strength of argument, and general levels of consensus, that this issue had to be addressed. However, they were conscious that any attempt to return Enfield Southgate to the

existing composition would impact on the Hendon, Chipping Barnet, Enfield, Edmonton, Hornsey and Wood Green, and Tottenham constituencies.

3.55 They were also conscious of evidence received in support of the proposed Tottenham constituency, and the opposition to the counter-proposals that addressed the Enfield concerns by dividing Tottenham between Edmonton and Stoke Newington/Finsbury Park. They noted in particular the comments of David Lammy, Member of Parliament for Tottenham (BCE-40499) in his secondary consultation response, who stated that, if the Conservative Party's counter-proposal is accepted, 'the result would be that the alienation of the most deprived northern Tottenham wards will be increased rather than decreased and that this would be likely to have a highly detrimental effect upon the Tottenham community'.

3.56 In light of the representations received, the assistant commissioners arranged a visit to the area, which reinforced their view that the Enfield Southgate concerns must be addressed, but also that they did not wish to divide the Tottenham area as a consequence. They also confirmed the evidence received that the Stroud Green ward was not easily accessed along its eastern border, there being, as stated, noting a lack of roads and footpaths connecting the ward to the Tottenham constituency.

3.57 The assistant commissioners therefore considered a solution that would address the concerns of those in opposition to the break-up of Enfield,

Southgate, while allowing Tottenham to be retained within its own constituency. They established that, by splitting the Brunswick Park ward between what would be a Finchley and Enfield Southgate, and a Chipping Barnet constituency, they could avoid splitting the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency into five and go some way to matching better the existing Enfield Southgate constituency, though they acknowledge that a fair amount of change is required in this area under any counter-proposal.

3.58 With the benefit of the site visit to the area, the assistant commissioners noted that, within the Brunswick Park ward, polling district CCD contained Middlesex University campus, and Brunswick Park itself. To the west lies the railway line, which is at the top of a steep incline with the streets running downhill in an easterly direction to Pymme's Brook. They observed that Russell Lane runs through the centre of the polling district. To the south of Brunswick Crescent lay the New Southgate Cemetery and Crematorium. These areas appeared to our assistant commissioners to be self-contained and quite distinct.

3.59 The assistant commissioners have given much consideration to the splitting of a ward and whether there are exceptional and compelling circumstances to justify this. While they acknowledged that wards should not be split lightly, and that a split ward had not been proposed by the local community, the solution is one that both avoids significant knock-on effects across the north of the sub-region, and also avoids a number of disruptions to local

ties that would have resulted from the initial proposals. With this polling district placed in the proposed Chipping Barnet constituency, it is now within the permitted electorate range.

3.60 The Brunswick Park ward (polling districts CCA, CCB and CCC) and Coppetts ward from the existing Chipping Barnet constituency will remain in the proposed constituency of Finchley and Enfield Southgate and will gain four wards from the existing Enfield, Southgate constituency and Woodhouse and East Finchley wards from the existing Finchley and Golders Green constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range.

3.61 The assistant commissioners propose to call this constituency Finchley and Enfield Southgate to reflect the addition of the Finchley wards. However, the splitting of wards is untested in the London region and the assistant commissioners encouraged us to specifically invite further evidence on this issue as part of the revised proposals consultation. Subject to that consultation, we accept the recommendation that there are exceptional and compelling circumstances to split a ward in this area.

3.62 The recommendations they put to us also allow the reuniting of Mill Hill in a Hendon constituency, which retains six wards from the existing constituency, and includes Golders Green ward to bring it within the permitted electorate range. The Woodside ward can be transferred into the Tottenham constituency, rather than the Stroud Green ward. We therefore accept the assistant commissioners'

recommendations for Enfield, Edmonton, Finchley and Enfield Southgate, Chipping Barnet, Hendon, Hornsey and Wood Green, and Tottenham constituencies.

Central and West London

3.63 Under our initial proposals the constituency of Cities of London and Westminster retained 10 wards, plus the City of London, from the existing constituency. In order to bring it within the permitted electorate range we included the Lancaster Gate ward from the existing Westminster North constituency and the Bloomsbury, and Holborn and Covent Garden wards from the existing Holborn and St. Pancras constituency. There was a degree of support for this constituency; for example, Mark Field (BCE-20127 and BCE-32183), Member of Parliament for the Cities of London and Westminster, gave oral evidence on day one of the public hearing held in Westminster. He said, 'I welcome the maintaining of the link between the City of London and Westminster which has remained intact since the first review in 1948 and I note that each of the other parties, my own Conservative Party to the Labour Party, Liberal Democrats and the Greens, also are in support of keeping that connection intact. This link is historical, economic and cultural. However, with the emergence of the increasingly commercial financial districts in Mayfair and St. James's, this connection has, if anything, strengthened over recent years.' Councillor Nickie Aiken (BCE-23673) said, 'I support the Commission's proposals for central London and specifically for the Cities of London and Westminster constituency ...

There are not only extremely strong community links between the two cities but also historical and geographical ties.'

3.64 The initial proposals for Queen's Park and Regent's Park constituency retained nine wards from the existing Westminster North constituency and included the Queens Park and Kilburn wards from the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. There was substantial opposition to this proposal as many respondents considered the separation of the Borough of Brent ward of Kilburn and the Borough of Camden ward of Kilburn into different constituencies was divisive. These two wards lay either side of the A5 (known as the Kilburn High Road) with the Borough of Brent to the west and Borough of Camden to the east. Lloyd Fothergill (BCE-26184), on behalf of the Kilburn Neighbourhood Plan Forum, said that the Forum had been 'created out of a community's frustration at being divided between administrative authorities and consequently not being a priority for either authority. It wasn't until the unification of Kilburn under the single constituency of Hampstead and Kilburn did the community have a single voice representing our needs ... This plan to divide the community is a massively regressive step and universally condemned by the Forum. We ask only one thing – to stay united as one community with one MP.'

3.65 However, there was also some support for the changes to the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. Among this support was the representation from Councillor Oliver Cooper (BCE-40730) who considered that the initial proposals

strengthened the unity of Kilburn rather than weakening it. He said, 'the Camden and Brent wards called Kilburn have only been in a single seat since 2010 ... [this points to] the Camden ward being a different community to the Brent ward, despite sharing the same name. As such, the use of the High Road as the boundary between constituencies is not unnatural ... I unhesitatingly support the proposal to unite Queen's Park and the vast majority of Kilburn – far more than in the current constituency of Hampstead & Kilburn – into the core of the Queen's Park & Regent's Park constituency.'

3.66 In light of the competing arguments in relation to our initial proposals for the Queen's Park and Regent's Park constituency, the assistant commissioners arranged a site visit to the area. They recommended a revised Queen's Park and Regent's Park constituency to retain eight wards from the existing Westminster North constituency, taking also Hyde Park ward from the existing Cities of London and Westminster constituency, and the Borough of Brent Queens Park and Kilburn wards from the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. Due to this reconfiguration, they recommended calling this revised constituency Kilburn. We agree with these recommendations.

3.67 They also recommended that the revised Cities of London and Westminster constituency should retain nine wards from the existing constituency and the City of London. It will lose the Hyde Park ward, gain two wards from the existing Holborn and St. Pancras constituency, and gain the Abbey Road and Regent's Park wards from the existing Westminster North

constituency, as both of these wards have associations with the Marylebone area of the constituency. We agree.

3.68 There was also substantial support for the inclusion of the two wards of Childs Hill and Garden Suburb in the proposed Hampstead and Golders Green constituency and opposition to the Labour Party's counter-proposals in this area. Among these, Linda Cooper (BCE-39363) said, 'Childs Hill and Hampstead Garden Suburb wards, which this map seems to show as including the Hampstead-facing part of Golders Green, would be logical additions. These links are immeasurably greater than the ties our area has to any of Brent – the greatest part of which local residents see is Wembley Park, not Kilburn, Kensal Green, or Brondesbury.'

3.69 However, many respondents were concerned about the inclusion of the Childs Hill and Garden Suburb wards in the Hampstead and Golders Green constituency, as some consider these Borough of Barnet wards as being 'outer London'. This was articulated by, among others, Ramon Prasad (BCE-40791) who said, 'I am concerned about the inclusion of large wards from outer London, such as Child's Hill and Hampstead Garden Suburb, in the proposed constituency as they may dilute the voice of those of us in smaller wards such as mine.' Cecil Jenkins (BCE-40778), in supporting Mr Prasad's view, said, 'The Old Borough of Hampstead would be perfectly well preserved by a constituency similar to the current one, there is no need to include outer London wards like Hampstead Garden Suburb and cross the large natural barrier that is the Heath.'

3.70 Having considered the evidence, on the basis of the evidence provided about the local ties between the Childs Hill and Garden Suburb wards and the rest of Hampstead, our assistant commissioners made no recommendation to change this constituency. However, there were suggestions for a change of name for this constituency, such as Hampstead & the Garden Suburb from Jan Hildebrand (BCE-36799). Our assistant commissioners considered the options and proposed simply Hampstead as it best reflects the composition of this constituency. We agree.

3.71 In our initial proposals for the Holborn and St. Pancras constituency, we retained eight wards from the existing constituency and included the Junction and St. George's wards from the existing Islington North constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. There was somewhat limited opposition to this. Huw Price (BCE-17804) said it made 'not a lot of sense, the ward [of] St. Georges is in LB of Islington [while] most of the proposed constituency is in Camden'. However, there was support from Ben Pearson (BCE-33995) who said, 'The new boundary proposals bring the ward of St. George's into the same constituency as our important transport links, social and commercial amenities in the Kentish Town, Fortess Road area ... Although there are unavoidably many issues with drawing boundaries amongst interconnected London communities, the new proposals are plainly a significant improvement upon the existing boundaries; the current constituency divides St. George's ward from its key amenities, and agglomerates it with distant areas of little

familiarity ... I believe the proposed new constituency is undoubtedly a positive development.’ Nevertheless, due to the constraints and changes made elsewhere in this area our assistant commissioners did not recommend any changes to the boundaries of this proposed constituency. However, they noted that a number of the respondents considered that the name of Holborn and St. Pancras was inappropriate, as it no longer contained the Holborn and Covent Garden ward or what was considered to be the historic area of St. Pancras. Among the suggested new names were Camden and Kentish Town, and Camden Town and Hampstead. Our assistant commissioners considered the suggestions and agreed that a change of name was appropriate, recommending Camden and St. Pancras as a suitable name that reflected the composition of the constituency. We agree with this recommendation.

3.72 Our initial proposals for the Finsbury Park and Stoke Newington constituency retained five wards from the existing Islington North constituency and included five wards from the existing Hackney and Stoke Newington constituency. The Junction and St. George’s wards were included in our proposed Holborn and St. Pancras constituency (as described above), while Mildmay ward was included in our proposed Islington constituency. Among those who were opposed to these proposals was Andy Nicholls (BCE-35550) who said, ‘Islington North should remain a single constituency and not be rolled into a mega constituency which extends way out to Hackney and Stoke Newington.’ However, there was some support, for example, from Conor Sacks (BCE-14419) who said, ‘I support these proposals to

equalise constituencies and reduce the number of MPs. I believe these are fairer on the public and fairer on the MPs. I reject allegations of gerrymandering and counter that in fact constituencies have failed to keep up with the pace of change to reflect modern Britain’s demographics.’ Our assistant commissioners did not recommend any amendments to this constituency. We agree.

3.73 In our initial proposals we suggested an Islington constituency which was the same as the existing constituency of Islington South and Finsbury but was modified to include the Mildmay ward from the existing Islington North constituency. In formulating this proposed constituency, we noted that the Mildmay ward was well connected with the constituency via Wallace Road and the A105. We received few representations on this constituency during the consultation periods, and received nothing specific regarding the inclusion of the Mildmay ward in this constituency. Our assistant commissioners did not recommend any changes to the composition of this proposed constituency, and suggested the name remain Islington. We agree.

3.74 The existing Hackney North and Stoke Newington constituency was within the permitted electorate range. However, in formulating the initial proposals, we proposed this constituency would be reconfigured. We included the five wards of Brownswood, Clissold, Stamford Hill West, Stoke Newington, and Woodberry Down along with five wards from the existing Islington North constituency (Hillrise, Tollington, Finsbury Park, Highbury West and Highbury East) in our proposed Finsbury Park and Stoke Newington

constituency. The remaining five wards of the existing Hackney North and Stoke Newington constituency (Springfield, Lea Bridge, Hackney Downs, Shacklewell and Cazenove) were included in a constituency with five wards from the existing Hackney South and Shoreditch constituency. These were Victoria, Hackney Wick, Hackney Central, Homerton and King's Park. We named this constituency Hackney Central.

3.75 Similarly, the existing Hackney South and Shoreditch constituency was also within the permitted electorate range. However, in formulating the initial proposals, we suggested this constituency also be reconfigured. We proposed it retain the five wards of De Beauvoir, Haggerston, Hoxton East & Shoreditch, Hoxton West, and London Fields in a constituency with four wards from the existing Bethnal Green and Bow constituency (Bethnal Green, Spitalfields & Banglatown, St. Peter's, and Weavers) plus the Dalston ward from the existing Hackney North and Stoke Newington constituency, which we called Hackney West and Bethnal Green.

