

---

# **Boundary Commission for England**

---

## **PROPOSALS FOR PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN SOME OF THE SOUTH LONDON BOROUGHES**

The Commission held four local inquiries during July 2001 into their provisional recommendations for parliamentary constituencies in some South London boroughs.

On 20 December 2001, the Commission will publish revised recommendations for constituencies in some boroughs and are, today, announcing their final recommendations for constituencies in other boroughs.

### **Bexley and Greenwich**

A local inquiry was held on 10 July 2001. The Commission have adopted their provisional recommendations as their final recommendations.

### **Bromley and Lewisham**

A local inquiry was held on 26 July 2001. The Commission have revised their recommendations for three constituencies.

### **Lambeth and Southwark**

A local inquiry was held on 4 and 5 July 2001. The Commission have revised their recommendations with regard to the naming of one constituency.

### **Wandsworth**

A local inquiry was held on 3 July 2001. The Commission have adopted their provisional recommendations as their final recommendations.

### **Provisional recommendations**

The Commission's provisional recommendations for each borough, or pair of boroughs, in South London were published in local newspapers on 1 February 2001. The Commission invited representations about their proposals which could be made until 1 March 2001. As a result of the representations received, the Commission decided:-

- a) to hold local inquiries into their provisional recommendations for:-

Bexley and Greenwich  
Bromley and Lewisham  
Lambeth and Southwark  
Wandsworth

- b) that the representations they received did not require them to hold local inquiries into their provisional recommendations for the boroughs set out below. Final recommendations for these boroughs were announced on 25 April 2001:-

Croydon  
Kingston upon Thames and Richmond upon Thames  
Merton  
Sutton

## **Revised and final recommendations**

Details about each borough or pair of boroughs at a) above for which a local inquiry was held are set out in the following pages of this news release.

The revised and final recommendations for the boroughs at a) above are illustrated in outline maps – (please see separate link and note the copyright warning). The letters on the maps (where they are used) refer to the boroughs and the numbers refer to the borough wards. The maps are to be used in conjunction with the ward listings. These lists show the names and numbers of the wards and the 2000 ward electorates on which the Commission are required, by law, to work.

All the wards mentioned in this document are the new wards which will come into effect at the local government elections in May 2002.

## **Bexley and Greenwich**

### **Assistant Commissioner's report**

The local inquiry was held in Woolwich Town Hall on 10 July 2001. There was no objection to the pairing of the boroughs. The main issues raised at the inquiry were:-

- a) the Commission's proposed inclusion of the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward of Greenwich Borough in the Eltham seat;
- b) a counter-proposal from the Greenwich and Woolwich Constituency Labour Party involving the Kidbrooke with Hornfair, Glyndon, and Plumstead wards of Greenwich Borough;
- c) a counter-proposal from Clive Efford MP and the Eltham Constituency Labour Party involving the Kidbrooke with Hornfair and Woolwich Common wards of Greenwich Borough;
- d) a counter-proposal from the Labour Party (Greater London Region) involving the Danson Park and East Wickham wards of Bexley Borough; and
- e) the name of the Erith and Thamesmead seat.

### **Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward**

The Commission provisionally recommended that the divided Greenwich Borough ward of Kidbrooke with Hornfair, which is partly in the Greenwich and Woolwich seat and partly in the Eltham seat, should be wholly included in the Eltham seat in order to increase the low electorate of the Eltham seat. Many objections were made about this proposal both in the written representations and at the local inquiry.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that there was much evidence that Hornfair, and other parts of the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward that lie north of Shooters Hill Road, had strong local ties with Charlton and the Greenwich and Woolwich seat. However, there was also evidence of local ties between the southern part of the ward and Eltham. After considering the counter-proposals, which included the ward in the Greenwich and Woolwich seat, the Assistant Commissioner supported the Commission's proposed inclusion of the ward in the Eltham seat. He considered that it was without question the best solution to the problems presented to the Commission by the Rules for Redistribution of Seats (i.e. the conflicting requirements of equalising constituency electorates whilst respecting local boundaries and ties – see the paragraph "Rules" below).

### **Counter-proposal from Greenwich and Woolwich Constituency Labour Party**

The counter-proposal included the whole of the divided Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward in the Greenwich and Woolwich seat instead of the Eltham seat; the whole of the divided Glyndon ward in the Erith and Thamesmead seat instead of the Greenwich and Woolwich seat; and the whole of the divided Plumstead ward in the Eltham seat instead of the Erith and Thamesmead seat.

The Assistant Commissioner reported opposition to the counter-proposal from John Austin, MP for Erith and Thamesmead, whose view was that the Plumstead ward had no affinity with Eltham, and that the people of Plumstead had not been consulted on the matter and would be very opposed to it. The Assistant Commissioner also reported opposition to the counter-proposal from Clive Efford, MP for Eltham, whose view was that Plumstead had community links with both Abbey Wood to its east and Glyndon to its west, and that its removal to a separate constituency away from both of them could not be defended. The Assistant Commissioner reported further opposition to the counter-proposal from the Labour Party (Greater London Region) because the inclusion of the Plumstead ward in the Eltham seat would create an awkward shape, including part of central Plumstead which would almost be detached from the rest and with only circuitous road connections to Eltham.

