LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR ISLINGTON

March 1999

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the London borough of Islington.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

© Crown Copyright 1999
Applications for reproduction should be made to:
Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.
The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by The Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Crown Copyright. Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to proceedings. Licence Number: GD 63114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

WHY YOUR LOCAL AUTHORITY IS UNDER REVIEW v
SUMMARY vii
1 INTRODUCTION 1
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS 3
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED 7
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS 9
5 NEXT STEPS 19

APPENDICES
A Proposed Electoral Arrangements from: – Islington Borough Council 21
B The Statutory Provisions 23

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Islington is inserted inside the back cover of the report.
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 Islington 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 Islington. 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

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Islington on 22 September 1998.

- 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 Islington:

- in six of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, and one ward varies by 20 per cent from the average;
- by 2003 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in seven wards, and by more than 20 per cent in one ward.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 75-76) are that:

- Islington Borough Council should be served by 48 councillors, four fewer than at present;
- there should be 16 wards, four fewer than at present, which would involve changes to the boundaries of all 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 but one of the 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 is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillors in all of the wards expected to vary by no more than 2 per cent from the average for the borough in 2003.

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

- We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 23 March 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important 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.

- The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 17 May 1999:

Director of Reviews
Islington Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphin Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgec.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 Barnsbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barnsbury ward (part); Clerkenwell ward (part); St Mary ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bunhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bunhill ward; Clerkenwell ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Caledonian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barnsbury ward (part); Holloway ward (part); Thornhill ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Canonbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canonbury East ward (part); Canonbury West ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clerkenwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clerkenwell ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Finsbury Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highbury ward (part); Sussex ward (part); Tellington ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highbury East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gillespie ward (part); Highbury ward (part); Mildmay ward (part); Quadrant ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Highbury West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gillespie ward (part); Highbury ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hillmarton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hillmarton ward; Highbury ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Junction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hillrise ward (part); Junction ward (part); St George's ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mildmay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildmay ward (part); Quadrant ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St George's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junction ward (part); St George's ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 St John's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highview ward (part); Hillrise ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barnsbury ward (part); Canonbury West ward (part); Holloway ward (part); St Mary ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 St Peter's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canonbury East ward (part); St Peter ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tellington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highview ward (part); Sussex ward (part); Tellington ward (part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Figure 2: The Commission’s Draft Recommendations for Islington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Barnsbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bunhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Caledonian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>2,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Canonbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>2,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clerkenwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>2,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Finsbury Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>2,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highbury East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Highbury West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,589</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,859</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hillmarton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>2,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Junction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mildmay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>2,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St George's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,784</td>
<td>2,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 St John's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,802</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,820</td>
<td>2,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 St Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 St Peter's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,793</td>
<td>2,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tellington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,789</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,940</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>123,786</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,478</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,579</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Islington Borough Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows 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

This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Islington.

In undertaking periodic electoral reviews, 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).

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.

The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

The London Boroughs

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.

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

<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>
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, Islington is in the third phase of reviews.

The Government’s subsequent White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, published in July 1998, sets out 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.

Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PFR 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 PFRs 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 PFRs of their areas. Our general experience so far is that proposals for three-member ward patterns are emerging from most areas in London.

As a quite separate exercise to the PFRs, 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.

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 highly and provide the building blocks for district or borough wards.

The Review of Islington

This is our first review of the electoral arrangements for Islington. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1977 (Report No. 219).

Stage One began on 22 September 1998, when we wrote to Islington Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the local authority associations, the Metropolitan Police, Members of Parliament and the Member of the European Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, and the headquarters 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 14 December 1998.

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

Stage Three began on 23 March 1999 and will end on 17 May 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 recommendation.

During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the views collected in 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 then determine when any changes come into effect.

2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

Islington is in inner London. Islington covers an area of 1,487 hectares and is one of the smallest of the London boroughs. With an estimated population of some 176,800, Islington has a population density approaching 120 people per hectare. It is bounded to the west by the borough of Camden, to the north by Haringey, to the east by Hackney and to the south by the City of London.

