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WHY YOUR LOCAL AUTHORITY IS UNDER REVIEW

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and to their electoral arrangements, such as the number of councillors representing residents in each area.

As a result of changes in the electorate, we are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England.

In broad terms, the objective of this periodic electoral review of Hammersmith & Fulham is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor on the Borough Council is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names, and propose the creation or abolition of wards. We cannot recommend changes to the external administrative boundary of the borough as part of this review.

This report sets out our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham. Our conclusions are summarised at the front of the report, and illustrated on the large map inside the back cover. Details of our draft recommendations, and how to comment on them, are set out in Chapters 4 and 5.

We have not yet decided on our final recommendations and wish to use this period to seek further evidence. We will be prepared to modify or change our draft recommendations in the light of views expressed if, in our judgement, the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would be better served. It is therefore important that all those interested in the review should give us their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.
SUMMARY


- This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Hammersmith & Fulham:

- in 10 of the 23 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, and three wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;
- this level of electoral equality is not expected to improve significantly over the next five years.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 108-109) are that:

- Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council should be served by 46 councillors, four fewer than at present;
- there should be 16 wards, seven fewer than at present, which would involve changes to the boundaries of all but one of the existing wards.

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- In all 16 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.
- This improved electoral equality a forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- We will consult on our draft recommendations for 10 weeks from 3 August 1999. We have not yet decided on our final recommendations and wish to use this period to seek further evidence. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses if, in our judgement, the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would be better served. It is important, therefore, that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

- After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

- It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will determine when any changes come into effect.

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 11 October 1999.

Review Manager
Hammersmith & Fulham Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
### Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Constituent areas (existing wards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Askew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coningham ward (part); Starch Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadway ward (part); Brook Green ward (part); Grove ward (part); Margravine ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brook Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Addison ward (part); Brook Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 College Park &amp; Old Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fulham Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eel Brook ward (part); Normand ward (part); Sherbrooke ward (part); Walham ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Margravine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Margravine ward (part); Normand ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Munster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colehill ward (part); Sherbrooke ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 North End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gibbs Green ward; Normand ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Olympia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Avonmore ward; Broadway ward (part); Brook Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Palace Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crabtree ward; Palace ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Parsons Green &amp; Walham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eel Brook ward (part); Palace ward (part); Sands End ward (part); Sullivan ward (part); Town ward (part); Walham ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grove ward (part); Ravenscourt ward; Starch Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sands End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sands End ward (part); Sullivan ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colehill ward (part); Eel Brook ward (part); Town ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 White City &amp; Shepherd's Bush</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Addison ward (part); Coningham ward (part); White City &amp; Shepherd's Bush ward (part); Wormholt ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Wormholt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White City &amp; Shepherd's Bush ward (part); Wormholt ward (part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Map 2 and the large map in the back of this report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

### Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Hammersmith & Fulham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1999)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2004)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Askew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>2,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brook Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 College Park &amp; Old Oak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fulham Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Margravine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Munster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,157</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7,165</td>
<td>2,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 North End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Olympia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,056</td>
<td>2,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Palace Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,534</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>2,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Parsons Green &amp; Walham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,082</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,598</td>
<td>2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sands End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,653</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>2,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 White City &amp; Shepherd's Bush</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,828</td>
<td>2,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Wormholt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Electorate figures are based on Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council's submission.

**Note:** The "variance from average" columns show by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor 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.
1. INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the London borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.

2. In broad terms, the objective of this periodic electoral review of Hammersmith & Fulham is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor on the Borough Council is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

3. In undertaking periodic electoral reviews (PERs), we must have regard to:

   - the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
     a. reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
     b. secure effective and convenient local government;
   - the Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix B).

4. We also have regard to our Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties (second edition published in March 1998). This sets out our approach to the reviews. We are not required to have regard to parliamentary constituency boundaries in developing our recommendations. Any new ward boundaries will be taken into account by the Parliamentary Boundary Commission in its reviews of parliamentary constituencies.

5. The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the borough as a whole. Wherever possible we try to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

6. We are not prescriptive on council size but, as indicated in our Guidance, would expect the overall number of members on a London borough council usually to be between 40 and 80. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that borough but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against an upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a borough's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other boroughs.

7. The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Submission of proposals to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Commission's analysis and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The London Boroughs

8 Our programme of periodic electoral reviews of all 386 local authorities in England started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004. The 1992 Act requires us to review most local authorities every 10 to 15 years. However, the Act is silent on the timing of the first London borough reviews by the Commission. (The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.)

9 Most London boroughs have not been reviewed since 1977. Having discussed the appropriate timing of London borough reviews with local authority interests, we therefore decided to start as soon as possible after the May 1998 London local government elections so that all reviews could be completed, and the necessary orders implementing our recommendations made by the Secretary of State, in time for the next London elections scheduled for May 2002. Our reviews of the 32 London boroughs started on a phased basis in June 1998 and the last group began in February 1999, with completion planned for June 1999 to February 2000.

10 We have sought to ensure that all concerned are aware of our approach to the reviews. Copies of our Guidance have been sent to all London boroughs, along with other major interests. In March 1998 we briefed chief executives at a meeting of the London branch of the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives, and we also met with the Association of London Government. Since then we have welcomed the opportunity to meet with chief officers and, on an all-party basis, members in the great majority of individual authorities. This has enabled us to brief authorities about our policies and procedures, our objective of electoral equity having regard to local circumstances, and the approach taken by the Commission in previous reviews.

11 Before we started our work in London, the Government published for consultation a Green Paper, Modernising Local Government - Local Democracy and Community Leadership (February 1998) which, inter alia, promoted the possibility of London boroughs having annual elections with three-member wards so that one councillor in each ward would stand for election each year. In view of this, we decided that the order in which the London reviews are undertaken should be determined by the proportion of three-member wards in each borough under the current arrangements. On this basis, Hammersmith & Fulham is in the fifth phase of review.

12 The Government's subsequent White Paper, Modern Local Government - In Touch with the People, published in July 1998, sets our legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. For all unitary councils, including London boroughs, it proposed elections by thirds. It also refers to local accountability being maximised where the whole electorate in a council's area is involved in elections each time they take place, thereby pointing to a pattern of three-member wards in London boroughs to reflect a system of elections by thirds.

13 Following publication of the White Paper, we advanced all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the London boroughs, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain the approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 Guidance. Nevertheless, we added that local authorities and other interested parties would no doubt wish to have regard to the Secretary of State's intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. Our general experience is that proposals for three-member ward patterns are emerging from most areas in London.

14 As a separate exercise to the PERs, the Commission was directed by the Secretary of State to review the electoral arrangements of the Greater London Authority. Our recommendations were put to the Secretary of State in November 1998.

15 Finally, it should be noted that there are no parishes in London, and in fact there is no legislative provision for the establishment of parishes in London. This differentiates the reviews of London boroughs from the majority of the other electoral reviews we are carrying out elsewhere in the country, where parishes feature largely and provide the building blocks for district or borough wards.

The Review of Hammersmith & Fulham

16 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBB), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1977 (Report No. 210).

17 Stage One began on 9 February 1999, when we wrote to Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the local authority associations, the Metropolitan Police, Members of Parliament and the Members of the European Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, and the chairmen of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and other publicity, and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 3 May 1999.

18 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

19 Stage Three began on 3 August 1999 and will end on 11 October 1999. This stage involves publication of the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

20 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.
2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

23 Hammersmith & Fulham is situated on the western edge of Inner London in a strategic location on the transport routes between central London and Heathrow and the Thames Valley. It is bounded by the River Thames to the south, Hounslow and Ealing boroughs to the west, Brent to the north and Kensington & Chelsea to the east. Hammersmith & Fulham features a number of significant east/west transport arteries: the Westway (A40(M)), Uxbridge Road (A4020), Goldhawk Road (A402), Talgarth Road (A4) and Lillie Road (A3218). It is also served by four London Underground railway lines (Central, Hammersmith & City, Piccadilly and District). The borough is the third smallest of the 32 London Boroughs in electorate terms and the fourth smallest by area. However, it has the fourth highest population density with 92 inhabitants per hectare. Hammersmith & Fulham is primarily residential in nature, although the north of the borough is dominated by Wormwood Scrubs prison.