3.76 We received substantial opposition to our proposed constituencies of Hackney Central, and Hackney West and Bethnal Green. We received a representation from Lynne Troughton (BCE-27392) opposing the proposed constituencies. She stated: 'I live in the proposed Hackney Central but believe Hackney will be severely affected by the proposals to incorporate large swathes of Tower Hamlets into Hackney West. The demographics are completely different, residents of Bethnal Green and Spitalfields etc require very specific services that Hackney does not require on anything like the same scale.' We also

received a representation from the Head of Electoral Services at the Borough of Hackney (BCE-35048) opposing the initial proposals. He said that 'currently the Borough, similar to many other London authorities, has two constituencies that are coterminous with the external boundary of the Borough. This allows for clear and straightforward administration of elections, with Hackney solely responsible for running parliamentary elections for the two existing constituencies. Should the proposals pass in their present or a similar form, the authority would be required to work closely with Islington and Tower Hamlets in administering future parliamentary elections. This increases complexity.'

3.77 In our initial proposals, we proposed a Bow and Canning Town constituency that included two wards from the existing Bethnal Green and Bow constituency, three from the existing Poplar and Limehouse constituency (Bromley North, Bromley South and Lansbury), and four from the existing West Ham constituency (Canning Town North, Canning Town South, Stratford and New Town, and West Ham). There was opposition to this proposal. Mohammad Islam (BCE-31533) opposed the proposed constituency. He said, 'I wish to express my opposition to the proposed splitting of the constituency of Bethnal Green and Bow. The Boundary Commission's proposals to partly split the constituency into two new seats and add the remainder of it to one existing constituency fail to understand the strong links in this part of the East End. It totally disregards the area's history and the important need to maintain community cohesion.'

3.78 However, we also received some support for the proposed Bow and Canning Town constituency. Rupert Wheeler (BCE-16829), Chairman of the Spitalfields Society, said, ‘the Spitalfields Society is a voluntary local amenity group dedicated to the preservation and improvement of the London neighbourhood of Spitalfields. This includes, although not exclusively, architectural, social and cultural issues. The Society is representative of a large number of the local community in Spitalfields and encompasses a wide range of different interests and backgrounds, both residential and commercial ... We consider this proposal highly sensible and desirable and believe it would constitute a strongly positive change.’

3.79 Our assistant commissioners noted the representations received, including the support and opposition to the proposed Hackney Central, Hackney West and Bethnal Green, and Bow and Canning Town constituencies. They noted that any further changes, including the retention of the existing constituencies in Hackney Borough, would require significant consequential changes to surrounding constituencies. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received to make any changes to these proposed constituencies, and therefore recommended no changes to the constituencies of Hackney Central, and Hackney West and Bethnal Green constituencies. However, they recommended the constituency of Hackney West and Bethnal Green be renamed to Shoreditch and Bethnal Green. We agree.

3.80 Our assistant commissioners proposed a revised constituency that contains Bow East, Bow West, St. Dunstan’s, Stepney Green, and Whitechapel wards from the existing Bethnal Green and Bow constituency and gains Bromley North, Bromley South, Shadwell, St. Katharine’s & Wapping wards from the existing Poplar and Limehouse constituency. Our assistant commissioners proposed this constituency should be named Stepney and Bow to reflect these changes and we agree.

3.81 As a result of changes to surrounding constituencies, our assistant commissioners proposed a Leyton and Stratford constituency, comprised of four wards from the existing West Ham constituency and five wards from the existing Leyton and Wanstead constituency. We agree.

3.82 In our initial proposals we proposed a Kensington and Chelsea constituency that was coterminous with the borough boundary. We received substantial support for this proposed constituency. The representation of Maxima Truffer (BCE-40704) was representative of many comments received: ‘I support the Boundary Commission’s proposals. It’s ideal for Kensington and Chelsea to be re-united and for the boundary of the Borough and the constituency to be the same. The proposed constituency boundaries provide the most benefit to the community.’ We received a counter-proposal for this constituency from the Labour Party (BCE-33244). They proposed to create three constituencies across the local authority, including the transfer of the Brompton and Hans Town, and Royal

Hospital wards to a Cities of London and Westminster constituency. There was substantial opposition to this counter-proposal. The representation from George George (BCE-28759) was representative of the opposition received: 'I agree with the recommended proposal [the initial proposals], which to me appears to be a parliamentary constituency that takes in the entirety of the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea. Compared to other proposals, such as the suggestion that part of K&C is merged with Westminster, this makes the most sense.' Our assistant commissioners recommended no revisions to the initial proposal for Kensington and Chelsea, and we agree.

3.83 In the initial proposals, we suggested a Hammersmith and Fulham constituency that included six wards from the existing Chelsea and Fulham constituency and six wards from the existing Hammersmith constituency. We received some opposition to this proposal, and also some counter-proposals were put forward. Andrew Slaughter (BCE-29011), Member of Parliament for Hammersmith, proposed that central London be kept together and that there should be 'four seats wholly contained within the Cities of London and Westminster, Hammersmith & Fulham, and Kensington & Chelsea'. This counter-proposal was supported by the Labour Party (BCE-33244) and many other respondents such as Jane Bain (BCE-40689) who said, 'I fully support the views of and alternative proposals proposed by Andy Slaughter MP. I am specifically concerned about the proposed changes to the Hammersmith constituency. The proposal to split the north of the borough (LBHF) across several different

constituencies will result in a loss of social cohesion. Splitting the north and south of Shepherd's Bush along Goldhawk Road will mean that communities are severed by an artificial constituency boundary down the middle of the street.'

3.84 However, we also received some support for our proposed Hammersmith and Fulham constituency. We considered that the representation from Oliver Van Dongen (BCE-28724) was representative of those supporting our initial proposals and objecting to the Labour Party counter-proposals. He said, 'I have lived in Fulham for the past 3 years and it is a wonderful location. One of the special things about Fulham is its village feel and that it is one of the few places in London where you can very easily define its geographical boundaries. Because of this Fulham very much feels like a distinctive community and this is a primary reason why I support the Boundary Commission's proposal as opposed to the counter proposal from the Labour Party.'

3.85 Our assistant commissioners considered the counter-proposals and noted the representations received. In their view, the counter-proposals would require consequential changes to neighbouring constituencies, including that of Kensington and Chelsea for which we had received significant support. They also noted that a number of representations supported the proposed Hammersmith and Fulham constituency. Therefore, they recommended no changes to this constituency as part of the revised proposals, and we agree.

3.86 In the initial proposals the Willesden constituency included eight wards from the existing Brent Central constituency, the Brondesbury Park ward from the existing Hampstead and Kilburn constituency, and the College Park and Old Oak ward from the existing Hammersmith constituency, to bring it into the permitted electorate range. We received some opposition to this proposal. Jonathan Goggs (BCE-25952) said, 'I live in Brondesbury Park ward, in the current Hampstead and Kilburn constituency. I'm very concerned about the impact of the Boundary Commission's proposed constituencies of Willesden, Hampstead and Golders Green and Regent's Park and Queen's Park.' Similarly, Helen Brown (BCE-22860) objected to the proposal, stating 'I rarely go to Wembley or visit the north of Brent ... Kilburn High Road desperately needs to be in one constituency.'

3.87 In our initial proposals for the Wembley and Harrow on the Hill constituency, we included three Harrow Borough wards from the existing Harrow West constituency, five wards from the existing Brent North constituency, and the Tokyngton ward from the existing Brent Central constituency. We received significant opposition to the inclusion of Harrow on the Hill ward with the area of Wembley to form a constituency. Christopher James (BCE-28206) said, 'I have lived in Harrow, mostly Harrow-on-the-Hill, for over 40 years and I am very unhappy about the proposed boundary changes. Although you say that consideration has been made for geographical factors, I can see no evidence of this. Harrow-on-the-Hill IS Harrow. The present borough known as Harrow developed and expanded around

the core of the old village of Harrow now known as Harrow-on-the-Hill and is rightly regarded as the heart of the borough – indeed, it is featured on the coat of arms of Harrow. To detach it from the rest of the borough in this way and lump it with Wembley makes no sense geographically, socially or historically to either party.' John Bryant (BCE-28336) in his counter-proposal said, 'The BCE's proposed seat crosses the boundary between Brent and Harrow and seriously disrupts existing ties in Harrow. In particular, it separates Greenhill ward (the modern town centre of Harrow) from Harrow on the Hill ward (the historic original settlement of Harrow, including the ancient parish church and the famous school). If the seat, rather than extending northwestwards from Wembley into Harrow as the BCE proposes, instead moves eastwards to include the areas displaced from the BCE's suggested Willesden seat, then it can be contained entirely within the borough of Brent.'

3.88 John Bryant went on to propose that 'the seat should lose its three Harrow wards and the Brent wards of Sudbury and Northwick Park, and gain the Dollis Hill, Dudden Hill and Welsh Harp wards from the BCE's proposed Willesden seat, and the Barnhill and Fryent wards from the proposed Kenton. These are major changes and require a change of name: 'Wembley' is suggested (although 'Wembley and Neasden' or 'Brent Central' would be possibilities).'

3.89 In the initial proposals four wards of the Harrow East constituency were included in our proposed Kenton constituency, with five wards from the existing Harrow West constituency to bring it into the permitted electorate range.

There was substantial opposition to this change and a campaign from Harvey Garfield (BCE-33251) on behalf of the members of the Stanmore and Canons Park Synagogue. He said, 'Stanmore & Canons Park Synagogue has one of the largest Jewish congregations in Europe with around 3,000 active members. It is situated in Canons Ward and most of its members live in the wards of Stanmore Park, Canons and Belmont. The Commission's proposals would mean the Belmont ward would be located in the new constituency of Kenton but we think that it should be included in the proposed Stanmore and Harrow constituency. We believe that it is important for reasons of community cohesion that the members of our Synagogue, with our Synagogue, should remain in the same constituency.'

3.90 Councillor Vina Mithani (BCE-27762) supported the inclusion of the Borough of Brent ward of Kenton in our initially proposed Kenton constituency. Councillor Mithani said, 'I am in Harrow East constituency. All of the Kenton Wards share a common community with strong links around the Hindu Kenton Temple and the local churches', and referred to the communities around the Greek Orthodox Church, the Jain Temple on the Brent side of Kenton Road and the Synagogue on the Brent side of Kenton Road. John Bryant (BCE-28336) proposed a Harrow North constituency that retained the Belmont, Canons, Harrow Weald, Stanmore Park, and Wealdstone wards from the existing Harrow East constituency and included the Headstone North, Headstone South, and Marlborough wards from the existing Harrow West constituency.

3.91 However, there was some support for our proposed Kenton constituency. Mir Akbari (BCE-34119) said, 'As a resident of Kenton, I want to fully support the Boundary Commission's proposal to establish a Kenton constituency, representing the clear and defined community that straddles the Harrow/Brent boundary. Often these 'boundary communities' are overlooked and poorly represented as their representation is divided, but I feel a Kenton constituency would better deal with this problem in our area. My only note of concern is in regards to what actually makes up the Kenton area. Beyond the obvious Kenton wards, I want to commend the Commission on using the tube lines as borders, however the proposed Kenton constituency, excludes the area of South Kenton which falls into the Preston ward in Brent.'

3.92 In the initial proposals we proposed an Ealing Central and Shepherd's Bush constituency that included six wards from the existing Ealing Central and Acton constituency, and the Askew, Shepherd's Bush Green, and Wormholt and White City wards from Hammersmith Borough. We received substantial opposition to this proposed constituency, for example from Jelena Bogunovic (BCE-24072). Joseph Bitar (BCE-16421) also opposed the suggested constituency: 'As a resident of the W12 postcode area in London (Wormholt and White City) I have a strong emotional tie to both Hammersmith and Fulham that I developed as a child. I have much more of an emotional tie to Hammersmith than any other part of London, having travelled through the area every day on the way to school and gathered there with friends on weekends from a young age into my adulthood.'

Under the proposed boundary changes White City and Wormholt will be lumped into one borough with Ealing and Acton – areas that I have little attachment to.’

3.93 In his representation John Bryant (BCE-28336) said of Ealing Central and Shepherd’s Bush: ‘Despite the inclusion of ‘Ealing Central’ in the name, the BCE proposal separates Walpole ward from the rest of central Ealing. The BCE also extends the seat eastwards into the adjoining borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to include the Shepherd’s Bush area, which is of a very different character to the rest of the seat. If, however, Walpole ward is retained in a central Ealing seat and Elthorne is added, the seat can be contained wholly within the borough of Ealing. It is therefore proposed that the seat should lose the three wards in Hammersmith and Fulham and gain the Elthorne and Walpole wards. To reflect these changes, its name should be changed to ‘Ealing and Acton’.’

3.94 In the initial proposals for Ealing North we included six wards from the existing constituency of Ealing North, plus the Lady Margaret and Dormers Well wards from the existing Ealing, Southall constituency. We received few representations that commented on this constituency. In his counter-proposal John Bryant (BCE-28336) suggested changing the constituency, so that Greenford was its focus. He said of the Ealing North constituency: ‘Having lost its two Southall wards of Dormers Wells and Lady Margaret, this seat, which is very much focused on the town of Greenford, can be brought back into the permitted size range by the inclusion of the Brent wards

of Northwick Park and Sudbury, lying just across the borough boundary from Greenford. The seat loses Dormers Wells and Lady Margaret and gains Northwick Park and Sudbury, changing its name to ‘Greenford and Sudbury’ (or ‘Ealing North and Sudbury’).’

3.95 The assistant commissioners recognised the substantial changes that had been proposed in the boroughs of Brent, Harrow and Ealing. They considered the evidence in the representations and counter-proposals and recommended to us that we adopt the proposals suggested by John Bryant (BCE-28336), because they considered that his proposals would allow for a better configuration of constituencies throughout the boroughs of Harrow, Ealing and Brent. We agree with their general conclusions regarding these boroughs.