The south of the borough is predominantly commercial and industrial in character, with a relatively small but increasing residential population, while the northern part is mainly residential. Open space and parkland in Islington are limited, consisting mainly of Highbury Fields and Barnard Park; however, there are also New River Walk and many small, open squares. Islington has excellent transport links, with the Archway Road, Holloway Road and Upper Street (forming the southernmost part of the A1 trunk road) running through the centre of the borough. There is good access to six London Underground lines from a number of stations, local rail services via North London Railways and Thameslink stations and mainline rail services running from Kings Cross and Liverpool Street stations which are within easy reach of the borough.

To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of elections 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’.

The electorate of the borough (February 1998) is 118,940. The Council currently has 52 councillors who are elected from 20 wards (Map 1 and Figure 4). Twelve wards are each represented by three councillors and eight wards elect two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.

Since the last electoral review (completed in 1977), there has been a decrease in electorate in the borough, with 4 per cent less electors than at that time, mainly as a result of a decline in average household size. However, recent years have witnessed an increase in electorate, and the Council forecasts that this upward trend will continue and that there will be an overall increase in the electorate of around 4 per cent by the year 2003.

At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,287 electors, which the Council forecasts will increase to 2,381 by the year 2003 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 six of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. The worst imbalance is in Buntinghill ward where each of the three councillors represents on average 20 per cent fewer electors than the borough average.
Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Barnbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,791</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>2,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bunhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Canonbury East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Canonbury West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>4,088</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clerkenwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,968</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>3,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gillespie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>2,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>2,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Highview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hillmarton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,951</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hillrise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,651</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6,679</td>
<td>2,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Holloway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Junction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6,827</td>
<td>2,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mildmay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,048</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Quadrant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>2,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 St George's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,957</td>
<td>2,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 St Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>6,144</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 St Peter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sussex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>2,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Thornhill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tollington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,304</td>
<td>2,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>118,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Islington 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. For example, in 1998, electors in Barnbury ward were relatively over-represented by 20 per cent, while electors in Mildmay ward were relatively under-represented by 17 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

24 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 Islington Borough Council. During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their cooperation and assistance.

25 We received two representations during Stage One. The Council submitted a borough-wide scheme. We also received a representation from the Islington Green Party. These submissions, with accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

Islington Borough Council

26 The Council submitted a borough-wide scheme based on 16 three-member wards. It proposed decreasing the council size from 52 to 48 members in order to facilitate the creation of an all three-member ward scheme and to achieve better levels of electoral equality. It argued that its proposals represented an effective balance between reflecting the identities and interests of local communities and securing easily identifiable boundaries wherever possible. The most significant boundary modifications that it proposed were in Highview, Hillrise, Sussex and Tollington wards in the north of the borough; in Highbury ward in the centre-east of the borough; and in Holloway ward in the centre-west of the borough. The Council also proposed new names for eight of its wards and suggested retaining eight existing ward names. The Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

Islington Green Party

27 The Islington Green Party did not put forward a detailed scheme for the whole of the borough, but suggested that the Highbury, Quadrant, Gillespie and Mildmay wards (currently electing a total of 10 councillors) be modified into three

three-member wards. It proposed that Highbury ward be extended to include the 'corner' area surrounded by Highbury Grove and St Paul's Road, "as residents in this area probably consider that they live in Highbury", and that Quadrant ward be abolished and its constituent parts added to enlarged Gillespie and Mildmay wards. The Green Party also supported the concept of an all three-member ward scheme and annual elections, and commented on styles of local government and local government election voting methods.
4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

28 As indicated previously, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Islington 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".

29 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.

30 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.

31 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. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. In reviews 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

32 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2003, projecting an increase in the electorate of 4 per cent, from 118,940 to 123,786, over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. It expected most of the growth to be in the southern half of the borough, most notably in Bunhill and Clerkenwell wards, mainly as a result of new residential developments on formerly non-residential sites. The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to the unitary development plan for the borough, the expected rate of building and demolition over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

33 We accept that this is an inexact 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

34 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.