The Assistant Commissioner considered that the counter-proposal had been put forward in an attempt to accommodate the objections of those in the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward to being included in the Eltham seat. However, he concluded that the counter-proposal was flawed. It involved major change and Kidbrooke was more naturally linked to the Eltham area than was Plumstead. It also created a poorly shaped Erith and Thamesmead seat. He rejected the counter-proposal.

### **Counter-proposal from Clive Efford MP and Eltham Constituency Labour Party**

The counter-proposal included the whole of the divided Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward in the Greenwich and Woolwich seat instead of the Eltham seat; and the whole of the divided Woolwich Common ward in the Eltham seat instead of the Greenwich and Woolwich seat.

The Assistant Commissioner reported opposition to the counter-proposal from John Austin MP, who considered that it would make no sense as it would take the Eltham seat almost into Woolwich town centre. The Assistant Commissioner also reported that there was no general support from the residents in the Woolwich Common ward for the counter-proposal, which had been put forward at a late stage and, it had been suggested, would be widely opposed if it were generally known. The Assistant Commissioner concluded that the Woolwich Common ward lies more naturally in the Greenwich and Woolwich seat than does the Kidbrooke part of the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward. He rejected the counter-proposal.

### **Counter-proposal from the Labour Party (Greater London Region)**

The counter-proposal included the whole of the divided Danson Park ward in the Old Bexley and Sidcup seat instead of the Bexleyheath and Crayford seat; and transferred the East Wickham ward from the Old Bexley and Sidcup seat to the Bexleyheath and Crayford seat.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that the counter-proposal would involve the movement between constituencies of 13,064 electors in Bexley, whereas the Commission's proposals would involve the movement of only 3,194 electors. He further reported that opponents of the counter-proposal stated that the East Wickham ward was part of Welling rather than Bexleyheath, that the ward was more strongly associated with the Falconwood and Welling ward to its south, and that the eastern part of the Danson Park ward was essentially part of the Bexleyheath area and should be included in that constituency.

The Assistant Commissioner could see no strong reason for moving the East Wickham ward from one constituency to another and concluded that the Danson Park ward was better placed in the Bexleyheath and Crayford seat. He therefore rejected the counter-proposal.

### **Name of the Erith and Thamesmead seat**

A suggestion was made that the Erith and Thamesmead seat should be renamed “Erith, Abbey Wood and Thamesmead”, or “Greenwich East and North Bexley”, or “Greenwich North East and Bexley Riverside” to describe the seat more accurately. The Assistant Commissioner rejected these suggestions because there was little support for them and the advantage of continuity outweighed the possible disadvantages.

### **Conclusion**

The Assistant Commissioner recommended no change to the Commission’s provisional recommendations. In the circumstances, and after considering all the evidence, the Commission have decided to accept the Assistant Commissioner’s recommendations in full. The Commission accept that some local ties will be broken in the Hornfair part of the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward by including the ward in the Eltham seat, but adjustments have to be made in order to equalise constituency electorates. The counter-proposals put forward all involve breaking local ties elsewhere and a much greater degree of unnecessary change. The Commission believe that the inclusion of the Kidbrooke with Hornfair ward in the Eltham seat remains the best option in a difficult situation.

### **Final recommendations**

The Commission have decided to confirm their provisional recommendations as their final recommendations. No further representations will be considered. The final recommendations for Bexley and Greenwich, which will be embodied in their report to be submitted to the Secretary of State at the end of the general review, and which are shown on the attached map, are for the following constituencies (2000 electorates in brackets):-

**BEXLEYHEATH AND CRAYFORD BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (64,032).** Eight wards of the London Borough of **Bexley**:- Barnehurst, Brampton, Christchurch, Colyers, Crayford, Danson Park, North End, St Michael’s.

**ELTHAM BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (64,907).** Seven wards of the London Borough of **Greenwich**:- Coldharbour and New Eltham, Eltham North, Eltham South, Eltham West, Kidbrooke with Hornfair, Middle Park and Sutcliffe, Shooters Hill.

**ERITH AND THAMESMEAD BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (64,307).** Five wards of the London Borough of **Bexley**:- Belvedere, Erith, Lesnes Abbey, Northumberland Heath, Thamesmead East; three wards of the London Borough of **Greenwich**:- Abbey Wood, Plumstead, Thamesmead Moorings.

**GREENWICH AND WOOLWICH BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (60,473).** Seven wards of the London Borough of **Greenwich**:- Blackheath Westcombe, Charlton, Glyndon, Greenwich West, Peninsula, Woolwich Common, Woolwich Riverside.

**OLD BEXLEY AND SIDCUP BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (65,186).** Eight wards of the London Borough of **Bexley**:- Blackfen and Lamorbey, Blendon and Penhill, Cray Meadows, East Wickham, Falconwood and Welling, Longlands, St Mary’s, Sidcup.

The wards upon which the Commission based their recommendations were created by The London Borough of Bexley (Electoral Changes) Order 2000 and The London Borough of Greenwich (Electoral Changes) Order 2000.

