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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 Lambeth 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 Lambeth. 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 those interested 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 Lambeth:

- in four of the 22 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 more than 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 five wards, and by more than 20 per cent in two wards.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figure 1 and paragraphs 96-97) are that:

- Lambeth Borough Council should be served by 63 councillors, one less than at present;
- there should be 21 wards, one less than at present, which would involve changes to 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 20 of the 21 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 8 per cent from the borough average.
- This improved electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 4 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 26 January 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 22 March 1999:

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

Fax: 0171 404 0142
e-mail: reviews@lgcc.gov.uk
1. INTRODUCTION

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

2. In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:
   - the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
     - reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
     - 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).

3. 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 Boundary Commission in its reviews of Parliamentary constituencies.

4. The review is in four stages (Figure 2).

The London Boroughs

5. 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 reviews of the London boroughs. (The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.)

6. 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 will begin in February 1999, with completion planned for June 1999 to February 2000.

7. 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 equality having regard to local circumstances, and the approach taken by the Commission in previous reviews.

Figure 2: 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>
The Review of Lambeth

This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Lambeth. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1977 (Report No. 257).

Stage One began on 23 June 1998, when we wrote to Lambeth 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 28 September 1998.

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

Stage Three began on 26 January 1999 and will end on 22 March 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.

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

In 1900 Lambeth became a Metropolitan Borough. Prior to 1900 Lambeth was one of six large London ‘Parishes’ administering services, mainly for the poor. The current London borough of Lambeth came into being in 1965 when parts of Streatham and Clapham were merged with the old Metropolitan area as part of the reorganisation of London local government.

The borough covers some seven miles north to south, and about two and a half miles east to west. The north of the borough is bounded by the River Thames, with the bridges of Waterloo, Westminster, Lambeth and Wandsworth all partly located within Lambeth’s boundaries. The Eurostar Rail Terminal is located within the borough at Waterloo International Station, providing a direct link to the Continent. Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is also located within the borough.

There are many other important sites and cultural attractions in the borough including the South Bank, the Old Vic Theatre, the National Theatre, the Royal Festival Hall and the Oval Cricket Ground, as well as the Brixton, Lower Marsh and Lambeth Walk markets.

Socially and culturally Lambeth is one of the most diverse local authority areas in Great Britain, with 30 per cent of the population from ethnic minorities. Of these, 22 per cent are from black groups and 4 per cent from the Indian sub-continent. Lambeth has the highest proportion of Afro-Caribbean residents of any London borough, and the third highest for black Africans. There are also many refugees living in Lambeth from countries such as Angola, Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Somalia and Vietnam as well as groups such as the Kurds. Approximately 110 languages are spoken in the borough and, after English, the main languages spoken are Yoruba and Portuguese.

Lambeth has an acute unemployment problem with an official unemployment rate (April 1998) of 11 per cent, compared to 10 per cent for inner London and 7 per cent for Greater London as a whole. The problem is compounded by the length of time many Lambeth residents remain unemployed, with 57 per cent of those out of work having been unemployed for more than six months.

To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councilor: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 183,695. The Council currently has 64 councillors who are elected from 22 wards (Map 1 and Figure 3). Twenty wards are each represented by three councillors while the other two wards elect two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.

At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,870 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts would increase to 3,002 by the year 2003 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes since the last electoral review, the number of electors per councillor in four of the 22 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and is one ward by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Prince’s ward where each of the three councillors represents an average 27 per cent fewer electors than the borough average.
### Existing Electoral Arrangements

<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 Angell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bishop’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>11,104</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clapham Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,625</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,920</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Clapham Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ferndale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,443</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gipsy Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,791</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Herne Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8,427</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Knight’s Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Larkhall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,665</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,724</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Oval</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,324</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Prince’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,278</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St Leonard’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,321</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,546</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 St Martin’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Stockwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7,916</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Streatham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,359</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Streatham South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,590</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Streatham Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Thornton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,174</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Thurlow Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Town Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,082</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tulse Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Electoral Arrangements (continued)

<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>22 Vassall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,503</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,627</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>183,695</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>192,103</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electoral figures are based on Lambeth Borough Council's submissions.

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. For example, in 1990, electors in Angell ward were relatively over-represented by 12 per cent, while electors in Clapham Park ward were relatively under-represented by 12 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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 Lambeth Borough Council.