35 Islington Borough Council currently has 52 members. Over the past 20 years the borough has experienced a 4 per cent decline in electorate, although it has been increasing in recent years and is forecast to increase further by some 4 per cent over the next five years. The Council’s submission, which was endorsed by both the Labour and Liberal Democrat Groups (the only political groups represented on Islington Council), proposed reducing the current council size from 52 to 48.
Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representation received, we have concluded that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would best be met by a council of 46 members. We would welcome any further views on this issue during Stage Three.

Electoral Arrangements

We have carefully considered the representations received, including the borough-wide scheme received from the Council which was supported by both the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have informed us when preparing our draft recommendations.

The current electoral arrangements provide for a mixture of two- and three-member wards in Islington. Having had regard to the Government's White Paper, Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People, the Council submitted detailed proposals based on a pattern of three-member wards for the borough. The Islington Green Party also supported ad hoc three-member ward schemes. In addition, the Council proposed reducing the council size to 48 members. In light of the consensus between both the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups on the Council over the number of wards and the number of councillors that should represent each ward, we are proposing a pattern of 16 three-member wards for the borough.

There was also general recognition in the Council's submission that the existing arrangements provide some good natural boundaries, such as Holloway Road/St Paul's Road and Pentonville Road/City Road. We have noted this view and, in light of the fact that these topographical features currently provide good recognisable boundaries, we have striven to maintain them where possible within our proposals, where this is compatible with our aim of securing electoral equality.

The Council's proposed 16 three-member ward scheme would provide improved electoral equality throughout the borough. The number of wards in which the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average would reduce from six to one. Due to the forecast changes in the number and distribution of electors, the Council's scheme would not have any ward varying by more than 6 per cent from the borough average by 2003.

In light of the improved level of electoral equality and the identifiable boundaries that the Council's proposals would provide, in addition to the support that they have received from both the Labour and Liberal Democrat Groups, we have decided to base our scheme on the Council's proposals. In order to secure an even better level of electoral equality across the borough, particularly on the five-year forecast electorate, and having regard to the statutory criteria, we propose making some modifications to our Council's scheme. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- Bunhill and Clerkenwell wards;
- Thornhill, Barnsbury, St Mary, Holloway and Hillmarton wards;
- St Peter, Canonbury East and Canonbury West wards;
- Mildmay, Quadrant, Highbury and Gillespie wards;
- St George's and Islington wards;
- Tollington, Sussex, Hillrise and Highview wards.

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

**Bunhill and Clerkenwell wards**

These two three-member wards are situated in the southernmost part of the borough. Bunhill ward is currently the most over-represented ward in the borough with an electoral variance of 20 per cent. This level of electoral inequality is forecast to increase slightly to 12 per cent in 2003. Conversely, Clerkenwell ward is considerably under-represented at present with an electoral variance of 16 per cent. This level of electoral inequality is forecast to deteriorate further to 35 per cent above the average in 2003 due to a forecast increase in electorate (see also paragraph 32).

The Council stated that prior to 1965 these two wards comprised most of the former Metropolitan Borough of Finsbury, before it was merged with the Borough of Islington, and as a result the area "has a particularly strong sense of identity" which is "reinforced by the pronounced physical barrier of the Pentonville and City Roads along its northern edge". It therefore proposed retaining these roads as the boundary of the two wards. However, in order to address the electoral imbalance that currently exists in these wards, the Council proposed transferring 1,605 electors from Clerkenwell ward into Bunhill ward. Under this proposal the number of electors per councillor in the revised three-member Bunhill and Clerkenwell wards would be 5 per cent below and 14 per cent below the borough average respectively. However, due to a projected increase in the level of electoral equality was forecast to improve by 2003, when the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent above and almost equal to the borough average respectively.