## 2000 WARD ELECTORATES TO BE USED THROUGHOUT REVIEW

<b>Bexley</b>	167,946	<b>Greenwich</b>	150,959
1. Barnehurst	8,121	1. Abbey Wood	9,498
2. Belvedere	7,981	2. Blackheath Westcombe	9,343
3. Blackfen and Lamorbey	8,031	3. Charlton	9,358
4. Blendon and Penhill	8,424	4. Coldharbour and New Eltham	9,451
5. Brampton	8,306	5. Eltham North	9,394
6. Christchurch	8,319	6. Eltham South	9,149
7. Colyers	8,036	7. Eltham West	9,400
8. Crayford	7,624	8. Glyndon	9,144
9. Cray Meadows	8,133	9. Greenwich West	8,050
10. Danson Park	8,061	10. Kidbrooke with Hornfair	8,615
11. East Wickham	8,197	11. Middle Park and Sutcliffe	9,462
12. Erith	7,312	12. Peninsula	7,053
13. Falconwood and Welling	8,153	13. Plumstead	9,379
14. Lesnes Abbey	8,267	14. Shooters Hill	9,436
15. Longlands	7,826	15. Thamesmead Moorings	6,702
16. North End	7,547	16. Woolwich Common	9,252
17. Northumberland Heath	7,844	17. Woolwich Riverside	8,273
18. St Mary's	8,129		
19. St Michael's	8,018		
20. Sidcup	8,293		
21. Thamesmead East	7,324		

### **Bromley and Lewisham**

#### **Assistant Commissioner's report**

The local inquiry was held in the Civic Centre, Bromley on 26 July 2001. The main issues raised at the inquiry were:-

- a) the Commission's proposed transfer of the Biggin Hill and Darwin wards of Bromley Borough from the Orpington seat to a Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat, and counter-proposals that sought to retain the two wards in the Orpington seat;
- b) the proposed Lewisham West and Penge seat, which straddles the boundary between Bromley and Lewisham and includes the Clock House ward of Bromley;
- c) a counter-proposal involving the Lewisham Central and Rushey Green wards of Lewisham Borough; and
- d) constituency names.

#### **Biggin Hill and Darwin wards**

The Assistant Commissioner reported many objections to the Commission's proposed transfer of the Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Orpington seat to a Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat. She also reported much evidence of local ties between the two wards and Orpington and a lack of ties, and poor transport links, between the wards and Beckenham. She concluded that the two wards should be retained in a seat with Orpington, therefore rejecting the Commission's proposals, and considered a number of counter-proposals which achieved that end.

The first counter-proposal transferred the:-

- a) Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat to the Orpington seat;
- b) Cray Valley East and Cray Valley West wards from the Orpington seat to a Chislehurst seat;
- c) Bromley Town ward from the Bromley and Chislehurst seat to a Bromley and Beckenham seat; and
- d) Bromley Common and Keston ward from the Bromley and Chislehurst seat to the Orpington seat.

This counter-proposal was rejected as it broke local ties in that it divided the commercial centre of Bromley, and separated the Cray Valley East ward from Orpington. It included both the Cray Valley wards in a Chislehurst seat, but there was evidence that no significant ties would be broken by placing the wards in different seats. Also, the counter-proposal created a Chislehurst seat when the three major centres in the Borough of Bromley were Beckenham, Bromley and Orpington.

The second counter-proposal transferred the:-

- a) Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat to the Orpington seat; and
- b) Bromley Common and Keston ward from the Bromley and Chislehurst seat to a Beckenham seat.

This counter-proposal was rejected because it created a Bromley and Chislehurst seat with a very low electorate of 51,720, an Orpington seat with a high electorate of 78,743, and consequently an excessive disparity of 27,023 between the constituency electorates.

The third counter-proposal transferred the:-

- a) Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat to the Orpington seat;
- b) Cray Valley West ward from the Orpington seat to the Bromley and Chislehurst seat; and
- c) Bromley Common and Keston ward from the Bromley and Chislehurst seat to a Beckenham seat.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that there was evidence of significant local ties between Orpington and the new Cray Valley East ward, which now includes both St Mary's Cray and St Paul's Cray, whereas there were fewer ties between Orpington and the Cray Valley West ward which did have some ties with Chislehurst. There was also evidence that the Bromley Common and Keston ward is an area of relative independence and could probably be included in any of the three seats within Bromley. The Assistant Commissioner therefore accepted this counter-proposal as the best method of retaining the Biggin Hill and Darwin wards in the Orpington seat.

Other counter-proposals that either treated Bromley and Lewisham separately, or involved pairing Bromley with Croydon and Lewisham with Southwark, were rejected as they had little or no support, or created excessive disparities between the constituency electorates. The Assistant Commissioner also noted that there was considerable support for the pairing of Bromley with Lewisham.

### **Lewisham West and Penge seat**

The Assistant Commissioner reported a measure of support for this cross-borough constituency. However, there was some objection to the inclusion of the Clock House ward of Bromley, because it would break ties between the ward and Beckenham, and there was a counter-proposal to retain the ward in the Bromley seat. However, without the inclusion of the Clock House ward in the Lewisham West and Penge seat, the electorate of the seat would be too low, and no viable alternative solution was put forward at the inquiry. The Assistant Commissioner therefore recommended that this constituency, as proposed by the Commission, should be adopted.

