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Introduction

Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹ We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

2 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Susan Johnson OBE
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Andrew Scallan CBE
- Jolyon Jackson CBE (Chief Executive)

What is an electoral review?

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority’s electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed.
- How many wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division.

4 When carrying out an electoral review the Commission has three main considerations:

- Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
- Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
- Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

5 Our task is to strike the best balance between these three considerations when making our recommendations.

More detail regarding the powers that we have, as well as the further guidance and information about electoral reviews and the review process in general, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why Hillingdon?

We are conducting a review of Hillingdon Council (‘the Council’) as its last review was completed in 1999 and we are required to review the electoral arrangements of every council in England ‘from time to time’. In addition, some councillors currently represent many more or fewer voters than others. This is ‘electoral inequality’. Our aim is to create ‘electoral equality’, where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Hillingdon are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

Our proposals for Hillingdon

Hillingdon should be represented by 53 councillors, 12 fewer than there are now.

Hillingdon should have 21 wards, one fewer than there is now.

The boundaries of 19 wards should change; two, Heathrow Villages and West Drayton, should stay the same.

How will the recommendations affect you?

The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change.

Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to consider any representations which are based on these issues.

---

Have your say

14 We will consult on the draft recommendations for a ten-week period, from 8 January 2019 to 18 March 2019. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to comment on these proposed wards, as the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be in making our final recommendations.

15 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

16 You have until 18 March 2019 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 23 for how to send us your response.

Review timetable

17 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Hillingdon. We then held a period of consultation with the public on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

18 The review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 August 2018</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2018</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 January 2019</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 2019</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June 2019</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis and draft recommendations

19 Legislation\(^3\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^4\) there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

20 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

21 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Hillingdon</td>
<td>201,209</td>
<td>227,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,796</td>
<td>4,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. All of our proposed wards for Hillingdon are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2024.

Submissions received

23 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).

Electorate figures

24 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2024, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2019. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 13% by 2024.

25 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

\(^3\) Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

\(^4\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
Number of councillors

26 Hillingdon Council currently has 65 councillors. We have looked at evidence provided by the Council and Hillingdon Labour Group and have concluded that decreasing by twelve councillors will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

27 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 53 councillors, for example, 53 one-councillor wards or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

28 We received three submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. Two of the submissions objected to the reduction in council size but neither proposed an alternative number nor explained how Hillingdon residents would be better represented by more than 53 councillors. The third submission supported the reduction in the number of councillors. Given the lack of detailed evidence in any of these submissions, we based our draft recommendations on a 53-councillor council.

Ward boundaries consultation

29 We received 69 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included three borough-wide proposals: from the Council, Hillingdon Labour Party (‘Labour’) and a resident (‘the first resident’). We also received a proposal for all the wards north of the A40 from a resident (‘the second resident’). The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

30 The three borough-wide schemes provided mixed patterns of wards for Hillingdon. The Council proposed one single-councillor ward, five two-councillor wards and 14 three-councillor wards. Labour proposed ten two-councillor wards and eleven three-councillor wards. The first resident proposed one single-councillor ward, eight two-councillor wards and twelve three-councillor wards. The second resident proposed five two-councillor wards and three three-councillor wards north of the A40. We carefully considered the proposals received and were of the view that the proposed patterns of wards resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas and used clearly identifiable boundaries in some places. When we analysed the schemes, we noted that only the Council’s proposal had good electoral equality in all its wards.

31 Our draft recommendations take into account local evidence that we received, which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals we received did not
provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries.

32 We visited Hillingdon in order to look at the different proposals on the ground. This tour of the area helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

Draft recommendations

33 Our draft recommendations are for twelve three-councillor wards, eight two-councillor wards and one one-councillor ward. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

34 The tables and maps on pages 8–20 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Hillingdon. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation.
- Reflecting community interests and identities.
- Providing for effective and convenient local government.

35 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table starting on page 27 and on the large map accompanying this report.

36 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

---

### Ward name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harefield Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ickenham &amp; South Harefield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Hills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruislip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruislip Manor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ruislip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harefield Village and Ickenham & South Harefield**

37 We received 23 submissions in relation to this area in addition to the three borough-wide proposals and the proposal for wards north of the A40. These were from Ickenham Residents’ Association and 22 residents.