24 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

25 The electorate of the borough (February 1999) is 112,861. The Council currently has 50 councillors who are elected from 23 wards (Map 1 and Figure 4). Nineteen wards are each represented by two councillors and four wards elect three councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.

26 As a result, each councillor represents an average of 2,257 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,306 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 10 of the 23 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and in three wards by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalances are in College Park & Old Oak ward, where each of the three councillors represents on average 31 per cent fewer electors than the borough average, and Walham ward, where each of the two councillors represents 24 per cent more electors than the borough average.
### Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Addison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,194</td>
<td>2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Avonmore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>2,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Broadway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Brook Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Colchill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>2,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 College Park &amp; Old Oak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coningham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,795</td>
<td>2,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Crabtree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Eillobrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>2,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gibbs Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>2,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Margravine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Normand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4,455</td>
<td>2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Palace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>2,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ravenscourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>2,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sandi End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,391</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>3,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sherbrooke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sarch Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>2,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sullivan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4,517</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued overleaf*
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

26 At the start of the review, we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council.

27 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received nine representations during Stage One, of which the Borough Council and the Conservative Group on the Council submitted borough-wide schemes. These, with accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment, along with copies of all other representations received.

Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council

28 The Borough Council proposed a reduction in the current council size from 50 to 45 councillors and a pattern of 15 three-member wards throughout the borough. It argued that a decrease in the number of councillors was merited by the Council's new cabinet-style structure, which has streamlined the decision-making process. It also argued that "a reduced council size is seen as appropriate to the Council's new structure and to the political management models set out in the recently published draft Local Government (Organisation and Standards) Bill."

29 Given the proposed change in council size and the existing structure of predominantly two-member wards, the Borough Council's scheme would significantly alter the current warding arrangements, with the exception of Canning Town ward, which would remain unchanged. In the north of the borough, the most significant change would be the creation of a three-member Wormwood ward combining parts of College Park & Old Oak and Wormholt wards, as well as three other new wards – Ravenscourt Park, Shepherds Bush Green and White City – and revised ward boundaries in the existing Brook Green and Broadway wards. In the east, the Council proposed a new North End ward stretching from Fulham Broadway in the south to Hammersmith Road in the north. In the south, to accommodate the significant development planned for Imperial Wharf in Sands End ward, the Council proposed giving the ward a third councillor and extending it northwards to Fulham Broadway. It proposed six new three-member wards – Baron's Court, Dawes, Fulham Reach, Munster, North End and Baron's Green – as well as a revised Palace ward.

Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council

28 The Conservative Group proposed that the number of councillors be increased by one to 51, representing 17 three-member wards. They did not accept the Council’s reasons for proposing a substantial change in council size, namely the adoption of a cabinet-style of administration, and argued that the current council size is broadly appropriate for the borough. While the Conservatives’ proposals would modify all of the existing wards, the retention of a broadly similar council size would mean that boundary changes tended to be less marked than in the Borough Council’s submission. In the north of the borough, they put forward six new three-member wards – Askew, Godolphin, Olympia, Shepherd’s Bush, White City and Wormwood – and proposed revising the existing Broadway, Brook Green and Ravenscourt (renamed Ravenscourt Park) wards. They put forward six new three-member wards in the south of the borough – Filmer, Harlington,
Marker, Monster, North End and Palace Riverside — and proposed similar arrangements to the Council for the Sands End/Penton’s Green area. The Conservative Group’s proposals would provide electoral variances of no more than 3 per cent from the borough average in 16 of the 17 wards. Their proposed Sands End ward would have 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average currently, improving to 1 per cent more by 2004. The Conservative Group’s proposals are summarized in Appendix A.

Other Representations

31 We received a further seven representations from other interested parties in Hammersmith & Fulham. Hammersmith & Fulham Liberal Democrats proposed a council size of 51 but made no detailed proposals on the basis that they had insufficient time and resources. Edward Woods Tenants & Residents’ Association and Councillor Gibbons proposed that the Edward Woods Estate should remain linked with Shepherd’s Bush rather than being combined with areas to the south of Shepherd’s Bush Green and Goldhawk Road. Councillor Gibbons argued this could be best facilitated by retaining a two-member College Park & Old Oak ward. The Fulham Society expressed a preference for three-member wards and suggested any new warding arrangements should reflect natural boundaries in the borough, especially London Underground railway lines, Tidgarth Road and Lillie Road. West Kensington Residents’ Association and Councillor Mallinson objected to the Borough Council’s proposal to divide the existing Avonmore ward and favoured the Conservative Group’s proposal for the area. Councillor Brendan Bird submitted alternative proposals to the Borough Council for the south-east of the borough. He proposed creating two new wards — Sands End & Sullivan and Penton’s Green & Fulham — oriented north-south rather than east-west.

32 As part of the Borough Council’s own consultation process, the Association of Residents in Sands End (ARISE), Philpot Square Residents’ Association, Sands End Adventure Project & Sands End Flavhouse, Sullivan Court Residents’ Association and four residents indicated their preference for Councillor Bird’s alternative option for this area. Brook Green Association argued that Brook Green and Addison wards should be combined rather than combining them with areas to the south of the Hammersmith Road. Also as part of the Borough Council’s own consultation process, Hammersmith & Fulham Labour Party supported the Borough Council’s proposals. One resident opposed any re-warding which would affect the political balance on the authority “by mixing middle class areas with deprived ones”, while another resident proposed a council size of 40 and suggested that all of Veldham Road should remain within one ward, preferably Broadway ward.

33 The Conservative Group undertook its own consultation exercise and received five submissions. Rosebank Residents’ Association opposed the Borough Council’s proposed Fulham Reach ward and expressed concern regarding the proposed reduction in the number of councillors. Novello Street Action Group argued for a ward focused round the King’s Road and Ed Brook Common. The Rotary Club of Hammersmith supported the Conservative Group’s proposals in general. One resident also supported the Conservative Group’s proposal to extend Avonmore ward northwards to include the Olympia area.

4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

34 As indicated previously, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham is to achieve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the ratio of electors to councillors being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

35 However, our function is not merely arithmetical. First, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. Second, we must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries, and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken. Third, we must consider the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities.

36 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

37 Our Guidance states that, while we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, such an objective should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. The new electoral system could also be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or result in, an imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. In views of predominantly urban areas such as the London boroughs, our experience suggests that we would expect to achieve a high degree of electoral equality in all wards.

Electorate Forecasts

38 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of 2 per cent from 112,861 to 115,302 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expected most of the growth to be in Ravenscourt and Sands End wards due to the proposed redevelopment of Queen Charlton Hospital and the Imperial Wharf sites in each ward respectively. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to the unitary development plan for the borough, and the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

39 We accept that this is an exact science, and having given consideration to the Council’s forecast electorates, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

40 We indicated in our Guidance that we would normally expect the number of councillors serving a London borough to be in the range of 40 to 80. As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

41 Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council currently has 50 members. The electorate of the borough has fluctuated over the past 20 years, with the current electorate almost identical to that in 1978 (113,050). The Borough Council proposed reducing the number of councillors for the borough from 50 to 45, while the Conservative Group on the Council proposed increasing the current council size by one to 51. The
Hammersmith & Fulham and Ealing, Acton & Shepherds Bush Liberal Democrats expressed their support for the current council size, but proposed reducing it to 51 councillors in order to create 17 three-member wards.

