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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 administratively 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 Southwark 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 Southwark. Our conclusions are summarised at the front of the report, and illustrated on the large map inside the back cover. Details of our draft recommendations, and how to comment on them, are set out in Chapters 4 and 5.

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


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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Southwark:

- in nine of the 25 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, and four wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;
- by 2003 electoral equality is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 13 wards, and by more than 20 per cent in four wards.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 128-130) are that

- Southwark Borough Council should be served by 63 councillors, one less than at present;
- there should be 21 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 of the 21 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.
- The electoral equality is forecast to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 8 per cent from the borough average 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. He will determine when any changes come into effect.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Constituent areas (existing wards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brunswick ward (part); St Giles ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brunswick ward (part); Newington ward (part); St Giles ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cathedral ward; Browning ward (part); Chaucer ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chaucer ward (part); Abbey ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>College ward; Ruskin ward (part); Rye ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dulwich</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alleyne ward (part); Bellenden ward (part); Lyndhurst ward (part); Rye ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faraday ward (part); Brunswick ward (part); Burgess ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abbey ward (part); Bricklayers ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livesey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consort ward (part); Friary ward (part); Rotherhithe ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newington ward (part); Browning ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barset ward; Consort ward (part); The Lane ward (part); Waverley ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friary ward (part); Liddle ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bellenden ward (part); Rye ward (part); Waverley ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Riverside ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rotherhithe ward (part); Dockyard ward (part); Riverside ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bermondsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bricklayers ward (part); Burgess ward (part); Rotherhithe ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Camberwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bellenden ward (part); Lyndhurst ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Docks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dockyard ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Lane ward (part); Bellenden ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alleyne ward (part); Lyndhurst ward (part); Ruskin ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Browning ward (part); Burgess 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 Southwark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electorate per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electorate per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,472</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>7,419</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>7,062</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,608</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dulwich</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,783</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7,620</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livesey</td>
<td>7,985</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,063</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>8,183</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,012</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,543</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,876</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bermondsey</td>
<td>7,805</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Camberwell</td>
<td>7,901</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,780</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Docks</td>
<td>7,561</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,795</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued overleaf
1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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 Parliamentary Boundary Commission in its reviews of parliamentary constituencies.

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

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 began 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 (continued):

The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Southwark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (2003)</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 The Lase</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Village</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160,464</td>
<td>163,747</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes:
1. 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.
2. The total electorate figures differ from those shown in Figure 4 by 20 and 20 electors respectively, which has a negligible impact on variances.

---

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 a 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, Southwark 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, set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. For all unitary councils, including London boroughs, it proposed elections by thirds. It also referred 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 PER programme, including the London boroughs, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain the approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 Guidance. Nonetheless, we added that local authorities and other interested parties would no doubt wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. Our general experience so far is that proposals for three-member ward patterns are emerging from most areas in London.

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

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.

### 2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Review of Southwark

This is our first review of the electoral arrangements for Southwark. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in April 1977 (Report No. 205).

Stage One began on 22 September 1998, when we wrote to Southwark 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 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.

Since the last electoral review, there has been a decrease in electorate in the borough, with around 13 per cent fewer electors than two decades ago, although in recent years the electorate has begun to stabilise and the electorate in the borough as a whole is forecast to increase by approximately 2 per cent by 2003. The largest areas of growth are anticipated to be in the existing wards of Abbey, Chaucer, Dockyard (which has already experienced substantial growth) and Riverdale in the north of the borough and the Liddle and Friary wards in the Peckham area.

At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,508 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,558 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 nine of the 25 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and in four wards by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Dockyard ward where each of the three councillors represents an average 76 per cent more electors than the borough average.

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

The electorate of the borough (February 1998) is 160,493. The Council currently has 64 councillors who are elected from 25 wards (Map 1 and Figure 4). Fourteen wards are each represented by three councillors and 11 wards return two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.
### Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor from average</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor from average</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abbey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Alleyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Barset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bellenden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bricklayers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,788</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Browning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Burgess</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>4,098</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cathedral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,384</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,717</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chaucer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,699</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,468</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Consort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dockyard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,278</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13,746</td>
<td>4,582</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Faraday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,548</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Friary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>5,639</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Liddle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,989</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5,717</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lyndhurst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Newington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,666</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Rotherhithe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Ruskin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,903</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued overleaf*
### 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 Southwark Borough Council.

25 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their cooperation and assistance. We received four representations during Stage One, including borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council, the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats, and a submission from Unwin and Friary Tenants & Residents' Association. These, with accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

### Southwark Borough Council

26 The Borough Council proposed a reduction in council size from 64 to 63 members in order to facilitate the introduction of a three-member ward pattern across the borough, in response to the Government's White Paper *Modern Local Democracy - In Touch with the People*. The Council proposed modifications to all of the existing ward boundaries, resulting in a net reduction of four wards. The Council undertook a consultation exercise, with a leaflet sent to households in the borough, and placed information in local libraries and council offices throughout the borough. However, it received a limited number of responses and stated that it was difficult to draw any conclusions from them. The Council's proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

### The Conservatives

27 The Conservative Group on the Council (jointly with the Constituency Conservative Associations of Camberwell & Peckham, Dulwich & West Norwood and North Southwark & Bermondsey) proposed a council size of 63 serving a pattern of 21 three-member wards for the borough. They proposed a number of boundaries that were similar to the Borough Council's and also proposed retaining some existing ward boundaries. They stated, "we believe that the ward boundaries we have suggested achieve, as nearly as maybe, the criterion of equality between the wards", having regard to identifiable boundaries and local ties. The Conservatives added that they had "liaised with the local Liberal Democrats at the stage of planning our proposals, and we have made the same proposals in terms of ward boundaries as the Liberal Democrats". These proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

### The Liberal Democrats

28 The Liberal Democrats on the Council (jointly with Simon Hughes MP Camberwell & Peckham and Dulwich & West Norwood Liberal Democrats) also proposed a council size of 63 and a pattern of 21 three-member wards. They stated that in developing their proposals they had sought to "achieve the primary rule of electoral equality as well as maintaining or creating identifiable boundaries and enhancing or re-creating natural communities wherever possible". Their proposed ward boundaries were the same as those proposed by the Conservatives.

### Other Representations

29 We received one further representation from Unwin and Friary Tenants & Residents' Association which commented on the Borough Council's proposals. The Association considered that the Council's proposals would divide the Unwin and Friary estates between two wards, thereby adversely affecting the Association's relationship with the councillors for the area. It added that the Council's consultation period had been limited.
4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

30 As indicated previously, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Southwark 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.