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 six representations during Stage One. The Borough Council and the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council submitted borough-wide schemes. These schemes, with accompanying mapping, and copies of the relevant representations received, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

Lambeth Borough Council

The Borough Council proposed that there should be 60 councillors, a reduction of four, and 20 wards, two less than at present. It proposed no change to the boundaries of three of the existing 22 wards – Bishop’s, Gipsy Hill and Knight’s Hill. Overall, the Council’s scheme would improve the present level of electoral equality, although its proposals would still result in some serious electoral imbalances. Under its scheme, two wards would initially vary by more than 10 per cent from the average, with one ward exceeding 20 per cent. This would improve slightly by 2003 by which time two wards were projected to exceed 10 per cent, the worst imbalance being 16 per cent. The Council’s proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

Lambeth Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group

The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that there should be 63 councillors, a reduction of one, and 21 wards, one less than at present. It proposed no change to the boundaries of three wards – Clapham Town, Fornalde and Larkhall. Significant changes were proposed to the wards of Angell, Town Hall and Thornton while the existing St Martin’s ward would be split between four revised wards. Overall, the Group’s scheme would significantly improve the present level of electoral equality, although one ward would initially exceed 36 per cent from the average. However, by 2003 no ward was expected to exceed 7 per cent. The Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

Other Representations

Four other submissions were received. The Streatham Labour Party and the Dulwich & West Norwood Labour Party both expressed their support for the ward boundary changes proposed by Lambeth Borough Council. The Streatham and Vauxhall Conservative Associations, in a joint submission, supported the Borough Council’s proposals for the wards of Clapham Town and Clapham Park. The Dulwich & West Norwood Conservative Association supported the Borough Council’s proposals in respect of the four wards of Gipsy Hill, Herne Hill, Knight’s Hill and Thurlow Park.
4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

31. 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.

22. 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.

33. 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 be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorate. 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

34. The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4.6 per cent from 183,695 to 192,103 over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. It expected much of the growth to be in the present Bishop's ward in the north of the borough, as analysed in subsequent paragraphs. The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to the unitary development plan for the borough, the expected rate of building 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. We are aware that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration (see below) to the Council's forecast electorates, we consider that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

28. An unusually high level of electorate growth was forecast for the north of the borough, particularly affecting the present Bishop's ward and, to a lesser extent, Prince's and Oval wards. The electorate in Bishop's ward was projected to rise from 7,880 to 11,104, an increase of more than 40 per cent. In view of this, we closely examined the methodology used to calculate these figures and the assumptions on which they were based. We also considered the comments contained in the submissions of the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats.

26. The Council stated that the projected electorate statistics for 2003 were calculated "on the basis of information supplied by the Council's planning section in relation to the approved planning applications during the last five years. Each unit of accommodation was multiplied by two to provide final details of the forecast number of electors." We understand from the Council that the figure of two electors per household was used because local authorities in comparable urban areas outside
London had previously used such a figure and because a number of other London boroughs involved in the PERS process proposed using between 1.8 and 2.0 as the ‘multiplier’ figure in calculating their electorate projections.

The Council commented specifically on the electorate projections for the north of the borough. It stated that, in that area, “certain wards have a very high [increase in] electorate forecast as a result of proposed redevelopment and conversion of the many empty office blocks in the area. It is possible that this development may not in fact take place and those that do will not be completed in the next five years”. The Liberal Democrats, in their submission, stated that they were “sceptical as to whether some of the [electorate] projection will happen in reality”.

The Council also raised the issue of under-registration of electors, which is a common one in inner city areas. It listed a variety of reasons for people not registering and informed us that groups such as students, people with second homes, foreign nationals who reside in the borough, and citizens from other European Union countries were among those who did not register in the borough. The Council also contended that despite not registering, many such residents brought issues to the attention of local councillors, therefore contributing to the elected representatives’ workload.

As part of our Periodic Electoral Reviews we take into account the number of local government electors on the electoral register at the commencement of the review, and the best estimate of the likely number who will be registered in five years time. Those residents over 18 years old who are not on the electoral roll for whatever reason are not taken into account for the purposes of this review. However, we have taken account of our advice that we are cautious about any substantial increases in council size, the Liberal Democrats proposed a 63-member council size, a decrease of one.

Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would best be met by a council size of 63 members. We would welcome further views on council size during Stage Three of this review.

Electoral Arrangements

The Borough Council proposed changes to 19 of the 22 existing wards, putting forward a pattern of entirely three-member wards in its 60-strength Borough Council size. As outlined in the previous chapter, the Council’s scheme would improve the present level of electoral equality although its proposals would still result in some electoral imbalances. We recognise the difficulties involved in producing a scheme for the borough which produces good electoral equality having regard to the five-year forecast of electors, secures effective and convenient local government, and reflects local community identities and interests.