### **Lewisham Central and Rushey Green wards**

The Assistant Commissioner considered a counter-proposal for the transfer of:-

- a) the new Lewisham Central ward from the Commission's proposed Lewisham, Deptford seat to the proposed Lewisham East seat; and, in exchange,
- b) the new Rushey Green ward from the proposed Lewisham East seat to the proposed Lewisham, Deptford seat.

In support of the counter-proposal, evidence was given that:-

- a) the new Lewisham Central ward had ties with Blackheath, Grove Park and Lee Green, which were in the proposed Lewisham East seat;
- b) the new Lewisham Central ward did not have ties with areas in the north of the borough, which were in the proposed Lewisham, Deptford seat; and
- c) the new Rushey Green ward was now more closely linked with areas in the north of the borough, which were in the proposed Lewisham, Deptford seat.

However, in opposition to the counter-proposal, there was other evidence that:-

- a) the new Rushey Green ward (which is similar to but not the same as the old Catford ward) had ties with the new Catford South ward which was in the proposed Lewisham East seat, and the counter-proposal would therefore split Catford in half;
- b) the new Rushey Green ward contained part of the old Blythe Hill ward which was in the proposed Lewisham East seat; and
- c) the new Lewisham Central ward contained part of the Ladywell community, had ties with the proposed Lewisham, Deptford seat and its inclusion in that seat would unite the centre of Lewisham.

The Assistant Commissioner concluded on balance that, although there was much support for the counter-proposal, there was no compelling evidence that the Commission's proposals would be likely to breach local ties. In the absence of such evidence, she recommended that the Commission's proposals should be adopted.

### **Constituency names**

As a result of accepting the counter-proposal to transfer the Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat to the Orpington seat, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the name of the former seat should revert to Beckenham.

The Assistant Commissioner considered that the proposed name of the Lewisham West and Penge constituency had a degree of imbalance, referring to a comprehensive geographical area of the Lewisham part in the north of the seat, but to the name of a small town in the Bromley part in the south of the seat. She considered that the imbalance appeared to describe

one part of the constituency more fully than the other. She accordingly recommended that the constituency be called Sydenham and Penge as had been counter-proposed.

### **Revised Recommendations**

After considering all the evidence, the Commission decided to accept all but one of the Assistant Commissioner's recommendations and they are therefore revising their recommendations. They accept that their provisional recommendation to transfer the Biggin Hill and Darwin wards from the Orpington seat to the Beckenham seat broke local ties between the two wards and Orpington and had met with opposition from all sides. They also agreed with the Assistant Commissioner that the counter-proposal that she had accepted was the best solution for retaining the two wards in the Orpington seat.

The Commission also agreed with the Assistant Commissioner's decision to reject the counter-proposal affecting the Lewisham Central and Rushey Green wards. They further agreed with the Assistant Commissioner's reasons for rejecting the other counter-proposals. They also considered that, without the inclusion of the Biggin Hill area, the name of the Beckenham and Biggin Hill seat should revert to Beckenham.

The Commission decided to reject the Assistant Commissioner's recommendation to change the name of the Lewisham West and Penge seat to Sydenham and Penge. They noted that there had been some objection at the inquiry to the name of Sydenham and Penge which was later recommended by the Assistant Commissioner. The Commission considered that, whilst there was some support for the name of Sydenham and Penge, it was not unanimous. They considered that there was no reason why a constituency name should not include the name of a borough and the name of a town. They concluded that Lewisham West was an existing constituency name, that there was no need to change it because it accurately described that part of the Borough of Lewisham contained in the seat, and that their provisional recommendation to call the seat Lewisham West and Penge should therefore stand.

The Commission noted that the disparity of 22,196 between the electorates of the existing constituencies would be further reduced from the 5,849 in their provisional recommendations to 5,006 in their revised recommendations.

### **Composition of Constituencies**

No change is proposed to the names or composition of the following three provisionally recommended constituencies (2000 electorates in brackets) and no further representations will be considered:-

**LEWISHAM EAST BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (67,833)**

**LEWISHAM WEST AND PENGE BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (68,411)**

**LEWISHAM, DEPTFORD BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (67,682)**

The names and composition of the following three revised constituencies would be (2000 electorates in brackets):-

**BECKENHAM BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (63,405).** Six wards of the London Borough of **Bromley**:- Bromley Common and Keston, Copers Cope, Hayes and Coney Hall, Kelsey and Eden Park, Shortlands, West Wickham.

**BROMLEY AND CHISLEHURST BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (63,489).** Six wards of the London Borough of **Bromley**:- Bickley, Bromley Town, Chislehurst, Cray Valley West, Mottingham and Chislehurst North, Plaistow and Sundridge.

**ORPINGTON BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (66,974).** Seven wards of the London Borough of **Bromley**:- Biggin Hill, Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom, Cray Valley East, Darwin,

Farnborough and Crofton, Orpington, Petts Wood and Knoll.