3.96 They considered that Mr Bryant’s counter-proposal had merit as it would include the area of Harrow on the Hill in a Harrow South and Kenton constituency and combine Wembley with areas of the existing Brent Central and Brent North constituencies to form a constituency he called Wembley.

3.97 Similarly, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that the Mr Bryant’s counter-proposal for Harrow North, and Harrow South and Kenton constituencies provided the best solution in the Borough of Harrow, though they recommended one change to his proposal in Hatch End (discussed later in this report). We agree.

3.98 Our assistant commissioners noted the representations that suggested the Shepherd's Bush area should be included in a Hammersmith constituency. However, they considered that persuasive evidence had not been received to support that configuration, given the knock-on effects that would result. They also investigated alternative proposals to Mr Bryant's, particularly in light of opposition to our proposed Ealing Central and Shepherd's Bush constituency. They noted the representations from Robert Largan (BCE-30528 and BCE-33852) who proposed that the Shepherd's Bush area could be included in a Willesden and Shepherd's Bush constituency. Our assistant commissioners decided to visit the area to observe for themselves whether the proposed constituency had suitable road connections. Having visited the area, they observed that road connections were good. We accept the recommendation to adopt Mr Bryant's counter-proposal for this area.

3.99 Our assistant commissioners therefore endorsed Mr Bryant's counter-proposal for the constituencies of Ealing and Acton, Greenford and Sudbury, and Southall and Heston, noting that they unite communities and allow for local ties to be restored in Wembley, Harrow, Southall, and (to some extent) Shepherd's Bush and White City. The assistant commissioners acknowledged that there will remain opposition to moving the White City area into a Willesden constituency, but could not find a suitable alternative.

3.100 In the initial proposals our Brentford and Chiswick constituency retained seven wards from the existing Brentford and Isleworth constituency and included the Northfield ward from the Ealing Southall constituency, and the Southfield ward from the Ealing Central and Acton constituency. There was some support for this proposal. We received a representation from Robert Speirs (BCE-14387) who commented: 'I agree with the proposals as they relate to my ward (Northfield), currently in the Ealing Southall constituency, being moved to Brentford and Chiswick. This better reflects the geographic and transport connections between these areas, as I frequently visit, shop and socialise in Brentford and Chiswick but in 10 years have only ever driven through Southall as it's not easy to access without a car.'

3.101 Similarly, a Southfield ward resident, Steven Shone (BCE-16007), objected to the counter-proposals. He said, 'I decided to read your proposals and look at the new constituency boundaries insofar as they affect me (i.e. the proposed new 'Brentford and Chiswick' constituency). They seem fair and reasonable and so I want to express general support.'

3.102 On day one of the Kingston public hearing, Councillor Gregory Stafford (BCE-32603) also expressed support for the initial proposals: 'I think that the Boundary Commission's proposals for the new Brentford and Chiswick seat are extremely important and indeed are of natural communities. For us in Ealing

it means that Southfield ward, which is, to all intents and purposes, a Chiswick ward, is being reunited with the three other Chiswick wards that are currently in the London Borough of Hounslow. The people of that ward – Southfield ward – shop on the Chiswick High Road. They use the stations that are in the Hounslow borough and the Bedford Park area is split between those areas, so it is a natural place for Southfield to go. Northfield ward is also moving down into that new seat and it also pulls closer to the Brentford area than it does to Ealing.’

3.103 Our assistant commissioners recommended that we make no changes to the boundaries of the initially proposed Brentford and Chiswick constituency. However, they considered that it should be renamed Isleworth, Brentford and Chiswick in order to reflect all the communities included in the proposed constituency. We agree.

3.104 In the initial proposals we included in the Feltham and Hounslow constituency six wards from the existing Feltham and Heston constituency, plus the Hounslow South, Hounslow Central and Hounslow Heath wards to bring it within electorate range. We received some support for our proposed Feltham and Hounslow constituency. Maneesh Singh (BCE-32597) who gave evidence on day one of the Kingston public hearing said, ‘The most important reason for me is Hounslow Lampton school where most of the children are from Hounslow Central and Hounslow Heath and Feltham wards. They attend the same school. It makes sense that socially in one particular school pupils from the same ward, from the same constituency are attending the same school ... Yes, I

really agree with this proposal and I would like to go ahead with this.’ Further support came from Kath Atkinson of the Feltham and Heston Conservative Association (BCE-19994).

3.105 However, we also received some opposition to the proposed constituency. We received a representation from Martin Ellis (BCE-16977) who was concerned that the proposal divided the Woodlands estate. He said, ‘I don’t understand why the Woodlands Estate Isleworth is to be in Hounslow & Feltham when it is very much a part of Isleworth and demographically fits in much better with Brentford & Chiswick. Why is Isleworth being split like this? It just doesn’t make sense. A much more logical border would be Worton Road/Bridge Road to the West and and the railway line to the North. I understand that it’s about numbers but it seems ridiculous to split communities like this.’

3.106 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence that had been received, both in support of and objection to our initial proposals, but were not convinced that those opposing the initial proposals had provided sufficiently persuasive evidence to suggest that we should change our proposed Feltham and Hounslow constituency. We agree.

3.107 In the initial proposals we suggested a Twickenham constituency that was unchanged from the existing constituency. We received significant support for this proposal. We considered that the representation from Samantha Gore (BCE-17194) represented the views of many Twickenham residents: ‘I was already aware of changes to our area but feared that our corner of the existing

Twickenham seat was going to be pushed into Hounslow. I am very pleased to see that we are remaining in Twickenham.’ Our assistant commissioners recommended that, in view of the substantial support that had been received for our initial proposals for the Twickenham constituency, it should not be changed further. We agree.

3.108 In our initial proposals we retained in the Hayes and Harlington constituency all the wards from the existing constituency plus the Yiewsley ward from the existing Uxbridge and South Ruislip constituency. We received representations regarding the inclusion of Yiewsley ward in this constituency. Gordon Jones (BCE-24711) supported the proposal and said, ‘My village of Yiewsley which is currently in the Uxbridge and South Ruislip Constituency moves to the Hayes and Harlington constituency under these initial proposals. This is a far better ‘geographic’ constituency than that proposed in the previous review proposals of 2011-13 which included Feltham, which lies beyond Heathrow Airport.’ Mr Jones proposed that the constituency be called Hayes and West Drayton. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that Mr Jones’s suggestions were persuasive enough and recommended that no changes be made to this constituency, including the name of the constituency. We agree.

3.109 In the initial proposals for a Hillingdon and Uxbridge constituency, we included five wards from the existing Uxbridge and South Ruislip constituency, the Harefield and Ickenham wards from the existing Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency, and the Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End wards from the existing Ealing North constituency. This

was done to bring the constituency within the permitted electorate range. We received some support for this proposal. Laurance Clark (BCE-29228) supported this change. He said, ‘The new constituency does reflect a more cohesive local area and puts Cavendish Ward back with the rest of Eastcote/Ruislip where it would seem to belong.’

3.110 However, there was also significant opposition to the proposed boundary that would split the village of Ickenham, for example from Brian Walters (BCE-16912), Jim Hall (BCE-18933), and Lisa Cronin (BCE-16985). Brian Cable (BCE-16840) stated, ‘The Boundary Commission proposals to change the Parliamentary constituency boundaries will affect Ickenham in that the village will be in 2 adjoining constituencies Uxbridge/South Ruislip and Ruislip/Northwood/Eastcote. The north of the village from Oak Ave and Austins Lane to the Chiltern Line will be in Ruislip/Northwood/Eastcote whilst the rest will be in Uxbridge/Ruislip. There is a consensus of opinion among residents that the boundary should be moved north to the Chiltern Line to ensure that all the village is in the same constituency and I ask the commission to take that into account.’

3.111 Notwithstanding the support for moving Cavendish ward into Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner, our assistant commissioners sought to address the splitting of Ickenham village by uniting Ickenham and West Ruislip wards in the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency. They also recommended moving Manor and Cavendish wards into Hillingdon and Uxbridge constituency. Hillingdon and Uxbridge constituency would retain seven wards from the existing

constituency, and would include the Northolt Mandeville and Northolt West End wards to bring it into permitted electorate range. We agree.

3.112 In the initial proposals for the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency we retained six wards from the existing constituency. We noted that the existing constituency was within the permitted electorate range, but we proposed changes to it as a result of modifications to neighbouring constituencies. We received support for the initial proposal for this constituency, both wholly and in part. In her representation Christine Moore (BCE-20481) said, 'For the area I live in, it is good because it maintains the integrity of the Ruislip and Northwood unit. This is important because so many community things are focused on this unit – e.g. secondary schools, leisure facilities, public services, ethos and local newspapers ... Any split would lack rationale in terms of community organisation.' In supporting our proposals, Ms Moore opposed the counter-proposals by both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, which were not dissimilar in nature, as she felt they would 'destroy' the Ruislip–Northwood link. Despite this, we received some support for both the Conservative Party (BCE-33279) and the Labour Party (BCE-33244) counter-proposals. In his representation Reverend Michael Natrass (BCE-27463) said, 'I consider that the current proposals perpetuate the regrettable current division between historically and naturally linked communities around Pinner and actually make it worse by separating Hatch End from Pinner.' Many respondents supported the Conservative Party counter-proposal, which retained six of the existing wards

in the Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency but did not include West Ruislip, Ickenham and Hatch End wards.

3.113 In his counter-proposal John Bryant (BCE-28336) retained the constituency as in the initial proposals. We received a representation from Howard Erdunast (BCE-28714) who submitted a counter-proposal based on his knowledge of the area having lived there for more than 25 years. Mr Erdunast proposed the inclusion of the Hatch End, Harefield and Ickenham wards in order to bring the proposed constituency within the permitted electorate range; thereby the revised Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner constituency would be the same as the existing constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered that we should incorporate these changes into the overall counter-proposal submitted by John Bryant, therefore producing a better balance of the statutory factors. We agree.

South Thames

3.114 In the boroughs of Richmond and Kingston upon Thames, the electorates of the existing Richmond Park constituency (which crosses the borough boundary with the inclusion of the four Kingston upon Thames wards of Canbury, Coombe Hill, Coombe Vale and Tudor), and the Kingston and Surbiton constituency were within the permitted electorate range. We were able to retain both constituencies unchanged in our initial proposals.

3.115 There was generally support for these proposals with only limited opposition such as that expressed by Patrick Morrissey (BCE-14688) who

said, 'Kingston and New Malden are related areas. The current and proposed boundaries split Kingston/New Malden between Richmond and Surbiton centres. This is illogical and prevents proper representation of the area's best interests by one MP.' The assistant commissioners did not consider that this was sufficient evidence to amend our initial proposals. They also noted that the initial proposals for the two constituencies had been supported by the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties and that a local resident, James Giles (BCE-14756), had said, 'It is absolutely fantastic that Kingston and Surbiton will stay in one piece as it currently stands – the 2013 boundary review particularly concerned me as it split the constituency into three. This review for 2018 is far better and one I fully support.'

3.116 There was some support for a change of name of the Richmond Park constituency to Richmond Park and North Kingston, for example, from the Conservative Party (BCE-33279) and Brian Marcel (BCE-19120) on the basis that the name would 'better reflect the geographical layout of the constituency'. However, our assistant commissioners considered that, as the constituency was not changed, there was no need to change its name. We agree.

3.117 Our proposals for the Wimbledon area were much more contentious, with a significant degree of opposition to our proposed Wimbledon Common and Putney, and Merton and Wimbledon Central constituencies, with many of the representations expressing common concerns. There was some support for our proposed Wimbledon Common and

Putney constituency from residents of Wandsworth who approved of our initial proposals to include Wimbledon Park and Village wards in the constituency. Justine Greening, Member of Parliament for Putney, articulated these views in her representation (BCE-31770). She said, 'in relation to the initial proposals made by the Boundary Commission, there has been overall positive feedback, principally driven by the natural community links with the Wimbledon Park and Wimbledon Village wards.'

3.118 However, these views were not generally shared in the representations that were received from the 'Wimbledon wards'. Dr Elaine Crosthwaite (BCE-31266) said of the proposals: 'they do not meet several of the criteria for making a constituency ... the proposal to put Wimbledon village and the All England Tennis Club, known worldwide as 'Wimbledon' into a Putney constituency does not make sense and would no doubt cause some confusion. The Wimbledon Common and A3 represent a physical barrier; there are no local ties over the large expanse of the Common. In relation to shopping and transport, Wimbledon Town is the natural hub for residents of Wimbledon Village.' Jacqueline Wood (BCE-27348) said, 'it seems totally crazy and bizarre to split Wimbledon in this way. I have lived in Wimbledon village all my adult life, but I walk daily to the station, shop in the Centre and the supermarkets down the hill. It's ALL Wimbledon. I would hate the village to be separated from the life down the hill. I have very little knowledge of Putney. The Common and the A3 make a strong barrier between the two areas.'

3.119 Mr Eric Samuelson (BCE-32243), Chief Executive of AFC Wimbledon, spoke on day one of the public hearing held in Westminster. He highlighted the diverse community groups and links throughout the whole area, but with regard specifically to Wimbledon he considered that, in most people's minds, Wimbledon was a 'most clear and distinct image' and that it should have 'representation as a community in its own right'.

3.120 Our assistant commissioners considered that there were two key themes regarding counter-proposals for the Wimbledon area. The Labour Party (BCE-33244), the Conservative Party (BCE-33279), Stephen Hammond, Member of Parliament for Wimbledon (BCE-31639), and Pete Whitehead (BCE-27879) suggested that the Village ward should be included in the same constituency as wards that are currently included in the existing Wimbledon constituency, for example, the Hillside, Raynes Park, Trinity, Abbey and Dundonald wards.

