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WHY YOUR LOCAL AUTHORITY IS UNDER REVIEW

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

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

In broad terms, the objective of this periodic electoral review of Waltham Forest 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 Waltham Forest. Our conclusions are summarised at the front of the report, and illustrated on the large map inside the back cover and on maps in Appendix A. Details of our draft recommendations, and how to comment on them, are set out in Chapters 4 and 5.

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

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Waltham Forest on 23 June 1998.

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

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

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

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figure 1 and paragraphs 95-96) are that:

- Waltham Forest Borough Council should be served by 60 councillors, one more than at present;
- there should be 20 wards, as at present; the boundaries of 17 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries.

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 20 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average;
- This improved level of electoral equality is projected to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all 20 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average by 2003.

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

- We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 26 January 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.
- After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations.
- The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 22 March 1999:

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

Fax: 0171 404 6142
Email: reviews@lgcce.gov.uk
1. INTRODUCTION

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

2. In undertaking periodic electoral reviews, we must have regard to:

   - the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
     
     (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and

     (b) secure effective and convenient local government;

   - the Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

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

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

The London Boroughs

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

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

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

Figure 2:
Stages of the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Submission of proposals to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Commission's analysis and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Before we started our work in London, the Government published for consultation a Green Paper, Modernising Local Government - Local Democracy and Community Leadership (February 1998) which, inter alia, promoted the possibility of London boroughs having annual elections with three-member wards so that one councillor in each ward would stand for election each year. In view of this, we decided that the order in which the London reviews are undertaken should be determined by the proportion of three-member wards in each borough under the current arrangements. On this basis, Waltham Forest is in the first phase of reviews.

9. 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.

10. Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 Periodic Electoral Review (PER) programme, including the London boroughs, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State the Commission would continue to maintain the approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 Guidance. Nevertheless, we added that local authorities and other interested parties would do well 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.

11. 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.

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

The Review of Waltham Forest

13. This is our first review of the electoral arrangements for Waltham Forest. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBK), which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1977 (Report No. 235).

14. Stage One began on 23 June 1998, when we wrote to the London Borough of Waltham Forest 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 major political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and other publicity, and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 28 September 1998.

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

16. Stage Three began on 26 January 1999 and will end on 22 March 1999. This stage involves publication of the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

17. 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 area, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

18. The borough of Waltham Forest covers an area of some 4,000 hectares in North-East London. The borough is bounded by the boroughs of Hackney and Newham to the south, Epping Forest to the north, Redbridge to the east, and Havering and Enfield to the west. The Lee (or Lea) Valley makes the borough's western edge. Waltham Forest comprises three former Essex boroughs and is connected to central London by the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway line, the London Underground Victoria line; and, upon completion, will be served by the M11 motorway extension. While containing some belts of industry, Waltham Forest is essentially a residential area.

19. 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'.

20. The electorate of the borough (February 1998) is 157,622. The Council currently has 37 councillors who are elected from 20 wards (Map 1 and Figure 3). Of these, 17 wards are each represented by three councillors while three wards elect two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years. Since the last electoral review, there has been a small decrease in electorate in the borough.

21. At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,765 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will change little overall by the year 2003 if the present number of councillors is maintained, although there are expected to be either increases or decreases in electorate in most wards. Due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in four of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and is one ward by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Larkwood ward where each of the three councillors represents on average 23 per cent more electors than the borough average.
### Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cann Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cathall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,487</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chapel End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chingford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,014</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Endebury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7,909</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grove Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hale End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,548</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,538</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hatch Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,345</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 High Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,024</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Higham Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,933</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hoe Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,078</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,997</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Larkwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,201</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10,109</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lea Bridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Leyton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Leytonstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lloyd Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7,585</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 St James' Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,482</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9,687</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,348</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,505</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wood Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,547</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,422</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>157,910</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,765</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,770</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Electorate figures are based on Waltham Forest Borough Council's submissions.

**Note:** The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1998, electors in Higham Hill ward were relatively over-represented by 11 per cent, while electors in Larkwood ward were relatively under-represented by 23 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 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 Waltham Forest Borough Council.

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

Waltham Forest Borough Council

24 Waltham Forest Borough Council proposed that there should continue to be 20 wards, but that the number of councillors should increase from 57 to 60. Under the proposal the boundaries of 17 of the 20 wards should change to varying degrees. Only Cann Hall, Leytonstone and Forest would remain unchanged under their proposals.