### Places of inspection

A copy of the revised recommendations, maps illustrating them and a copy of the Assistant Commissioner's report are open for public inspection at:-

<b>Beckenham</b>	Beckenham Library, Beckenham Road, Beckenham
<b>Biggin Hill</b>	Biggin Hill Library, Church Road, Biggin Hill
<b>Bromley</b>	Bromley Civic Centre, Stockwell Close, Bromley
<b>Catford</b>	Lewisham Town Hall, Rushey Green, Catford
<b>Deptford</b>	New Cross Library, 283-285 New Cross Road, Deptford
<b>Lewisham</b>	Manor House Library, Old Road, Lewisham
<b>Orpington</b>	Orpington Library, The Priory, Church Hill, Orpington

### 2000 WARD ELECTORATES TO BE USED THROUGHOUT REVIEW

<b>Bromley</b>	222,759	<b>Lewisham</b>	175,035
1. Bickley	10,897	1. Bellingham	9,552
2. Biggin Hill	7,761	2. Blackheath	9,834
3. Bromley Common and Keston	10,842	3. Brockley	9,850
4. Bromley Town	11,117	4. Catford South	10,236
5. Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	10,755	5. Crofton Park	9,689
6. Chislehurst	11,586	6. Downham	9,440
7. Clock House	11,073	7. Evelyn	9,419
8. Copers Cope	10,957	8. Forest Hill	9,482
9. Cray Valley East	10,748	9. Grove Park	10,229
10. Cray Valley West	11,769	10. Ladywell	9,053
11. Crystal Palace	7,031	11. Lee Green	9,527
12. Darwin	3,815	12. Lewisham Central	10,353
13. Farnborough and Crofton	11,393	13. New Cross	9,492
14. Hayes and Coney Hall	12,092	14. Perry Vale	9,982
15. Kelsey and Eden Park	10,843	15. Rushey Green	8,957
16. Mottingham and Chislehurst North	7,162	16. Sydenham	10,504
17. Orpington	11,629	17. Telegraph Hill	9,826
18. Penge and Cator	10,787	18. Whitefoot	9,610
19. Petts Wood and Knoll	10,873		
20. Plaistow and Sundridge	10,958		
21. Shortlands	7,432		
22. West Wickham	11,239		

### Lambeth and Southwark

#### Assistant Commissioner's report

The local inquiry was held in Lambeth Town Hall on 4 and 5 July 2001. The main issues raised at the inquiry were:-

- a) a counter-proposal from the Conservative Party involving the Clapham Town, Coldharbour, and Tulse Hill wards of Lambeth Borough;

- b) the proposed inclusion of the Southwark Borough ward of Livesey in the Camberwell and Peckham seat;
- c) the division of Brixton between three constituencies;
- d) a counter-proposal from Mr C Warbey; and
- e) the names of three constituencies.

### **Counter-proposal from the Conservative Party**

The counter-proposal transferred the:-

- a) Lambeth Borough ward of Coldharbour from the Dulwich and West Norwood seat to the Vauxhall seat;
- b) Lambeth Borough ward of Clapham Town from the Vauxhall seat to the Streatham seat; and
- c) the Lambeth Borough ward of Tulse Hill from the Streatham seat to the Dulwich and West Norwood seat.

The Assistant Commissioner considered that aspects of the counter-proposal had merit, such as the inclusion of the Coldharbour ward in the Vauxhall seat, thereby acknowledging the ties of the majority of the electors in the ward. He also considered that the extensive ties between the Clapham Town ward and the Clapham Common ward would be re-inforced if the former ward were included in the Streatham seat. However, he did not consider that there were any appreciable ties between the Tulse Hill ward and the Dulwich and West Norwood seat. He considered that Brockwell Park acted as a barrier between the Tulse Hill ward and the Dulwich and West Norwood seat and that the Tulse Hill ward had strong ties with the Brixton Hill ward in the Streatham seat. The counter-proposal would slightly increase the disparity between the constituency electorates from 3,596 to 3,619.

The Assistant Commissioner concluded that, on balance, the counter-proposal should be rejected, as he did not consider that its justification was sufficient to outweigh the disruption that would be caused by the changes.

### **Counter-proposal from the Bonamy-Bramcote Tenants' Association concerning the Livesey ward**

The Association objected to the inclusion of the Southwark Borough ward of Livesey in the Camberwell and Peckham seat. They contended that the ward should be included in the North Southwark and Bermondsey seat.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that evidence was given that there was a clear dividing line between those electors in the Livesey ward who lived north of the Old Kent Road and those who lived south of it. Those who lived north of the Old Kent Road had ties with Rotherhithe, whilst those who lived to the south, had ties with Peckham. He noted that 2,203 electors had ties with Bermondsey, but that the clear majority (5,988) had ties with Peckham. He concluded that to accede to the transfer of the ward would break the local ties of the majority of the electors within the ward, and would also increase the disparity between the constituency electorates from 3,596 to 14,824. He therefore rejected the counter-proposal.

The Assistant Commissioner also reported that it had been suggested during the inquiry that it would not be too difficult for Southwark Borough Council to cope with a split ward in a parliamentary election, thereby solving the problem of the Livesey ward. However, the Assistant Commissioner endorsed the Commission's policy of not splitting wards and consequently rejected this alternative.

### **Counter-proposal from Ms I de Ridder and Ms P Lewis**

The counter-proposal suggested that Lambeth should not be paired and that the whole of Brixton should be included in one constituency, rather than be split between three as at present. The counter-proposal also suggested the division of wards between constituencies.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that there was almost unanimous support for the provisionally recommended pairing of Lambeth and Southwark and that he found the Commission's reasons for retaining the pairing compelling. He therefore rejected the counter-proposal.