42 The Borough Council argued that Hammersmith & Fulham was the first borough to have set up a full cabinet model of internal management prior to the Commission embarking on its PER (in June 1998) and that political structure is therefore a consideration when addressing the issue of council size. It considered that a reduction of 51 was appropriate when it had a traditional committee system, but it would not be cost-effective in favour of the smallest size for an authority commensurate with the efficient and democratic discharge of its duties. It argued that while a council size of 50 was appropriate when it had a traditional committee system, this was not the case as much of the authority’s work now rested with the Mayor and his six deputies. The Borough Council noted that a reduction to 45 councillors would place the Council towards the lower end of the Commission’s 40 to 80 councillor band, yet it considered that even a council size of 45 may be high in view of future systems of modernised local government. It noted that the current council size was established in 1969 and predicted that over the period 1965 to 2004 there will have been a net reduction of 54,470 in the borough’s population.

43 The Conservative Group proposed a council size of 51, one councillor more than at present, to facilitate a pattern of three-member wards across the borough. When introducing a cabinet style of management, the Conservative Group stated that one of the main aims had been to give greater prominence to councillors’ role within their areas and to improve representation, and that at no stage had there been any suggestion of modifying council size. They noted that while some 90 per cent of authorities are proposing a move to cabinet style government, no significant change in council size has been proposed in the majority. The proposed 51 council size would be the smallest in London and, they argued, would run counter to the Commission’s preference to build on local consensus in this case the Council “has neither sought nor achieved”. They contrasted the situation with Lewisham, Havering and Bilington where proposed changes in council size were based on a political consensus within the authorities concerned.

44 Hammersmith & Fulham and Ealing, Acton & Shepherds Bush Liberal Democrats considered that the change to internal management arrangements was an insufficient reason to change council size. They argued that “the recent move towards a centralised decision-making process by the ruling group is an experiment, and it is not accepted by all parties within the borough. They also commented that Hammersmith & Fulham is an inner-city borough with high incidences of local deprivation leading to low levels of casework for councillors.

45 As part of the Conservative Group’s own consultation, Rosebank Residents’ Association expressed concern about a further reduction in council size and felt it may result in a noticeable deceleration in the services received from local councillors. One local resident favoured a reduction in council size to 40, while another local resident opposed any decrease in council size, arguing that individual councillors would have less time to spend on constituents’ problems and that a reduction in wards would divide historically cohesive areas.

46 The issue of council size has not generally proved contentious during our periodic electoral reviews. The indicative range bands set out in the Guidance — 40 to 90 councillors for London boroughs — appear to have met with general acceptance, and while we have indicated that we are prepared to consider changes to council size, most authorities have proposed maintaining broadly the existing number of councillors or relatively modest change. This range, however, is not intended to be prescriptive and we recognize that in some authorities a lower council size may be appropriate.

47 We recognize that in relation to Hammersmith & Fulham, there is no consensus over the issue of council size and that the change to a new system of internal management was not predicated on a reduction in council size. However, Hammersmith & Fulham is one of the smallest boroughs in London and has been operating a new system of internal management for a year. Under the new structure, much of the decision-making now rests with the Mayor and his six deputies. We have clear evidence of a new structure of political management in operation and consider that as a consequence, it is not appropriate for the Council to reassess what would be the most appropriate council size for the borough. We are also aware that Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council has undertaken local consultation on changes to the Council’s political structures and future democratic structures. We do not consider that a reduction in council size of the level suggested by the Council would lead to a deterioration in the convenience and effectiveness of local government in the borough, and are therefore content to put forward a reduction in council size.

48 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we therefore conclude that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would best be met by a council size of 46, rather than 45 as proposed by the Borough Council.

Electoral Arrangements

49 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council and the Conservative Group on the Council. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which we feel we should inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.

50 First, we have been persuad by the evidence submitted in support of a reduction in council size and, as detailed earlier, we are proposing a council of 46 members as part of our draft recommendations. This reduction in council size — resulting in an increase in the average councillor to electorate ratio from 2,357 to 2,484 — together with the significant electoral imbalances evident in the current wards would mean that we are proposing significant changes to the existing ward pattern in our draft recommendations.

51 Second, the current electoral arrangements provide for predominantly two-member wards in Hammersmith & Fulham, although there are also four three-member wards. The Borough Council and the Conservative Group both submitted proposals for future electoral arrangements based on a pattern of three-member wards for the borough. In most London boroughs, we have put forward a pattern consisting entirely of three-member wards. Upon inspection, we considered that there are a number of significant physical barriers in the borough, such as the Westway, Talgarth Road and Lillie Road, which we believe should continue to be reflected in any future warding arrangement. In order to do this, and reflect our view that a reduction in council size is appropriate, we propose putting forward a mixed pattern of 14 three-member wards and two two-member wards.

52 Third, we have noted the arguments put to us about community identities in the borough. We have tried to reflect such considerations in our draft recommendations where it would be consistent with the objective of electoral equality. Although we note that there is no consensus locally on the precise boundary of such communities.

53 Finally, both borough-wide schemes submitted would provide improved electoral equality. Under the Borough Council’s and the Conservative Group’s proposals the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough would reduce from 10 to one. By 2004, no ward would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average in each of these schemes. We consider, however, that in order to produce a uniform pattern of three-member wards in the borough, both of the borough-wide schemes have had to unite areas either side of significant physical boundaries which would not, in our view, reflect community identities in these areas.

54 Wherever possible, we have sought to build on the proposals put to us by the Borough Council, the Conservatives and other interested parties in formulating our draft recommendations. Our draft recommendations would provide a substantial improvement on the current warding arrangement, as well as a reasonable level of electoral equality. The proposals would provide for a council size which in our view reflects the balance of arguments put to us, and would better reflect community identities by utilizing the significant east/west boundaries of the Westway (A40(M)), Talgarth Road (A4) and Lillie Road.

55 Under our draft recommendations no ward would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average currently. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years, so that by 2004 no ward would have an electoral variances in excess of 6 per cent from the average. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

(a) College Park & Old Oak, White City & Shepherd’s Bush and Wormholt wards;

(b) Canning Town, Ravenscourt and Starch Green wards;
(w) Grove and Broadway wards;
(x) Addison, Aonmore and Brook Green wards;
(y) Crabtree, Margravine and Palace wards;
(z) Gibbs Green, Normand and Wilham wards;
(a) Colchill and Sherbrooke wards;
(b) Eldbrook, Sands End, Sylvania and Town wards.

Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inset at the back of the report.

College Park & Old Oak, White City & Shepherd's Bush and Wormold wards

57 The three wards of College Park & Old Oak, White City & Shepherd's Bush and Wormold are located in the north of the borough and are represented by three councillors each. College Park & Old Oak covers that area of the borough to the north of the Westway (A40M) and is a large, disparate ward containing Wormold Scrubs prison. The ward currently has the worst level of electoral inequality in the borough, with 31 per cent fewer elected per councillor than that borough average. White City & Shepherd's Bush and Wormold wards are also over-represented with 7 per cent and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. The level of electoral equality in each ward is not projected to improve significantly by 2004.

58 The Borough Council proposed creating three new three-member wards for the area. It proposed a new Wormold ward combining the existing College Park & Old Oak ward with part of the existing Wormold ward. The Council stated that while "College Park & Old Oak has a natural southern boundary the Westway", it proposed breaching the road in order to achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality and a three-member ward. It proposed that part of Wormold ward comprising the Cleverley and Wormold estates (containing around 3,000 electors) should form part of the new Wormold ward and that the Westway should form the southern boundary of the eastern part of the ward. The Borough Council's proposed White City ward would be bounded by the Westway in the north and Uxbridge Road in the south, and would contain part of Wormold ward to the east of Galloway Road and the area to the north-west of the London Underground Hammersmith & City Line, currently in College Park & Old Oak and White City & Shepherd's Bush wards. The area to the south-east of the Hammersmith & City Line, including the Edward Woods estate, would form part of a new Shepherd's Bush Green ward. The Borough Council's proposed Wormold and White City wards would have 1 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently (both equal to the borough average by 2004), based on a council size of 45.