38 The Council and the first resident proposed similar single-councillor Harefield Village and three-councillor Ickenham & South Harefield wards. In both cases, their Ickenham & South Harefield wards included some roads off Ickenham Road to the north of West Ruislip Station. Labour proposed a two-councillor Harefield ward that included part of West Ruislip between Bury Street and Ladygate Lane, and a three-
councillor Ickenham ward that included an area between West Ruislip Station and High Street, Ruislip. These wards would have had good levels of electoral equality. The second resident proposed two two-councillor wards, with his Harefield ward, which would have the same boundaries as the existing ward, having a forecast electoral variance of -29%.

39 Of the other submissions, one stated that there should be no change to the current boundaries in the area and another argued that the Ickenham Park and Brackenbury Village areas had stronger links with West Ruislip than Ickenham. The other 21 submissions, including that of Ickenham Residents’ Association, objected to the fact that that Ickenham is currently split between wards and proposed that Ickenham should be united in the same ward. Residents living south of West Ruislip Station pointed out that Ickenham is where they access most facilities and services. The Residents’ Association proposed that the ward boundary follows the Ickenham Neighbourhood Plan Area, which uses the railway line as its northern boundary and also includes a small area south of the A40 around Hillingdon Station.

40 Having considered all the submissions, we noted that a ward that consisted solely of Harefield, following the boundaries of the current two-councillor Harefield ward, would have an electoral variance of -29% in 2024. This is exceedingly poor electoral equality and the Commission is not persuaded to adopt a ward with such a variance. Therefore, any ward that contains all of Harefield would need to include part of Ickenham, Northwood or Ruislip as well, as proposed in the Labour submission; or Harefield would need to be split with part of it warded with another area, as proposed by the Council and the first resident.

41 We have noted the lengthy consideration of this issue in the Council’s submission and its conclusion that, on balance, the best option is to link south Harefield with Ickenham as the areas have shared ecclesiastical parish and diocese boundaries. These connections are not shared between Harefield and Northwood or Ruislip. We consider that the Council has provided the best evidence for its proposal and we are adopting its Harefield Village ward in our draft recommendations.

42 We received more submissions in relation to Ickenham than any other area in Hillingdon. The vast majority of these submissions supported an Ickenham ward between the railway line and the A40. However, a three-councillor ward that exactly followed these boundaries, the area proposed by Ickenham Residents’ Association, would have an electoral variance of -11%. We note the support for this ward but consider that a ward which includes south Harefield with Ickenham, as proposed by the Council and the first resident, has all of Ickenham in one ward and leads to good electoral equality, which would better reflect our statutory criteria.
43 We propose to adopt the Council’s Ickenham & South Harefield ward, as it fits best with the community evidence we received from residents, subject to two amendments. Firstly, for access reasons, we propose to include the area around Old Clack Farm in our Ickenham & South Harefield ward. This affects very few electors.

44 Secondly, we received submissions from both Ickenham and Ruislip residents which argued that the railway line is a clear and well-known boundary between Ickenham and Ruislip. This concurred with what we saw when we visited the area. In addition, while the nearest residential properties either side of the railway line are geographically very close, the road layout means that the walking distance between them is approximately half a mile. We consider this to be a large gap in an urban area. Therefore, we propose to use the railway line as the north-eastern boundary of our Ickenham & South Harefield ward.

45 Finally, we note that the ward boundary proposed by Ickenham Residents’ Association, but not the Council and the first resident, included the development at Hillingdon Circus, south of the A40. This area currently contains no electors. We have included this area in our Hillingdon East ward as it leads to better electoral equality and we received no evidence about the likely community identity of the people who will live in this area.

**Eastcote, Northwood, Northwood Hills, Ruislip and Ruislip Manor**

46 We received 14 submissions in relation to this area in addition to the three borough-wide proposals and the proposal for wards north of the A40. These were from five local organisations, which included Eastcote Residents’ Association, Northwood Hills Residents’ Association, Ruislip Residents’ Association and nine local residents.