We have noted that under the Council's scheme the proposed Bunhill ward is forecast to be under-represented by 6 per cent by 2003. However, as described later in this chapter, the Council's proposed St Mary's, Hillmarton and Tollington wards, in the centre and north of the borough, are forecast to be over-represented by 4 per cent, 5 per cent and 4 per cent respectively by 2003. In light of this slight imbalance in projected electoral equality between the south and the centre/north of the borough, and in order to improve electoral equality overall, we propose transferring 429 electors (in the Northampton Square area) from the Council's proposed Bunhill ward into its proposed Clerkenwell ward and modifying the boundary between the Council's proposed Clerkenwell and Barnsbury wards (to follow Penton Rise), thus transferring 71 electors from the former to the latter. The number of electors per councillor in our proposed Bunhill and Clerkenwell wards would be 10 per cent below and 15 per cent below the borough average initially, however, in both wards it would be almost equal to the borough average by 2003 due to the forecast increase in electorate.

While our modifications would entail breaking the Pentonville Road as a ward boundary, this would allow slight modifications to be made to the boundaries of the Council's proposed St Mary's and Hillmarton wards in order to improve electoral equality in those wards (as detailed later in this report). Consistency of the council warding would mean that electoral equality across Islington would be more evenly balanced, having regard to the 2003 electorate projections. Officers from the Commission have visited the area concerned and of the view that the Pentonville Road can be crossed relatively easily via a number of pedestrian crossings. Given the improved level of electoral equality that would result from this proposal, we are of the view that our proposal to breach the Pentonville Road as a ward boundary is justified and therefore put forward modifications to the Council's proposals, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of the report, as our draft recommendations. We would welcome views from all interested parties during Stage Three.

Thornhill, Barnsbury, St Mary, Holloway and Hillmarton wards

These five wards are situated in the centre and west of the borough. The number of electors per councillor in the three-member Thornhill ward and three-member Barnsbury and St Mary wards, (situated to the north of Pentonville Road and to the south of the North London railway line) is 6 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 13 per cent below the borough average respectively (6 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 14 per cent below by 2003). The number of electors per councillor in the three-member Holyrow ward and the two-member Hillmarton wards, (situated to the north of the North London railway line and to the west of the Holloway Road) is 8 per cent below and 8 per cent above the borough average initially (8 per cent below and 5 per cent above by 2003).

The Council put forward modifications to all five wards in this area, proposing that this part of the borough be represented by four three-member wards. It proposed a new ward, focused on the Caledonian Road, which it believed gave the area "a sense of local identity". The ward would comprise all of the current Thornhill ward, in addition to a total of 397 electors from the northern and western parts of Barnsbury ward and 2,253 electors from the southern-western part of Holloway ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed Caledonian ward would be almost equal to the borough average initially and equal to the average by 2003.

The Council also proposed a modified three-member Barnsbury ward which would retain the majority of the existing ward, but would mean that electoral equality across Islington would be more evenly balanced, having regard to the 2003 electorate projections. Officers from the Commission have visited the area concerned and
addition to transferring 397 electors from Barnsley ward into the new Caledonian ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed Barnsley ward would be 1 per cent above the borough average initially (1 per cent below the average by 2003).

50 The Council also put forward a new St Mary’s ward which would be centred around the “unifying feature” of Upper Street. In addition to 146 electors from the northern edge of the current Barnsley ward, the Council’s proposed ward would comprise 4,668 electors from the current St Mary’s ward, 473 electors from the western edge of Cannonbury West ward and 1,866 electors from the south-eastern part of the present Holloway ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed St Mary’s ward would be 4 per cent below the borough average both initially and by 2003.

51 Finally, in this area, the Council put forward a modified Hillmarton ward, comprising all the current Hillmarton ward and 2,195 electors from the northern part of Holloway ward. The Council’s proposal would retain the northern and eastern boundaries of the existing Hillmarton ward, as it was of the view that the Camden/Arkthorpe Roads and Holloway Road provided clearly defined and identifiable boundaries. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s revised Hillmarton ward would be 4 per cent below the borough average initially (5 per cent below by 2005).