59 The Conservative Group put forward three new three-member wards for this area of the borough - Wormold, White City and Shepherd's Bush. Their proposed Wormold ward, similar to that proposed by the Borough Council, would comprise all of the existing College Park & Old Oak ward (excluding the area to the south of the Westway) and the Wormold and Cleverley estates currently located in Wormold ward. They argued that the Westway "would normally form an ideal ward boundary", but the number of electors to the north of it was not sufficient to form a three-member ward and therefore they opted to breach the Westway in the west to achieve electoral equality. Their proposal of a remaining part of Wormold should be joined with the White City Estate and Barman Close, currently in White City & Shepherd's Bush ward, to form a new three-member White City ward. Their proposed Shepherd's Bush ward would contain most of the existing White City & Shepherd's Bush ward, the part of College Park & Old Oak to the south of the Westway and the northern half of Addison ward, which they argued would coincide with the community around Shepherd's Bush into one ward. Under the Conservative Group's scheme, Wormold, White City and Shepherd's Bush wards would have electoral variations of no more than 2 per cent from the borough average (1 per cent by 2004), based on a council size of 51.

60 In his submission, Councillor Ivan Gibbons argued that the simplest warding arrangement in the north of the borough would be to retain the existing College Park & Old Oak ward and that the Westway should form the southern boundary of the eastern part of the ward. The Borough Council's proposed White City ward would be bounded by the Westway in the north and Uxbridge Road in the south, and would contain part of Wormold ward to the east of Galloway Road and the area to the north-west of the London Underground Hammersmith & City Line, currently in College Park & Old Oak and White City & Shepherd's Bush wards. The area to the south-east of the Hammersmith & City Line, including the Edward Woods estate, would form part of a new Shepherd's Bush Green ward. The Borough Council's proposed Wormold and White City wards would have 1 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently (both equal to the borough average by 2004), based on a council size of 45.

61 Having considered the representations received, we note that the particular geography of the existing three-member College Park & Old Oak ward, situated in the northernmost part of the borough and bounded on three sides by the boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Kensington & Chelsea, presents formidable obstacles to the revision of ward boundaries in the area. Consequently, any proposals for change in this area would have a disproportionate effect on the whole of the north of the borough. In particular, under the Council's proposal, the Edward Woods estate would be combined with areas to the south of Goldhawk Road which is opposed both by the Edward Woods Tenants & Residents' Association and Councillor Gibbons. College Park & Old Oak ward is relatively sparsely populated and in order to achieve a level of Electoral equality the remaining part of Wormold should be joined with the White City Estate and Barman Close, currently in White City & Shepherd's Bush ward, to form a new three-member White City ward. Their proposed Shepherd's Bush ward would contain most of the existing White City & Shepherd's Bush ward, the part of College Park & Old Oak to the south of the Westway and the northern half of Addison ward, which they argued would coincide with the community around Shepherd's Bush into one ward. Under the Conservative Group's scheme, Wormold, White City and Shepherd's Bush wards would have electoral variations of no more than 2 per cent from the borough average (1 per cent by 2004), based on a council size of 51.

Coningham, Ravenscourt and Starch Green wards

64 Coningham, Ravenscourt and StARCH Green wards are located in the north-west of the borough and are represented by two councillors each. Currently, Coningham ward has 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Ravenscourt and Starch Green wards have 6 per cent and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average. The level of electoral equality is not expected to improve significantly by 2004.

65 The Borough Council's scheme proposed no changes to the existing Coningham ward, which it argued has the clear and natural boundaries of Uxbridge Road, Ashew Road, Goldhawk Road and the London Underground Hammersmith & City Line. It proposed a new three-member Ravenscourt Park, covering all of the existing Starch Green ward together with the western part of Ravenscourt ward. Under the Borough Council's proposals, the remaining part of Ravenscourt ward would form part of a revised
three-member Broadway ward. The Council's proposed Coningham ward would have in 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, both now and in 2004, and Ravenscourt Parks ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor currently, improving to equal to the borough average by 2004, based on a council size of 45.

The Conservative Group proposed creating a new three-member Askew ward, which would cover the northern part of Starch Green ward and the western part of Broadway ward. The eastern part of Coningham ward would be combined with part of Grove ward to form part of a new Godolphin ward. Similar to the Borough Council, they put forward a new Ravenscourt Park ward, although their ward would have different boundaries. Their proposed ward would contain the southern part of Starch Green ward, the area to the south of Wexford Road, the majority of Ravenscourt ward and the western part of Grove ward, thereby uniting "a large community around Ravenscourt Park, the dominant feature of the new ward". The Conservative Group's proposed Askew and Ravenscourt Park ward would both have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (1 per cent below and equal to the borough average by 2004 respectively), assuming a council size of 51.

Having carefully considered the representations received for this area, we note that the Borough Council and the Conservative Group proposed different options, with respect to the existing Coningham and Starch Green wards. While the Borough Council proposed retaining the existing Coningham ward, the Conservative Group put forward a proposal, combining part of Coningham with part of Starch Green ward. The lack of consensus would appear to suggest there is no agreement as to the boundaries of communities in this area and in particular to the significance of Askew Road. Upon inspection, we were not persuaded that Askew Road is as significant as other primary roads in the borough that it acts as a significant boundary between communities. We consider that in order to reflect community ties and achieve reasonable electoral equality in the neighbouring White city & Shepherd's Bush ward, there is a good case for dividing the current Coningham ward and creating a new ward straddling Askew Road. The Conservatives argued that Askew Road acts as a focal point, uniting communities on both sides of the road, and that it is 'the centre of the community in this area of Hammersmith, providing a 'Key Local Shopping Centre' in the Borough's UDP ['Unitary Development Plan']'. We therefore propose creating a new three-member Askew ward, similar to that proposed by the Conservative Group, which would contain the part of Starch Green ward to the north of Wexford Road and Ravenscourt Road/Ash Church Terrace and the part of Coningham ward to the west of Stowe Road.

We also note that both borough-wide schemes proposed creating a new three-member Ravenscourt Park ward, combining areas either side of Goldhawk Road. The Borough Council's proposed Ravenscourt Park ward would contain all of Starch Green ward and most of Ravenscourt ward, whereas the Conservative Group's proposed ward would contain the southern part of Starch Green ward, most of Ravenscourt ward and part of Grove ward. We are content to put forward a three-member Ravenscourt Park ward as part of our draft recommendations based on these proposals made to us. Our proposed ward would contain all of the existing Ravenscourt ward together with the part of Starch Green ward to the south of Wexford Road and Binden Road/Ash Church Terrace. In order to further improve electoral equality, we also propose creating a new ward straddling Goldhawk Road, which would contain the part of Grove ward to the east of Brackenbury Road and part of Coningham ward to the west. They also put forward a revised three-member Broadway ward, which they argued would unite all the main civic and amenity sites of the Hammersmith Green and Broadway within one ward for the first time. This ward would combine the existing Broadway ward, excluding the area to the south of Queen Caroline Street (which would likely propose to be combined with Cranford and Palace wards to the south and west of Fulham Palace Road, together with the part of Godolphin ward to the north of Grenville Road and the part of Ravenscourt ward to the east of Rivercourt Road and Ravenscourt Road. The Conservative Group's proposed Godolphin and Broadway wards would have 1 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1 per cent below and 1 per cent above by 2004), assuming a council size of 51.

As part of the Borough Council's consultation exercise, a local resident proposed including the whole of Yeldham Road within Broadway ward, rather than dividing the street between Broadway ward and Fulham Reach ward, as proposed by the Borough Council.