There are similarities between the Council’s scheme and that of the Liberal Democrats. Both propose a pattern of entirely three-member wards, both proposed a broadly similar overall council size and both schemes contained proposals for easily identifiable ward boundaries, using recognisable features such as main roads and railways. However, the Liberal Democrat scheme, in our view, would generally secure better levels of electoral equality than the Council’s proposals, having regard to the five-year electorate projections, particularly in the north of the borough. We have decided to use the Liberal Democrat Group’s scheme as the basis of our draft recommendations, although we believe that further improvements to electoral equality are attainable in certain areas of the borough. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- Bishop’s Park and Prince’s wards;
- Oval, Stockwell and Vassall wards;
- Clapham Common, Ferndale and Larkhall wards;
- Angell, Herne Hill, St Martin’s and Tube Hill wards;
- Clapham Park, Thornton and Town Hall wards;
- Gipsy Hill, Knight’s Hill and Thurlow Park wards;
- St Leonard’s ward and the Streatham wards of Hill, South and Wils.

Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 5 and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Bishop’s Park and Prince’s wards

The three-member Bishop’s Park ward is the most northerly in the borough, lies on the south bank of the river Thames and contains Whitechapel Station. It is dominated by office buildings, many of which have been empty for several years and are in the process of being converted into residential use. The ward has an electorate of 7,800 and is 60 per cent over-represented at present, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 8 per cent. However, as explained earlier in this chapter, there is substantial growth forecast for the ward with an increase of 1,104 by 2003. This increase in electorate (of more than 40 per cent) would result in the ward being the most under-represented ward in the borough in five years time with an electoral variance of 23 per cent.

The three-member Prince’s ward, which lies immediately to the south of Bishop’s Park, has an electorate of 6,278 and is presently the most over-represented ward in the borough, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 27 per cent. A projected increase of 628 electors would result in this high level of over-representation being improved only slightly, with the ward continuing to be the most over-represented in the borough with an electoral variance of 23 per cent in 2003.

The Borough Council proposed no change to the electoral arrangements of the existing Bishop’s Park ward, although it did propose renaming the ward Waterloo. Under its scheme (for 60 councillors rather than the present 64) the ward would initially be over-represented by 14 per cent. However, the substantial projected increase in electorate for the ward would result in it becoming under-represented instead, with the number of electors per councillor varying by 16 per cent above the borough average by 2003. With equal numbers proposed, the Council proposed transferring 2,545 electors from Oval ward and 110 electors from the Kennington Park area (presently part of Vassall ward) to improve electoral equality. The number of electors per councillor in the revised ward (which the Council proposed to rename Kennington) would vary from the borough average by 3 per cent (5 per cent by 2003) under the Council’s scheme.

In order to take account of the large projected increase in electorate in the north of the borough, the Liberal Democrat Group proposed transferring the VAE polling district (which contains the whole of the Edbrooke Estate and 1,804 electors) from Bishop’s Park ward into Prince’s ward. The Group contended that this proposal would not sever local ties as, for example, the Housing Office which covers most of Prince’s ward also serves the Edbrooke Estate. No other changes were proposed in this area. Under the Liberal Democrat Group’s 63-member scheme, the number of electors per councillor in the modified Bishop’s Park and Prince’s wards would initially vary by 13 per cent and 6 per cent below the borough average respectively. However this level of electoral equality would be substantially improved by 2003, when the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below and equal to the borough average respectively.
As discussed above in the paragraphs on electorate projections, the main issue in this part of the borough is the extent of the projected increase in electorate. Although both the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group voiced concerns over the pace of development that may take place by 2003, both submissions agreed that the projected electorate statistics were the best presently available. We corresponded (and met with officers from the Council to reconfirm this. The Council’s proposed Waterloo ward would have a better initial degree of electoral equality than the Liberal Democrats’ proposal for this area – 14 per cent over-represented rather than 31 per cent. However, the agreed projected increase of 3,224 electors in the present Bishop’s ward would result in the Council’s proposed ward being considerably under-represented by 2003. We do not consider that such a level of electoral imbalance (16 per cent) is justified in a predominantly urban area such as Lambeth.

In view of this and having considered the representations received at Stage One we are content to endorse the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals for revised Bishop’s and Prince’s wards at this stage. We believe that, on the balance of evidence received, the Group’s approach to achieving electoral increase in electorate in the area and attempting to reflect the community interests of the Etheredge Estate is the most appropriate way forward. Both proposed wards are projected to have electoral variances of 3 per cent or less in five years. A new available ward boundary would be secured. Our draft recommendations for revised Bishop’s and Prince’s wards are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Our draft recommendations are based on certain assumptions which lead to the electorate forecast statistics (as described above) though clearly expressed in doubt as to the validity of the figures in relation to the north of the borough. Given this uncertainty we are specifically seeking views on the electorate projections (as described above) in relation to our proposed Bishop’s and Prince’s wards. It is particularly important given the geography of the borough that this northern area is given appropriate ward boundaries at any change to the southern boundary of the proposed Prince’s ward would clearly have implications for the structure of the wards to the immediate south of this area, as discussed below.