52 In view of the excellent level of electoral equality secured under the Council’s proposed Caledonian ward we are content to adopt this new ward as part of our draft recommendations. However, in order to further improve the electoral imbalance (under the Council’s proposals) between the south and the centre/north of the borough, and to improve electoral equality overall while retaining the Holloway Ward as a strong ward boundary, we propose modifying the other three wards put forward by the Council in this area. In addition to modifying the southern boundary of the Council’s proposed Barnsley ward, involving the transfer of 471 electors into the ward from Clerkenwell ward (as detailed above), we propose modifying Barnsley ward into its proposed St Mary’s ward. We also propose slightly modifying the northern boundary of the Council’s proposed St Mary’s ward to follow the centre of Liverpool Road and Sheringham Road, in order to improve electoral equality in both the proposed St Mary’s and Hillmarton wards. Our modification would involve a net transfer of 201 electors from the Council’s proposed St Mary’s ward into its proposed Hillmarton ward.

53 Under our proposals the number of electors per councillor in the Barnsley, St Mary’s and Hillmarton wards would be almost equal to, 1 per cent above and 1 per cent below the borough average initially (2 per cent below, 1 per cent above and 2 per cent below the average by 2003). Given the overall improvement in electoral equality that would be secured by revisions to the Council’s proposals, and the better boundary that would be provided by using a longer section of Liverpool Road, we are putting forward these wards, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of this report, as our draft recommendations. We would welcome views on our proposals from all interested parties during Stage Three.

St Peter, Cannonbury East and Cannonbury West wards

54 These three wards are situated in the centre-east of the borough, to the north of City Road and to the south of St Paul’s Road. The number of electors per councillor in the three-member St Peter’s Ward is 3 per cent below the borough average (4 per cent below in 2003). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Cannonbury East and Cannonbury West wards is 10 per cent above and 9 per cent below the borough average (10 per cent above and 9 per cent below the average by 2003).

55 The Council put forward modifications for this area which would create two new wards, proposing that each be represented by three councillors. It proposed that a new St Peter’s ward be created by modifying the north-eastern boundary of St Peter’s ward to include a further 924 electors from Cannonbury East ward. It also proposed a new Cannonbury ward comprising 4,111 electors from the remainder of the present Cannonbury East ward and 3,707 electors from much of the present Cannonbury West ward. As detailed above, the eastern part of Cannonbury West ward, containing 473 electors, would be included in the new St Mary’s ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed St Peter’s and Cannonbury wards would be 2 per cent above and 5 per cent above the borough average initially (improving to 1 per cent above and equal to the average in 2003).

56 We noted that the Council proposed departing from using Cannonbury Road/New North Road as a ward boundary in this area, proposing instead that the new western boundary of Cannonbury Ward follow the centre of Compton Road/Awbyne Villas and Rotherfield Street. However, the Council stated that while there may be a case for retaining the Cannonbury Road as a ward boundary, it had not recommended this in order to secure an acceptable level of electoral equality in its proposed Cannonbury ward and to balance electorates in neighbouring wards. Given the good level of electoral equality that would be achieved under the Council’s proposals, we have decided to endorse its proposed St Peter’s and Cannonbury wards, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of this report, as our draft recommendations. We would welcome views on these proposals during Stage Three.

Mildmay, Quadrant, Highbury and Gillespie wards

57 These four wards are situated to the east of Holloway Road in the eastern part of the borough. The three-member Mildmay ward is currently the most under-represented ward in the borough with an electoral variance of 17 per cent. This level of electoral inequality is forecast to improve slightly to 14 per cent above the borough average by 2003. The two-member Quadrant ward is also considerably under-represented with an electoral variance of 15 per cent (13 per cent by 2003). The three-member Highbury ward and the two-member Gillespie ward currently have good levels of electoral equality. The number of electors per councillor in Highbury ward is 2 per cent above the borough average while in Gillespie ward it is 2 per cent below (1 per cent above and 2 per cent below the average respectively by 2003).