Having considered the representations received, we note that there is considerable agreement regarding the creation of a three-member Broadway ward centring on Hammersmith town centre, although the Borough Council and the Conservative Group disagreed about the precise boundaries of the revised ward. In the light of this broad agreement, we are content to put forward a three-member Broadway ward as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposal to retain Goldhawk Road as a boundary and to include part of the existing Grove ward within a new Ravenscourt Park ward, as described above, limits the centre to which we are able to consider the Conservative Group's proposals for a new Godolphin ward, which was based on a council size of 51. We concur with the Borough Council that the existing Broadway ward "cannot claim to have particularly strong or natural boundaries with other wards" and consider that the current ward unites several communities which focus on the town centre. Our proposals are based on the Borough Council's, although we have made some changes. In particular, we propose to largely retain the existing southern boundary of Broadway ward which we consider would have the advantage of retaining the Peabody and Guinness estates within a ward based on Hammersmith town centre and reflecting the parish boundary with Fulham. However, we have taken into account a local resident's suggestion that Yeldham Road should not be divided between Broadway and Margravine wards and propose that all of Yeldham Road and Bicely Road, which can be accessed only from Fulham Palace Road, be included within a revised Broadway ward.

We concur with the Borough Council's view that the existing boundary between Avonmore and Broadway wards should be modified, and propose that the area to the east of Shortlands should be combined with Avonmore ward. As outlined above, we propose that part of Grove ward should be transferred to a new Ravenscourt Park ward and therefore that only the part of Grove ward to the east of Brackenbury Road should form part of the revised Broadway ward. We further propose to include the part of Addison ward to the south of Brook Green in the new ward. We consider that Hammersmith Broadway and Town Centre are the
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clear focal points for residents in all of these areas and that this proposal would achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality. Under the proposed electoral arrangements, Broadway ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to 2 per cent from the average by 2004.

Addison, Avonmore and Brook Green wards

The wards of Addison, Avonmore and Brook Green are situated in the east of the borough and are bounded by the London Underground Hammersmith & City Line in the west, Goldhawk Road and Shepherd’s Bush Green to the north and the Talgarth Road and West Cromwell Road to the south. Each ward is currently represented by two councillors. Under existing arrangements, Addison and Brook Green wards are considerably under-represented with 15 per cent and 21 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Avonmore ward currently has 3 per cent more than average. The level of electoral equality in each ward is not expected to change significantly by 2004.

The Borough Council proposed that the three wards be divided between three new three-member wards – Shepherd’s Bush Green, Brook Green and North End. The Borough Council stated that Addison and Brook Green wards “cover a mass of residential streets primarily to the east of Shepherd’s Bush Road for which there is no natural boundary” and argued that the present boundary is confusing to electors and those who represent them. It proposed combining the area around Shepherd’s Bush Green and west of the London Underground Hammersmith & City Line, currently in White City & Shepherd’s Bush ward, with the more northerly part of the area (excluding around 200 electors in the southern part) and a small area of Brook Green ward to the north of Caithness Road to form a three-member Shepherd’s Bush Green ward. The Council proposed that the remaining part of Brook Green ward should be combined with the part of Broadway ward to the east of the Broadway Centre and the part of Avonmore ward to the west of North End Road to form a revised three-member Brook Green ward. It proposed that the part of Avonmore ward to the east of North End Road should form part of a new North End ward. The Borough Council’s proposed Shepherd’s Bush Green and Brook Green wards would have electoral variances of 1 per cent from the borough average, currently and by 2004, based on a council size of 45.

The Conservatives put forward a revised three-member Brook Green ward and a new three-member Olympia ward for the area. They argued that the southern part of Addison ward has a “natural affinity” with the area covered by Brook Green ward, should be joined with it with the exception of the area to the south of Arnhem Road and Hazlitt Road which should be combined with Avonmore ward to form a new three-member Olympia ward. They stated that the southern boundary of this ward would ideally be the Talgarth Road, but that for reasons of electoral equality they proposed including a section of Gibbs Green ward to the north of Comeragh Road and east of Hammersmith Cemetery (containing around 1,200 electors). The Conservative Group’s proposed Brook Green and Olympia wards would have 2 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to equal the borough average in both wards by 2004, assuming a council size of 51.

Councillor Mallinson objected to the Borough Council’s proposal to divide the existing Avonmore ward between two new wards, and proposed extending the current ward westwards to Hammersmith Broadway. West Kensington Residents Association supported the retention of the existing Avonmore ward and opposed the Borough Council’s proposal to divide the ward between new Brook Green and North End wards, which they argued reflect usage, unconnected areas. They considered that the Conservative proposal to enlarge the ward northwards to include the Olympia area was preferable. A local resident also opposed any division of Avonmore ward and supported the council’s proposals to create a new Olympia ward, stating that “the extension to the north is quite acceptable as Olympia has a big effect on the area and its inclusion would enable the [West Kensington] Residents Association to form even closer ties with its management for the benefit of the area.” He also suggested that Avonmore ward could be extended westwards to Caled Gardens, currently in Broadway ward, rather than breaching the Talgarth Road as put forward by the Conservatives. As part of the Borough Council’s own consultation process, the Brook Green Association argued that the current Addison and Brook Green wards form a cohesive unit, and regretted that the Council’s proposed Brook Green ward would include areas to the south of the Hammersmith Road and split up the Peabody Estate and would not include Augustine Road, Applegarth Road and Dummery Road.

Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One, we note that there is a lack of consensus regarding the most appropriate warding arrangements for the existing Addison, Avonmore and Brook Green wards. We also note that several respondents opposed the Borough Council’s division of Avonmore ward along North End Road. We are not persuaded that North End Road acts as a barrier between communities in this area, while the Talgarth Road and West Cromwell Road are of greater significance. On this basis, we have decided to base our proposals on the Conservative Group’s proposed three-member Olympia ward which we consider provides the most appropriate warding arrangement for the area. We concur with their assessment that the Olympia exhibition centre “has a very strong influence on the lives of those in its vicinity, notably the impact of parking traffic and noise”. We therefore divide the existing two-three-member Olympia ward which is broadly based on the Conservative Group’s submission, albeit with significant boundary changes in order to achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality under a council size of 45. Our proposed ward would contain all of the existing Avonmore ward, part of Broadway ward to the east of Shortlands and part of Brook Green ward to the east of Brook Green. The northern boundary of our proposed Olympia ward would run to the rear of Caithness Road, the rear of the properties on the north side of Faroe Road and the centre of Milton Road to the southern boundary. We recognise that this northern boundary is less than ideal, but have taken into account comments made by the Brook Green Association in formulating our proposals.

With respect to Brook Green ward, we note that the Borough Council and the Conservative Group each put forward a three-member Brook Green ward, but with different ward boundaries. We proposed combining Addison ward, excluding those roads with sole access from Goldhawk Road (Wells Road, Woodger Road and Bamboro Gardens), with the northern part of Brook Green ward to form a three-member Brook Green ward. The southern boundary of this ward would follow the centre of Brook Green, the rear of Caithness Road, the north side of Faroe Road and the centre of Milton Road to the borough boundary.

As outlined above, the areas to the south would form part of our proposed Broadway and Olympia wards. Under our proposed warding arrangements Brook Green and Olympia wards were 4 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (4 per cent more and 6 per cent fewer by 2004).

Crabtree, Margravine and Palace wards

Crabtree and Palace wards broadly cover the area between Fulham Palace Road and the River Thames in the south, and the borough. Margravine ward is located to the south of the Hammersmith Flyover/Talgarth Road between Fulham Palace Road and The Queen’s Club. Under existing electoral arrangements, each ward is represented by two councillors. Crabtree, Margravine and Palace wards are all currently over-represented with 6 per cent, 2 per cent and 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. The level of electoral equality in each ward is not projected to improve by 2004.

Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council proposed creating two three-member wards – Fulham Reach and Palace – for this area. Its proposed Fulham Reach ward would cover the area to the south of Hammersmith Bridge Road (currently in Broadway ward), the majority of the existing Margravine ward and the northern part of Crabtree ward. The ward would also contain The Queen’s Club and Greyhound Road currently located in Gibbs Green ward and Greyhound Mansions from Woolwich ward. The Council felt that these otherwise isolated electors and would further improve electoral equality in that ward. The Council argued that, in the north, Fulham Palace Road “acts as a focal point for the community and the River Thames” and named its ward after Fulham Reach, the area to the south side of Hammersmith Bridge. The Borough Council put forward a revised three-member Palace ward, covering the existing Palace ward, the southern part of Crabtree ward and the part of Tew ward to the south of and including Fulham Road. Under its proposed warding arrangements, Fulham Reach and Palace wards would both have electoral variances equal to the borough average currently (2 per cent fewer and 1 per cent fewer respectively by 2004), based on a council size of 45.