3.121 Other respondents – such as the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) and John Bryant (BCE-28349) – suggested a revised Wimbledon constituency that would contain the wards of Wimbledon Park and Village, in addition to the Wandsworth ward of Roehampton and Putney Heath from the existing Putney constituency. In providing evidence for this proposal, the Liberal Democrat Party said that 'the Roehampton community has its own High Street with shops, pubs, a library and other amenities. It has a clear sense of its own identity separate from Putney or other towns in Wandsworth. In short, we submit that far less damage to local ties would be done by transferring Roehampton

from Putney to Wimbledon than would be split in placing Wimbledon Park and Village wards in Putney.' They also considered that the A219 was an accessible transport route that would connect the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward to the rest of the constituency.

3.122 The Conservative Party counter-proposal suggested minor changes to our initial proposals for the Merton and Wimbledon Central constituency, with the inclusion of the Village ward and exclusion of the Colliers Wood ward, which they included in a Tooting constituency. The counter-proposals from John Bryant and the Liberal Democrat Party were similar, the difference being the inclusion of the Lower Morden ward and exclusion of the Colliers Wood ward in Mr Bryant's proposed Wimbledon constituency, while the Liberal Democrat Party included Colliers Wood in the constituency but not Lower Morden.

3.123 In view of the considerable objection to our initial proposals and the variations in a number of the counter-proposals, our assistant commissioners decided to visit the area to observe for themselves some of the links that had been suggested. In particular, they visited the Roehampton and Putney Heath, and Village wards and travelled into the centre of Wimbledon. In their view, they considered that both Village and Wimbledon Park wards were an integral part of the Wimbledon constituency. They also noted that the open space of Wimbledon Common was used by residents in the boroughs of Merton and Wandsworth, on both sides of the common, and that the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in particular had links to the common and the Village ward and

that it would be desirable to also include the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in a Wimbledon constituency. This configuration was suggested by the Liberal Democrat Party in their counter-proposal.

3.124 Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended the Liberal Democrat Party's (BCE-28274) counter-proposal for Wimbledon, which would include the Village, Wimbledon Park, and Roehampton and Putney Heath wards but exclude the Lavender Fields, Cricket Green, and Ravensbury wards, which they considered looked more towards Mitcham. They also agreed that the Colliers Wood ward was essentially a Mitcham ward, but considered that it would need to be included in the Wimbledon constituency in order to ensure that the electorate was within the permitted electorate range (the issues raised regarding Mitcham are discussed later in this report). We agree with this recommendation. We also agree with their recommendation to adopt this aspect of the Liberal Democrat Party's counter-proposal.

3.125 The removal of the Roehampton and Putney Heath, Village, and Wimbledon Park wards from our initial proposals for a Wimbledon Common and Putney constituency meant that that constituency electorate would be more than 5% below the permitted electorate range and other wards would have to be included to compensate. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) had proposed that the Wandsworth Common and Fairfield wards should be included in the constituency, but our assistant commissioners also considered whether the Earlsfield ward should be included instead of Wandsworth Common. They therefore also visited the

Earlsfield ward that we had included in our initially proposed Tooting constituency.

3.126 Having visited the area, our assistant commissioners observed that there were links between the Earlsfield ward and Putney and, in particular, the Southfields ward, and that the inclusion of this ward, as well as the Fairfield ward, would provide a better fit of wards than the inclusion of the Wandsworth Common ward and that it resulted in a more cohesive shape to the constituency. They therefore recommended this configuration for the constituency and, to reflect the changes that they had made, suggested that the constituency should be called Wandsworth and Putney. We agree.

3.127 We had made changes to the existing Sutton and Cheam, and Carshalton and Wallington constituencies in our initial proposals in order to bring both constituencies within the permitted electorate range by including the Lower Morden and St. Helier wards in the proposed Sutton and Cheam constituency, and including the Belmont ward from the existing Sutton and Cheam constituency in the proposed Carshalton and Wallington constituency. The Labour Party (BCE-33244) suggested an alternative arrangement for the constituencies. They retained the Belmont ward in the existing Sutton and Cheam constituency and added the Borough of Sutton ward of St. Helier in the Sutton and Cheam constituency. They also included the two Borough of Croydon wards of Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West in the Carshalton and Wallington constituency which they suggest could be named Carshalton, Wallington and Coulsdon, but provided little evidence to support these changes.

3.128 Our initial proposals had attracted some objection, particularly from residents of the Belmont ward who suggested that the ward should continue to be included in the Sutton and Cheam constituency; for example, P Lewis (BCE-21565) who said, ‘Belmont is part of south Cheam and closest to Cheam and Sutton. I have lived in Belmont for 20 years and in all that time I have NEVER used any public services, any transport links or any shops & businesses in Wallington or Carshalton. This proposal makes no sense at all. We need to vote on what matters where we live and that is in Sutton and Cheam.’ However, there was also some support for the inclusion of the Belmont ward from, for example, the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274), although they added that ‘we would not dispute Belmont ward’s links to both Sutton and Cheam. Nevertheless we accept the transfer of the ward to Carshalton & Wallington since this provides for a constituency wholly within Sutton borough.’

3.129 Our assistant commissioners accepted the evidence that Belmont’s links were with Sutton and Cheam. However, they considered that the ward should continue to be included in the proposed Carshalton and Wallington constituency as it would allow for a better fit of constituencies throughout the area of South London. They were not persuaded that the evidence provided was sufficient for them to recommend any changes to the initial proposals for the Sutton and Cheam, and Carshalton and Wallington constituencies. We agree.

3.130 In developing our initial proposals we had divided the existing constituency of Mitcham and Morden across four

different constituencies, and a number of representations drew attention to the fact the Borough of Merton would be split across five constituencies. This generated substantial opposition to our proposals, including five separate campaigns: Keep Morden Together (BCE-33219), Keep Mitcham and Morden Together (BCE-33214), Keep Mitcham Together (BCE-33218), Mitcham Should Stay Together (BCE-33224), and Keep Mitcham and Morden United (BCE-33206). These campaigns contained a combined number of 4,410 signatures. All the main political parties were opposed to our initial proposals, as well as many local residents. Under our initial proposals, the Lower Morden and St. Helier wards were included in the Sutton and Cheam constituency; the Graveney ward was included in the Tooting constituency; the Figge’s Marsh, Longthornton and Pollards Hill wards were included in the Streatham and Mitcham constituency; and the Colliers Wood, Lavender Fields, Cricket Green and Ravensbury wards were included in the Merton and Wimbledon Central constituency.

3.131 There was widespread opposition to our initial proposals from residents in Merton, and at the Westminster public hearing a wide cross-section of the community groups from the borough spoke. Alan Barley (BCE-39931) and Father David Pennells (BCE- 32344) provided a detailed history of the area in their representations.

3.132 The Member of Parliament for Mitcham and Morden, Siobhain McDonagh, submitted a number of written representations, and in her substantive representation (BCE-31787) said, ‘under

the Commission's proposals, one of London's smallest boroughs will be split between five different MPs ... no respect has been paid to the community of Mitcham which has a long and proud history.'

3.133 In view of the significant and widespread opposition to our initial proposals for Merton, our assistant commissioners arranged a site visit to the area to observe the community links. The visit reinforced their view that the Merton concerns must be addressed. Our assistant commissioners weighed up the substantial body of evidence that was contained in the written representations, the campaigns and the oral representations that were made in the public hearings, and concluded that the counter-proposal suggested by the Liberal Democrat Party provided the most appropriate solution. This proposal included seven of the ten wards of the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency with the three Borough of Croydon wards of Norbury, West Thornton and Broad Green in a Mitcham and Norbury constituency. They therefore recommended to us that we adopt the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) counter-proposals for this area. We agree.

3.134 Our initial proposals for the Tooting constituency did not generate a large number of representations, although they were supported by the Labour Party (BCE-33244). Most of those submitting a representation commented on the Graveney ward. The representation from Sue Pearson (BCE-15513) seemed to reflect a number of the representations that were received. She said, 'I'm happy about this boundary and

staying part of the strong Tooting and Furzedown community, others I know have also expressed relief about not being shoe-horned onto Streatham or Mitcham. I'm writing because I expect most of the comments are negative so wanted to let you know when you get things right!' However, with respect to the comments about the division of the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency, a number of representations objected to the inclusion of the Borough of Merton ward of Graveney in the constituency.

3.135 As described above, we had agreed with the recommendation of our assistant commissioners to adopt the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) counter-proposals in this area. To bring the Tooting constituency within the permitted electorate range, the Liberal Democrat Party had proposed the inclusion of the Balham ward from the proposed Battersea constituency. This was also suggested by John Bryant (BCE-28349) in his counter-proposal.

3.136 A number of counter-proposals suggested alternative configurations. The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) had included the two Borough of Merton wards of Colliers Wood and Graveney in the Tooting constituency, although they had also included the Earlsfield ward in the Putney constituency. In addressing the Mitcham and Morden issue and its knock-on effects, the assistant commissioners were further able to recommend the Liberal Democrat Party proposal (BCE-28274) for the Tooting constituency, which would retain six wards from the existing constituency, gain Balham ward from the existing Battersea

constituency, and lose Earlsfield ward to bring it into the permitted electorate range. We agree with their recommendation.

3.137 We received multiple representations supporting the counter-proposal submitted by the then Member of Parliament for Battersea, Jane Ellison (BCE-30714), which proposed that the Borough of Lambeth ward of Clapham Common be added to the initially proposed Battersea constituency in place of Thornton ward. Respondents stated that the Thornton ward looked south towards Streatham as opposed to north and west towards Battersea. In her representation, while articulating this point, Ms Ellison also said that geographically and historically the Clapham Common ward would be a more suitable fit.

3.138 In view of the significant level of support for the inclusion of the Clapham Common ward in the constituency, our assistant commissioners recommended that this alteration should be made. However, this meant that the electorate of the Battersea constituency would fall below the permitted electorate range and it was necessary that another ward be added to the constituency. The Labour Party (BCE-33244) and John Bryant (BCE-28349) recommended that the Clapham Town ward be added, as did the Liberal Democrat Party. In their representation (BCE-28274) they reasoned that ‘this avoids splitting Thornton and Clapham Common. The ongoing major development at the Clapham Park Estate straddles the two wards east and west of Clarence Ave. Our solution keeps them together. It also unites the Lambeth Clapham wards for the first time in many decades.’ Our assistant commissioners considered

that this proposal was the best solution for the renamed Battersea and Clapham constituency and recommended to us that we accept the proposal. We agree.

3.139 In the Borough of Croydon there was significant opposition to the three constituencies that we had initially proposed. We had included the wards of Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Kenley and Heathfield in a Croydon South constituency; the wards of Addiscombe, Ashburton and Purley in a Croydon Central constituency; and the Shirley ward was included in a Beckenham constituency (which we acknowledged would be an ‘orphan’ ward). The majority of the representations objected to our proposals that led to the Purley ward being included in a separate constituency to Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West and Kenley.

3.140 The Member of Parliament for Croydon South, Chris Philp (BCE-30710), stated that ‘Coulsdon and Purley should be together as they share transport links (such as the A23 and Brighton Main Line)’. He also added: ‘Purley is the major station serving the Kenley area and most people living in Kenley shop in Purley. Purley and Kenley should therefore be represented in the same Parliamentary constituency.’ In their representations Oliver Raven (BCE-30111) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) suggested that the four wards of Purley, Kenley, Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West should be reunited in a single constituency. The A23 was seen as a major corridor that united both Coulsdon and Purley in particular.

3.141 The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) supported our initial proposals in this part of the sub-region, although our assistant commissioners noted they also suggested that the proposals submitted by the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) for Croydon South East and Croydon South West were ‘coherent’. The Labour Party (BCE-33244) had proposed that both the Coulsdon East and Coulsdon West wards should be included in a Carshalton, Wallington and Coulsdon constituency. This proposal was also suggested by Pete Whitehead in his representation (BCE-27879), while in his counter-proposals, Adam Gray (BCE-16382) included Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Kenley, and Purley, in a Coulsdon and Wallington constituency.

3.142 A number of individual representations objected to our proposals for the Shirley ward. Anthony Pearson (BCE-26660) said, ‘Shirley is an integral part of Croydon. It has its own primary and secondary schools and other public places. It looks to Croydon on local government matters and on vital questions to do with the current regeneration of Croydon. It makes little sense for Shirley to be in the Beckenham constituency, where the MP will naturally look to Bromley as the lead borough.’ There were many suggestions to include all three of the wards that contain parts of the community of Shirley – which were identified as being Ashburton, Shirley, and Heathfield – in the same constituency, namely Croydon Central as they are at present.

3.143 Furthermore, in her representations, Susan Entwistle (BCE-26808) said, ‘I would point out that key Shirley landmarks are in Ashburton and Heathfield wards eg Monks Orchard School and St. George’s

Shirley are both in Ashburton; Shirley High School, Shirley Windmill, the Shirley Inn, Shirley Methodist Church and St. John The Evangelist Shirley are all in Heathfield. The proposal to ‘move’ parts of Shirley to a Beckenham constituency whilst remaining under the ‘care’ of Croydon Council just does not make sense.’ However, there was some support for our proposals. Michael Tickner (BCE-19350) said, ‘I support the proposal to include the Shirley ward in the parliamentary constituency of Beckenham. Many residents of this ward use West Wickham and Beckenham as their nearest shopping centres and attend events there such as Remembrance services.’