### **Counter-proposal from Mr Warbey**

Mr Warbey counter-proposed that Lambeth should be allocated three constituencies and that Southwark should be paired with Lewisham, with a total of five seats being allocated, in order to narrow the disparity between the constituency electorates, and to better reflect local and historical links.

The Assistant Commissioner confirmed his agreement with the Commission's reasons for pairing Lambeth and Southwark, and noted that the electorate of the Vauxhall seat proposed by Mr Warbey would be 57,046, which he considered would be too far (12,888) below the electoral quota. He therefore rejected the counter-proposal.

### **Constituency names**

The Assistant Commissioner reported that alternative names were suggested for the Camberwell and Peckham, North Southwark and Bermondsey, and Streatham seats. He rejected the alternative of "Camberwell, Peckham and Walworth" for Camberwell and Peckham as being too unwieldy and not supported at the inquiry. He also rejected the alternative of "Streatham and South Brixton" for Streatham, because it would not be right to include reference to Brixton in one constituency, rather than another.

The Assistant Commissioner supported the alternative name of "Bermondsey and Old Southwark" in preference to the existing name of North Southwark and Bermondsey. He considered that the alternative name was more appropriate and that Old Southwark was a better description than North Southwark, which he considered was misleading. He rejected the inclusion of Rotherhithe in the name, because it would make the name too long and unwieldy, and because Rotherhithe was part of the former Metropolitan Borough of Bermondsey.

### **Revised Recommendations**

After considering all the evidence, the Commission have decided to accept the Assistant Commissioner's recommendations in full. Accordingly, they are publishing revised recommendations to change the name of the North Southwark and Bermondsey seat to Bermondsey and Old Southwark. They are also announcing final recommendation for the other four constituencies.

### **Composition of Constituencies**

No change is proposed to the names or composition of the following four provisionally recommended constituencies (2000 electorates in brackets) and no further representations will be considered:-

**CAMBERWELL AND PECKHAM BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (67,764)**

**DULWICH AND WEST NORWOOD BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (66,856)**

**STREATHAM BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (69,355)**

**VAUXHALL BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (65,759)**

**Boundary Commission for England**

No change is proposed to the composition of the following constituency. The revised name of the constituency would be (2000 electorate in brackets):-

**BERMONDSEY AND OLD SOUTHWARK BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (66,206)**

**Places of inspection**

A copy of the revised recommendation and the Assistant Commissioner's report are open for public inspection at:-

<b>Bermondsey</b>	Spa Centre, Spa Road, Bermondsey
<b>Brixton</b>	Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton Hill, Brixton
<b>Camberwell</b>	Southwark Town Hall, Peckham Road, Camberwell
<b>Dulwich</b>	Dulwich Library, 369 Lordship Lane, East Dulwich
<b>Herne Hill</b>	Carnegie Library, 188 Herne Hill Road, Herne Hill
<b>Kennington</b>	Durning Library, 167 Kennington Lane, Kennington
<b>Streatham</b>	Tate Library, Streatham High Road, Streatham

**2000 WARD ELECTORATES TO BE USED THROUGHOUT REVIEW**

<b>Lambeth</b>	179,481	<b>Southwark</b>	156,459
1. Bishop's	6,234	1. Brunswick Park	7,136
2. Brixton Hill	8,861	2. Camberwell Green	7,606
3. Clapham Common	8,364	3. Cathedrals	7,159
4. Clapham Town	8,875	4. Chaucer	7,669
5. Coldharbour	9,067	5. College	6,978
6. Ferndale	8,713	6. East Dulwich	7,420
7. Gipsy Hill	8,806	7. East Walworth	7,772
8. Herne Hill	8,947	8. Faraday	7,582
9. Knight's Hill	8,915	9. Grange	6,795
10. Larkhall	9,075	10. Livesey	8,191
11. Oval	7,916	11. Newington	7,765
12. Prince's	7,942	12. Nunhead	7,465
13. St Leonard's	8,903	13. Peckham	6,960
14. Stockwell	8,321	14. Peckham Rye	7,429
15. Streatham Hill	8,948	15. Riverside	6,806
16. Streatham South	8,765	16. Rotherhithe	7,299
17. Streatham Wells	8,694	17. South Bermondsey	7,173
18. Thornton	8,160	18. South Camberwell	7,602
19. Thurlow Park	8,632	19. Surrey Docks	7,768
20. Tulse Hill	8,660	20. The Lane	7,793
21. Vassall	8,683	21. Village	8,091

**Wandsworth**

**Assistant Commissioner's report**

The local inquiry was held in Wandsworth Town Hall on 3 July 2001. There was widespread support for the borough to retain three seats and for the borough boundary to be respected. The main issues raised at the inquiry were:-

- a) a counter-proposal from Wandsworth Borough Council, the Conservative Party and others, affecting the Balham and Wandsworth Common wards which also contained consequential changes of name for the Battersea and Tooting seats; and
- b) a counter-proposal from Mr C Warbey.

### **Counter-proposal from Wandsworth Borough Council**

The Council submitted that the Balham ward should be transferred from the Battersea seat to the Tooting seat in exchange for the Wandsworth Common ward, in order to place more of Balham in the Tooting seat. Others also proposed that the Tooting seat should consequently be renamed Balham and Tooting, and that the Battersea seat should be renamed Battersea and Wandsworth.