32 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 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

34 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2003, projecting an increase in the electorate of 2 per cent from 166,493 to 163,727 over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. It expects much of the growth to occur in the north of the borough, particularly in the wards along the River Thames but also with growth in the Peckham area, particularly in the existing Liddle and Friary wards. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to the unitary development plan for the borough, and the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

35 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

36 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.

37 Southwark Borough Council currently has 64 members. The Borough Council, the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats all proposed minimal change to the existing council size, submitting proposals based on a council size of 63 in order to facilitate a pattern of three-member wards throughout the borough.
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 63 members.

Electoral Arrangements

We have carefully considered all the representations received, including two borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council, and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats. From these representations a number of considerations have emerged which have informed us when preparing our draft recommendations.

First, there appears to be an acknowledgement locally that the present electoral arrangements are unsatisfactory and capable of significant improvement. Each of the borough-wide schemes made positive proposals for change and would improve on the current levels of electoral inequality, although to different degrees.

Second, there was consensus on a council size of 63, one member less than at present. The Borough Council stated that in reaching a decision on council size, it had adopted a three-member warding pattern across the whole borough, having regard to the Government’s White Paper. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also supported the pattern of 21 three-member wards for the borough.

Third, there was a degree of consensus between the two borough-wide proposals on a number of features that provide good boundaries, such as the London Bridge to Kent railway line and Old Kent Road in the north, and Lordship Lane in the south. There was some affinity between proposed ward boundaries, particularly in the north and west of the borough, although less so in the centre and south of the borough.

Fourth, in seeking to reflect local identities and in view of the large number of established housing estates in the borough, respondents generally sought to avoid splitting estates between wards where this was consistent with the need to achieve electoral equality. However, such estates do not always fit into equal ward sizes and, therefore, to achieve a fair level of representation across the whole borough, it is necessary sometimes to divide estates for the purpose of borough warding. We have tried to reflect such considerations in our draft recommendations where it would be consistent with our objective of electoral equality.

Our prime objective of securing electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, has guided us in developing our draft recommendations. We recognise the significantly better electoral equality which would result in the great majority of wards proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, compared to the Borough Council’s proposals. We also note that electoral equality was expected to improve over time under the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ scheme, while under the Council’s scheme it would generally worsen over the five-year period.

While a number of the Council’s proposed wards appeared to provide marginally better electoral equality or follow more prominent ward boundaries when viewed in isolation, it has not always been possible to adopt such proposals due to the consequential charges to adjacent wards. We have had to consider the borough as a whole rather than individual wards.

Finally, we have sought to build on the proposals we received in order to put forward electoral arrangements which would achieve yet further improvements in electoral equality, while also seeking to reflect the statutory criteria. In formulating our proposals we have sought to reflect the consensus among respondents for warding arrangements, where it exists. We are proposing modifications to ward boundaries in those areas where we consider further improvements in electoral equality can be achieved or more easily identifiable boundaries followed. Inevitably, we could not reflect the preferences of all the respondents in our draft recommendations.

We therefore conclude that the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposals would better meet the objectives of the review and we have used their proposals as a starting point, although we propose a number of additional boundary modifications.

Following discussions with Council officers, a number of minor errors ‘have been identified in the electorate figures used in the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposals. The majority of these errors had minimal impact on electoral variances and did not significantly affect the good level of electoral equality under their scheme. Having sought clarification from the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats on the precise location of ward boundaries and electorate data contained within their original submissions, we have also noted that, in some areas where polling districts would be split, they had used the draft 1999 electoral register. In consultation with Council officers we have revised electorate figures to reflect accurately the proposed boundaries, and used the 1998 electoral register figures and calculated any revisions to 2003 electorate forecasts which would occur for those areas that form the basis of our draft recommendations.

The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

(a) Cathedral and Chaucer wards;
(b) Abbey, Bricklayers and Riverside wards;
(c) Dockyard ward;
(d) Browning, Burgess, Parfay and Newington wards;
(e) Consort, Friary, Liddle and Rotherhithe wards;
(f) Brunswick and St Giles wards;
(g) Banister and The Lane wards;
(h) Allen, Bellenden and Lyndhurst wards;
(i) Ryde and Waverley wards;
(j) College and Ruskin wards.

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

The two wards of Cathedral and Chaucer are situated in the north-west corner of the borough. Cathedral ward is currently represented by two councillors and the average number of electors per councillor is 7 per cent above the borough average (expected to be 12 per cent above in 2003). In Chaucer ward the average number of electors represented by each of the three councillors for the ward is currently only 1 per cent above the average. However, in view of the growth forecast for this area of nearly 1,000 electors over the five-year period, electors in the ward would be under-represented by 12 per cent in 2003.

The Borough Council proposed extending Cathedral ward to the south to include an area west of Newington Causeway and the Blackfriars to Kent railway line (currently in Chaucer ward), together with an area south of Elephant and Castle, north of Brixton Batts and west of the railway line (currently in Browning ward). The Council argued that it proposed including properties around the Elephant and Castle Shopping Centre, such as Metro Central Heights, in Cathedral ward in order to create a ward with “a common Elephant & Castle identity”. Under the Council’s proposals the average number of electors in Cathedral ward would be 4 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average in 2003).

The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a similarly modified ward for this area, except where they proposed that the ward boundary should extend further along Newington Causeway as far as Elephant and Castle, rather than follow the railway line as proposed by the Council. The Liberal Democrats argued that their proposed Cathedrals ward would create a new and easily identifiable boundary along the whole length of Borough High Street and Newington Causeway to the Elephant and Castle. Under the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposed Cathedrals ward the average number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the average (equal to the average in 2003) based on corrected electorate data.

The Borough Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed splitting the boundaries for a modified Chaucer ward. In addition to their proposed western ward boundaries with a modified Cathedral ward, described above, both schemes proposed that the eastern ward boundary should be extended to include part of the existing Abbey ward. The Council proposed that the boundary should go northwards along Tower Bridge Road, turning west along Long Lane, north along Weston Street, Guy’s Way and Kipling Street before rejoining the existing boundary near Guy’s Hospital.

The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also proposed using Tower Bridge Road and Long Lane as a new boundary, but proposed following Long Lane between Tower Bridge Road and the existing boundary at Crosby Row. The Liberal Democrats argued that this would utilise identifiable boundaries throughout.
The average number of electors per councillor in Chaucer ward under the Council's proposals would be equal to the borough average (10 per cent above the average in 2003), and under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals, using amended electorate figures, would be 8 per cent below the average (5 per cent above the average in 2003).