Oval, Stockwell and Vassall wards

The three-member Oval ward has an electorate of 8,735, divided into three sections per councillor, presently varying from the borough average by 1 per cent (4 per cent in 2003). The three-member Stockwell ward is over-represented: it has an electorate of 7,856 and the number of electors per councillor presently varies by 9 per cent from the borough average. A small projected increase in electorate for the ward is expected to result in an electoral variance of 12 per cent in 2003. The three-member Vassall ward is under-represented: it has an electorate of 9,503 and the number of electors per councillor presently varies from the borough average by 10 per cent (7 per cent in 2003).

As described above the Council proposed transferring 2,545 electors from the northern part of Oval ward into a revised Prince’s ward. To compensate for this loss of electors, the Council proposed a new South Lambeth ward which would be created from most of the southern part of the present Oval ward (the area south of Miles Street, east of Meadow Road and south of the Oval Cricket Ground) and from the north-west and north-east of the present Stockwell ward. The remaining central and southern parts of Stockwell ward would be added to almost all of Larkhall ward to form a new three-member ward.

The Council proposed that Vassall ward be modified by gaining the south-eastern part of Oval ward bar losing its eastern area to a new Coldharbour ward. Consequently Vassall ward would be renamed North Brixton. Under its scheme, the new wards of North Brixton and South Lambeth would initially vary from the average number of electors per councillor by 4 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (equalling the borough average and varying by 2 per cent by 2003).

Having proposed that the present and future levels of electoral inequality in Prince’s and Bishop’s wards could be resolved without breaching the present Oval ward’s northern boundary, the Liberal Democrats approached Oval, Stockwell and Vassall wards from a different perspective. In their submission the Liberal Democrats acknowledged the fact that the area of Oval ward which lies to the east of Clapham Road is somewhat cut-off from the rest of the ward. However, they argued that to include all this area with Vassall ward could result in disruption to the boundaries of neighbouring wards, with many main roads needing to be crossed to produce wards with good electoral equality.

In view of this, they proposed moving the boundary between Oval and Vassall wards only slightly, retaining electors from the former to the latter. This proposal, it was argued, would unite the whole of the Calderdale Estate which is presently divided between the two wards. The Liberal Democrats added that this boundary alteration could be extended to also include South Island Place (a further 384 electors) within Vassall ward. Although such a modification would further improve Vassall ward’s electoral equality, it would have an adverse effect on equality in Oval ward and in view of this was not formally put forward by the Liberal Democrats. They also offered as a ‘suggestion’ that the area north of Camberwell New Road (the Kensington Park area), which contains 110 electors living mainly in St Agnes Place, could be transferred from Vassall ward into Oval ward to improve the ward boundary.

In order to improve the levels of electoral equality in the present Stockwell and Vassall wards, the Liberal Democrats proposed transferring the whole of the VEA polling district from the south-western part of Vassall ward into Stockwell ward. The Group contended that this area shares links with Stockwell, not only with regard to road and estate names but also in its shared proximity to Stockwell Underground Station. While acknowledging that their proposed Vassall ward would be a ‘slightly under-sized’ ward, the Liberal Democrats believed their scheme to be the best solution for the area and argued that any further adjustments would be at the expense of electoral equality in neighbouring wards. Under the Liberal Democrats’ scheme the revised wards of Oval, Stockwell and Vassall would vary from the average number of electors per councillor by 2 per cent, 3 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (equal to the borough average, 1 per cent and 5 per cent by 2003).

The proposals for this area from both the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group would provide for an improved level of electoral equality. However, we have already described above our reservations for this stage the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals for revised Bishop’s and Prince’s wards. This clearly has a knock on effect on the northern boundary of Oval ward and consequently affects Stockwell and Vassall wards.

In view of this, and having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we are therefore content to endorse in principle the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals for this area. We accept their proposals for a revised Stockwell ward. We also examined the ‘suggestions’ from the Group in relation to the Kempena Park area (the possible transfer of electors from Vassall ward to Oval ward) and in the vicinity of South Island Place (Oval ward to Vassall ward).

If these modifications were made to the proposed boundaries we could further improve upon the level of electoral equality in Vassall ward. Instead of the number of electors per councillor varying by 2 per cent initially and 5 per cent by 2003, the electoral variance would be 1 per cent initially and 2 per cent by 2003. These changes would have an adverse effect on the proposed Oval ward, which instead of varying by 2 per cent (equal to the borough average in 2003) would vary by 5 per cent (3 per cent by 2003). On balance, we are content to propose these amendments because we believe that ward boundaries would be improved upon and the highest degree of electoral inequality by 2003 would be 3 per cent, rather than 5 per cent. Therefore, we are recommending these further boundary modifications in addition to those formally put forward by the Liberal Democrats. Our draft revised wards of Oval, Stockwell and Vassall are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

Clapham Town, Ferndale and Larkhall wards

The three-member Clapham Town ward has an electorate of 8,870. The number of electors per councillor varies from the borough average by 3 per cent. Electoral equality is expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor projected to equal the borough average by 2003. The three-member Larkhall ward has an electorate of 8,665. The number of electors per councillor varies from the borough average by 1 per cent (projected to be 3 per cent in 2003). The three-member Ferndale ward with an electorate of 9,443 is presently under-represented and varies from the average number of electors per councillor by 10 per cent (9 per cent in 2003).