The Assistant Commissioner reported that the counter-proposal had merits but concluded that it should be rejected because its merits were not sufficient to justify the transfer of some 18,000 electors or to outweigh the disruption that would be caused by the changes. It followed that the consequential name changes should also be rejected.

### **Counter-proposal from Mr Warbey**

Mr Warbey submitted that Wandsworth should be paired with Lambeth, with a total of five seats being allocated, in order to narrow the disparity between the electorates and to better reflect local and historical links. The Assistant Commissioner reported that there was no support for the counter-proposal and that there was objection to it from both the Conservative and Labour Parties. He acknowledged that the counter-proposal had some benefits but he considered that it would be unduly disruptive, because it would be necessary to create a constituency that straddled the boundary between the two boroughs, and he rejected it.

### **Final recommendations**

The Assistant Commissioner recommended no change to the Commission's provisional recommendations. Having considered all the evidence, the Commission agreed with the Assistant Commissioner that the two counter-proposals should be rejected. The counter-proposals had little or no support and the disruption that each would cause had not been justified. The Commission particularly agreed that the movement of 18,000 electors had not been justified, when their provisional recommendations involved only the minimum amount of change required to realign constituency boundaries with the new ward boundaries. They also considered that the poor shape of the Tooting seat created by the Council's counter-proposal was a relevant factor in its rejection.

The Commission have decided to confirm their provisional recommendations as their final recommendations. No further representations will be considered. The final recommendations for Wandsworth, which will be embodied in their report to be submitted to the Secretary of State at the end of the general review and which are shown on the attached map, are for the following constituencies (2000 electorates in brackets):-

**BATTERSEA BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (67,111).** Seven wards of the London Borough of **Wandsworth**:- Balham, Fairfield, Latchmere, Northcote, Queenstown, St Mary's Park, Shaftesbury.

**PUTNEY BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (59,331).** Six wards of the London Borough of **Wandsworth**:- East Putney, Roehampton, Southfields, Thamesfield, West Hill, West Putney.

**TOOTING BOROUGH CONSTITUENCY (69,445).** Seven wards of the London Borough of **Wandsworth**:- Bedford, Earlsfield, Furzedown, Graveney, Nightingale, Tooting, Wandsworth Common.

The wards upon which the Commission based their provisional recommendations were created by The London Borough of Wandsworth (Electoral Changes) Order 2000.

### **2000 WARD ELECTORATES TO BE USED THROUGHOUT REVIEW**

<b>Wandsworth</b>	195,887
1. Balham	10,031
2. Bedford	9,586
3. Earlsfield	9,918
4. East Putney	10,342
5. Fairfield	9,355
6. Furzedown	9,911
7. Graveney	10,034
8. Latchmere	9,482
9. Nightingale	10,218
10. Northcote	9,845
11. Queenstown	9,103
12. Roehampton	9,723
13. St Mary's Park	9,182
14. Shaftesbury	10,113
15. Southfields	10,250
16. Thamesfield	9,494
17. Tooting	10,291
18. Wandsworth Common	9,487
19. West Hill	9,902
20. West Putney	9,620

### **Publication of Revised Recommendations**

The revised recommendations will be published formally in a notice appearing in local newspapers on 20 December 2001. Local authorities, MPs, the Political Parties' Headquarters, and others will be sent a copy of the recommendations. The notice will also be published on the Commission's web site at:-

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pbc/>

### **Representation Period: 20 December 2001 to 1 February 2002**

As mentioned above, no further representations can be considered for those constituencies where the Commission are announcing (or have already announced) their final recommendations. However, as with their provisional recommendations, the Commission are statutorily required to consider representations made about their revised recommendations within one month of local publication on 20 December 2001. In this case, the representation period has been extended to allow for the Christmas and New Year holidays. The representation period will therefore end on 1 February 2002.

Representations about the revised recommendations should be addressed to the Boundary Commission for England, PO Box 31060, London, SW1V 2FF, or faxed to 020 7533 5176, or emailed to:-

**Boundary Commission for England**

## **London boroughs**

## **Email address**

Bromley and Lewisham  
Lambeth and Southwark

chris.ault@ons.gov.uk  
gerald.tessier@ons.gov.uk

All representations received by the Commission will be acknowledged. It should be noted that the Commission are not statutorily required to hold second inquiries into representations about their revised recommendations.

The Commission are also not required to consider any representations made after 1 February 2002, but will endeavour to take late representations into account. However, the later the representation is made, the more difficult this will be. The Commission therefore encourage that all representations be made within the extended statutory representation period. Those who make representations are requested to say whether they approve of, or object to, the Commission's revised recommendations and to give their reasons for their approval or objection.

The Commission wish to stress that their recommendations relate solely to parliamentary constituencies and do not affect London borough boundaries, or council taxes or services. The Commission will therefore not take account of any representation made about those local issues.

## **Background Note**

The Commission are constituted under Schedule 1 to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986. The ex officio Chairman is the Speaker of the House of Commons. The Deputy Chairman, who presides over Commission meetings, is a High Court Judge appointed by the Lord Chancellor.

The other two Commissioners are appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions. The two Assessors to the Commission are the Registrar General of England and Wales and the Director General of Ordnance Survey. Assistant Commissioners are lawyers appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct local inquiries.