We would normally expect any electoral imbalances to improve over the five-year period, and we were therefore concerned at the degree of electoral inequality which would result under the Borough Council's proposals in 2003. We judge that the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals would use clearly definable boundaries, particularly greater use of Long Lane, and achieve better electoral equality. We are therefore adopting the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed boundaries for Cathedral and Chaucer wards. We propose to retain the ward name Cathedral, rather than Cathedrals as proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats.

Abbey, Bricklayers and Riverside wards

These three wards are located in the north of the borough, with Abbey and Bricklayers wards each currently returning two councillors and Riverside returning three councillors. Abbey and Riverside wards are both currently over-represented, with 8 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (unchanged from 2003). Abbey ward is significantly under-represented, with 37 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (unchanged in 2003).

Both borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats attempts to address the notable imbalances in these three wards. The schemes shared a number of similarities, although some alternative ward boundaries were proposed under each scheme.

The proposals from both the Borough Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats would create a new three-member ward incorporating much of the area covered by the existing Abbey and Bricklayers wards. The proposals differed only slightly for the ward's east and west boundaries. Both proposed using the London Bridge to Kent railway line as the northern boundary of the new ward. The proposed western ward boundaries with Chaucer ward are described earlier.

For the ward's east boundary, both schemes proposed extending an existing ward boundary of Old Kent Road as far as the junction with Duntom Road. At this point the Council proposed turning north along Duntom Road, east on Lynton Road, north along Riversey Road, east at Southwark Park Road and north along the existing boundary of St James's Road to join the London Bridge to Kent railway line. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed following Duntom Road further north until its junction with Southwark Park Road, along which the boundary would run in an easterly direction as far as the existing ward boundary.

The two schemes proposed different names for the new ward: the average number of electors per councillor under the Council's proposed Grange ward would be 5 per cent above the borough average (8 per cent above in 2003), and under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed, West Bermondsey ward, based on revised electorate data, it would be 6 per cent below the average (2 per cent below in 2003). We propose adopting the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed warding pattern in this area as it would provide a high degree of electoral equality. We propose a slight modification to their proposed eastern ward boundary of West Bermondsey, following a line along Linsey Street to the London Bridge to Kent railway line which would better reflect ground detail in the area. We also propose naming the new ward as Grange ward as suggested by the Council.

The two borough-wide schemes proposed minimal change to the boundaries of the existing Riverside ward, except to the eastern boundary which currently follows Southwark Park Road and part of Jamaica Road. Instead the Council proposed a minor modification so that the northern part of the eastern boundary would traverse Kings Stairs Gardens, before rejoining the existing boundary of Jamaica Road. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed that the existing boundary along Southwark Park Road should continue due north along West Lane. Both schemes proposed retaining the existing ward name of Riverside.

The electoral variance would be 5 per cent under the Borough Council's proposals (4 per cent in 2003) and 9 per cent under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals (zero in 2003) using amended electorate figures.

We consider that the boundary along West Lane, as proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, would provide a coherent boundary and an improving level of electoral equality over the five-year period. We are endorsing it as our draft recommendation for Riverside ward.

Dockyard ward

Dockyard ward, in the north-east of the borough, is bounded to the north and east by the River Thames, and has experienced the most significant electorate growth in the borough due to the residential development of the docks. With 76 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (79 per cent in 2003), Dockyard suffers the greatest electoral inequality of any ward in the borough under the existing arrangements.

In order to address the significant under-representation in this area, both the Borough Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed dividing the existing ward into two new three-member wards. Both proposals involved a north-south split of the area, but the boundary between the two new wards differed under the two schemes.

The Council proposed a new Dockyard ward covering the eastern area and a new Rotherhithe ward to the west. In proposed boundary between the two wards would lie to the west of Greenland Quay, running north along Surrey Quays Road before following Alson Channel to Surrey Water and extending to the borough boundary.

The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a new Surrey Docks ward covering the eastern area and a new Rotherhithe ward to the west. Their proposed boundary between the two wards would extend northwards along Lower Road to Redriff Road and north along the centre of Surrey Quays Road, and along Canada Street, Quebec Way and Russia Walk, lying to the west of Russia Dock Woodland and south of Becontree College, extending eastwards to include more of Timber Fon Road in their proposed Rotherhithe ward, and finally following a footpath through to Surrey Water and the borough boundary beyond.

The electoral variance in the Council's proposed Dockyard ward would be 5 per cent and in the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed Surrey Docks ward it would be 1 per cent (5 per cent and zero respectively in 2003).

The two schemes also proposed similar amendments to the western boundary of the proposed Rotherhithe ward. The Council proposed broadly following the existing ward boundary south from the River Thames, although extending this boundary along Southwark Park Road to where it meets the London Bridge to Kent railway line, turning east along the railway line to South Bermondsey station and the borough boundary. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a similar boundary along Southwark Park Road and part of the London Bridge to Kent railway line, but followed the centre of Rotherhithe New Road east from the junction with the railway line before turning south along the existing ward boundary of Warrndale Road. They also proposed an alternative boundary north of Southwark Park Road, following a line from the River Thames, then west along Bermondsey Wall East and south along West Lane.

The average number of electors per councillor in Rotherhithe ward would be equal to the borough average under the Council's proposal (unchanged in 2003) and, following a minor recalibration of the electorate figures, 1 per cent below the average under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposal (1 per cent above in 2003).

There was much similarity between the two sets of proposals for this area, with both using boundaries such as Southwark Park Road and Surrey Quays Road. However, we propose adopting the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed boundaries for these two wards as they would achieve good electoral equality, follow easily identifiable boundaries and facilitate good warding arrangements elsewhere in the borough. We propose one minor boundary modification to follow a line from Bacos College across Timber Pond Road and along Dock Hill Avenue, which would affect 20 electors who would fall within the proposed Surrey Docks ward. We are consulting on the proposed ward names of Rotherhithe, as proposed under both schemes, and Surrey Docks as proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats. We consider that the latter ward name would better reflect the fact that this is a new ward. Under our proposals the electoral variance would be 1 per cent in both Surrey Docks ward and
Rotherhithe ward, with little or no change expected in 2003.

Browning, Burgess, Faraday and Newington wards

Moving southwards, the three wards of Faraday, Browning and Newington each retain three councillors and Burgess ward currently returns two councillors. Faraday and Newington wards are both under-represented, with 14 per cent and 23 per cent fewer councillors per electorate than the borough average respectively (15 per cent and equal to the average in 2003). Browning and Burgess wards are both significantly over-represented, with 10 per cent and 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively (15 per cent and 20 per cent in 2003).