58 The Council proposed creating three new three-member wards in this area. It put forward a revised Mildmay ward comprising 7,010 electors from the central and eastern parts of the current Mildmay ward and 705 electors from around Highbury New Park in the southeastern part of Quadrant ward. The Council stated that it had drawn up its re- warding proposals for this area starting with Mildmay ward because of the “tight constraints imposed by the borough boundary and Balls Pond Road”. It contended that the proposed new western boundary of Mildmay ward would allow the overall identity of the local community, focusing on Newington Green, to be preserved. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed Mildmay ward would be 4 per cent above the borough average initially (almost equal to the average by 2003).

59 The Council also put forward a new Highbury East ward which would “maintain the communities focused on Aberdeen Park, Highbury Quadrant and Highbury Fields”. The new ward would comprise 1,038 electors from the western part of Mildmay ward, 1,513 electors from around the Highbury Fields area in the southern part of Highbury ward, the majority of Quadrant ward (4,562 electors) and 491 electors from the eastern part of Gillespie ward (to the east of Blackstock Road). The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed Highbury East ward would be 2 per cent above the borough average initially (1 per cent below the average by 2003).

60 Finally, in this area, the Council proposed a new Highbury West ward comprising all of the west of Blackstock Road in Gillespie ward and 2,033 electors from the central part of the existing Highbury ward. The Council contended that while it would be desirable for the proposed Highbury West ward’s northern boundary to follow the whole length of the railway line between Finsbury Park and Holloway Road, it would not be possible to create a three-member ward of adequate size for a 48-member council within these constraints.

61 In light of its proposal to retain the Holloway ward as the southern and western boundary of the wards in this area, and the constraint of the borough boundary on the east, the Council proposed including an area to the north of the line. It put forward a revised Quadrant ward comprising 7,010 electors from the central and eastern parts of the current Quadrant ward and 705 electors from around Highbury New Park in the southeastern part of Quadrant ward. The Council stated that it had drawn up its re- warding proposals for this area starting with Mildmay ward because of the “tight constraints imposed by the borough boundary and Balls Pond Road”. It contended that the proposed new western boundary of Mildmay ward would allow the overall identity of the local community, focusing on Newington Green, to be preserved. The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed Mildmay ward would be 4 per cent above the borough average initially (almost equal to the average by 2003).

62 The Council also put forward a new Highbury East ward which would “maintain the communities focused on Aberdeen Park, Highbury Quadrant and Highbury Fields”. The new ward would comprise 1,038 electors from the western part of Mildmay ward, 1,513 electors from around the Highbury Fields area in the southern part of Highbury ward, the majority of Quadrant ward (4,562 electors) and 491 electors from the eastern part of Gillespie ward (to the east of Blackstock Road). The number of electors per councillor in the Council’s proposed Highbury East ward would be 2 per cent above the borough average initially (1 per cent below the average by 2003).
Like the Council, the Green Party suggested that the wards in this area be reconfigured into three instead of four. It put forward a general proposal for the area, containing that the current Highbury ward should be extended to include the 'corner' area surrounded by Highbury Grove and St John's Park, the council in this area believe that they live in Highbury: As a consequence of this proposal it also suggested that Quadrant ward should be split and the elections currently in that ward be added to revised Gillespie and Mildmay wards.

Having considered both the representations submitted to us, we noted that there was broad agreement that those electors residing in the Highbury Grove area, currently in Mildmay ward, form part of the Highbury community. Under the Council's proposals these electors would be included in one of the "Highbury" wards, while electoral equality in all the wards in this area would improve. We have therefore decided to endorse the Council's proposals, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of this report, as our draft recommendations in this area and would welcome views from all interested parties during Stage Three, particularly with regard to ward names.

St George's and Junction wards

The number of electors per councillor in the three-member wards of St George's and Junction, situated in the north-western part of the borough, is 1 per cent above and 5 per cent below the borough average (3 per cent below and 4 per cent below the average by 2003).

