

Re: Freedom of Information request - Representation of Camberwell LONDON SE5

1 message

Boundary Commission England Information Mailbox

<information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk>

14 December 2022 at

09:00

To: [REDACTED]
Bcc: Boundary Commission England Information Mailbox <information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk>

Dear [REDACTED]

BCE FOI/2022/17

Thank you for your email request for information to the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) on 27 November 2022, which has been considered under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) 2000. In your request for information you asked *for answers to the questions below relating to the number of concerns about the Camberwell area, how this compares to the level of concerns relating to other constituencies, and what measures were considered by the Commission to address or alleviate the concerns of Camberwell citizens.*

- 1. At that 2021 consultation, how many direct responses were received in relation to the representation of Camberwell*
- 2. Of these, how many were not in favour of, or took issue with, the Boundary Commission's proposals for the area*
- 3. If the number of concerns, direct and indirect (but formally brought to the attention of the Commission), was compared for each constituency, where would Camberwell & Peckham constituency be ranked (where the constituency ranked as first is the one with most concerns raised)*
- 4. What measures, if any, were considered in response to the concerns about Camberwell, and why was it not possible to adopt them.*
- 5. For other constituencies, with similar numbers of total concerns, (plus/minus 200) were any changes made to address their concerns*
- 6. What was the decision process for, and the reasons for, eradicating the Camberwell area name completely from newly named constituency areas*

Please see my response below to each of your questions in bold:

1. At that 2021 consultation, how many direct responses were received in relation to the representation of Camberwell

At the 2021 consultation on the Initial proposals, 80 direct responses were received in relation to the representation of Camberwell. All these were subsequently published on our website.

2. Of these, how many were not in favour of, or took issue with, the Boundary Commission's proposals for the area

Of those 80 responses, 56 were opposed to the Boundary Commission's proposals for the Camberwell area.

3. If the number of concerns, direct and indirect (but formally brought to the attention of the Commission), was compared for each constituency, where would Camberwell & Peckham constituency be ranked (where the constituency ranked as first is the one with most concerns raised)

The Commission does not carry out a ranking of the quantity of opposition in each constituency, therefore we do not hold data on this. Rather we consider the quality of evidence in each area, and consider the implications and knock-on effects of counter-proposals, the comparisons of which are contained in our revised proposals report for London. You can read all of the representations received during the first two consultation periods at bcereviews.org.uk.

4. What measures, if any, were considered in response to the concerns about Camberwell, and why was it not possible to adopt them.

A number of counter-proposals, from members of the public and political parties, were considered. While these counter-proposals presented different constituency arrangements for the Camberwell area, they also presented different constituency arrangements for much of South London. Therefore the Camberwell area could not be considered in isolation due to knock-on implications. Please see the [revised proposals report for London](#), paragraphs 3.208 to 3.244, for a description of our reasoning behind the changes we have proposed across the South Central London sub-region.

In formulating any pattern of constituencies across England, the Commission must ensure every constituency (barring two protected constituencies on the Isle of Wight) falls within the permitted electorate range, which for the 2023 Review is 69,724 to 77,062. Therefore, the Commission can not recommend a constituency outside of this range.

5. For other constituencies, with similar numbers of total concerns, (plus/minus 200) were any changes made to address their concerns

As outlined in the response to question three, we do not compare concerns across constituencies in this way, and therefore we do not hold data on this. We have made changes across England in response to evidence outlined in representations. We revised the boundaries of 47% of our initially proposed constituencies as a result of representations received during the first two periods of public consultation, and there may be further changes for our final recommendations.

6. What was the decision process for, and the reasons for, eradicating the Camberwell area name completely from newly named constituency areas

When naming the revised constituencies, the Commission applied the policy found in paragraphs 44 to 46 of the Guide to the 2023 Review. We also took into account the evidence received from representations and counter-proposals regarding the naming of constituencies. The counter-proposal upon which our revised South Central London area is based put forward a 'Peckham' constituency and a 'Vauxhall and Camberwell' constituency. However, for reasons outlined in paragraphs 3.224 and 3.243 of the revised proposals report for London, the Commission felt that 'Vauxhall' was a more appropriate name than 'Vauxhall and Camberwell'.

Under the provisions of the FOI Act if you are dissatisfied with the response provided you may wish to ask for an internal review. If this situation arises you should write to:

The Secretary to the Boundary Commission for England

35 Great Smith Street

Westminster

London

SW1P 3BQ

Email: information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk

If it transpires you are not content with our response or the internal review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the Information Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the BCE. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

The Office of the Information Commissioner,

Wycliffe House,

Water Lane,

Wilmslow,

Cheshire,

SK9 5AF

Kind regards



Head of Corporate Services



Boundary Commission for England

35 Great Smith Street | London | SW1P 3BQ

t: 020 7276 1102

e: information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.ukw: www.bcereviews.org.uk

On Sun, 27 Nov 2022 at 15:25, Sophy Tayler <request-923963-15f88ad6@whatdotheyknow.com> wrote:

Dear Parliamentary Boundary Commission for England,

During the previous round of public consultation in 2021, the SE5 Forum for Camberwell, Camberwell Society, and Camberwell Identity Group submitted a response, highlighting the [change.org](https://www.change.org/p/keep-camberwell-together-change.org) petition *Petition · Keep Camberwell together · Change.org*. At that time there were 800+ signatories. These added to the responses received directly by the Boundaries Commission represent a significant number of concerns about the representation of the Camberwell area within Parliament. We understand that the Commission is required by the 'Guide to the 2023 Review of Parliamentary constituencies' to give consideration to 'local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies'.

The latest version of the proposals not only continue to subdivide the Camberwell area between constituencies, but have even edited out the name of our area from any of the constituencies of which we are a part.

The questions to which we would like answers relate to the number of concerns about the Camberwell area, how this compares to the level of concerns relating to other constituencies, and what measures were considered by the Commission to address or alleviate the concerns of Camberwell citizens.

1. At that 2021 consultation, how many direct responses were received in relation to the representation of Camberwell
2. Of these, how many were not in favour of, or took issue with, the Boundary Commission's proposals for the area
3. If the number of concerns, direct and indirect (but formally brought to the attention of the Commission), was compared for each constituency, where would Camberwell & Peckham constituency be ranked (where the constituency ranked as first is the one with most concerns raised)
4. What measures, if any, were considered in response to the concerns about Camberwell, and why was it not possible to adopt them.
5. For other constituencies, with similar numbers of total concerns, (plus/minus 200) were any changes made to address their concerns
6. What was the decision process for, and the reasons for, eradicating the Camberwell area name completely from newly named constituency areas

I hope by raising these questions, even at this late stage, the Commission can reflect on these points, and that it will be possible to show Camberwell voters that their views matter, and at the very least restore the Camberwell name to one of our constituency areas.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

Please use this email address for all replies to this request:

request-923963-15f88ad6@whatdotheyknow.com

Is information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk the wrong address for Freedom of Information requests to Parliamentary Boundary Commission for England? If so, please contact us using this form:

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/change_request/new?body=boundary_commission_for_england

Disclaimer: This message and any reply that you make will be published on the internet. Our privacy and copyright policies:

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/help/officers>

For more detailed guidance on safely disclosing information, read the latest advice from the ICO:

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/help/ico-guidance-for-authorities>

<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/help/ico-anonymisation-code>

Please note that in some cases publication of requests and responses will be delayed.

If you find this service useful as an FOI officer, please ask your web manager to link to us from your organisation's FOI page.