A reasonable amount of change to ward boundaries in this area is necessary due to the large electoral imbalances which exist and the enlargement of Burgess ward to form a three-member ward. Both the Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed slightly modified wards of Faraday and Newington, but on different boundaries. The existing Burgess ward currently includes Burgess Park and straddles part of Old Kent Road; both schemes proposed following Old Kent Road as a boundary throughout this area. However, the Council proposed including Burgess Park, with the area to its south, in a revised Liddle ward, while the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed including the majority of the park, with an area to its south, in a new Walsworth ward.

Under both schemes an area of the current Browning ward around Elephant and Castle would be transferred into modified wards (as detailed previously). Both the Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed retaining a number of the existing ward boundaries in this area along Walsworth Road, New Kent Road, part of East Street and Thurlow Walk. Both schemes proposed a broadly similar modified eastern boundary for Faraday ward in the area of Bagshot Street, in order to include the Aylesbury Estate in one ward.

The Council proposed an enlarged Browning ward incorporating the northern part of the existing Burgess ward and, the southern part of Burgess ward would form part of an enlarged Liddle ward (detailed later). The Council proposed a revised western boundary for Browning ward which would follow Albany Road from Bagshot Street to Old Kent Road. In contrast, the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed extending the ward further south to incorporate an area around Burgess Park, utilising the existing western and southern ward boundaries of Burgess ward and a modified eastern ward boundary along Old Kent Road. The remainder of the existing Burgess ward east of Old Kent Road would form part of a new South Bermondsey ward under their proposals, as detailed later. Under the Council’s proposals the area east of Old Kent Road and south of Albany Road would form parts of new Liddle and South Bermondsey wards (detailed later).

Both schemes proposed similar modifications to Newington ward, to include part of the existing Browning ward south of Newington Butts and Walsworth Road. The Council proposed following the existing boundary along Walsworth Road, extending this boundary at the southern end before turning west to follow the rear of properties along the southern side of John Ruskin Street to the borough boundary. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats similarly proposed utilising the existing boundary along Walsworth Road, although maintaining the existing ward boundaries along Fielding Street, the Blackfriars to Sevenoaks railway line and John Ruskin Street to the borough boundary.

The Council proposed modifying the east and west boundaries of the existing Faraday ward, with the ward’s western boundary being redrawn to wholly follow Walsworth Road. The eastern boundary would lie east of Bagshot Street, as mentioned above. The Council argued that its proposals in this area would respect local community ties and housing patterns as well as utilising strong ward boundaries. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a similar northern boundary (the existing boundary along Old Street) and eastern ward boundary to the Council (although its eastern boundary would follow the centre of Bagshot Street), and also proposed transferring a similar area of the existing Faraday ward west of Walsworth Road into an adjoining ward. However, they proposed that the existing southern ward boundary along Albany Road should be extended to include the western part of Burgess Park (north of Bowyer Place and Parkhouse Street and west of Wells Way) from the existing Brunwick ward.

Under the Council’s proposals the electoral variances in its proposed three wards for this area of Browning, Faraday and Newington would be 2 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent respectively (8 per cent, 8 per cent and 10 per cent in 2003 respectively). Under the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposed wards of Faraday, Newington and Walsworth, the electoral variances would be 7 per cent and 3 per cent (2 per cent, 3 per cent and 2 per cent respectively in 2003).

We have carefully considered the alternative proposals for this area. We recognise the use of a number of common boundaries by both schemes, notably Walsworth Road, East Street and Old Kent Road, and that both schemes would unite the whole of Aylesbury estate in one ward. However, the proposed warding arrangements from the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats would achieve much better electoral equality than the Council’s proposals. In fact, they were concerned at the level of relative under-representation in Newington ward and over-representation in Browning and Faraday wards that would result under the Council’s proposals.

We therefore conclude that the Conservatives’ and Independent proposals’ would better meet the main objective of the review, that of electoral equality, and adopt their proposed wards for this area as part of our draft recommendations.

Consort, Friary, Liddle and Rotherhithe wards

These four wards in the centre of the borough are all significantly over-represented under the current electoral arrangements. The two-member Consort and Friary wards each return two councillors per elector (rising to 4 of every 150 per cent in 2003), and the three, three-member wards of Friary, Liddle and Rotherhithe each have more than 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (unchanged in 2003).

The existing Rotherhithe ward would be subject to considerable modification under the two schemes, each of which judged the different ward patterns for the area. The Council proposed a new South Bermondsey ward which would cover the majority of the existing Rotherhithe ward, and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a new South Bermondsey ward on different boundaries, which would cover that part of the existing Rotherhithe ward north of Rotherhithe New Road, with the area to the south forming part of a new Livesey ward.

In particular, the Council proposed that part of the existing Rotherhithe ward north of the London Bridge to Kent rail line should form part of a new Walsworth ward (detailed earlier) which would lie north of the railway line and east of Southwark Park Road (an area currently within Dockyard ward). The eastern boundary of the Council’s proposed South Bermondsey ward would follow the borough boundary; and the western boundary would form a boundary with its proposed Grange ward, broadly following Darton Road, Lynton Road, Rotherhithe Park Road and St James Road, thereby incorporating part of the existing Bricklayer’s ward. The whole of the Council’s proposed southern boundary for South Bermondsey ward would be the Old Kent Road.

The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a substantially different warding pattern to the Council in this area. They proposed that a new Bermondsey ward would comprise that part of the existing Rotherhithe ward generally west of Rotherhithe New Road, together with that part of the existing Bricklayer’s ward south of Southwark Park Road and east of Darton Road, and part of Burgesses ward north of Old Kent Road. The southern boundary would follow the Old Kent Road. The remainder of the existing Rotherhithe ward would form part of a new Consort ward to the south.

For the area to the south of its proposed South Bermondsey ward, south of Old Kent Road, the Council proposed a new Livesey ward comprising parts of the existing wards of Consort and Friary. The proposed southern boundary for the ward would follow the existing boundary along Queen’s Road and as far as the library, its western boundary would follow Peckham Park Road and Buller Close to the existing boundary and its eastern boundary would be the borough boundary.

For the area to the south of their proposed South Bermondsey ward, south of Rotherhithe New Road, the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also proposed a new Livesey ward, but on different boundaries. Their proposed ward would straddle Old Kent Road in this part of the borough, with its eastern boundary following the borough boundary; its southern boundary going west on Clifton Way and part of Meeting House Lane, and its western boundary going north along Naylor Road, west on Commercial Way, north to the rear of properties on Peckham Park Road and
west on Bird in Bush Road to the existing boundary with Liddle ward.