47 The Council proposed four three-councillor wards in this area, using the railway line at Northwood Hills Station as part of its boundary between its Ruislip Woods and Northwood wards. Labour proposed three three-councillor and one two-councillor wards, as it had included two parts of West Ruislip in its Harefield and Ickenham wards. The first resident and the second resident proposed two three-councillor and three two-councillor wards, but with very different boundaries in Eastcote and Ruislip. Both proposals had good electoral equality.

48 Eastcote Residents’ Association and Ruislip Residents’ Association proposed complementary schemes for Eastcote and Ruislip consisting of three-councillor Eastcote and Ruislip wards and a two-councillor Ruislip Manor ward. Both provided maps of what they considered to be the boundaries of their communities, pointing out that both Eastcote and Ruislip are currently split across several wards. Both residents’ associations argued that the Pembroke Park estate looks more to Ruislip than Eastcote and warding it with Ruislip would lead to better electoral equality. Five
residents either supported these proposals or argued for a Ruislip ward that ran from Bury Street to Ruislip Gardens.

49 Northwood Hills Residents’ Association and three residents explained that Northwood Hills was regenerated in 2006, arguing that the success of this regeneration was, in part, due to having a community united in one ward. The shopping area on Joel Street, which crosses the railway line at Northwood Hills Station, is the centre of the community. This would be split by the Council’s proposal. Residents and the Residents’ Association also stated that for community identity reasons it was important that several schools attended primarily by children from Northwood, as well as Northwood Health Centre, were in Northwood Hills ward.

50 The final resident argued that Wentworth Drive should all be in one ward as it is currently split between Eastcote & East Ruislip and Northwood Hills wards.

51 We have considered all the submissions very carefully and also spent some time in the area to consider all the boundaries on the ground.

52 Firstly, in relation to Northwood Hills, we find the evidence provided by Northwood Hills Residents’ Association and the residents to be persuasive. Joel Street goes over the railway line at Northwood Hills Station and shops and businesses are tightly bunched either side of the line. We consider that the railway line does not divide the community in this area. When we visited in the late afternoon, we saw many people crossing the railway line on foot in both directions, more than at any of the other stations we passed during our visit. The written evidence we received regarding the relationship between the community and schools either side of the railway line is also convincing. Therefore, we consider that any ward we create for Northwood Hills in our draft recommendations must be on both sides of the railway line.

53 Given the strong evidence that supports our proposed Ickenham & South Harefield and Northwood Hills wards, the only schemes which fitted with that evidence in Ruislip and Eastcote were those of the first and second resident and the complementary proposals of Eastcote Residents’ Association and Ruislip Residents’ Association. The other wards proposed would not facilitate our recommendations for Ickenham & South Harefield and Northwood Hills wards, which we were persuaded we should adopt.

54 On balance, we consider the proposals of Eastcote Residents’ Association and Ruislip Residents’ Association to be best evidenced and we are persuaded to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations. We note that these were the only proposals that split Ruislip between two wards – all the other proposals split it between at least three wards. However, we have amended the boundary between Ruislip and Ruislip Manor wards proposed by Ruislip Residents’ Association. We
consider the boundary proposed on Windmill Way, West Hatch Manor and Old Hatch splits narrow residential streets between wards and this risked dividing the community. We considered the other boundaries proposed in this area to be unclear. Therefore, we have placed the boundary on Pembroke Road and Park Way. This also leads to very good electoral equality in our Ruislip and Ruislip Manor wards.

55 Finally, in relation to Pembroke Park, we are aware that vehicular access for part of the estate is south through our Eastcote ward and for part it is west through our Ruislip ward. In the absence of more substantial evidence, we have included Pembroke Park in our Ruislip ward, which leads to considerably better electoral equality. However, we would welcome comments from local residents in response to our draft recommendations about the identity of this area.