The Conservative Group put forward a new three-member Palace Riverside ward, containing all of Crabtree ward, the part of Palace ward to the north of Putney Bridge and a small part of
Broadway ward to the south of Queen Caroline Street. As with the Borough Council's Palace ward, Fulham Palace Road would serve as the eastern boundary of the ward. The Conservative Group argued that the new ward would have a "strong commonality of interest in the close proximity of all its residents to the Thames" and that the Palace Riverside name would reflect the dominant feature of the area, Fulham Palace and the River Thames. They proposed that the remaining part of Palace ward to the south of Putney Bridge should form part of a new Hurlingham ward, together with part of the Town ward to the south of Fulham Road and part of Sands End ward to the west of Peterborough Road. The Conservatives argued that the new Hurlingham ward would form a logical triangle between the river, Fulham Road and the Pursons Green Lane and Peterborough Road. With respect to the existing Magravine ward, they proposed that the area to the north of Greyhound Road should form part of a revised Broadway ward, as described above. The remaining area of Magravine to the south of Greyhound Road would be combined with Colne Hill ward to form part of a new three-member Munster ward. The Conservative Group's proposed Palace Riverside ward would have electoral variances of no more than 1 per cent currently and by 2004, based on a council size of 51 members.

66 As part of the Conservative Group's own consultation exercise, Rosebank Residents' Association expressed their opposition to the Borough Council's proposed Fulham Reach ward. They argued that the River Thames and the Fulham Palace Road provide logical boundaries for this area and that "Fulham Palace Road is a major traffic artery which separates [residents] from those in the Town ward." As part of the Borough Council's own consultation exercise, a local resident suggested that the proposed Fulham Reach ward should be named Augustine ward. The Fulham Society suggested any new warding arrangements should reflect natural boundaries and historic areas in the borough and argued that the boundary between the Borough Council's proposed Fulham Reach and Palace wards does not meet this criteria. The Liberal Democrats opposed the Borough Council's proposed Fulham Reach ward citing concern over the political impact of such a proposal.

67 Having carefully considered the representations received, we note that both the Borough Council and the Conservatives proposed expanding the current Palace ward northwards to incorporate areas alongside the River Thames. However, they differed on the most appropriate boundaries for the ward. We also note that there was some local opposition to the Borough Council's proposed Fulham Reach ward, with residents near the current boundary of Fulham Palace Road. We note the Conservative Group's view that the communities in Cranbee and Palace ward share much affinity and are significant in the east-west boundary. We have not been persuaded that the Borough Council's proposed Fulham Reach ward adequately fulfils the statutory criteria, and are basing our part on the Conservative Group's proposals for this area. Nevertheless, given our proposed council size of 46, we are unable to put forward their proposed Palace Riverside ward in its entirety, as it was based on a council size of 51 members. We propose creating a three-member Palace Riverside ward, comprising the existing Cranbee and most of Palace ward, excluding the area to the north of Hurlingham Road. The remaining part of Palace ward would form part of a revised Parsons Green & Wallah ward, as discussed below.

68 With respect to the existing Magravine ward, we note that there was a lack of commonalities between the borough-wide proposals for this area. The Borough Council proposed combining Magravine ward with Cranbee ward, whereas the Conservative Group proposed dividing the ward between Broadway and Munster wards. Our view that a new Palace Riverside ward should not breach Fulham Palace Road and that we should largely maintain the existing southern boundary of Broadway ward, described previously, is directed by the extent to which we are able to put forward either borough-wide proposal for this area. We note that the current ward has several significant boundaries, including the London Underground District Line and Talgarth Road in the north, Fulham Palace Road in the west and Lillie Road in the south and consider that any warding arrangement in this area should respect these prominent boundaries. In the light of this, we consider that there are sound electoral equality and community arguments for retaining a two-member Magravine ward and put this forward as part of our draft recommendations. The Liberal Democrats opposed the proposed changes. We propose that the south side of Yelldon Road and all of Biscay Road in the north of the ward, which can be accessed only from Fulham Palace Road, should be transferred to a new Broadway ward, as described above. This change would ensure that all of Yelldon Road is located within one ward.

69 We also propose that the ward expand eastwards to include the part of Gibbs Green ward to the west of Queens Club Gardens. Under our proposed warding arrangements, Palace Riverside and Magravine wards would each have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (1 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer respectively by 2004).

Gibbs Green, Normand and Wallah wards

70 Gibbs Green, Normand and Wallah wards are located in the east of the borough, stretching from Kings Road in the south to Talgarth Road and West Cromwell Road in the north. Each ward is currently represented by two councillors. Under existing electoral arrangements, Gibbs Green and Wallah wards are under-represented, with 18 per cent and 24 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average. Normand ward has 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. The level of electoral equality in each ward is now expected to change significantly by 2004.

71 The Borough Council's proposals for this area disregard existing ward arrangements. It put forward a three-member North End ward, stretching from Hammersmith Road in the north to the London Underground District Line in the south, containing parts of the existing Avonmore, Gibbs Green and Wallah wards. It would be bounded by North End Road in the west and the boundary with Kensington & Chelsea in the east. The Borough Council acknowledged that the warding arrangement is not well served by the Talgarth Road and the London Underground Piccadilly/District railway lines, but stated that the requirements of electoral equality made the crossing of such major boundaries inevitable. It proposed that the part of the proposed ward to the west of North End Road and the part of Normand ward to the north of Lillie ward should be combined to create a new three-member Barons Court ward. In order to improve electoral equality further, their proposed ward would also contain the Bayonne Estate, currently located in Magravine ward. The remaining part of Wallah ward, containing the Chelsea Football Ground, would form part of a revised three-member Sands End ward and the Clem Attlee Estate, currently in Normand ward, would form part of a new three-member Dawes ward, as discussed below. The Borough Council's proposed Barons Court and North End wards would have electoral variances of no more than 4 per cent above or below the borough average currently (2 per cent by 2004), based on a council size of 45.

72 The Conservative Group also proposed creating a three-member North End ward, although with markedly different ward boundaries. Their proposed ward would contain most of the existing Gibbs Green ward, less the area to the north of Cranbee Road which would go to a new Olympia ward, together with part of Normand ward to the north of Lillie Road and west of Kinnoul Road, including all of Queen's Club Gardens and Normand Park. The Conservatives argued that their proposed ward would counter the notion that Queen's Club with Queen's Club Gardens, which were "unnaturally divided in the last review." They also stated that the North End ward name was chosen because North End Road acts as a focal point for residents in this area of northern Fulham. The Conservative Group proposed creating a new three-member Market ward comprising part of Wallah ward to the north of Fulham Road, part of Eel Brook ward to the north of Dawes Road and the Clem Attlee estate in Normand ward. It would also contain the area to the west of and including Barclay Road, currently in Eel Brook ward, which naturally looks towards Fulham Broadway. They argued that their proposed Market ward, named after a historic 1800s market, would form a cohesive whole around Fulham centre. Under the Conservative Group's proposed warding arrangements North End and Market wards would have electoral variances of no more than 2 per cent from the borough average (equal to the average by 2004), based on a council size of 51.

73 The Liberal Democrats objected to the Borough Council's proposed North End ward. They argued that the ward would straddle two major arterial roads "and there is no community interest in such an arrangement unless natural boundaries or distinct communities". The Fulham Society argued that the boundary between the Borough Council's proposed Dawes and Munster wards did not reflect natural boundaries or historic areas in the borough. As detailed earlier, West Kensington Residents' Association, Councilor Mallinson and a local resident opposed the Borough Council's North End ward as it would divide the West Kensington area.