81. The Council argued that the boundary between its proposed Livery and South Bermondsey wards along Old Kent Road is a major natural boundary and this change would act to cement the border between Rothethebite and Peckham. On the other hand, the Liberal Democrats argued that "both communities to the north and south of the Old Kent Road look to the Old Kent Road as their natural area for shopping and leisure facilities", and this was reflected in their proposal for a ward that straddles a small section of Old Kent Road in the east of the borough.

82. Under the Council's proposal the average number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the borough average in Livery ward and 12 per cent above in South Bermondsey ward (5 per cent above and 9 per cent above in 2003 respectively). Under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrat proposals, Livery and South Bermondsey wards would be 3 per cent above and 1 per cent above the average respectively (2 per cent above and 1 per cent below in 2003).

9. To the west of that area the Council proposed a new Liddle ward which would cover the whole of the existing ward together with that part of the existing Friary ward north-west of Peckham Park Road, that part of Burgess ward south of Albany Road and Old Kent Road, including Burgess Park, and part of Brunswick ward of South Tottenham Peckham and east of Welth. The electoral variance in the Council's proposed Liddle ward would be 3 per cent (5 per cent in 2003).

91. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also proposed a new ward to the west, again including the whole of the existing Liddle ward but together with parts of the existing Friary ward west of Naylor Road, north of Goldsmith Road and Peckham Hill Road, and the electoral variance would be 1 per cent above the average (1 per cent in 2003).

92. Under their proposals most of Burgess Park would form part of a new Walworth ward (detailed earlier).

93. We have carefully considered the alternative warding patterns for this area. We note that each set of proposals would use some of the same clear boundaries, including Old Kent Road, and each would use a number of other clearly identifiable, but different, boundaries. However, in using the length of Old Kent Road as a boundary, the Council's proposals would result in a degree of electoral imbalance across the borough. While it is a major road, we notice that the existing wards of Burgess and Consort both straddle the road. We therefore propose using most of the Old Kent Road as a ward boundary, except in the most easterly part where the existing Consort ward straddles the road, as does the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed Liddle ward. This is necessary if the objective of electoral equality is to be achieved across the whole borough.

94. We propose modifying the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed Livery ward in order to facilitate an improved warding pattern in the wider area, while maintaining good electoral equality and clear boundaries. We propose that the southern boundary of Livery ward should lie to the north of properties on Clifton Crescent, turning south along Asylum Road, then west along the existing boundary of Queen's Road. Furthermore, we propose that the existing boundary along Meeting House Lane and Nayer are a ward boundary between the proposed Livery and Peckham wards, with the whole of Acoen estate remaining within one ward, and the boundary should continue westwards along Commercial Road as far as the existing boundary at the recreation ground. Under our draft recommendations the average number of electors per council would be 5 per cent above the average in Livery ward and 5 per cent below the average in Peckham ward (3 per cent and 5 per cent above in 2003). In South Bermondsey it would be 2 per cent above the average (equal to the average in 2003).

95. We recognise that South Bermondsey railway station would be just outside the ward of the same name under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposal which we are adopting, but the proposed ward would also cover much of the same area as the Council's proposed South Bermondsey ward and we therefore conclude that we should consult on the ward name. We would welcome views during Stage Three.

Brunswick and St Giles wards

96. Brunswick and St Giles wards are situated in the west of the borough, and each currently returns three councillors. The area covered by both wards is relatively over-represented, with the councillors for Brunswick ward each representing 9 per cent fewer electors than the average for the borough (10 per cent in 2003) and the councillors for St Giles ward each representing 1 per cent fewer electors (4 per cent in 2003).

97. The Borough Council proposed modifying the existing Brunswick ward by transferring the eastern area north of Southampan Way and west of Wells Way into a modified Liddle ward, and incorporating an area bounded by Wyndham Road, Camberwell Road and John Ruskin Road, currently part of Furnivall and Furnivall wards. The Council argued that the area between Wyndham Road and John Ruskin Street encompasses a "natural community" which is currently divided between two wards. The northern and southern ward boundaries along Albany Road and Peckham Road respectively would be retained under its proposals. The Council also proposed retaining the majority of the existing St Giles ward south of Wyndham Road in a ward of the same name, subject to extending the eastern boundary to follow a line to the east of properties along Talfourd Road.

98. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a new ward called Camberwell Green which would comprise parts of the existing wards of St Giles, Brunswick and Faraday. The ward would include that part of the existing Faraday ward bounded by Bethwil Road and Ladesley Close to the south, and John Ruskin Street to the north; that part of St Giles ward north of Daneville Road; and that part of the existing Brunswick ward bounded by Addington Square, Southampan Way, Elmington Road, Don Elen Close and Camberwell Church Road. The Conservatives noted that their proposed ward would "focus on Camberwell Green, an area with a strong sense of identity and strong local ties". Their proposed Brook Green ward would cover much of the existing Brunswick ward as far north as Bowyer Place and Parkhouse Street.

99. Under the Council's proposal the number of electors per councillor would be 10 per cent above the borough average in Brunswick ward and 8 per cent below in St Giles ward (9 per cent above and 11 per cent below respectively in 2003). Under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed Brunswick Park ward it would be equal to the average and in Camberwell Green ward it would be 2 per cent above the average (2 per cent below and 1 per cent below respectively in 2003).

We carefully considered the alternative proposals for this area. Under the Council's proposals Brunswick ward would be relatively under-represented while St Giles ward would be over-represented to a similar degree. The Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals would achieve a superior level of electoral equality and we are putting forward a modified Brunswick Park and Camberwell Green wards for consultation. However, we propose modifying their eastern ward boundary of Brunswick Park ward to follow the centre of Bushey Hill Road rather than Crofton Road, in order to further improve electoral equality in the area. Under our proposals the average number of electors per councillor in both Brunswick Park and Camberwell Green would be 1 per cent above the average (1 per cent below the average and 2 per cent below in 2003).

Barset and The Lane wards

100. These two wards, each returning two councillors, are located in the east of the borough. Under the current arrangements the average number of electors per councillor in Barset ward is 14 per cent below the borough average (13 per cent below in 2003) and in The Lane ward it is equal to the average (3 per cent below in 2003).