South Ruislip
56 The boundaries of this ward are affected by our proposals in relation to our Eastcote, Ickenham & South Harefield and Ruislip Manor wards where we received much stronger evidence. In relation to the boundary between Eastcote and South Ruislip wards, Eastcote Residents’ Association in particular stressed that Yeading Brook is a major community boundary in the area. We received almost identical proposals for South Ruislip ward in the borough-wide schemes, with South Ruislip Residents’ Association supporting the Council’s proposal. Accordingly, we are adopting the three-councillor South Ruislip ward proposed by the Council, subject to minor amendments at its north-eastern corner to reflect the proposal of Eastcote Residents’ Association and on its western side to reflect the proposal of Ickenham Residents’ Association.
Barnhill, Belmore and Charville

The only submissions we received for this area were the three borough-wide submissions. They proposed very different boundaries.

The Council proposed two-councillor Barnhill and Charville wards and a three-councillor Yeading ward that were similar to the current wards in the area. It argued that the two parts of its Barnhill ward were linked by Shakespeare Avenue. Labour proposed three two-councillor wards, all of which had poor electoral equality with the highest being 19% in Yeading. The first resident proposed two-councillor Barnhill and Charville wards and a three-councillor Belmore ward. He argued that the northern and southern parts of the current Barnhill and Yeading wards are separated.
by the sizable barrier presented by Yeading Brook, which led to an unsatisfactory boundary.

59 Given the relatively limited evidence we received, we visited the area. As the first resident stated, Yeading Brook does present a significant barrier and we were unable to discern any clear links between the different parts of the wards that crossed it, as proposed by the Council and Labour. We also considered that the Council’s boundaries on Norwood Gardens and Shakespeare Avenue potentially split the communities in these areas. Given the high electoral inequality in the three wards proposed by Labour and the poor reflection of community identity by crossing Yeading Brook in the Council’s proposal, we propose to adopt the first resident’s scheme in this area as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that this leads to the clearest boundaries and an acceptable level of electoral equality.

Hayes Town, Pinkwell and Wood End

60 We received three submissions that referred to this area in addition to the three borough-wide submissions. They were from Hayes Town Business Forum, Hayes Town Partnership and a local resident.

61 The Council proposed three three-councillor wards. In support of its proposals, it stated that its Hayes Town ward reflected the community of Hayes town centre, which is currently split between wards. The Council felt it was important from the perspective of community identity to place all the main business areas of Hayes in one ward. Its Wood End ward would consist of the residential areas of Wood End and Wood End Green that largely look to Hayes for shops and services.

62 Labour proposed two two-councillor wards and two three-councillor wards. Both three-councillor wards had high electoral inequality: -10% in the proposed Townfield ward and -15% in the proposed Pinkwell ward.

63 The first resident also proposed three three-councillor wards. He stated that the Townfield estate is split by the current ward boundaries. It could be reunited by using Church Road as the boundary between his Townfield and Wood End wards. This would also place all of the substantial development at the Nestlé site in his Townfield ward. This would leave all of what he described as ‘historic Hayes’ in his Wood End ward.

64 Both Hayes Town Business Forum and Hayes Town Partnership argued that Hayes town is a distinct place and the current wards mean little to local people. It is confusing for businesses to deal with two sets of councillors and two neighbourhood policing teams. A single ward would allow the business and residential communities to speak with a much clearer voice. The final submission from the resident proposed using the West Coast Mainline as a ward boundary.
We have reviewed all the submissions and consider that we have received persuasive evidence to support putting all of Hayes town centre in one ward, as proposed by the respondents from the local area. Of the three borough-wide submissions, the Council's was the only one that did this. Therefore, we are basing our proposals in this area on the Council's scheme. We consider in particular that effective and convenient local government will be enhanced by the whole business area being represented in one ward rather than two.
Heathrow and West Drayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Drayton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heathrow Villages and West Drayton**

66 We received two submissions in relation to this area in addition to the three borough-wide proposals. These were from Harmondsworth & Sipson Residents’ Association and a local resident. The Residents’ Association argued for the current ward to be broken up into smaller parts and the resident stated that any Heathrow ward should not cross the M4.