The Commission are required by the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 as amended by the Boundary Commissions Act 1992 to conduct a general review of all the constituencies in England every eight to twelve years. The Commission completed their previous general review on 12 April 1995 and must therefore complete the current review after 11 April 2003 and before 12 April 2007.

The general review started formally with the publication of a notice in the London Gazette on 17 February 2000. The Commission's recommendations throughout the review must by law be based on the numbers of electors on the electoral registers on that date.

## **Rules**

In recommending new constituencies, the Commission are required to give effect to the Rules for Redistribution of Seats which are contained in Schedule 2 to the 1986 Act.

Rule 1 places a limit on the total number of constituencies. Rule 2 requires single member constituencies. Rule 3 relates to the City of London. Rule 4 states that county and London borough boundaries are to be followed so far as is practicable. Rule 5 states that the electorates of constituencies are to be as nearly equal as practicable. Rule 6 allows the Commission to depart from rules 4 and 5 if special geographical considerations make a departure desirable. Rule 7 allows the Commission to depart from other rules; and requires them to take account of inconveniences caused or local ties broken by changes to constituencies. Rule 8 defines the electoral quota as the total number of parliamentary electors in England (36,995,157) divided by the existing number of seats (529), and requires the Commission to use the electorates as at the start of a review.

## **Boundary Commission for England**

## **Procedures**

In conducting a general review of constituencies, the Commission are required by the legislation to follow certain procedures, principally to provide for public consultation.

The Secretary of State must be given notice of a review and that notice must be published in the London Gazette. Provisional recommendations must be published in newspapers in the affected constituencies and, unless the proposals are for no changes to be made, they must also be deposited for public inspection in at least one place in each affected constituency.

Representations may be made within one month of publication of the provisional recommendations and the Commission must take any representations into consideration. Where objections are received from a London borough council, or from a body of 100 or more electors, a local inquiry must be held.

If the Commission revise their recommendations as a result of an inquiry, the revised recommendations must also be published and further representations invited and considered. A second local inquiry cannot be forced by these further representations. There is discretionary power to hold a second inquiry, but second inquiries are rarely held.

Any further modifications, as a result of further representations or a second inquiry, must also be published and representations invited. When the Commission have decided their final recommendations for the whole country, they must submit a report to the Secretary of State.

## **Implementation of the recommendations**

The Secretary of State has a statutory duty to lay the Commission's report before Parliament together with a draft Order in Council giving effect to the Commission's recommendations with or without modifications. If modifications are proposed, the Secretary of State must also lay a statement of reasons for the modifications. The draft Order in Council is submitted to both Houses of Parliament for approval and, after it is made by Her Majesty in Council, it cannot be called into question in any legal proceedings. The new constituencies take effect at the general election following the making of the Order in Council.

The above information is intended to be a general guide only. For a definitive statement of the law, please refer to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, as amended by the Boundary Commissions Act 1992, the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994, the Government of Wales Act 1998, and the Scotland Act 1998, together with the Court of Appeal ruling in *R v Boundary Commission for England Ex parte Foot* [1983] QB 600.

## **Crown Copyright**

The outline maps in this document and the maps deposited at the addresses listed above are based on Ordnance Survey data and are subject to ©crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction will infringe Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Any person wishing to reproduce the outline maps or the maps placed on deposit should first contact the Copyright Office at Ordnance Survey, Romsey Road, Southampton SO16 4GU (telephone 023 8079 2929).

## Enquiries

Should you require further information about the Commission's review of the constituencies in South London or about other aspects of the Commission's work please write to:-

Boundary Commission for England  
PO Box 31060  
London  
SW1V 2FF

or send a Fax to 020 7533 5176.

For general enquiries about the Commission's work, please telephone 020 7533 5177 or send an email to [bcomm.england@ons.gov.uk](mailto:bcomm.england@ons.gov.uk)

For enquiries about the Commission's review of specific South London boroughs, please telephone or email:-

<b>London Borough</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Bexley and Greenwich	Alan Bannister 020 7533 5147	<a href="mailto:alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk">alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk</a>
Bromley and Lewisham	Chris Ault 020 7533 5174	<a href="mailto:chris.ault@ons.gov.uk">chris.ault@ons.gov.uk</a>
Croydon	Chris Ault 020 7533 5174	<a href="mailto:chris.ault@ons.gov.uk">chris.ault@ons.gov.uk</a>
Kingston upon Thames and Richmond upon Thames	Gerald Tessier 020 7533 5173	<a href="mailto:gerald.tessier@ons.gov.uk">gerald.tessier@ons.gov.uk</a>
Lambeth and Southwark	Gerald Tessier 020 7533 5173	<a href="mailto:gerald.tessier@ons.gov.uk">gerald.tessier@ons.gov.uk</a>
Merton	Alan Bannister 020 7533 5147	<a href="mailto:alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk">alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk</a>
Sutton	Chris Ault 020 7533 5174	<a href="mailto:chris.ault@ons.gov.uk">chris.ault@ons.gov.uk</a>
Wandsworth	Alan Bannister 020 7533 5147	<a href="mailto:alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk">alan.bannister@ons.gov.uk</a>

The Internet version of this news release and other documents concerning the general review are available on the Commission's web site at the following address:-

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pbc/>