

**Minutes of the Commissioners' decision meeting for final recommendations on the
London region
19 April 2018**

Present

Mr Justice Andrew Nicol, Deputy Chair
David Elvin QC, Commissioner
Neil Pringle, Commissioner
Sam Hartley, Secretary to the Commission
Tony Bellringer, Deputy Secretary to the Commission
Tim Bowden, Head of Reviews
Donna Smith, Review Manager (London)

Overview

The Commissioners noted the overview information from the paper presented by the Secretariat.

No justification to change the sub-regions. Over half revised proposals actively supported by Conservatives. For Labour and the Liberal Democrats, they each only actively opposed and counter-proposal put forward for one or two constituencies.

The review team presented the proposed final recommendations for each sub-region to the commissioners. It was noted that these proposals had been agreed following briefings and discussions with the lead commissioner for the region, David Elvin QC.

The commissioners noted the presentation, and in particular the following points of contention.

North Thames sub region

North East

Commissioners considered the counter-proposal to split Eastbrook ward between Dagenham and Rainham and Romford constituencies. This had been considered at previous iterations and they maintained their view that they not consider that there was sufficient justification to split a ward in this instance.

There had been a general level of support for the revised proposals for this area, in particular Chingford and Woodford (though Commissioners agreed with the representations seeking to add 'Green' to the name, as it better reflected the existing name), and Walthamstow.

Commissioners agreed all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London.

North Central

Opposition received to revised proposals for Finchley and Enfield Southgate. Noted potential knock-on effects on neighbouring constituencies, and accordingly the justification for a split ward in this area, to prevent this knock-on. Commissioners considered an alternative ward split proposed by the Liberal Democrats (noting that as this had only been put forward in the revised proposal consultation, it had not been itself tested in public consultation).

Recognised the evidence of benefit in being able to unite the Finchley area in one constituency, but the potential difficulty might be the possible split of Barnet. Provisionally agreed to adopt the counter-proposal, subject to further analysis of any representations that commented on the splitting of Finchley at earlier consultation rounds, and a final check across the regions for consistency of approach.

Commissioners agreed all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London.

North West

Considered Conservative counter-proposal for Hillingdon and Uxbridge, noting knock-on effects on five constituencies in this area. Also noted it was different from what Conservatives had originally proposed at initial proposals consultation. Agreed not to accept these counter-proposals. Also considered counter-proposal in the Harrow and Kenton area from two local councillors, but felt there was not really any strong evidence to support it, so did not agree it. Also considered counter-proposal from Mr Erdunast for composition of Wembley and Greenford and Sudbury constituencies, but did not feel there was sufficient evidence to make these changes.

Hammersmith and Fulham constituency in revised proposals continues to attract opposition, but could not see a more optimal alternative that would not produce significant problems in neighbouring constituencies.

Commissioners agreed to all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London.

South Thames sub region

South West

Wimbledon constituency has attracted opposition for the Roehampton and Putney Heath areas it includes. Counter-proposal suggests splitting of a ward to address this. Commissioners did not think there was sufficient justification for this proposed ward split (and were particularly concerned about proposed split of Earlsfield ward, which was untested and likely to break ties).

Commissioners agreed to all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London.

South Central

Reconfigured Mitcham and Croydon areas had received better feedback than the initial proposals, but there were further counter-proposals that Commissioners considered. Felt that what was proposed to deal with a relatively minor remaining issue would cause

significant disruption around. Commissioners did not feel that the Labour counter proposal had sufficient justification to split the Heathfield ward between constituencies.

Commissioners agreed to all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London.

South East

Looked at counter-proposals for Camberwell and Peckham, Dulwich and Sydenham, and Lewisham and Catford constituencies. Considered there was an even balance of factors between revised proposals and the counter proposal. Agreed the Crofton Park and Bellingham ward swap (as closer to existing constituency), but not the other elements.

Considered representations in respect of Erith and Crayford and Bexley and Sidcup constituencies, e.g: that from the Conservatives. Did not feel there was sufficient evidence to support the counter-proposal.

Commissioners agreed to all other recommendations in the paper for this area of London, including the tabled name-change to Eltham and East Wickham.

Name changes

Agreed Chingford and Woodford Green: largely unchanged constituency.

Agreed Chipping Barnet and Finchley, but sought a shorter alternative for Enfield South and East Barnet: reflecting new composition of constituencies.

Agreed Islington South and Finsbury: largely existing.

Agreed Paddington and Queen's Park: reflecting two local authorities.

Agreed Ealing Central and Acton: largely existing.

Agreed Ealing North and Sudbury: recognises existing and additional local authority

Agreed Uxbridge and Northolt: recognises main centre and second authority

Agreed Hackney: encompasses most of authority

Agreed Putney and Wandsworth Town: recognises Wandsworth borough goes wider

Agreed Tooting and Balham: reflects public response that Balham needs to be in the name

Agreed Streatham and Brixton Hill: reflects public response of a Brixton name that means something

Agreed Eltham and East Wickham: better description of second authority area, as Welling goes wider.