67 The Council proposed a three-councillor Heathrow Villages ward and a two-councillor West Drayton ward. It argued that this was a better reflection of the communities. Labour and the first resident proposed retaining the existing wards, with the first resident exploring the possibility of dividing the current Heathrow Villages ward into two single-councillor wards, using the section of the M4 that runs south of Junction 4A as the boundary. The first resident also suggested that the ward containing the airport was renamed either Heathrow & Harlington or Harmondsworth & Harlington to reflect the areas where most of the ward’s electorate lived.
We accept, as the borough-wide submissions did, that the ideal northern boundary of our Heathrow ward would be the M4, which is a clear and substantial boundary. However, a ward entirely south of the motorway would have an electoral variance of -16%. Due to the expected development of the third runway, it is likely that the electorate in this area will fall or grow more slowly than the rest of Hillingdon and therefore electoral inequality will worsen rather than improve. Therefore, we are unwilling to propose a ward with such a high negative variance in this part of the borough.

Given the lack of community evidence in the borough-wide submissions, we visited the area to assess the schemes on the ground. We are concerned that the boundary proposed by the Council that runs along Thornton Avenue, North Road and Wintergreen Boulevard would split the community in those areas, including the incomplete development at Drayton Garden Village. If we moved the Council’s boundary so that it ran along Porters Way and west of Park Lodge Avenue, we considered that the boundary would be reasonably clear, but it would lead to electoral variances of 11% in our Heathrow Villages ward and -14% in our West Drayton ward. We do not consider this level of electoral inequality to be acceptable.

Instead, while the current boundary between the wards is not ideally located, it is clearer than that proposed by the Council, it has been in use for nearly 20 years and we received no other proposals that led to good electoral equality. Accordingly, we are proposing to adopt the Heathrow Villages and West Drayton wards proposed by Labour and the first resident. In relation to the name of our Heathrow Villages ward, we have noted the first resident’s comments that there are no electors living in the Airport itself. However, it is common for us to use generic names for wards that contain several communities or a very prominent, well-known feature. We consider both elements to be the case here and therefore propose to make no change to the current name of the ward.

Given the issues facing residents in this part of the borough and the strength of the M4 as a boundary, we would welcome alternative proposals for this part of Hillingdon that have good electoral equality.
Colham & Cowley, Hillingdon East, Hillingdon West, Uxbridge and Yiewsley

72 We received six submissions in relation to this area in addition to the three borough-wide proposals. These were from North Uxbridge Residents’ Association, Oak Farm Residents’ Association, Uxbridge Business Improvement District and three local residents.

73 All three borough-wide schemes proposed three three-councillor wards and two two-councillor wards in this area, albeit with very different boundaries.

74 The Council proposed an Uxbridge ward that included residential areas north and south of the town centre, arguing that this reunited Uxbridge town centre in one ward and that Park Road was a strong boundary between the town centre and the St Andrew’s development to its east. The Council pointed out that the northern part of
Long Lane in its Hillingdon East ward is not a good boundary as residents in both the Sweetcroft Lane and Ryefield Avenue areas use the shops and businesses on Long Lane. They also travel through Hillingdon Station, which is in the same area.

75 Labour argued that its Oak Farm ward would be concentrated on the Oak Farm estate, which people identified with much more strongly than Hillingdon. They pointed out that Cowley is a distinct settlement between Uxbridge and Yiewsley and that this was being recognised in their proposal.

76 The first resident argued that his proposal reunited Cowley in his Uxbridge South & Cowley ward. Yiewsley had been expanded at the last review beyond its natural boundaries and he proposed to include the Beechwood Avenue and Violet Avenue areas in his Colham ward.

77 Oak Farm Residents’ Association argued in favour of a ward that crossed Long Lane for similar reasons to the Council, pointing out that such an arrangement would strengthen their community. North Uxbridge Residents’ Association, Uxbridge Business Improvement District and one of the residents argued that Uxbridge town centre should be in one ward. One resident stated that Harlington Road and Colham Green Road should be used as boundaries, without providing detailed evidence. The final resident commented on the Council’s proposals without providing much additional evidence.

78 We have carefully considered all the submissions and also toured the area. We noted that the boundaries between Uxbridge North and Uxbridge South wards in both the Labour and the first resident’s schemes used the current boundary that runs along the High Street. We consider that from the evidence provided in relation to the town centre by the Council and others, and based on what we saw when we walked through the town, the High Street is a poor boundary that splits the town centre community along a busy, partially pedestrianised street. We consider that having all of Uxbridge’s sizable shopping centre in one ward will lead to better and clearer representation of businesses in this area. We are persuaded that the Council’s scheme better reflects communities in this area for that reason and it will also lead to more effective and convenient local government. Accordingly, we are adopting the Council’s Uxbridge ward as part of our draft recommendations.