3.144 In addition to the large number of objections we received to our initial proposals to include the Croydon ward of Shirley in a Beckenham constituency, there was also opposition to the inclusion of the Borough of Bromley ward of Crystal Palace in the Croydon North constituency, with a number of representations suggesting that the configuration should be switched around, with Shirley being included in a Croydon constituency, and the Crystal Palace ward being included in a Bromley constituency. Simon Boyles (BCE-19511) said, ‘moving the Crystal Palace ward which is in LA Bromley and adding to a Croydon constituency appears perverse. The MP will have little time for one ward of another local authority and the area has nothing in common with Croydon.’

3.145 However, opposition to the inclusion of the Crystal Palace ward in a Croydon constituency was not unanimous and the inclusion was supported in a number of representations. For example, Andrew Quinn (BCE-18295) said, ‘I wholeheartedly agree with the proposed

new Croydon North constituency, which retains six wards from the existing constituency, and adds the Bromley borough ward of Crystal Palace from the existing Lewisham West and Penge constituency. Adding Crystal Palace Park to the Crystal Palace town centre adds clarity to an area which is essentially one and the same thing.'

3.146 Our assistant commissioners weighed up all the evidence with regard to the Shirley ward. While there were conflicting arguments, they considered that the evidence for including these three wards in the same constituency was strong and persuasive. They therefore recommended to us that the wards of Ashburton, Shirley and Heathfield be included in a revised Croydon South East constituency. As a consequence, the electorate of the Beckenham constituency would be outside the permitted electorate range and they recommended to us that the Crystal Palace ward should be included in the constituency. We agree.

3.147 With respect to the Borough of Croydon, our assistant commissioners recommended two constituencies that were wholly contained in the Borough: Croydon South West which would contain Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Purley and Kenley, and Croydon South East constituency which would contain Heathfield, Addiscombe, Ashburton and Shirley. They further recommended a cross-borough constituency between Croydon and Lambeth, which they called Norwood and Thornton Heath. These matters are considered later in this chapter.

3.148 Among those opposed to our proposals for the Beckenham constituency (apart from representations that focused on the Shirley and Crystal Palace wards) was Paul Campbell (BCE-19461). He said, 'I live in Shortlands, near Bromley. Currently it is part of Beckenham constituency, and the proposals leave it there. But I think this should have been an opportunity to correct a bad decision. Bromley is the local hub, for shopping, entertainment, work, travel etc. Beckenham is considerably less significant, and further away. I live less than a third of a mile from the centre of Bromley and from Bromley South station. Whereas Beckenham is about a mile and a half away. I hardly ever visit Beckenham. I visit Bromley most days.' However, such opposition was not widely expressed and our assistant commissioners considered that no further changes should be made to the proposed Beckenham constituency.

3.149 Elsewhere in the Borough of Bromley, and apart from our proposals for the Beckenham constituency, our initial proposals for the constituencies of Bromley and Chislehurst, and Orpington elicited very few comments, whether in support of or opposition to our proposals, and no representations were received that made specific reference to our proposals for the Orpington constituency. Of the proposed Bromley and Chislehurst constituency, Anthony Quastel (BCE-18857) said, 'I support the recommendations for Bromley and Chislehurst to remove Cray Valley West and include Bromley Common and Keston and Hayes and Coney Hall. These areas are more connected with Bromley.' In view of the lack of any substantive opposition, our

assistant commissioners recommended to us that the Bromley and Chislehurst, and Orpington constituencies should not be changed further, and we agree with their recommendation.

3.150 In the London boroughs of Greenwich and Bexley there was significant and vocal opposition to our proposed Woolwich constituency which crossed the boundary between the two boroughs with the two Bexley Borough wards of St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey being included in a Woolwich constituency. Typical of those objecting was Manjinder Gabrhi (BCE-28437) who said, 'for last 17 years I have been living in Bexley which comes under Bexley borough and for last 7 years I've been working for Bexley Council. I do my shopping at Bexleyheath shopping centre and do my banking in Bexleyheath. My religious temple is in Erith which also comes under Bexley Borough. I have more in common with Bexley residents than Woolwich residents and would like to stay in Bexley Constituency.' The representation from Christine Newton (BCE-31913) said, 'the proposals to put St. Michael's in the Woolwich constituency makes no geographical sense. The ward has no community or residential links with the rest of the proposed Woolwich constituency. St. Michael's is an integral part of both Welling and Bexleyheath, and belongs in a Bexley seat.'

3.151 The Labour Party (BCE-33244), in objecting to our initial proposals, considered that they resulted in ties being broken between the St. Michael's ward (from the proposed Woolwich constituency) and the East Wickham ward

(which is located in the proposed Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency). They therefore proposed that the East Wickham ward should be included in a Woolwich constituency along with the St. Michael's ward, and included the Lesnes Abbey ward in an Erith and Crayford constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) objected to our initial proposals in this area and included both the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards in a renamed Erith and Thamesmead constituency along with the ward of Thamesmead Moorings.

3.152 In his representation, John Bryant (BCE-28349) suggested that the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards should be included in an Erith constituency along with the Danson Park ward. In his revised Woolwich constituency he included the Woolwich Common and Peninsula wards, and removed the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards. In suggesting these changes he said, 'this proposal recommends a new Woolwich seat extending east from Peninsula and Charlton wards to the boundary with Bexley: this forms a very logical Thames-facing seat centred on the town of Woolwich and avoids separating Woolwich Common from the rest of Woolwich as in the BCE scheme.' However, our assistant commissioners considered that this resulted in an awkward shape to the Erith and Crayford constituency.

3.153 Other representations were received that considered the proposed Woolwich constituency along with other alternatives suggested. Darryl Chamberlain (BCE-26353) provided evidence to support his proposals that the Peninsula ward

should be included in a revised Woolwich constituency and that the ward should be paired with the Charlton ward. He appreciated the difficulty of the task of constructing constituencies within the permitted electorate range with but said, 'in terms of infrastructure, Charlton would be better served by being part of the same constituency as Greenwich (or at least the same as neighbouring Peninsula ward) – many local people commute through North Greenwich tube station and the current proposals slice Charlton rail station, and the adjacent transport hub, in two ... the commission should resist any call to place Charlton ward in an Eltham-seat – there are no public transport or direct main road links between Charlton and Eltham town centre; and historic ties link Charlton with Greenwich and Woolwich rather than its southern neighbour.' The assistant commissioners considered the evidence and the strength of feeling in this part of London and recommended that the wards of Woolwich Common and Peninsula be included in the Woolwich constituency. We agree with their recommendation.

3.154 The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) proposed two options in this part of London. The first involved splitting Lesnes Abbey ward. However, our assistant commissioners did not consider that the splitting of a ward was necessary in this part of London, despite the opposition to our initial proposals and the difficulties they had in recommending an appropriate set of constituencies to us that would command some public acceptance. They considered the evidence but did not believe that it reached the threshold of being exceptional or compelling and therefore recommended to us that we

do not split a ward. We agree with their recommendation, and therefore reject the first option of the Conservative Party counter-proposal on this basis.

3.155 The Conservative Party also suggested an alternative that did not split a ward. They proposed retaining a Woolwich constituency in the Borough of Greenwich, but crossing into Bexley at Thamesmead and Belvedere. This would then allow for the St. Michael's ward to be included in the Erith and Crayford constituency with the East Wickham ward. In their representation they acknowledged that their proposed constituency might 'appear odd on a map' but they considered 'there are natural but separate community links north and south of the railway line. Danson Park would then be part of a line of wards including Barnehurst and Christchurch.'

3.156 In light of the views and evidence they had received, our assistant commissioners decided to visit the area and to observe for themselves these wards and, in particular, whether the Danson Park ward or the Crayford ward was the more suitable candidate for inclusion in the Erith and Crayford constituency. During their visit, the assistant commissioners considered that Danson Park ward formed a more natural and coherent part of the continuous residential and urban settlement with adjoining wards whereas Crayford was a separately identifiable urban area on the fringe of Greater London. They therefore considered that the Crayford ward was a better candidate for inclusion in the Erith and Crayford constituency as its inclusion would result in what they considered would be a more natural shape.

3.157 Apart from the issue of the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards and the cross-borough constituency, we received very few representations about the Erith and Crayford constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence that had been presented to them and recommended that the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards be included in the Erith constituency, as suggested by John Bryant in his counter-proposals (BCE-28349). We agree.

3.158 Our initial proposals for the Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency elicited few comments, but some support, for example from Rob Leitch (BCE-31952) of the Old Bexley and Sidcup Conservative Association. Support was also received locally from Dean Surtees (BCE-14838), although he suggested that the constituency be renamed Bexley South. Following the adoption of John Bryant's counter-proposals (BCE-28349) for the Woolwich, and Erith and Crayford constituencies, minus the Danson Park ward, consequential changes would have to be made to the Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency. Our assistant commissioners arranged a site visit to the area to assess whether the Crayford ward or the Danson Park ward should be included in the revised Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency, as the Crayford ward appeared to be more industrial than the Danson Park ward.

3.159 The assistant commissioners concluded that the wards of Danson Park, Christchurch, and Barnehurst should be included in the Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency and that the East Wickham, and Falconwood and Welling wards should

no longer be included in Old Bexley and Sidcup, but in the Eltham constituency. Consequential changes would be necessary to the proposed constituencies of Woolwich and Eltham. The assistant commissioners recommended that the East Wickham, and Falconwood and Welling wards be included in the Eltham constituency and that the Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency should be renamed as Bexley and Sidcup. We agree.

3.160 Our initial proposals for the Eltham constituency had generally been well-supported. The Labour Party (BCE-33244) supported our proposed Eltham constituency, as did the Member of Parliament for Eltham, Clive Efford (BCE-21669). On day two of the public hearing held in Bromley (BCE-32506) he said, with particular regard to the Woolwich Common ward: 'I would also like to welcome the proposal to bring Woolwich Common into the Eltham constituency. That ward which includes many areas like the Woolwich Common and Barnfield Estates which have both been included in Eltham constituencies in the past.'

3.161 The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) also supported our proposed Eltham constituency. They said, 'we support the proposed Eltham constituency totally within the Greenwich borough which is the current constituency plus the ward of Woolwich Common thus being compliant with Rule 5 (1) b and c.' The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) proposed a slight change to Eltham: 'we would transfer to Eltham the three Welling wards north of the A2 (ie Danson Park, Falconwood & Welling and East Wickham).' This reflects a slight change to the scheme

as presented at the public hearing. ‘On reflection we are proposing that Shooters Hill stay within Eltham and that Blackheath Westcombe stay linked to Woolwich. There are arguments to us the A207 and Oxleas Woods as the dividing line of the constituencies, but we ultimately prefer the option that involves least change to the current constituencies.’

3.162 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence but did not support the suggestion as proposed by the Liberal Democrat party and recommended changes to our initial proposals. In light of the changes to the Woolwich, Erith and Crayford, and Old Bexley and Sidcup constituencies, they recommended that the revised Eltham constituency should retain seven wards from the existing constituency with the addition of East Wickham, and Falconwood and Welling wards from the existing Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency to bring it into the permitted electorate range. In common with the proposals from John Bryant (BCE-28349) they considered that the constituency should be renamed Eltham and Welling. We agree.

3.163 Having made their recommendations for the Woolwich, and Eltham and Welling constituencies, our assistant commissioners then considered the representations with regard to the proposed Greenwich and Deptford constituency. They noted that there was a significant degree of opposition to our initial proposals. For example Tahsin Khan (BCE-25807) said, ‘this is a ridiculous division that will put me into a constituency that has no connections to where I live: I am nowhere near Greenwich or

Deptford. This will make access to an MP difficult, and makes it very likely that the responsible MP will feel able to overlook our area with impunity. The changes are illogical and unnecessary, not to mention being detrimental to the community culture that characterises London regions.’

3.164 In his counter-proposal John Bryant (BCE-28349) supported our initial proposals but with the inclusion of the Telegraph Hill ward and the exclusion of the Peninsula ward. His rationale for suggesting this was to avoid the division of New Cross and Hatcham in our proposals. His arrangement retained the inclusion of Ladywell in the Lewisham and Catford constituency and Lee Green in the Greenwich and Deptford constituency.

3.165 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence and, while they were mindful of the opposition to, and strength of feeling with regard to our proposals for Greenwich and Deptford, they considered that a degree of change was inevitable in the context of constructing constituencies in the area. They considered that John Bryant’s counter-proposals had merit in that he did avoid the division of New Cross between constituencies and recommended to us that we adopt Mr Bryant’s counter-proposal for the Greenwich and Deptford constituency. We agree.

3.166 We received few representations from local responders with regard to our proposed Lewisham and Catford constituency, with some limited support for, and opposition to, our proposals, for example from Gordon Cowie (BCE-29911).

3.167 Both the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) and John Bryant (BCE-28349) supported our initial proposals for the proposed constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-33279) largely supported the constituency but suggested the swapping of four wards. They said, ‘The Commission has, we believe, used the correct wards for the two seats of Greenwich and Deptford and Lewisham and Catford. We propose however that by swapping four wards the Commission could better meet Rule 5 (1) c. A direct swap of Blackheath and Lee Green wards for Ladywell and Lewisham Central would result in the existing Lewisham East seat being retained in full and much more of the existing Deptford constituency would also remain in a new, single seat.’ The Labour Party (BCE-33244) proposed a substantially revised Lewisham, Deptford and Catford constituency.

3.168 However, given some support for our initial proposals and the limited opposition, and the fact that our assistant commissioners had made their recommendations for the Greenwich and Deptford constituency, they recommended that we should not adopt any of the counter-proposals that made alternative suggestions and that we should make no further changes to our initial proposals for the Lewisham and Catford constituency. We agree.