In order to improve electoral equality in these and neighbouring wards, the Council put forward two revised wards for this area. As a consequence of its proposal to retain the centre of Camden Road as the southern boundary of St George's ward, the Council is proposing the ward's northern boundary, which would involve a net transfer of 809 electors from Junction ward into St George's ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed St George's ward would be 4 per cent above the borough average initially (1 per cent above the average by 2003).

As a consequence of its proposals for a revised St George's ward, the Council proposed moving Junction ward's north-eastern boundary to follow the centre of the Archway Road (the A1 trunk road) which it considered to be a natural barrier and "perhaps the worst road in Islington in terms of its severance effect". It acknowledged that while its revised Junction ward would include electors from an area to the north-east of Holloway Road, and it is itself an identifiable boundary, the ward would have merit in that it would allow for unified representation of the area around Archway underground station and the larger part of the Archway area, which are main focal points of the ward. The Council's proposed Junction ward would comprise 5,037 electors from the central and northern parts of the current Junction ward, 714 electors from the north-western corner of St George's ward and 1,642 electors to the north-east of Highbury Hill/Holloway Road, currently in Hillrise ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed Junction ward would be 1 per cent below the borough average both initially and by 2003.

As stated earlier in the report, we have noted the consensus on the Council (between the political groups) in support of its proposals. In light of this and the good level of electoral equality that would be secured under the Council's proposals, we are putting them forward as our draft recommendations, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of the report. We would welcome views on these proposals during Stage Three.

Tollington, Sussex, Hillrise and Highview wards

These four wards are situated in the northern part of the borough, to the north and east of Highbury Hill and Holloway Road. The three-member Tollington ward and the two-member Sussex ward are both slightly under-represented at present, with electoral variances of 5 per cent and 3 per cent respectively (2 per cent and 8 per cent by 2003). The three-member Hillrise ward and the two-members Highview ward, on the other hand, are both over-represented, with electoral variances of 3 per cent and 14 per cent respectively, which are forecast to worsen further to 6 per cent and 17 per cent by 2005.

The Council put forward boundary modifications which would create three new wards covering the majority of this area, proposing that each be represented by three councillors. It proposed a new Finsbury Park ward which would comprise 1,920 electors transferred from the northern part of Highbury ward, together to include the southern part of Sussex ward (to the south of Tollington Way) and 4,107 electors from the southern part of Tollington ward (to the south of Tollington Park). It stated that the boundaries of its proposed ward were "largely dictated by the physical constraints of the Holloway Road in the west, the Finsbury Park and Holloway Road to the south and the borough boundary to the east", and that Tollington Park/Tollington Way was a "well-established thoroughfare in Islington and the location of the local divide. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed Finsbury Park ward would be 1 per cent above the borough average initially (3 per cent above the average by 2003).

The Council further proposed a modified Tollington ward which would use the Holloway Road as a strong western boundary. This ward would comprise 3,123 electors from the northern part of the current Tollington ward, 3,210 electors from the northern part of Sussex ward and 993 electors, to the south of Shafesbury Road, from the southern part of Highview ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed Tollington ward would be 1 per cent below the borough average (4 per cent below the average by 2003).

Further to its proposal to use the A1 trunk road (Archway Road) as an identifiable boundary for a revised Junction ward, the Council proposed a new St John's wards comprised 5,009 electors from the central and eastern parts of Hillrise ward and the majority (2,926 electors) of Highview ward. The borough boundary would form the northern and eastern boundaries of this new ward, while its southern boundary would follow the centre of Holly Park/Shafesbury Road and a section of the Crouch Hill/Upper Holloway railway line. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's proposed St John's ward would be 7 per cent above the borough average initially (3 per cent above the average by 2003).