74 We have carefully considered the evidence received for this area. While we recognise that the Borough Council's proposals provide a reasonable level of electoral equality, we consider that its
proposed North End ward, which is dissected by two major roads - Talgarth Road and Lillie Road - would not best reflect community ties in this area. We consider that the Conservative Group's proposals better fulfil the statutory criteria and put them forward as part of our draft recommendations, with some boundary changes in order to reflect the boundary of the Talgarth Road and to improve representation in a council size of 46. We propose that North End ward should comprise all of the existing Gibbons Green ward and the part of Normand ward to the north of Lillie Road and west of Musard Road and Moylan Road.

We propose that the existing Walham Green ward, excluding the area to the south of Fulham Broadway Station on the London Underground District Line, be joined with the Glen Allire Estate from Normand ward and the area to the north of Dawes Road, currently located in Eel Brook and Sherbrooke wards, to form a three-member Fulham Broadway ward. We recognise that our proposals for this area are different from those proposed locally; and would particularly welcome views from local residents and interested parties regarding the appropriateness of our proposed ward names at Stage Three.

Under our proposed electoral arrangements, North End ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average. The Conservative Party forward a new three-member Fulmer ward comprising the entirety of Sherbrooke ward and the part of Town ward to the north of Fulham Road. It would also contain the part of Eel Brook ward between Dawes Road and the London Underground District Line and the part of Normand ward to the west of Musard Road. They argued that their proposed ward would have a good level of commonality and that the residents in the southern part of Margravine ward looked towards Munster Road rather than Hammersmith centre for shops and other amenities. The Conservatives put forward a new three-member Fulmer ward comprising the entirety of Sherbrooke ward and the part of Town ward to the north of Fulham Road. It would also contain the part of Eel Brook ward between Dawes Road and the London Underground District Line and the part of Normand ward to the west of Musard Road. They argued that their proposed ward would have a good level of commonality and that the residents in the southern part of Margravine ward looked towards Munster Road rather than Hammersmith centre for shops and other amenities. The Conservatives put forward a new three-member Fulmer ward comprising the entirety of Sherbrooke ward and the part of Town ward to the north of Fulham Road. It would also contain the part of Eel Brook ward between Dawes Road and the London Underground District Line and the part of Normand ward to the west of Musard Road. They argued that their proposed ward would have a good level of commonality and that the residents in the southern part of Margravine ward looked towards Munster Road rather than Hammersmith centre for shops and other amenities.

Similar to the Borough Council, the Conservative Group proposed creating a three-member Munster ward. Their proposed ward would cover all of Colehill ward, the part of Margravine ward to the south of Greyhound Road and the part of Normand ward to the west of Musard Road. They argued that their proposed ward would have a good level of commonality and that the residents in the southern part of Margravine ward looked towards Munster Road rather than Hammersmith centre for shops and other amenities. The Conservatives put forward a new three-member Fulmer ward comprising the entirety of Sherbrooke ward and the part of Town ward to the north of Fulham Road. It would also contain the part of Eel Brook ward between Dawes Road and the London Underground District Line and the part of Normand ward to the west of Musard Road. They argued that their proposed ward would have a good level of commonality and that the residents in the southern part of Margravine ward looked towards Munster Road rather than Hammersmith centre for shops and other amenities.

The four wards of Eel Brook, Sands End, Sullivan and Town wards are located to the south of the borough. Eel Brook and Town wards contain residential areas around Fulham Road and to the north of New King's Road. Sands End and Sullivan wards are also primarily residential and have their council offices in the River Thames. It is expected that a significant portion of the growth in the borough will be in Sands End ward, where the Borough Council projects an additional 1,200 electors by 2004. Under the existing warding arrangements, Eel Brook, Sullivan and Town wards have 4 per cent fewer 2 per cent fewer and 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (5 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer, 7 per cent more by 2004). Sands End ward currently has 19 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average and is expected to increase to 44 per cent above the average by 2004.

The Conservative Group put forward three new wards for this area - Hurlland, Parsons Green and Sandford - each represented by three councillors. Hurlland ward would contain the part of Palace ward to the east of Fulham Palace, the part of Town ward to the south of Fulham Road and the part of Sullivan ward to the west of Peterborough Road. Their proposed Parsons Green and Sandford wards would be oriented east-west, sharing a boundary along Wandsworth Bridge Road and to the rear of Haylebury Road and Edgware Road. The revised Sands End ward would comprise the existing two-member Sands End ward, as well as the part of Walham ward to the south of Fulham Road. The area to the north of Fulham Road, currently located in Eel Brook and Town Wards would form part of the Conservative Group's proposed Walham ward. Under the Conservative Group's proposed warding

boundaries. We concur with the Borough Council's assessment that Munster Road acts as a focal point for communities living around it, and propose a three-member Munster ward combining areas on either side of Fulham Road. However, we propose to include Munster Road to the north of the residential road integrating comfortably. The remaining Sherbrooke ward would form part of the Borough Council's proposed new three-member Fulmer ward, together with the Glen Allire Estate from Normand ward and the part of Eel Brook ward to the north of the London Underground District Line. The Borough Council's proposed Munster and Dawes wards would have electoral variances equal to and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively (2 per cent below and equal to the borough average by 2004), based on a council size of 45.

We also propose that the area to the east of Pellsound and south of Dawes Road, currently in Sherbrooke ward, should form part of a new three-member Fulham Broadway ward, as described above. We propose transferring the north side of Fulham Road to a revised three-member Town ward, thereby uniting all of Fulham Road within one ward, as detailed below. Our proposed Munster ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (5 per cent fewer by 2004).

Eel Brook, Sands End, Sullivan and Town wards

The four wards of Eel Brook, Sands End, Sullivan and Town are located to the south of the borough. Eel Brook and Town wards contain residential areas around Fulham Road and to the north of New King's Road. Sands End and Sullivan wards are also primarily residential and have their council offices in the River Thames. It is expected that a significant portion of the growth in the borough will be in Sands End ward, where the Borough Council projects an additional 1,200 electors by 2004. Under the existing warding arrangements, Eel Brook, Sullivan and Town wards have 4 per cent fewer 2 per cent fewer and 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (5 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer, 7 per cent more by 2004). Sands End ward currently has 19 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average and is expected to increase to 44 per cent above the average by 2004.

The Borough Council proposed creating two three-member wards oriented east-west in this area - Parsons Green and Sands End. Its proposed Sands End ward would comprise most of the existing Sands End ward, the part of Walham ward to the south of the London Underground District Line, and a small area of Sullivan ward to the west of Wandsworth Road Bridge. To accommodate the significant development planned for the Imperial Wharf site in Sands End ward, the Borough Council felt it was required to "produce a ward which, at present, is significantly beneath electoral equality." The Council proposed combining most of Sullivan ward with the part of Town ward to the west of Munster Road and south of Fulham Road, the part of Eel Brook ward to the south of the London Underground District Line and the part of Sands End ward, containing areas near Wandsworth Bridge Road, to create a new Dunns Green ward. According to the Borough Council's scheme the remaining area of Eel Brook ward to the north of the London Underground District Line would form part of a new Dunns Green ward, while the remainder of the existing Town ward would be divided between its proposed Munster and Palace wards. The Borough Council's proposed Parsons Green ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent more by 2004). Its proposed Sands End ward would initially have 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, improving significantly to 1 per cent more by 2004, based on the forecast growth in electorate over the next five years.