3.169 In the boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark there was considerable opposition to the inclusion of the Borough of Lambeth ward of Bishop’s in our initially proposed Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency. We received a campaign against the inclusion of the ward in the constituency (BCE-33249)

that contained 37 signatures. However, there was some support for our proposals for the constituency, for example, from the Conservative Party (BCE-33279) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274), although the latter suggested that it be renamed Bermondsey and South Bank ‘in recognition that it now contains the whole of the South Bank community. Links between the South Bank area and the riverside through Southwark to Tower Bridge and beyond are strong.’

3.170 Both Neil Coyle (BCE-41143), the Member of Parliament for Bermondsey and Old Southwark, and Kate Hoey (BCE-40113), the Member of Parliament for Vauxhall, opposed our initial proposals. Kate Hoey said, ‘on behalf of my constituents in Waterloo and the surrounding areas, I wish to make it clear that there is strong community feeling that that part of my constituency should not be separated from its traditional neighbours in the old Lambeth North constituency. This has been the case since the 19th century, and forms a natural community as opposed to being separated off into an orphan ward in a Southwark-dominated seat.’ Neil Coyle, in opposing the suggestion from the Liberal Democrat Party said, ‘the Lib Dems support proposals which would divide Walworth further and provide an ‘orphan’ ward (Bishops) from Lambeth in the north Southwark constituency’.

3.171 In considering the responses from the politicians and political parties, our assistant commissioners also considered the local representations, most of which were against the proposal to include the Bishop’s ward in the Bermondsey and

Old Southwark constituency. Harry Ades (BCE-18964) said, ‘Bishop’s ward at the north of Lambeth has a small electorate and has been broken away from its local authority, Lambeth, and tacked on to the existing constituency of B&OS in Southwark. The change introduces a high risk that the needs and concerns of Bishop’s residents will be marginalised, as it becomes little more than a small appendage belonging to a ‘foreign’ local authority.’ They also noted the representation from the Waterloo Action Centre (BCE-31902). Sara Bredemear, Chair of the Centre, said, ‘we are extremely concerned by the initial boundary proposals that this ward, in Lambeth, be attached to a constituency which is over 92% in Southwark. While we appreciate that some parliamentary constituencies will have to cross local authority boundaries this degree of marginalisation is absurd.’

3.172 Having carefully considered the representations, our assistant commissioners considered that the Bishop’s ward should not be included in the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency, and instead should be included in a revised Brixton and Vauxhall constituency. To compensate for the exclusion of this ward, they recommended that the Faraday ward be included in the constituency, from the existing Camberwell and Peckham constituency. We agree.

3.173 Our initial proposals for Peckham and Lewisham West were largely objected to on the basis that we split Peckham by including parts of it with Lewisham and New Cross. Caroline Horgan (BCE-20835) said, ‘I currently live in the Lane Ward which is part of Camberwell and Peckham Constituency. Geographically, socially

and emotionally this area is Peckham NOT Lewisham. The very fact that we are virtually on Peckham Rye Common and I emphasise Peckham reflects this. People living in this area benefit immensely from being managed by Southwark Council and have no historical relationship with Lewisham.’

3.174 As a result of our recommendations for the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency, changes would have to be made to our proposed Camberwell and Vauxhall Bridge, and Peckham and Lewisham West constituencies, but our assistant commissioners did not consider that they would be able to address some of the concerns that were expressed about the constituencies. Having recommended that the Faraday ward be included in the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency, our assistant commissioners decided to adopt John Bryant’s counter-proposals (BCE-28349) for the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency and a reconfigured Camberwell and Peckham constituency.

3.175 In considering the various community representations, the assistant commissioners felt that John Bryant’s counter-proposals were most relevant and constructive in addressing the issues raised. However, they were still not able to include the Peckham Rye ward in the reconfigured Camberwell and Peckham constituency. They noted the comments of John Bryant in his representation: ‘The current Camberwell and Peckham seat gains Newington and loses Faraday and Peckham Rye; it is therefore wholly within Southwark and does not contain two Lambeth wards as in the BCE scheme. The exclusion of Peckham Rye from this seat is

regrettable, since this ward is clearly part of Peckham; but this is far preferable to the BCE scheme, which divides the Peckham area literally down the middle of the High Street (which, apart from the obvious disadvantages of such an arrangement, means that BCE proposes a seat named Peckham & Lewisham West that does not actually include the ward of Peckham).’

3.176 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence with regard to the Camberwell and Peckham constituency and agreed with the sentiments of John Bryant with regard to the Peckham Rye ward which is included in the proposed Dulwich and Sydenham. They therefore recommended we adopt Mr Bryant’s counter-proposal. We agree.

3.177 We had agreed with our assistant commissioners not to include the Bishop’s ward in the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency and noted the objections that had also been received to our initial proposals for the Vauxhall constituency. Although we were mindful of the limitations and difficulties of making changes in this area and the consequent knock-on effects, we considered that the inclusion of the Bishop’s ward in a revised Vauxhall constituency (the ward is currently located within the existing Vauxhall constituency) would be the most suitable solution to this issue.

3.178 We considered the proposals from Mr Bryant, who, in his wider counter-proposals for the constituencies in this part of South London, had suggested a Brixton and Vauxhall constituency. We accepted our assistant commissioners’ recommendations to include the Borough of Lambeth wards of Clapham Common,

Clapham Town, and Thornton in the revised Battersea and Clapham constituency. To compensate for the loss of these wards, and the Brixton Hill ward which they proposed should be included in the Streatham and Brixton South constituency (see below), they proposed that, in addition to the Bishop’s ward, both the Prince’s and Vassall wards (as mentioned above) should be included in the Vauxhall constituency. However, our assistant commissioners did not also include, as Mr Bryant had suggested, the Herne Hill ward. They also considered that the name that Mr Bryant had suggested for this constituency, Brixton and Vauxhall, was entirely suitable. We accept the recommendations of our assistant commissioners for the Brixton and Vauxhall constituency.

3.179 The consequences of these changes and our proposals affecting the Borough of Merton, discussed earlier in this report, meant that we were required to reconfigure the proposed Streatham and Mitcham constituency. Following changes that we had made to our initial proposals to at least partly address the division of Mitcham by grouping together wards of the existing constituency of Mitcham and Morden, the wards that made up Streatham were excluded from a constituency in our assistant commissioners’ recommendations. To resolve this, they sought to keep the four wards that made up Streatham together. Such a solution was proposed in the representations, for example by Tim Barnsley (BCE-29086) who said, ‘Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill (which run through these four wards) form one continuous shopping area, within which are also the main cultural and social facilities for the town.’

3.180 Our assistant commissioners considered that the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) had a workable solution: the four wards of Streatham South, St. Leonard's, Streatham Wells, and Streatham Hill were included in a constituency with the wards of Brixton Hill, Herne Hill, Thurlow Park, and Tulse Hill, which they suggested be called either Streatham and Brixton South or Streatham and Tulse Hill. Our assistant commissioners considered that this aspect of their counter-proposal had much to commend it and recommended to us that we adopt the Liberal Democrat Party's counter-proposals for a new Streatham and Brixton South constituency. We agree.

3.181 There were a number of objections to our proposed constituencies of Croydon North, and Dulwich and West Norwood. We have already considered above the objection to our initially proposed Peckham and Lewisham West constituency. Helen Hayes (BCE-32168), Member of Parliament for Dulwich and West Norwood, who gave oral evidence on day one of the public hearing in Harrow, was concerned that the community of Herne Hill was divided in our initial proposals and that it should be combined a single constituency. Also, Su McLaughlin (BCE-19168), Steering Committee Member of the Norwood Forum, said, 'the news that you are planning to swallow Knight's Hill Ward into another constituency – including crucial landmarks such as St. Luke's church, our Post Office, West Norwood Station, West Norwood Health & Leisure Centre and other key community touch points besides – has caused much worry and concern.'

3.182 However, the objection was not unanimous and our assistant commissioners noted support for our initial proposals, from, among others, Ian McInnes (BCE-26448) of the Dulwich Society. In support for our initial proposals, he said, 'the Society is content with the current proposed boundary for the Dulwich and West Norwood Constituency as the boundaries generally reflect the perceived extent of the various local communities.'

3.183 In attempting to construct constituencies in this area in the context of the other constituencies that our assistant commissioners had recommended to us, they considered in particular detail the counter-proposal from the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28274) which, they considered, provided an appropriate solution. Under their proposals they substantially reconfigured the wards that had made up the Dulwich and West Norwood constituency in our initial proposals. They considered that most of West Norwood town centre is situated in Knight's Hill. In their view, Knight's Hill should therefore not be separated from the Borough of Lambeth ward of Gipsy Hill, which they considered contains the eastern parts of West Norwood town centre. Furthermore, they did not think that it would be appropriate to separate the Tulse Hill ward from the Brixton Hill ward in a constituency. They said, 'these two wards comprise southern Brixton and share use of the commercial amenities and major transport links on the A23 Brixton Hill. They are currently convincingly paired with Streatham further south along the A23 corridor and we would like to see this retained.'

3.184 Our assistant commissioners considered that the counter-proposals from the Liberal Democrat Party did provide an acceptable solution to the pattern of constituencies in this area of South London, and recommended to us that we accept their proposal for the constituency of Norwood and Thornton Heath, which includes most of the existing Croydon North constituency, with the addition of the ward of Woodside from the existing Croydon Central constituency, and the two Borough of Lambeth wards of Gipsy Hill and Knight's Hill. We agree.

3.185 Consequently, our assistant commissioners also recommended that we adopt a similar configuration to the Liberal Democrat Party proposal (BCE-28274) with the exception of the South Camberwell ward which we propose be placed in the Camberwell and Peckham constituency as described earlier in this report. The Liberal Democrat Party said, in their representation, 'we are therefore not proposing to retain a seat based on Dulwich & West Norwood. If it is abolished it is then possible to retain a pattern of constituencies in Lambeth and Southwark that more closely resembles the present pattern while also retaining a unified Mitcham. In our view there are relatively few real ties uniting Dulwich and West Norwood which sit in separate boroughs, and splitting them is a small price to pay to maintain a Mitcham-based constituency, where local ties are clearly very strong.' Our assistant commissioners noted that John Bryant put forward a similar constituency, although under his pattern

our proposals for Lewisham and Catford would not be changed. Our assistant commissioners recommended we adopt Mr Bryant's proposed Dulwich and Sydenham constituency. We agree.

4 How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to the Government.

4.2 While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart at this late stage in the review from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and that simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

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

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

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

How can you give us your views?

4.5 We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, www.bce2018.org.uk, when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BQ.

4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at:

<http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

What do we want views on?

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

4.8 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

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

1. Barking and Beckton BC		73,046
Abbey	Barking and Dagenham	7,039
Becontree	Barking and Dagenham	7,631
Eastbury	Barking and Dagenham	6,652
Gascoigne	Barking and Dagenham	5,598
Goresbrook	Barking and Dagenham	6,637
Longbridge	Barking and Dagenham	7,599
Mayesbrook	Barking and Dagenham	6,013
Parsloes	Barking and Dagenham	5,836
Thames	Barking and Dagenham	6,625
Beckton	Newham	7,335
Royal Docks	Newham	6,081
2. Battersea and Clapham BC		75,056
Clapham Common	Lambeth	8,296
Clapham Town	Lambeth	9,187
Thornton	Lambeth	8,078
Latchmere	Wandsworth	9,569
Northcote	Wandsworth	9,292
Queenstown	Wandsworth	9,948
Shaftesbury	Wandsworth	9,921
St. Mary's Park	Wandsworth	10,765
3. Beckenham BC		72,004
Clock House	Bromley	10,932
Copers Cope	Bromley	11,254
Crystal Palace	Bromley	7,783
Kelsey and Eden Park	Bromley	11,872
Penge and Cator	Bromley	11,248
Shortlands	Bromley	7,221
West Wickham	Bromley	11,694
4. Bermondsey and Old Southwark BC		77,623
Cathedrals	Southwark	9,551
Chaucer	Southwark	9,361
East Walworth	Southwark	7,317
Faraday	Southwark	6,882
Grange	Southwark	10,308
Riverside	Southwark	9,177
Rotherhithe	Southwark	8,634
South Bermondsey	Southwark	8,148
Surrey Docks	Southwark	8,245
5. Bexley and Sidcup BC		72,341
Barnehurst	Bexley	8,017
Blackfen and Lamorbey	Bexley	7,845
Blendon and Penhill	Bexley	8,100
Christchurch	Bexley	8,117
Cray Meadows	Bexley	8,012
Danson Park	Bexley	7,845
Longlands	Bexley	7,828
Sidcup	Bexley	8,348
St. Mary's	Bexley	8,229