The Liberal Democrat Group proposed no change to the electorate arrangements of all three of these wards. Under a 63-member council size, the Clapham Town ward would remain well...
represented, varying from the average number of electors per councillor by 1 per cent both initially and in 2003. However, the Fernsdale ward would remain under-represented (8 per cent initially, 7 per cent by 2003) while the Larkhall ward would become somewhat over-represented, varying by 1 per cent initially but 5 per cent by 2003.

44 The Council proposed similar (though not identical) boundaries for its proposed Clapham Town and Fernsdale wards although the latter would be renamed West Brixton ward. As described earlier in this chapter, the Council proposed that Larkhall ward should be extended to incorporate the central and southern parts of the present Stockwell ward and that the resultant ward be renamed Stockwell. The Council’s revised Clapham Town ward and new West Brixton ward would initially vary from the average number of electors per councillor by 3 per cent and 2 per cent respectively, improving to being equal to the average and varying by 1 per cent by 2003. However, its proposed Stockwell ward would be considerably under-represented: the number of electors per councillor in the ward would initially vary by 22 per cent from the borough average, with only a marginal improvement (to 18 per cent) by 2003.

45 The Council’s proposed Stockwell ward would be considerably under-represented, certainly too high a level of electoral inequality (having regard to the five-year forecast of electorate) for us to put forward. As explained earlier, we are proposing a council size of 63 as part forward by the Liberal Democrats and are therefore using their proposals as the basis of our draft recommendations in this area. However, we are of the view that further improvements to electoral equality are achievable by a relatively straightforward modification to the boundary between Fernsdale and Larkhall wards.

46 We propose transferring 601 electors (from an area near the north-east of South Western Hospital) from Fernsdale ward to Larkhall ward. Instead of projected electoral variances of 7 per cent and 5 per cent by 2003 if there were no changes to ward boundaries in this area, the number of electors per councillor in the modified Fernsdale and Larkhall wards would vary respectively from the borough average by 1 per cent and 2 per cent by 2003. This modification would secure an identifiably better boundary in addition to improving electoral equality in the two wards. We accept the proposal for no change to the present Clapham Town ward, given the good level of electoral equality that would result.

We would welcome views on our draft recommendations for this area, which are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

Angell, Herne Hill, St Martin’s and Tulse Hill wards

47 The three-member wards of Angell, Herne Hill, St Martin’s and Tulse Hill are all presently over-represented by varying degrees. The number of electors per councillor varies from the borough average by 4 per cent in 2003, 2 per cent in 2002 and operating a new 3 per cent respectively. Although the Tulse Hill ward is forecast to improve to just 1 per cent from the average by 2003, the other three wards in this part of the borough would remain over-represented: Angell by 15 per cent, Herne Hill by 6 per cent and St Martin’s by 7 per cent.

48 The Council proposed creating a new “East Brixton” ward by adding 1,429 electors from the south-eastern part of Vassall ward to the whole of the present Angell ward. It also proposed adding 661 electors from the north-eastern corner of Tulse Hill ward to create an enlarged Herne Hill ward, and adding 596 electors from the north-eastern part of Town Hall ward to a revised Tulse Hill ward. This latter ward would be renamed “South Brixton”.

49 The Council proposed that the St Martin’s ward be abolished and its eastern part added to a revised three-member Thurlow Park ward. Most of the eastern part of St Martin’s ward would be included in a new ward with the eastern part of the present Streatham Hill ward. Those proposals are discussed in more detail later in the report. Under the Council’s scheme, the proposed East Brixton ward, modified Herne Hill ward and new South Brixton, Streatham Hill and Thurlow Park. They acknowledged that the Angell and Herne Hill wards needed revision to improve electoral equality and stated that there may be different focuses within these wards. The northern and eastern parts of Herne Hill ward together with the eastern part of Angell ward, they stated, looked towards Camberwell and Dulwich in the neighbouring borough of Southwark. The western part of Angell ward and the Moorlands estate in the western part of Herne Hill ward, it was argued, may look more towards Brixton town centre.