The Conservative Party put forward three new wards for this area - Hurlland, Parsons Green and Sandford - each represented by three councillors. Hurlland ward would contain the part of Palace ward to the east of Fulham Palace, the part of Town ward to the south of Fulham Road and the part of Sullivan ward to the west of Peterborough Road. Their proposed Parsons Green and Sandford wards would be oriented east-west, sharing a boundary along Wandsworth Bridge Road and to the rear of Haylebury Road and Edgware Road. The revised Sands End ward would comprise most of the existing two-member Sands End ward, as well as the part of Walham ward to the south of Fulham Road. The area to the north of Fulham Road, currently located in Eel Brook and Town Wards would form part of the Conservative Group's proposed Walham ward. Under the Conservative Group's proposed warding
arrangements Hurlingham and Parsons Green wards would have an electoral variance of no more than 2 per cent from the borough average respectively (1 per cent by 2004). Their proposed Sandford ward would initially have 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, but is projected to improve to 1 per cent above the borough average by 2004.

105 Councillor Bird submitted alternative proposals to the Borough Council for this area of the borough. He proposed creating two new wards – Sands End & Sullivan and Parsons Green & Walham – oriented north-south rather than east-west. He stated that there are strong links between the southern part of Sullivan ward (including Sullivan Court) and the existing Sands End ward, in terms of transport links, public amenities and community organisations, such as the Association of Residents in Sands End (ARISE) and the Sands End Area Housing Forum. He proposed Parsons Green & Walham ward would contain the communities in the northern part of Sands End ward together with Parsons Green, Eel Brook, Petersham Estate and Moore Park/Walham Grove. As part of the Borough Council’s ongoing community planning process, the Association of Residents in Sands End (ARISE), Phelpse Square Residents’ Association, Sands End Adventure Project & Sands End Playhouse, Sullivan Court Residents’ Association and four residents indicated their preference for the Councillor Bird’s alternative option for this area. The Liberal Democrats opposed the Borough Council’s proposed Sands End ward citing concern over the practical impact of such a proposal.

106 We have carefully considered the representations received for this area. We note that both the Borough Council and the Conservative Group have both put forward two three-member wards for this area. Councillor Bird proposed creating two wards oriented north-south. Furthermore we recognise that there was significant opposition to the Borough Council’s proposed Parsons Green and Sands End, largely based on the lack of community ties between areas on both sides of New Kings Road and the resulting division of long-established communities in Sands End and Sullivan wards. We have also noted the arguments put to us about community identities in Sands End and Sullivan wards although we recognise that there is no consensus locally on the precise boundary of the communities. As a result, we have been persuaded that community identities and interests in this area would be better reflected by creating two three-member wards – one for the north and another for the south – broadly similar to the those put forward by Councillor Bird. We put forward as part of our recommendations a revised Sands End ward, containing most of the existing Sands End ward (excluding around 1,000 electors to the north of the Gas Works site, Maltins Place and Peckscroft Road) and the part of Sullivan ward to the south of the Clancarty Road (including Sullivan Court). In the north, we put forward a new Parsons Green & Walham ward, containing the area to the west of the London Underground District Line, currently located in Eel Brook and Walham ward. The ward would also contain the part of Palace ward to the north of Hurlingham Road and around 1,000 electors from the northern part of Sands End ward. The boundary between these two wards would follow the north side of the Gas Works Site to Imperial Road, to the south of all the properties on Maltins Place, and Peckscroft Road (including Peckscroft Court Road), Clancarty Road to Petersborough Road and Bromhouse Lane, to the north of Sullivan Court.

107 We also put forward as part of our draft recommendations a revised three-member Town ward. The ward would contain most of the existing Town ward (excluding the area to the west of Munster Road and south of the London Underground District Line), part of Eel Brook ward to the north of the London Underground District Line, and around 150 electors on Fulham Road currently located in Coghell ward. Our proposed Town ward would have Fulham Road as its focal point, thereby uniting the communities around it within one ward. Under our proposed warding arrangements, Sands End ward would initially have 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, improving to 6 per cent above the borough average by 2004. Parsons Green & Walham and Town ward would both have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor (4 per cent and 6 per cent fewer by 2004). We are content that our proposals for this area provide a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

Conclusions

108 We have considered carefully all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review. The borough-wide schemes submitted by the Borough Council and the Conservative Group would have achieved a significant improvement in electoral equality. However, as detailed earlier, there was a lack of consensus regarding the appropriate number of councillors to serve on Hammersmith & Fulham Council. As a result of our proposed council size of 46 members, and proposals for a mixed pattern of two- and three-member wards, we have not been able to put forward in their entirety any of the proposals made to us. In each area, we have taken into consideration all the submissions received during Stage One in formulating our draft recommendations. We consider that our draft recommendations provide a good balance of the statutory criteria guiding our work. Consequently, we propose that:

- Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council should be served by 46 councillors, four fewer than at present;
- there should be 16 wards, seven fewer than at present, which would involve changes to the boundaries of all or existing wards, with the exception of College Park & Old Oak ward.

In looking at eight broad areas of the borough, our conclusion for each area are summarised below:

- In the north of the borough we have proposed retaining the existing two-member College Park & Old Oak ward and we have put forward revised three-member White City & Shepherd’s Bush and Wormholt wards;
- In Coghell, Ravenscourt and Starch Green wards we put forward the two new wards of Askew and Ravenscourt Park based, in part, upon the Conservative Group’s and the Borough Council’s proposals;
- In Grove and Broadway wards we put forward a three-member Broadway ward to encompass the existing ward together with areas to its north and east;
- In Addison, Avenmore and Brook Green wards we propose modifications to the existing ward pattern based, in part, on the Conservatives’ scheme;
- In Crabtree and Palace wards propose combining elements of the Borough Council’s and Conservatives’ schemes, and in Margravine ward we have proposed minor amendments to the existing ward;
- In Gibbs Green, Nomand and Walham wards we have put forward proposals based on the Conservatives’ scheme with some boundary changes to further improve electoral equality;
- In Colnehill and Sherbrooke wards, we put forward a three-member Munster ward based, in part, on the Borough Council’s and Conservative Group’s proposals;
- In Eel Brook, Town Sands End and Sullivan wards we propose creating two three-member wards – Parsons Green & Walham and Sands End – broadly based on Councillor Bird’s proposals, and a revised three-member Town ward based around Fulham Road.

110 Figure 5 (overleaf) shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

111 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 10 to none. This improved balance of representation is expected to continue in the period up to 2004.

Draft Recommendation

Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council should comprise 46 councillors serving 16 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of the report.

112 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others on the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.
Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999 electorate</th>
<th>2004 forecast electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td>recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Hammersmith & Fulham
5. NEXT STEPS

133 The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Hammersmith & Fulham. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 11 October 1999. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

134 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Hammersmith & Fulham Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphin Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

135 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.
APPENDIX A

Proposed Electoral Arrangements

The following tables illustrate the electoral variances under the schemes submitted by the Borough Council and the Conservative Group on the Council. Full details of each submission, including accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council's Proposal

Table A1: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1999)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2004)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Baron's Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,511</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,545</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brook Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Coningham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dawes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,681</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fulham Reach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,549</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,549</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Munster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,528</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,536</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 North End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Palace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Parsons Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,749</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,858</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sands End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Shepherd's Bush Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,729</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued overleaf*
Figure A1 (continued):
Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 White City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,698</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Wormwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,456</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>112,861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' columns show by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor 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.

---

Hammersmith & Fulham
Borough Council
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Figure A2:
Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Askew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,605</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brook Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Filmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Godolphin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hurstingham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,725</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Market</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Munster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,819</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 North End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,757</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,749</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Olympia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,807</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,807</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Palace Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Parsons Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,803</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,542</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sandford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Shepherd's Bush</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,682</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 White City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,797</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,814</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Wormwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,567</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>112,861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council Conservative Group's submission.
APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: The Commission’s Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission’s predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas have been included in the Commission’s review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

(a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
(b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

• the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
• the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
• the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected (although current legislation provides for elections in London boroughs to be held every four years); and
• the name of any electoral area.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

4 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the “rules” set out in Schedule 11 to the 1973 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

5 In relation to London boroughs:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the borough likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

(a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the borough.

6 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a) above, regard should be had to:

(b) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
(c) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

3 The Local Government Boundary Commission did not, unlike its successor in the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.