79 We also note that the Council’s proposals accord with the only submission we received for the Hillingdon area from Oak Farm Residents’ Association, which argued in favour of a ward that crosses the northern end of Long Lane. Both of the other borough-wide schemes used Long Lane as a boundary. As we have received more evidence to support it, we propose to adopt the Council’s Hillingdon East and Hillingdon West wards, subject to a small amendment to the south-eastern end of Hillingdon East ward to ensure a clearer boundary with our Charville ward as well as providing for better electoral equality.
We consider that we have received good evidence to support our Hillingdon and Uxbridge wards. Adopting these proposals has affected our scheme in the wards to their south where we received less community evidence. Due to these decisions we are, again, adopting the Council’s Colham & Cowley and Yiewsley wards, subject to a minor change in the Royal Close area that leads to a clearer boundary. However, we would welcome additional evidence in relation to these two wards during the consultation on our draft recommendations.
Conclusions

The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality in Hillingdon, referencing the 2018 and 2024 electorate figures. A full list of wards, names and their corresponding electoral variances can be found at Appendix A to the back of this report. An outline map of the wards is provided at Appendix B.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,796</td>
<td>4,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft recommendations

Hillingdon should be made up of 53 councillors serving 21 wards representing one single-councillor ward, eight two-councillor wards and twelve three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Hillingdon. You can also view our draft recommendations for Hillingdon on our interactive maps at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk
Have your say

82 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole borough or just a part of it.

83 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for Hillingdon, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

84 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

85 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Hillingdon)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

86 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Hillingdon which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters.
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

87 A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.
88 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that each councillor would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in Hillingdon?

89 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents’ association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

90 Effective and convenient local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

91 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

92 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers. This includes your name, postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

93 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

94 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft
Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for Hillingdon Council in 2022.

**Equalities**

95 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.
## Appendices

### Appendix A

*Draft recommendations for Hillingdon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2018)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2024)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Barnhill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Belmore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,312</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>12,286</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Charville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,746</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,295</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Colham &amp; Cowley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,092</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13,598</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eastcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,336</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Harefield Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hayes Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>4,331</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Heathrow Villages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,288</td>
<td>4,144</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hillingdon East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,721</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>12,034</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hillingdon West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ickenham &amp; South Harefield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,571</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,583</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Northwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2018)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
<td>Electorate (2024)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Northwood Hills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,159</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8,709</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Pinkwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>12,968</td>
<td>4,323</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ruislip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,549</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ruislip Manor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8,597</td>
<td>4,299</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 South Ruislip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,940</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Uxbridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,546</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>12,086</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 West Drayton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,189</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>12,749</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wood End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12,961</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Yiewsley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>8,129</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>201,209</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>227,619</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,796</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Hillingdon Council.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (−) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Appendix B

Outline map

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/greater-london/greater-london/hillingdon
Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/greater-london/greater-london/hillingdon

Local Authority

- Hillingdon Council

Political Groups

- Hillingdon Labour Party

Local Organisations

- Eastcote Conservation Panel
- Eastcote Residents’ Association
- Harmondsworth & Sipson Residents’ Association
- Hayes Town Business Forum
- Hayes Town Partnership
- Ickenham Residents’ Association
- North Ruislip Flood Action Group
- North Uxbridge Residents’ Association
- Northwood Hills Residents’ Association
- Oak Farm Residents’ Association
- Ruislip Residents’ Association
- South Ruislip Residents’ Association
- Uxbridge Business Improvement District

Local Residents

- 54 local residents
## Appendix D

### Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council size</strong></td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</strong></td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division</strong></td>
<td>A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral fairness</strong></td>
<td>When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral inequality</strong></td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate</strong></td>
<td>People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of electors per councillor</strong></td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish council</td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also ‘Town council’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish (or town) council electoral arrangements</td>
<td>The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
<td>A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.