50 The Liberal Democrats therefore put forward a warding structure for this part of the borough which, though not perfect, no doubt reflect the perceived community identities in this area, but which would fit in with their overall electoral scheme for Lambeth and secure good levels of electoral balance by 2002. According to the Liberal Democrats, a new Coldharbour ward by placing 2,005 electors from the western part of Herne Hill ward with 4,774 from the western part of Angell ward and 2,781 from the north-eastern part of the present Tulse Hill ward. The Moorlands estate, which is effectively isolated from much of the present Herne Hill ward by the two sets of railway lines that meet at Herne Hill Station, would be included in the new ward. The ward name of Coldharbour was suggested because of the name of the main road running broadly east to west through the middle of the proposed ward.

51 As a consequence of their proposals for a new Coldharbour ward, the Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the remainder of the present Angell ward (the eastern part containing 2,792 electors) should be transferred to a revised Herne Hill ward. In relation to Tulse Hill ward, the Liberal Democrats proposed that the loss of its north-eastern part to the new Coldharbour ward be offset by the addition of the north-eastern part of Town Hall ward (an area to the east of the A23 road) together with the central part of St Martin’s ward. Under the Liberal Democrats’ 63-member scheme, the proposed wards of Coldharbour, Herne Hill and Tulse Hill would vary from the average: number of electors per councillor by 9 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (7 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent by 2003).

52 While the Council’s proposals for this area would secure good levels of electoral equality, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats’ scheme: the Council’s proposals for this part of the borough may be acceptable, but they do not fit in with the overall warding pattern we are proposing. Although we accept the basis of the Liberal Democrats’ proposals for this area (we accept their proposal for a revised Thurlow Park ward without modification) we believe a modification to the boundary between the proposed Coldharbour and Herne Hill wards would further improve electoral equality overall for the borough. Therefore, we propose transferring a further 272 electors from the southern part of the Liberal Democrats’ proposed Coldharbour ward (the Barnwell Road and Morvel Road area) to Herne Hill ward.

53 Instead of electoral variances of 7 per cent and 1 per cent by 2003 under the Liberal Democrats’ proposals, the number of electors per councillor in both the modified Coldharbour and Herne Hill wards would vary from the borough average by 4 per cent in five years time. We believe our modification would improve electoral equality overall in this area while having relatively little impact on local community identities. For the purposes of consultation we are content to accept the proposed ward name of ‘Coldharbour’ but would welcome further views during Stage Three. Our draft recommendations for this area are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

Clapham Park, Thornton and Town Hall wards

54 The three-member wards of Clapham Park and Town Hall are presently under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 12 per cent and 5 per cent respectively. This area was proposed as a revised Thornto ward. In 2003, it is expected to improve only slightly by 2003 with the wards projected to vary from the borough average by 10 per cent and 3 per cent respectively. Thornton ward is one of only two two-member wards in the borough. The ward is presently under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 6 per cent (improving to 3 per cent by 2003).

55 Having regard to the Government’s White Paper (as outlined in Chapter One) both the Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed creating three-member wards in the borough. In order to facilitate a three-member Thornton ward, the Council proposed dividing most of the adjoining Streatham Hill ward (using Streatham Hill road) in two, with those electors in the western area being placed with most of the present Thornton ward. Electors to the north of Ponders Road would be transferred from Thornton ward into a revised Clapham Park ward.

56 The Council proposed that electors to the east of Park Hill, currently in the north-eastern corner of Clapham Park ward, should be included in its
proposed Brixton Hill ward (currently Town Hall ward). These electors would replace those transferred to its proposed South Brixton ward (as described above). Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in its Brixton Hill, Clapham Park and Thornton wards would initially vary from the borough average by 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (4 per cent, equal to the borough average and 1 per cent by 2003).

7. The Liberal Democrats argued that, as most of Thornton ward lies between Thornton Road and the borough boundary, it was difficult to find a way of producing a three-member ward which both reflected natural communities and secured an optimum degree of electoral equality. Their ideal preference was therefore to retain Thornton as a two-member ward. However, they proposed the creation of a new three-member Thornton ward by adding parts of Clapham Park, Streatham Hill and Town Hall wards to most of the present Thornton ward.

8. The Clapham Park estate is currently split between a number of different wards. The Liberal Democrats proposed uniting the estate within one ward (Thornton) in order both to create a three-member ward with good electoral equality and to reflect that local community. The 1,585 electors in Clapham Park ward to the east of Clarence Avenue, 1,035 electors from the south-western part of Town Hall ward and 945 electors from the north-western part of Streatham Hill ward would all be included in the enlarged three-member Thornton ward.

9. The Liberal Democrats contended that the Clapham Park shops and restaurants of Abbeville Road provide a local focus to the area which is "becoming known as Abbeville Village". They therefore proposed renaming the modified Clapham Park ward as 'Abbeville'. In relation to the present Town Hall ward, the Liberal Democrats stated that they recognised the importance of the local shopping centre along Telegraph Parade which serves both the community south of Brixton Prion (Town Hall ward) and that in Home Garden Road, and proposed Rosspark Estate on the eastern side of Brixton Hill (St Martin's ward). They therefore proposed boundary modifications which would unite this area within one ward.

10. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the revised ward be renamed 'Brixton Hill' in preference to 'Town Hall' because of the confusion caused by saying that "Councillor X is a Town Hall representative". They also contended that as the Town Hall building is located in the far north-eastern corner of the ward, it should not be included within the ward's defining characteristics. 'Brixton Hill' would also reflect the new boundaries of the ward, which crosses Brixton Hill at the southern end and would no longer include any of the Clapham Park estate (transferred to the revised Thornton ward).

11. Under the Liberal Democrats' scheme, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Abbeville, Brixton Hill and Thornton ward would equal the borough average by 1 per cent, equal the borough average and vary by 4 per cent respectively (2 per cent, 2 per cent and equal to the borough average by 2003). Although the differing proposals for council size (60 and 63 members) provide for alternative warding arrangements, the proposals for this area from both the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group provide for an improved level of electoral equality. However, as we have stated above, we have decided to endorse the Liberal Democrats' scheme for the borough as a whole so therefore are content to endorse their proposals for Brixton Hill and Thornton wards.

12. In relation to their proposed 'Abbeville' ward, we are not convinced that the ward name of Clapham Park should be replaced; indeed this is one of the ward names that the Liberal proposal purports to retain. Therefore, we propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' recommendation regarding the boundaries of Clapham Park ward but not their proposed ward name. We would welcome further comments on the issue of ward names (particularly in relation to this area) during Stage Three. Our draft recommendations for the wards of Brixton Hill, Clapham Park and Thornton are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Gipsy Hill, Knight's Hill and Thurlow Park wards

13. The three-member ward of Gipsy Hill is presently under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 2 per cent. A projected (marginal) increase in electorate would result in the ward equalling the borough average by 2003. The neighbouring three-member Knight's Hill ward is presently under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 7 per cent (improving to 2 per cent). Under the Council's scheme, the number of electors per councillor in the ward would vary from the borough average by 3 per cent (1 per cent by 2003).

14. The Liberal Democrat Group also proposed extending the existing ward, by transferring 3,100 electors from St Martin's ward. The electors that would be transferred included those from the Peabody Estate. Under the Group's scheme, the number of electors per councillor would vary from the borough average by 1 per cent (3 per cent by 2003). Both the proposals we received would provide for good levels of electoral equality and appear to have taken into account the community identity of the Peabody Estate, currently contained within St Martin's ward. However, as we are recommending an overall council size of 63, we are content to accept the Liberal Democrats' proposal for a modified three-member Thurlow Park ward, although we invite further views during Stage Three. Our draft recommendations for revised Gipsy Hill, Knight's Hill and Thurlow Park wards are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

St Leonard's ward and the Streatham wards of Hill, South and Wells

15. The three-member wards of St Leonard's, Streatham Hill, Streatham South and Streatham Wells presently suffer from varying degrees of electoral imbalance. Streatham South wards are marginally over-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 3 per cent and 1 per cent respectively. Electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly, with both wards varying from the borough average by 5 per cent by 2003. Streatham Hill and Streatham Wells wards are presently under-represented, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the borough average by 7 per cent and 15 per cent respectively. Electoral equality is projected to improve slightly, with variances expected to be 4 per cent and 14 per cent respectively by 2003.

16. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the Streatham Hill ward be modified by adding 816 electors from the southern part of St Martin's ward, but losing a net total of 940 electors to the modified Thornton ward. Under their proposals, the number of electors per councillor would vary from the borough average by 4 per cent initially, 1 per cent by 2003. The Council proposed to divide the existing ward and preserve the expanded Thoron ward, and then extend the area of the new 'West Dulwich'. The proposed changes were not endorsed by the Council and Liberal Democrat Group.
ward to the east. Under its proposals, electoral equality in these two wards would be 3 per cent and 2 per cent from the average respectively, improving to 1 per cent and equal to the average by 2003.

95 The Liberal Democrats also proposed changes to the other wards in the Streatham area. They contended that the boundary between the wards of Streatham South and Streatham Wells is clearly marked by a Common and that, therefore, it was "not realistic to link a small arbitrarily selected part of the community to the north of the Common with that to the south". However, the boundary between Streatham South ward and St Leonard's ward is currently not altogether clear. St Leonard's ward includes 339 electors in streets south of Greyhound Lane who would perhaps be more appropriately placed in Streatham South ward. The Liberal Democrats therefore proposed amending the boundary so that it follows Greyhound Lane.