101. In describing its proposals for Barset and The Lane, the Council stated that "in essence both existing wards are to be merged", and they proposed to call this new ward Consall ward. A number of boundary modifications were proposed, an area south of Evelina Road and east of Nunhead Grove, currently in Barset ward, would form part of a modified Waverley ward; a number of properties broadly to the west of the Road currently in The Lane ward, would form part of a modified St Giles ward; and that part of The Lane ward around Blenheim Grove and Cloumert Grove would form part of a modified Bellenden ward.

102. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed an alternative reconfiguration of wards in this area. They proposed a new ward, to be called Nunhead, which would comprise all of the existing Barset ward along with parts of adjacent wards. The proposed northern boundary would lie north of Queen's Road (the boundary with their proposed Livery and Peckham wards); a modified western boundary would follow Rye Lane, Heathen Road and Ellery Street before turning north to the Peckham Rye to Nunhead railway line and
following the railway line south-east to the junction with Evelina Road before turning west along the existing ward boundary to Linden Grove, then along Bradley Footpath and Inverton Road to the borough boundary. The Liberal Democrats argued that their proposed Nunhead ward "centred on the established and recognised community of Nunhead". For The Lane ward, they proposed transferring an area in the north of the existing Bellenden ward bounded in the north by the existing northern ward boundary, in the east by Rye Lane, in the south by East Dulwich Road and in the west by Aida Road, Avondale Rise and the railway line from Bellenden ward into a modified The Lane ward. An area in the east of the existing The Lane ward would form part of their proposed Nunhead ward, as described earlier.

106 Under the Council's proposed Cossall ward, the number of electors per councilor would be 7 per cent below the average (8 per cent below in 2003). We noted a discrepancy between the figures supplied by the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats for part of polling district UB which would be split between their proposed Nunhead and Rye ward. After seeking clarification from officers at the Borough Council and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, we calculated that this discrepancy would reduce the disparity between electoral equality anticipated in their proposed Peckham Rye ward. In order to address this, we propose modifying the southern boundary between Peckham Rye and their proposed Sydenham Hill ward (detailed later). We also propose a modification to the northern boundary between Nunhead and Livesey wards in order to further improve electoral equality in the area, following the centre of Peckham High Street and Cossall by a north along Asylum Road and east to Old Kent Road to the north of properties along Clifton Crescent.

107 With this recalculation of the electorate data and our proposed boundary modifications, we consider that the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals would provide a fairer level of representation for the wider area than would the Council's. We are therefore endorsing their proposals as part of our draft recommendations. The two wards proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats provide a balanced level of representation when compared to the single ward proposed by the Borough Council as their Council proposed a modified warden pattern for two wards in the existing Rye and Waverley ward area, where the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed a single ward (detailed later). Under our draft recommendations, the average number of electors per councilor in Nunhead ward would be 2 per cent below the average and in The Lane ward equal to the average (1 per cent below and 3 per cent below respectively in 2003).

108 Albyn, Bellenden and Lyndhurst wards

109 Albyn, Bellenden and Lyndhurst are situated in the south-east of the borough. The average number of electors per councilor in the present Albyn, Bellenden and Lyndhurst wards varies by 5 per cent or less from the borough average both initially and in 2003.

110 Albyn ward would be redistributed and form parts of four adjacent wards under the Borough Council's proposals, Ruskin, Lyndhurst, Bellenden and Rye. Under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals, Albyn ward would be subject to significant change, with the majority of the existing Albyn ward (apart from an area south of Lordship Lane) forming a new East Dulwich ward, with the remainder of the ward together with an area of the existing Rye ward to the south (broadly west of Dunstan Road and south of Underhill Road) and areas of the existing Bellenden ward to the north of the proposed minimal change to the existing boundaries of Lyndhurst ward, also argued that their proposals would utilise easily identifiable boundaries.

111 Under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals, Bellenden ward would be relocated to form parts of modified Albyn, The Lane, Lyndhurst and Waverley wards. The Borough Council proposed retaining the centre of Bellenden ward's existing boundaries, only proposing new ward boundaries in the south-eastern corner of the ward (to follow a line to the north-east of properties along Barry Road), the south-west of the ward (to include an area around Fellbrigg Road, currently in Albyn ward, and transferring an area south of Grove Vale Road into a modified Lyndhurst ward), and the north-east (to include an area south of Queens Road to Denmark Hill railway line – via Peckham Rye station currently in The Lane ward).

112 The Borough Council proposed retaining the northern boundary of Lyndhurst ward along the Peckham Rye to Denmark Hill railway line and that part of the existing eastern ward boundary along the Peckham Rye to East Dulwich railway line. However, it proposed a slight modification to the remaining eastern ward boundary to follow Grove Vale from a point just north of East Dulwich railway station through to Lordship Lane where it rejoins the existing ward boundary. The southern boundary would also be modified by transferring an area generally north of Green Dale Path into a modified Ruskin ward. The ward's western boundary forms the borough boundary. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also proposed retaining the majority of Lyndhurst ward unchanged, although in a different manner to the Borough Council. They proposed retaining the existing northern, southern and western boundaries. The eastern boundary – from a point where the railway line crosses Avondale Rise to a point just north of East Dulwich railway station – would be modified, transferring an area of properties currently in Bellenden ward into a modified Lyndhurst ward, which they proposed renaming South Camberwell.

113 The Borough Council argued that its proposed Lyndhurst ward would be "preserved as an undivided community" and by retaining a number of existing boundaries, such as the railway lines it would follow natural boundaries, particularly in the north and east. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats argued that by proposing minimal change to the existing boundaries of Lyndhurst ward, also argued that their proposals would utilise easily identifiable boundaries.

114 The Borough Council suggested that its proposed modifications to Bellenden wards should broadly follow the existing ward boundaries, but where changes were suggested these would create more easily identifiable ward boundaries. The Conservatives argued that their proposed East Dulwich ward would have a "strong degree of natural community feeling" and the ward's proposed boundaries, particularly along Crystal Palace Road, Lordship Lane and Underhill Road, would provide "natural and readily identifiable boundaries".

115 Under the Council's proposed Lyndhurst and Bellenden wards, the average number of electors per councilor would be 6 per cent below the average and equal to the average (9 per cent below and 5 per cent below in 2003). Under the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed South Camberwell and East Dulwich wards, using revised electorate figures the average number of electors per councilor would be 3 per cent and 5 per cent above the average respectively (both equal to the average in 2003).

116 We are proposing to adopt the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' South Camberwell and East Dulwich wards as part of our draft recommendations, which we consider would achieve a more balanced level of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria and utilising easily identifiable ward boundaries. They would also form part of a good electoral scheme across the borough.