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
6. Brixton and Vauxhall BC			72,272
	Bishop's	Lambeth	6,094
	Coldharbour	Lambeth	10,101
	Ferndale	Lambeth	9,382
	Larkhall	Lambeth	10,139
	Oval	Lambeth	8,870
	Prince's	Lambeth	9,813
	Stockwell	Lambeth	8,434
	Vassall	Lambeth	9,439
7. Bromley and Chislehurst BC			75,812
	Bickley	Bromley	11,129
	Bromley Common and Keston	Bromley	11,891
	Bromley Town	Bromley	11,671
	Chislehurst	Bromley	11,512
	Hayes and Coney Hall	Bromley	12,135
	Mottingham and Chislehurst North	Bromley	6,701
	Plaistow and Sundridge	Bromley	10,773
8. Camberwell and Peckham BC			73,463
	Brunswick Park	Southwark	8,656
	Camberwell Green	Southwark	9,134
	Livesey	Southwark	8,669
	Newington	Southwark	9,433
	Nunhead	Southwark	9,269
	Peckham	Southwark	9,281
	South Camberwell	Southwark	8,471
	The Lane	Southwark	10,550
9. Camden and St. Pancras BC			76,685
	Camden Town with Primrose Hill	Camden	7,929
	Cantelowes	Camden	7,429
	Gospel Oak	Camden	7,232
	Haverstock	Camden	7,751
	Kentish Town	Camden	8,619
	King's Cross	Camden	5,625
	Regent's Park	Camden	7,590
	St. Pancras and Somers Town	Camden	8,611
	Junction	Islington	7,888
	St. George's	Islington	8,011
10. Carshalton and Wallington BC			75,579
	Beddington North	Sutton	7,636
	Beddington South	Sutton	7,734
	Belmont	Sutton	7,275
	Carshalton Central	Sutton	7,529
	Carshalton South and Clockhouse	Sutton	7,523
	St. Helier	Sutton	7,544
	The Wrythe	Sutton	7,439
	Wallington North	Sutton	7,749
	Wallington South	Sutton	7,496
	Wandle Valley	Sutton	7,654
11. Chingford and Woodford BC			71,105
	Bridge	Redbridge	7,854
	Church End	Redbridge	7,855
	Monkhams	Redbridge	7,725
	Chingford Green	Waltham Forest	7,777
	Endlebury	Waltham Forest	8,015
	Hale End and Highams Park	Waltham Forest	8,023
	Hatch Lane	Waltham Forest	8,063
	Larkwood	Waltham Forest	7,919
	Valley	Waltham Forest	7,874

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
12. Chipping Barnet BC			73,943
	Part of Brunswick Park (polling district CCD)	Barnet	3,748
	East Barnet	Barnet	10,684
	Finchley Church End	Barnet	9,733
	High Barnet	Barnet	10,508
	Oakleigh	Barnet	10,637
	Totteridge	Barnet	9,302
	Underhill	Barnet	10,537
	West Finchley	Barnet	8,794
13. Cities of London and Westminster BC			76,733
	Bloomsbury	Camden	5,016
	Holborn and Covent Garden	Camden	7,466
	City of London	City of London	6,158
	Abbey Road	Westminster	5,469
	Bryanston and Dorset Square	Westminster	5,300
	Churchill	Westminster	5,498
	Knightsbridge and Belgravia	Westminster	3,769
	Marylebone High Street	Westminster	4,772
	Regent's Park	Westminster	6,097
	St. James's	Westminster	5,952
	Tachbrook	Westminster	4,942
	Vincent Square	Westminster	5,967
	Warwick	Westminster	5,491
	West End	Westminster	4,836
14. Croydon South East BC			72,473
	Addiscombe	Croydon	10,130
	Ashburton	Croydon	10,117
	Fieldway	Croydon	6,787
	Heathfield	Croydon	9,497
	New Addington	Croydon	6,923
	Sanderstead	Croydon	9,617
	Selsdon and Ballards	Croydon	9,085
	Shirley	Croydon	10,317
15. Croydon South West BC			71,080
	Coulsdon East	Croydon	9,211
	Coulsdon West	Croydon	9,900
	Croham	Croydon	10,122
	Fairfield	Croydon	10,688
	Kenley	Croydon	10,381
	Purley	Croydon	10,251
	Waddon	Croydon	10,527
16. Dagenham and Rainham BC			73,863
	Alibon	Barking and Dagenham	6,150
	Eastbrook	Barking and Dagenham	7,226
	Heath	Barking and Dagenham	6,530
	River	Barking and Dagenham	6,100
	Valence	Barking and Dagenham	6,534
	Village	Barking and Dagenham	6,453
	Whalebone	Barking and Dagenham	6,487
	Elm Park	Havering	9,506
	Rainham and Wennington	Havering	9,203
	South Hornchurch	Havering	9,674
17. Dulwich and Sydenham BC			73,744
	Crofton Park	Lewisham	9,579
	Forest Hill	Lewisham	9,201
	Perry Vale	Lewisham	9,807
	Sydenham	Lewisham	9,663
	College	Southwark	8,312
	East Dulwich	Southwark	9,127

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Peckham Rye	Southwark	9,463
	Village	Southwark	8,592
18. Ealing and Acton BC			71,087
	Acton Central	Ealing	8,569
	Ealing Broadway	Ealing	8,975
	Ealing Common	Ealing	8,752
	East Acton	Ealing	9,989
	Elthorne	Ealing	9,276
	Hanger Hill	Ealing	8,625
	South Acton	Ealing	8,399
	Walpole	Ealing	8,502
19. East Ham BC			78,146
	Boleyn	Newham	8,696
	East Ham Central	Newham	8,867
	East Ham North	Newham	8,682
	East Ham South	Newham	8,347
	Green Street East	Newham	8,875
	Green Street West	Newham	8,752
	Little Ilford	Newham	8,873
	Manor Park	Newham	8,636
	Wall End	Newham	8,418
20. Edmonton BC			72,514
	Bush Hill Park	Enfield	9,872
	Edmonton Green	Enfield	9,491
	Haselbury	Enfield	8,872
	Jubilee	Enfield	8,502
	Lower Edmonton	Enfield	8,849
	Palmers Green	Enfield	9,154
	Ponders End	Enfield	8,441
	Upper Edmonton	Enfield	9,333
21. Eltham and Welling BC			77,628
	East Wickham	Bexley	7,868
	Falconwood and Welling	Bexley	7,966
	Coldharbour and New Eltham	Greenwich	9,407
	Eltham North	Greenwich	9,306
	Eltham South	Greenwich	8,252
	Eltham West	Greenwich	7,750
	Kidbrooke with Hornfair	Greenwich	9,180
	Middle Park and Sutcliffe	Greenwich	8,920
	Shooters Hill	Greenwich	8,979
22. Enfield BC			75,302
	Chase	Enfield	9,210
	Enfield Highway	Enfield	9,402
	Enfield Lock	Enfield	9,711
	Grange	Enfield	9,321
	Highlands	Enfield	9,630
	Southbury	Enfield	8,782
	Town	Enfield	10,525
	Turkey Street	Enfield	8,721
23. Erith and Crayford BC			77,063
	Belvedere	Bexley	7,977
	Brampton	Bexley	8,171
	Colyers	Bexley	7,179
	Crayford	Bexley	8,631
	Erith	Bexley	7,568
	Lesnes Abbey	Bexley	7,725
	North End	Bexley	7,329
	Northumberland Heath	Bexley	7,836
	St. Michael's	Bexley	7,954
	Thamesmead East	Bexley	6,693

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
24. Feltham and Hounslow BC			72,678
	Bedfont	Hounslow	8,200
	Feltham North	Hounslow	7,198
	Feltham West	Hounslow	9,208
	Hanworth	Hounslow	7,601
	Hanworth Park	Hounslow	7,537
	Hounslow Central	Hounslow	8,939
	Hounslow Heath	Hounslow	8,501
	Hounslow South	Hounslow	7,674
	Hounslow West	Hounslow	7,820
25. Finchley and Enfield Southgate BC			73,847
	Part of Brunswick Park (polling district CCA)	Barnet	1,830
	Part of Brunswick Park (polling district CCB)	Barnet	3,216
	Part of Brunswick Park (polling district CCC)	Barnet	2,029
	Coppetts	Barnet	9,989
	East Finchley	Barnet	9,748
	Woodhouse	Barnet	10,391
	Cockfosters	Enfield	9,532
	Southgate	Enfield	9,178
	Southgate Green	Enfield	8,805
	Winchmore Hill	Enfield	9,129
26. Finsbury Park and Stoke Newington BC			77,715
	Brownswood	Hackney	5,233
	Clissold	Hackney	8,255
	Stamford Hill West	Hackney	5,114
	Stoke Newington	Hackney	8,967
	Woodberry Down	Hackney	5,378
	Finsbury Park	Islington	9,184
	Highbury East	Islington	8,102
	Highbury West	Islington	10,748
	Hillrise	Islington	7,912
	Tollington	Islington	8,822
27. Greenford and Sudbury BC			72,517
	Northwick Park	Brent	8,919
	Sudbury	Brent	8,874
	Cleveland	Ealing	9,209
	Greenford Broadway	Ealing	10,465
	Greenford Green	Ealing	8,405
	Hobbayne	Ealing	8,858
	North Greenford	Ealing	8,849
	Perivale	Ealing	8,938
28. Greenwich and Deptford BC			76,793
	Blackheath Westcombe	Greenwich	9,103
	Greenwich West	Greenwich	11,499
	Blackheath	Lewisham	8,642
	Brockley	Lewisham	10,337
	Evelyn	Lewisham	9,129
	Lee Green	Lewisham	9,182
	New Cross	Lewisham	9,077
	Telegraph Hill	Lewisham	9,824
29. Hackney Central BC			75,824
	Cazenove	Hackney	7,737
	Hackney Central	Hackney	8,046
	Hackney Downs	Hackney	8,078
	Hackney Wick	Hackney	7,443
	Homerton	Hackney	7,498
	King's Park	Hackney	7,906
	Lea Bridge	Hackney	8,365
	Shacklewell	Hackney	5,290

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Springfield	Hackney	7,686
	Victoria	Hackney	7,775
30. Hammersmith and Fulham BC			77,725
	Addison	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,616
	Avonmore and Brook Green	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,509
	Fulham Broadway	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,394
	Fulham Reach	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,651
	Hammersmith Broadway	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,935
	Munster	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,323
	North End	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,477
	Palace Riverside	Hammersmith and Fulham	4,765
	Parsons Green and Walham	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,218
	Ravenscourt Park	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,632
	Sands End	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,808
	Town	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,397
31. Hampstead BC			75,774
	Childs Hill	Barnet	9,607
	Garden Suburb	Barnet	9,457
	Belsize	Camden	7,099
	Fortune Green	Camden	7,116
	Frognaal and Fitzjohns	Camden	6,160
	Hampstead Town	Camden	6,609
	Highgate	Camden	7,653
	Kilburn	Camden	7,369
	Swiss Cottage	Camden	7,459
	West Hampstead	Camden	7,245
32. Harrow North BC			77,308
	Belmont	Harrow	7,695
	Canons	Harrow	9,272
	Harrow Weald	Harrow	7,968
	Headstone North	Harrow	7,593
	Headstone South	Harrow	7,445
	Marlborough	Harrow	7,523
	Rayners Lane	Harrow	7,539
	Stanmore Park	Harrow	8,349
	Wealdstone	Harrow	6,809
	West Harrow	Harrow	7,115
33. Harrow South and Kenton BC			78,246
	Kenton	Brent	8,568
	Queensbury	Brent	9,697
	Edgware	Harrow	7,014
	Greenhill	Harrow	7,343
	Harrow on the Hill	Harrow	7,357
	Kenton East	Harrow	7,329
	Kenton West	Harrow	8,036
	Queensbury	Harrow	7,392
	Roxbourne	Harrow	8,078
	Roxeth	Harrow	7,432
34. Hayes and Harlington BC			78,097
	Barnhill	Hillingdon	8,270
	Botwell	Hillingdon	9,965
	Charville	Hillingdon	8,421
	Heathrow Villages	Hillingdon	6,875
	Pinkwell	Hillingdon	9,033
	Townfield	Hillingdon	9,167
	West Drayton	Hillingdon	9,733
	Yeading	Hillingdon	8,236
	Yiewsley	Hillingdon	8,397

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
35. Hendon BC			78,403
	Burnt Oak	Barnet	9,756
	Colindale	Barnet	9,764
	Edgware	Barnet	9,901
	Golders Green	Barnet	8,901
	Hale	Barnet	10,495
	Hendon	Barnet	9,159
	Mill Hill	Barnet	11,380
	West Hendon	Barnet	9,047
36. Hillingdon and Uxbridge BC			77,188
	Northolt Mandeville	Ealing	9,381
	Northolt West End	Ealing	9,598
	Brunel	Hillingdon	7,831
	Cavendish	Hillingdon	8,433
	Hillingdon East	Hillingdon	8,481
	Manor	Hillingdon	8,236
	South Ruislip	Hillingdon	8,305
	Uxbridge North	Hillingdon	9,225
	Uxbridge South	Hillingdon	7,698
37. Hornchurch and Upminster BC			78,064
	Cranham	Havering	9,798
	Emerson Park	Havering	9,467
	Gooshays	Havering	9,899
	Hacton	Havering	9,635
	Harold Wood	Havering	9,687
	Heaton	Havering	8,987
	St. Andrew's	Havering	10,410
	Upminster	Havering	10,181
38. Hornsey and Wood Green BC			75,582
	Bowes	Enfield	7,796
	Alexandra	Haringey	7,473
	Bounds Green	Haringey	7,195
	Crouch End	Haringey	8,207
	Fortis Green	Haringey	7,735
	Highgate	Haringey	7,150
	Hornsey	Haringey	7,880
	Muswell Hill	Haringey	7,049
	Noel Park	Haringey	7,078
	Stroud Green	Haringey	8,019
39. Ilford North and Wanstead BC			76,374
	Aldborough	Redbridge	9,277
	Barkingside	Redbridge	8,609
	Clayhall	Redbridge	9,446
	Fairlop	Redbridge	8,328
	Fullwell	Redbridge	8,623
	Hainault	Redbridge	8,154
	Roding	Redbridge	7,689
	Snaresbrook	Redbridge	8,105
	Wanstead	Redbridge	8,143
40. Ilford South BC			78,212
	Chadwell	Redbridge	9,131
	Clementswood	Redbridge	8,051
	Cranbrook	Redbridge	8,354
	Goodmayes	Redbridge	8,017
	Loxford	Redbridge	8,841
	Mayfield	Redbridge	8,883
	Newbury	Redbridge	10,171
	Seven Kings	Redbridge	8,873
	Valentines	Redbridge	7,891