96 In order to address the high level of electoral inequality in Streatham Wells ward, the Liberal Democrats proposed transferring electors from Streatham Wells to St Leonard's ward. The proposal would transfer part of polling district SUB (975 electors), an area of housing to the north of the railway line and the east of Streatham High Road. The Liberal Democrats contended that this proposal would unite the centre of the old Streatham Village, around St Leonard's Church, in one ward. Under the Group's proposal for a council size of 63 members, the modified St Leonard's, Streatham South and Streatham Wells wards would vary from the borough average by 3 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (equalling the average, 3 per cent and 2 per cent by 2003).

97 As discussed earlier, the Council proposed dividing the existing Streatham Hill ward along Streatham Hill road, with most of those electors to the west of the road forming part of a modified Thornton ward and those to the east forming part of its proposed Christchurch ward. The Council's modified Streatham Wells ward would lose 676 electors to the proposed Christchurch ward; the number of electors per councillor in the resultant Streatham Wells ward would equal the borough average both initially and by 2003.

98 Like the Liberal Democrats, the Council also proposed transferring 329 electors from the south of Greyhound Lane, presently in St Leonard's ward, to Streatham South ward. However, it further proposed adding 389 electors to St Leonard's ward (Strehall Avenue and Tenham Avenue) from the south western part of the present Streatham Hill ward. The number of electors per councillor in the Council's modified St Leonard's and South Streatham wards would vary from the borough average by 9 per cent and 4 per cent respectively (10 per cent and 7 per cent by 2003).

99 Although the differing proposals for council size (60 and 63 members) provide for alternative warding arrangements, the proposals for St Leonard's, Streatham South and Streatham Wells wards are broadly similar. However, the Liberal Democrats' proposals provide for a better overall level of electoral equality for the area with no ward exceeding 3 per cent by 2003. In view of this, we are content to endorse the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals for St Leonard's, Streatham Hill, Streatham South and Streatham Wells wards. Our draft recommendations for the revised wards are illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Conclusions

96 Having considered all the evidence and the representations received during the initial stage of this review, we propose that:

(a) there should be a council size of 63, a decrease of one;
(b) there should be 21 wards rather than 22 as at present;
(c) the boundaries of all but one of the existing wards should be modified.

97 We propose adopting the majority of the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals. However, we propose some modifications to its scheme in order to secure improved electoral equality having regard to the statutory criteria:

(a) transferring a further 384 electors from the Liberal Democrats' proposed Oval ward to Vassall ward, and 110 electors from the Kennington Park area presently in Vassall ward to the proposed Oval ward;
(b) transferring 601 electors from the existing Fulwell ward to the existing Larbland ward, and
(c) transferring 272 electors from the Liberal Democrats' proposed Goldthorpe ward to their proposed Herne Hill ward.

84 Figure 4 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.

99 As shown in Figure 4, our draft recommendations for Lambeth 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 four to one. By 2003 no ward is forecast to vary by more than 4 per cent from the average. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 5, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998 electorate</th>
<th>2003 forecast electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 5:**
The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Lambeth

<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 Bishop's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>8,872</td>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brixton Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,708</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,314</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clapham Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,654</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>2,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Clapham Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>3,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coldharbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,288</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,517</td>
<td>3,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fordside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>3,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Gipsy Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,031</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,215</td>
<td>3,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Herne Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>3,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Knight's Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Larkhall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,266</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,325</td>
<td>3,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Oval</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,298</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Prince's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,082</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>3,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 St Leonard's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,967</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,192</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Stockwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Streatham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,095</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,230</td>
<td>3,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Streatham South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,919</td>
<td>2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Streatham Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>3,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Thornton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,055</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>3,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Thurlow Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,859</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tulse Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,439</td>
<td>3,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Electorate figures are based on Lambeth 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.

**Figure 5 (continued):**
The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Lambeth

<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>21 Vassall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,815</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,696</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>192,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Electorate figures are based on Lambeth 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.
5. NEXT STEPS

The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Lambeth. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 22 March 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 us:

Director of Reviews
Lambeth 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

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 levels of electoral equality achieved under the schemes submitted by the Borough Council, and by the Liberal Democrat 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 by appointment.

Lambeth Borough Council’s Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Table A1:
Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<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 Brixton Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,904</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Christchurch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,635</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clapham Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,568</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Clapham Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,621</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 East Brixton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gipsy Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,791</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Herne Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,062</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kennington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 North Brixton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,566</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 St Leonards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 South Brixton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,823</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 South Lambeth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued overleaf
Lambeth Borough Council
Liberal Democrat Group’s
Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 5, differ substantively from the proposals put forward by the Liberal Democrat Group in six wards. The Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals for these areas were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,789</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,443</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,188</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,223</td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,665</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,724</td>
<td>2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9,158</td>
<td>3,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,541</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

The Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(3) 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 1972 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 elections 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.

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