Rye and Waverley wards

117 Rye and Waverley, currently both two-member wards, are located in the south-east of the borough. Rye ward is currently under-represented, with 17 per cent more electors per councilor than the average (13 per cent more in 2003), and Waverley ward is over-represented, with 7 per cent fewer electors per councilor (10 per cent fewer in 2003).

118 The Borough Council proposed a revised warding pattern for the area covered by the existing Rye and Waverley wards, whereby an area north and east of Forest Hill Road and Peckham Rye would be transferred into a modified Waverley ward. The existing western ward boundary, along Barry Road, would no longer be underlined under the Council's proposals instead an alternative boundary would follow a line to the west of properties on Crystal Palace Road from its junction with Lordship Lane in the south to Uphold Road in the north, thereafter north-east along Uphold Road and south-west along the rear of properties along Barry Road to the junction with Forest Hill Road. The Borough Council argued that its proposed ward, to be renamed Underhill ward, would adopt a number of clearly defined boundaries, such as Lordship Lane, Peckham Rye and Forest Hill Road. In addition to an area of Honor Oak noted above, the Council proposed transferring part of the existing Barset ward (broadly south of Nunhead railway station) into a modified Waverley ward, elsewhere retaining the existing ward boundaries.

119 The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed combining an area of the existing Rye ward, broadly north of Underhill Road, with an area of the existing Waverley ward, generally south-west of Inverton Road, Brookley footpath and Linden Grove and south of East Dulwich Road (including Peckham Rye Park). A further area bounded by East Dulwich Road, Crystal Palace...
Road and Upland Road (currently in Bellenden ward) would also be transferred into the enlarged Ryedale ward, which they proposed to rename Peckham Rye ward. Under their proposals the area around Nunhead Cemetery would form part of a new Nunhead ward, and the remaining parts of Ryedale ward would form part of their proposed Sydenham Hill and East Dulwich wards.

116 The Council argued that its proposed Underhill ward would create “a well-defined and logical constituency”. The modifications proposed to Waverley ward, it suggested, would rectify the exclusion of those areas around Honor Oak currently in Ryedale ward (broadly polling districts YA and YB), which the Council considered form part of a “natural local community” with areas to the north and east within Waverley ward. The Conservatives similarly argued that their proposed Peckham Rye ward, which would also include a similar area around Honor Oak with areas to the north, would best reflect local community ties, adding that “most of these living within the boundaries of this proposed ward will feel it appropriate to be included in a ward that has, at its centre, Peckham Rye”.

117 Under the Council’s proposed Underhill and Waverley wards, the average number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent and 2 per cent below the average (6 per cent and 5 per cent below in 2003). As mentioned above, we noted a discrepancy in the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ electorate data for polling district 152B which would reduce the anticipated electoral equality in Peckham Rye and Nunhead wards under their proposals. In order to address this imbalance, and in the light of our proposals for neighbouring areas, we propose modifying the Conservative and Liberal Democrats’ boundary between Peckham Rye and Sydenham Hill wards transferring an area around Hillcourt Road from their proposed Sydenham Hill ward into Peckham Rye. Under our proposed Peckham Rye ward, with recalculated electorate data and our boundary modification, the average number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the average (3 per cent below the average in 2003).

118 We are unable to look at any one area in isolation, but need to consider the consequential effects of proposed ward boundaries on surrounding areas. We conclude therefore that, in looking at the borough as a whole, the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposals for the area would contribute to a better overall electoral scheme. We include their proposed Peckham Rye ward as part of our draft recommendations, although with an amended southern boundary as described above.

**College and Ruskin wards**

119 The two-member College ward and the three-member Ruskin ward are located in the far south of the borough. College ward is under-represented under the current arrangements with 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (5 per cent in 2003) and Ruskin ward is over-represented by 8 per cent (11 per cent in 2003).

120. The borough’s most southerly existing ward, College, is both under-represented and served by two, rather than three, councillors at present. In order to address this situation, both schemes proposed expanding the current ward to form a three-member ward. The only direction in which this can be done is north or north-east since the rest of the ward’s boundaries are also borough boundaries. The Borough Council proposed extending the ward northwards to incorporate part of Dulwich Village (currently in Ruskin ward), while the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed expansion to the north-east to include part of the existing Ryedale ward.

121 Specifically, the Council’s proposed northern boundary for College ward would lie to the rear of properties on the north side of Turrey Road and Woodwaite Road, continuing along the centre of Lordship Lane, which is the existing boundary. The Council considered that its proposed boundaries would “create an easily identifiable and distinct ward,” combining much of Dulwich Village with the area covered by the existing College ward. Under this proposal the number of electors per councillor in College ward would be 7 per cent above the borough average (4 per cent in 2003).

122 The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats submitted in alternative proposal that would expand College ward to the north-east, and they proposed realigning it Sydenham Hill ward. Their proposed boundary with Peckham Rye ward would follow Dunstan’s Road, Underhill Road and Langston Road, thereby including the Dawson Heights and Lordship Lane estate, close to the recently formed Sydenham Hill ward. They stated that the Lordship Lane estate was only removed from the existing ward in 1978, and that it makes sense to include the Lordship Lane estate and Meldon Court (the estate on Meldon Road) in the same borough ward. Under their proposals the number of electors per councillor in Sydenham Hill ward would be 6 per cent above the average (3 per cent in 2003).

123 While both proposals would achieve similar levels of electoral equality, we consider that the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposals would better reflect local identities in the area, noting that the Council’s proposals would split Dulwich Village and miss the opportunity to retain the A205 South Circular Road as a distinct boundary, while achieving a good electoral balance. However, in order to address the electoral imbalance in the Peckham Rye ward which would result from the apparent calculation error noted above, and to improve electoral equality even further in this ward and neighbouring wards, we propose a slight modification to the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposed ward boundary, transferring an area around Hillcourt Road from their proposed Sydenham Hill to Peckham Rye ward.

124 We propose retaining the ward name of College, rather than Sydenham Hill as proposed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, as the new ward, with our modifications, covers broadly the same area as a ward with relatively minor changes to its north-eastern boundary. Under our draft recommendations, using revised electorate figures, the number of electors per councillor in College ward would be equal to the borough average (2 per cent below in 2003).

125 Ruskin ward lies immediately to the north of College ward. Under the Borough Council’s proposals the ward would be modified: the southern area around Dulwich Village would form part of a modified College ward, the northern boundary would be extended from the junction of Turrey Road and East Dulwich Road to follow Green Dale, a path across playing fields south of Dulwich Hospital and to the rear of properties along Dyke Road to the borough boundary. The eastern boundary would be extended to include an area generally south of Underhill Road and west of Crystal Palace Road. Under the Council’s proposals the average number of electors per councillor in Ruskin ward would be 6 per cent below the borough average (9 per cent below in 2003).