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
41. Isleworth, Brentford and Chiswick BC			72,875
	Northfield	Ealing	8,575
	Southfield	Ealing	8,987
	Brentford	Hounslow	9,080
	Chiswick Homefields	Hounslow	7,051
	Chiswick Riverside	Hounslow	7,590
	Isleworth	Hounslow	7,540
	Osterley and Spring Grove	Hounslow	8,361
	Syon	Hounslow	8,723
	Turnham Green	Hounslow	6,968
42. Islington BC			73,470
	Barnsbury	Islington	7,705
	Bunhill	Islington	8,444
	Caledonian	Islington	8,301
	Canonbury	Islington	8,039
	Clerkenwell	Islington	7,084
	Holloway	Islington	9,633
	Mildmay	Islington	8,541
	St. Mary's	Islington	7,800
	St. Peter's	Islington	7,923
43. Kensington and Chelsea BC			76,454
	Abingdon	Kensington and Chelsea	4,115
	Brompton & Hans Town	Kensington and Chelsea	4,284
	Campden	Kensington and Chelsea	4,218
	Chelsea Riverside	Kensington and Chelsea	5,036
	Colville	Kensington and Chelsea	5,093
	Courtfield	Kensington and Chelsea	3,758
	Dalgarno	Kensington and Chelsea	3,898
	Earl's Court	Kensington and Chelsea	4,288
	Golborne	Kensington and Chelsea	4,709
	Holland	Kensington and Chelsea	4,107
	Norland	Kensington and Chelsea	3,391
	Notting Dale	Kensington and Chelsea	5,185
	Pembridge	Kensington and Chelsea	2,872
	Queen's Gate	Kensington and Chelsea	3,537
	Redcliffe	Kensington and Chelsea	4,158
	Royal Hospital	Kensington and Chelsea	5,151
	St. Helen's	Kensington and Chelsea	3,610
	Stanley	Kensington and Chelsea	5,044
44. Kilburn BC			71,624
	Kilburn	Brent	9,522
	Queens Park	Brent	8,846
	Bayswater	Westminster	4,920
	Church Street	Westminster	6,332
	Harrow Road	Westminster	6,440
	Hyde Park	Westminster	5,386
	Lancaster Gate	Westminster	5,140
	Little Venice	Westminster	5,545
	Maida Vale	Westminster	5,689
	Queen's Park	Westminster	7,054
	Westbourne	Westminster	6,750
45. Kingston and Surbiton BC			77,995
	Alexandra	Kingston upon Thames	6,494
	Berrylands	Kingston upon Thames	6,287
	Beverley	Kingston upon Thames	6,671
	Chessington North and Hook	Kingston upon Thames	6,254
	Chessington South	Kingston upon Thames	7,335
	Grove	Kingston upon Thames	6,303
	Norbiton	Kingston upon Thames	5,942

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Old Malden	Kingston upon Thames	6,694
	St. James	Kingston upon Thames	6,232
	St. Mark's	Kingston upon Thames	6,136
	Surbiton Hill	Kingston upon Thames	7,026
	Tolworth and Hook Rise	Kingston upon Thames	6,621
46. Lewisham and Catford BC			72,781
	Bellingham	Lewisham	9,019
	Catford South	Lewisham	9,413
	Downham	Lewisham	9,072
	Grove Park	Lewisham	9,249
	Ladywell	Lewisham	8,688
	Lewisham Central	Lewisham	10,532
	Rushey Green	Lewisham	8,053
	Whitefoot	Lewisham	8,755
47. Leyton and Stratford BC			74,379
	Forest Gate North	Newham	8,392
	Forest Gate South	Newham	8,862
	Stratford and New Town	Newham	12,471
	West Ham	Newham	8,073
	Cann Hall	Waltham Forest	6,921
	Cathall	Waltham Forest	6,515
	Grove Green	Waltham Forest	7,387
	Leyton	Waltham Forest	8,067
	Leytonstone	Waltham Forest	7,691
48. Mitcham and Norbury BC			77,160
	Broad Green	Croydon	10,859
	Norbury	Croydon	9,766
	West Thornton	Croydon	10,159
	Cricket Green	Merton	7,142
	Figge's Marsh	Merton	6,997
	Graveney	Merton	5,860
	Lavender Fields	Merton	6,198
	Longthornton	Merton	6,583
	Pollards Hill	Merton	7,185
	Ravensbury	Merton	6,411
49. Norwood and Thornton Heath BC			77,544
	Bensham Manor	Croydon	9,553
	Selhurst	Croydon	10,293
	South Norwood	Croydon	10,268
	Thornton Heath	Croydon	9,557
	Upper Norwood	Croydon	10,068
	Woodside	Croydon	10,112
	Gipsy Hill	Lambeth	9,064
	Knight's Hill	Lambeth	8,629
50. Orpington BC			78,277
	Biggin Hill	Bromley	7,747
	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	Bromley	10,957
	Cray Valley East	Bromley	10,685
	Cray Valley West	Bromley	11,553
	Darwin	Bromley	4,041
	Farnborough and Crofton	Bromley	11,388
	Orpington	Bromley	11,479
	Petts Wood and Knoll	Bromley	10,427
51. Poplar and Canning Town BC			78,073
	Canning Town North	Newham	8,333
	Canning Town South	Newham	8,543
	Custom House	Newham	6,971
	Plaistow North	Newham	8,215
	Plaistow South	Newham	8,290

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Blackwall & Cubitt Town	Tower Hamlets	7,284
	Canary Wharf	Tower Hamlets	6,517
	Island Gardens	Tower Hamlets	7,220
	Lansbury	Tower Hamlets	9,623
	Limehouse	Tower Hamlets	3,659
	Poplar	Tower Hamlets	3,418
52. Richmond Park BC			74,740
	Canbury	Kingston upon Thames	7,844
	Coombe Hill	Kingston upon Thames	5,953
	Coombe Vale	Kingston upon Thames	6,365
	Tudor	Kingston upon Thames	6,301
	Barnes	Richmond upon Thames	6,460
	East Sheen	Richmond upon Thames	6,812
	Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	6,409
	Kew	Richmond upon Thames	7,373
	Mortlake and Barnes Common	Richmond upon Thames	7,255
	North Richmond	Richmond upon Thames	7,120
	South Richmond	Richmond upon Thames	6,848
53. Romford BC			77,329
	Chadwell Heath	Barking and Dagenham	6,376
	Brooklands	Havering	10,698
	Havering Park	Havering	9,408
	Hylands	Havering	10,250
	Mawneys	Havering	9,352
	Pettits	Havering	10,187
	Romford Town	Havering	11,171
	Squirrel's Heath	Havering	9,887
54. Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner BC			71,331
	Hatch End	Harrow	8,207
	Pinner	Harrow	7,825
	Pinner South	Harrow	7,802
	Eastcote and East Ruislip	Hillingdon	9,701
	Harefield	Hillingdon	5,350
	Ickenham	Hillingdon	7,945
	Northwood	Hillingdon	7,863
	Northwood Hills	Hillingdon	8,306
	West Ruislip	Hillingdon	8,332
55. Shoreditch and Bethnal Green BC			75,449
	Dalston	Hackney	5,215
	De Beauvoir	Hackney	5,668
	Haggerston	Hackney	7,821
	Hoxton East & Shoreditch	Hackney	6,205
	Hoxton West	Hackney	6,951
	London Fields	Hackney	7,713
	Bethnal Green	Tower Hamlets	11,043
	Spitalfields and Banglatown	Tower Hamlets	6,792
	St. Peter's	Tower Hamlets	10,598
	Weavers	Tower Hamlets	7,443
56. Southall and Heston BC			78,143
	Dormers Wells	Ealing	9,059
	Lady Margaret	Ealing	9,625
	Norwood Green	Ealing	8,974
	Southall Broadway	Ealing	9,353
	Southall Green	Ealing	9,613
	Cranford	Hounslow	7,651
	Heston Central	Hounslow	7,751
	Heston East	Hounslow	8,091
	Heston West	Hounslow	8,026

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
57. Stepney and Bow BC			77,554
	Bow East	Tower Hamlets	10,427
	Bow West	Tower Hamlets	7,850
	Bromley North	Tower Hamlets	5,980
	Bromley South	Tower Hamlets	6,532
	Mile End	Tower Hamlets	10,236
	Shadwell	Tower Hamlets	7,086
	St. Dunstan's	Tower Hamlets	7,336
	St. Katherine's & Wapping	Tower Hamlets	6,728
	Stepney Green	Tower Hamlets	7,232
	Whitechapel	Tower Hamlets	8,147
58. Streatham and Brixton South BC			72,663
	Brixton Hill	Lambeth	9,625
	Herne Hill	Lambeth	9,975
	St. Leonard's	Lambeth	8,684
	Streatham Hill	Lambeth	9,010
	Streatham South	Lambeth	8,241
	Streatham Wells	Lambeth	8,830
	Thurlow Park	Lambeth	8,776
	Tulse Hill	Lambeth	9,522
59. Sutton and Cheam BC			73,858
	Lower Morden	Merton	6,491
	St. Helier	Merton	6,942
	Cheam	Sutton	7,852
	Nonsuch	Sutton	7,922
	Stonecot	Sutton	8,007
	Sutton Central	Sutton	7,145
	Sutton North	Sutton	7,189
	Sutton South	Sutton	6,664
	Sutton West	Sutton	7,322
	Worcester Park	Sutton	8,324
60. Tooting BC			71,051
	Balham	Wandsworth	10,443
	Bedford	Wandsworth	10,234
	Furzedown	Wandsworth	9,791
	Graveney	Wandsworth	9,892
	Nightingale	Wandsworth	10,555
	Tooting	Wandsworth	10,498
	Wandsworth Common	Wandsworth	9,638
61. Tottenham BC			73,484
	Bruce Grove	Haringey	6,953
	Harringay	Haringey	6,907
	Northumberland Park	Haringey	7,143
	Seven Sisters	Haringey	8,276
	St. Ann's	Haringey	7,006
	Tottenham Green	Haringey	7,729
	Tottenham Hale	Haringey	8,091
	West Green	Haringey	7,135
	White Hart Lane	Haringey	7,389
	Woodside	Haringey	6,855
62. Twickenham BC			78,247
	Fulwell and Hampton Hill	Richmond upon Thames	7,304
	Hampton	Richmond upon Thames	7,332
	Hampton North	Richmond upon Thames	6,727
	Hampton Wick	Richmond upon Thames	7,401
	Heathfield	Richmond upon Thames	7,062
	South Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	6,780
	St. Margarets and North Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	7,509
	Teddington	Richmond upon Thames	7,346

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Twickenham Riverside	Richmond upon Thames	6,720
	West Twickenham	Richmond upon Thames	7,267
	Whitton	Richmond upon Thames	6,799
63. Walthamstow BC			71,280
	Chapel End	Waltham Forest	8,001
	Forest	Waltham Forest	7,321
	High Street	Waltham Forest	7,737
	Higham Hill	Waltham Forest	8,197
	Hoe Street	Waltham Forest	7,960
	Lea Bridge	Waltham Forest	8,459
	Markhouse	Waltham Forest	7,735
	William Morris	Waltham Forest	7,597
	Wood Street	Waltham Forest	8,273
64. Wandsworth and Putney BC			72,359
	Earlsfield	Wandsworth	10,820
	East Putney	Wandsworth	10,060
	Fairfield	Wandsworth	9,986
	Southfields	Wandsworth	11,168
	Thamesfield	Wandsworth	10,761
	West Hill	Wandsworth	9,704
	West Putney	Wandsworth	9,860
65. Wembley BC			78,428
	Alperton	Brent	8,991
	Barnhill	Brent	9,956
	Dollis Hill	Brent	7,699
	Dudden Hill	Brent	8,250
	Fryent	Brent	8,035
	Preston	Brent	9,237
	Tokington	Brent	9,540
	Welsh Harp	Brent	7,633
	Wembley Central	Brent	9,087
66. Willesden and Shepherd's Bush BC			77,035
	Brondesbury Park	Brent	7,552
	Harlesden	Brent	8,447
	Kensal Green	Brent	7,766
	Mapesbury	Brent	8,228
	Stonebridge	Brent	9,896
	Willesden Green	Brent	7,440
	Askew	Hammersmith and Fulham	8,162
	College Park and Old Oak	Hammersmith and Fulham	4,930
	Shepherd's Bush Green	Hammersmith and Fulham	6,837
	Wormholt and White City	Hammersmith and Fulham	7,777
67. Wimbledon BC			78,285
	Abbey	Merton	6,376
	Cannon Hill	Merton	6,559
	Colliers Wood	Merton	6,511
	Dundonald	Merton	6,046
	Hillside	Merton	5,666
	Merton Park	Merton	6,329
	Raynes Park	Merton	6,607
	Trinity	Merton	6,424
	Village	Merton	5,633
	West Barnes	Merton	6,831
	Wimbledon Park	Merton	7,034
	Roehampton and Putney Heath	Wandsworth	8,269

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
68. Woolwich BC			78,107
	Abbey Wood	Greenwich	9,505
	Charlton	Greenwich	9,235
	Glyndon	Greenwich	9,788
	Peninsula	Greenwich	10,036
	Plumstead	Greenwich	9,485
	Thamesmead Moorings	Greenwich	9,966
	Woolwich Common	Greenwich	9,328
	Woolwich Riverside	Greenwich	10,764