We noted that under the Council's scheme Tollington ward was forecast to be over-represented by 4 per cent by 2003, while St John's and Finsbury Park wards were both forecast to be under-represented by 3 per cent by that time. In order to secure a better level of electoral equality in this area, and to provide for an improved electoral balance in the borough overall, we are proposing two slight modifications to the Council's proposals. We propose modifying the southern boundary of the Council's proposed Tollington ward to include all of the southern side of Tollington Park (including Everleigh Street and Dulux Street) within the revised ward. In addition, we propose modifying the ward's northern boundary to include all the properties on the northern side of Shafesbury Road within Tollington ward.

These modifications involve transferring 133 electors from the Council's proposed St John's ward and 330 electors from its proposed Finsbury Park ward into its proposed Tollington ward. While we are aware of the Council's contention that Tollington Park would provide for an identifiable ward boundary, we are of the view that we should move away from that proposal in order to achieve better levels of electoral equality for this area overall. Furthermore, our proposal would unite electors on both sides of the road within one ward, as would be the case under our proposal for those electors who live on either side of Shafesbury Road.

As a result of our revisions to the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the new Finsbury Park, Tollington and St John's wards would be 3 per cent below, 5 per cent above and 5 per cent above the borough average initially (improving to 1 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 1 per cent above the average by 2003). Given the improved level of electoral equality that our proposals would achieve (having regard to the five-year forecast of electorate), we are putting them forward, as shown on the large map inserted at the back of the report, as our draft recommendations.

We would welcome views on our proposals for these and all other wards, including in relation to the proposed ward names.

Conclusions

We have considered carefully all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review. We welcome both the consensus approach, and the quality of work undertaken by the Council on this review. Overall the Council's proposals would result in a significant improvement to the level of electoral equality, although we believe the proposals are further improved by our boundary modifications. Our proposals would maintain the east/west divide of the Holloway Road and, substantially, the north/south divide of the Pentaver Road. We believe that our proposals strike a satisfactory balance of the criteria guiding our work. Consequently, we propose that:

(i) there should be a council size of 48, a decrease of four;
(ii) there should be 16 wards, four less than at present,
the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified.

76 As already indicated, we propose adopting the majority of the Borough Council's proposals. However, we propose modifications to its scheme in two main areas in order to secure improved electoral equality having regard to the statutory criteria:

77 In the south and centre of the borough we propose transferring 429 electors from the Council's proposed Bunhill ward into its proposed Clerkenwell ward; 471 electors from its proposed Clerkenwell ward into its proposed Barnsbury ward; 565 electors from its proposed Barnsbury ward into its proposed St Mary's ward; and a net total of 261 electors from its proposed St Mary's ward into its proposed Hillmarton ward.

78 In the north of the borough we propose transferring 133 electors from the Council's proposed St John's ward and 330 electors from its proposed Finsbury Park ward into its proposed Tollington ward.

79 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1998 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2003.

As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Islington 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 six to one. This improved balance of representation is expected to continue in 2003, with no ward expected to vary by more than 2 per cent from the average number of electors per councillor at that time. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of the report.

Draft Recommendation
Islington Borough Council should comprise 48 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.

We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Islington 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>1998 electorate</th>
<th>2003 forecast electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 2:
The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Islington: Proposed Wards
5. NEXT STEPS

The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Islington. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 17 May 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.

Views may be expressed by writing directly to:

Director of Reviews
Islington Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphins Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

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

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 table illustrates the levels of electoral equality that would be attained under the scheme submitted by Islington Borough Council. Full details of the representations received during Stage One, including accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

Islington Borough Council’s Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Barnsbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,518</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bunhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,188</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Caledonian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Canonbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clerkenwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Finsbury Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,522</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highbury East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Highbury West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,589</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,859</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hildenarton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,353</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Junction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mildmay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St George’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,784</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 St John’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued overleaf)
APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions


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 (LGBCE), submitted its 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:
   (a) the total number of councillors to be elected to the council,
   (b) the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions),
   (c) 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
   (d) 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 1972, 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 1972 Act. For ease of reference, these 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.

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.