126 The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats proposed minimal changes to the existing Ruskin ward, only moving away from the existing ward boundaries in the east to follow the centre of Lordship Lane from a position on Overhill Road, then following an alternative line along Welbourne Grove and East Dulwich Grove before turning south along the East Dulwich Railway Line. They proposed to rename this ward as Village ward.

127 We considered that the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposed Village ward would achieve a good degree of electoral equality and utilise easily identifiable ward boundaries and we are therefore adopting this ward as part of our draft recommendations. In light of our proposal to adopt the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ proposed warding in this area, we are not adopting the Council’s proposed Ruskin ward which would be incompatible with our recommendations for surrounding areas. The average number of electors per councillor in Village ward using revised electorate figures, would be 7 per cent above the borough average (4 per cent in 2003).

**Conclusions**

128 We have carefully considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review. There was a general consensus among respondents for a pattern of 21 three-member wards, and that changes should be made to the boundaries of all the existing wards in order to improve the balance of representation across the borough. We concluded that these principles should form the basis of our recommendations. Consequently, we propose that:

(1) Southwark should be represented by a total of 63 councillors, one less than at present;

(2) there should be 21 wards, four fewer than at present, which would involve changes to the boundaries of all the existing wards. Each ward would be served by three councillors.

129 Overall, the proposals from the Borough Council and from the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats would both achieve improved electoral equality compared to the current arrangements. However, the Conservatives’ and Liberal Democrats’ scheme would achieve a far higher level of equality than the Borough Council’s, and one which reflects the level we would expect to achieve in an urban area such as Southwark. Generally, where possible, we seek to base our recommendations on electoral...
schemes which are generated locally, providing we judge that they address the statutory criteria and achieve good electoral equality. We therefore concluded that the warding pattern put forward by both the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' submissions should form the basis of our draft recommendations.

130 However, in order to further improve the scheme, particularly in following identifiable boundaries and, where possible, to avoid splitting housing estates, we propose a number of modifications to the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposals, some of which reflect the Borough Council's proposed ward boundaries in specific areas. We believe that our proposals strike a satisfactory balance of the criteria guiding our work. The areas where we propose modifications to the ward boundaries submitted by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats are as follows:

(a) along the boundary between Surrey Docks and Rotherhithe wards, we propose to follow a line to the rear of Bacon College through Thames Hill Road, rather than extending a boundary north-east along part of Timber Pond Road, in order to provide a more easily identifiable ward boundary;

(b) the southern boundary of Peckham and Limehouse wards should follow the centre of Peckham High Street, a boundary used by the Council and which would create an easily identifiable ward boundary for the area. We also propose retaining part of the existing ward boundary between these two wards along Meeting House Lane and Naylor Road in order to reflect local ties in the area;

(c) a minor modification to the northern boundary between Limehouse and Whittington wards in order to reflect ground detail to follow a line along the centre of Old Kent Road and south along Old Kent Road before rejoining the existing boundary;

(d) a minor modification to the western ward boundary between Peckham and Brunswick Park wards in order to follow ground detail and include the whole of Almamundi Court in one ward;

(e) we propose the ward names of Grange and College for the proposed wards broadly composed of the existing Abbey and Bricklayers wards and College ward, as suggested by the Borough Council. We consider that both of these ward names would more accurately reflect the nature of the areas;

(f) in the south of the borough, to transfer an area around Milkwall Road from the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed Sydenham Hill ward (for which the ward name College would be retained under our proposals) into Peckham Rye ward in order to improve electoral equality in the area;

(g) in the north of the borough (generally south of the London Bridge to Kent railway and north of Old Kent Road) we propose moving the western ward boundary of the Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' proposed South Bermondsey ward (replaced Grange ward under our proposals) west to follow a line along Limehouse Street to the railway line in order to provide a ward boundary which is more identifiable.

131 During Stage Three of the review, we would welcome comments on our draft recommendations which build on those areas where consensus exists between the Stage One representations. Representations should be supported by evidence and argumentation, whether or not respondents agree with our proposals. If respondents propose modifications to our proposals, we will need to be convinced that alternative proposals would provide better electoral arrangements in terms of our statutory criteria. We particularly welcome proposals that have been subject to local consultation and on which there is a measure of local support.

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

133 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Southwark 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 nine to zero. This improved balance of representation is expected to continue, with no ward varying by more than 5 per cent from the average in 2003. 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 this report.

**Draft Recommendation**

Southwark Borough Council should comprise 63 councillors serving 21 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of this report.

We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Southwark 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.
5. NEXT STEPS

The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Southwark. 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 us:

Director of Reviews
Southwark Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great T urnst il e
London WC1 V 7 H 7

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 tables illustrate the electoral variances under the schemes submitted by Borough Council, and the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats. Full details of each submission, including accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

Southwark Borough Council’s Proposals

<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 Bellenden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Browning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,463</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>2,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brunswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,475</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cathedral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,361</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>2,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Chaucer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,612</td>
<td>2,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>2,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cossall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,071</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dockyard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,167</td>
<td>2,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Faraday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>2,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Grange</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,444</td>
<td>2,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Liddle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Livesey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>2,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued overleaf
### The Conservatives' and Liberal Democrats' Proposals

#### Figure A2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Brunswick Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>2,547 0</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Camberwell Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,763</td>
<td>2,588 2</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cathedrals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>2,452 -4</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chaucer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>2,399 -10</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 East Dulwich</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>2,677 5</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faraday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,544</td>
<td>2,515 -1</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Liskev</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,846</td>
<td>2,615 3</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Newington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>2,725 7</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nunhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,577</td>
<td>2,509 -1</td>
<td>7,789</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Peckham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>2,347 -8</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Peckham Rye</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>2,680 5</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>2,316 -9</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Rotherhithe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>2,449 -4</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 South Bermondsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,741</td>
<td>2,580 1</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 South Camberwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>2,574 1</td>
<td>7,608</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Surrey Docks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>2,517 -1</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sydenham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,066</td>
<td>2,689 6</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td>2,609 2</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>2,646 4</td>
<td>7,868</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes:
1. 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.

2. The total electorate figures differ from those shown in Figure 4 by 15 and 16 electors respectively, which has a negligible impact on the variances.
APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992:
The Commission’s Role

1. Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission’s predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBK), 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 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.

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