25 In the south of the borough, the Council proposed a number of changes. St James’ Street ward would be reduced in size and renamed Markhouse ward, with sections of the ward transferring to Lea Bridge and Hoe Street wards. The area to the west of Higham Hill Road would be transferred from Lloyd Park ward to Higham Hill ward; Lloyd Park ward would be enlarged to include an area to the west of Hoe Street from Hoe Street and High Street wards. With the ward gaining a councillor, Hoe Street would lose its north-west corner to Lloyd Park, but gain parts of Wood Street and St James’ Street wards. The Council also proposed minor amendments between Cathall, Leyton and Grove Green wards to reflect the M11 motorway extension.

26 In the northern part of the borough, the Borough Council proposed transferring the Aldriche Way housing estate and surrounding roads from Larkwood ward to Hale End ward. Hale End ward would be renamed Hale End and Higham’s Park ward and would return three councillors.

27 Elsewhere, the northernmost boundary of Enfield ward would be enlarged to include an area to the south of the A110, which, previously, formed part of Chingford Green ward and would return three councillors. The remaining wards of Hatch Lane, Valley and Chapel End would experience minor alterations.

28 The Borough Council’s scheme would provide improved electoral equality for the borough as a whole, resulting in the number of electors per councillor varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average in all 20 wards. This level of electoral equality was projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years. The Council’s proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

Waltham Forest Conservative Group and Associations

29 Waltham Forest Borough Council Conservative Group (‘the Conservatives’) submitted proposals for the whole of the borough. These proposals were also endorsed by Chingford & Woodford Green, Leyton & Wannstead, and Walthamstow Constituency Conservative associations. As with the Borough Council submission, the scheme retained 20 wards and would increase the total number of councillors from 57 to 60. The Conservative proposals were the same as the Borough Council’s for Cann Hall, Cathall, Leyton, Leytonstone, Forest, Grove Green and Chapel End wards.

30 The Conservatives proposed alternative arrangements for the Chingford and Walthamstow areas. Like the Borough Council, they proposed to enlarge Higham Hill ward, but considered that it should include much of the northern part of Lloyd Park ward. Lloyd Park ward would expand southwards to include the part of Hoe Street ward to the west of Hoe Street itself, and be renamed Greenleaf ward. The proposals for Hoe Street,
Wood Street and High Streetwards differ only slightly from the Council’s proposals. In addition, the Conservatives proposed moving a section from St James’ Street ward to High Street ward. It also proposed that Lea Bridge ward remain unchanged.

31. In the Chingford area, the Conservatives opposed the transfer of the south-eastern part of Larkswood ward to Hale End ward; instead they proposed that Hale End ward should be expanded to include part of Hatch Lane ward. Hatch Lane ward would, in turn, be expanded northwards to include part of Chingford Green ward. The northern part of Larkswood ward would be transferred to Eppingbury ward, whose boundary with Chingford Green ward would also be modified.

32. The Conservatives’ proposals would provide improved electoral equality for the borough as a whole, resulting in the number of electors per councillor varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average in all 20 wards. This level of electoral equality was projected to remain constant over the next five years. The Conservatives’ proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

Waltham Forest Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group, Chingford & Woodford Green and Walthamstow Constituency Liberal Democrats

33. Waltham Forest Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group, the Chingford & Woodford Green and the Walthamstow Constituency Liberal Democrats (‘the Liberal Democrats’) also put forward proposals for the whole of the borough. The Liberal Democrats agreed with the Borough Council on ward boundaries, the number of wards and the total number of councillors in Leyton and Leytonstone, as well as for St James’ Street, Hoe Street and Chingford Green wards. The Liberal Democrats also proposed a council size of 60, and 20 wards.

34. In the west of the borough, the Liberal Democrats proposed that High Street ward remain unchanged. However, they proposed different arrangements to the Borough Council and the Conservatives for Lloyd Park and High Hill wards. They proposed that the western part of Lloyd Park ward remain largely unchanged, but that the part of Lloyd Park ward to the north of Wains Avenue and to the east of Higham Hill Road be transferred to Higham Hill ward. As with the council’s proposals, Lloyd Park ward would be expanded to include the area to the west of Hoe Street from Hoe Street ward. In addition, they proposed that Lloyd Park ward be renamed William Morris ward.

35. In the Chingford area, the Liberal Democrats’ proposals were similar to the Borough Council’s; while they agreed that the Aldridge Way housing estate should be transferred from Larkswood ward to Hale End ward, they proposed that the Rogers Avenue area should remain in Larkswood ward and that Hale End ward should be expanded to include a small area from Hatch Lane ward. Hale End ward would be renamed Hale End & Higham’s Park ward. The Liberal Democrats also proposed that Priory Avenue and Priory Close remain in Valley ward, rather than be transferred to Eppingbury ward.

36. The Liberal Democrats’ proposals would provide improved electoral equality for the borough as a whole, resulting in the number of electors per councillor varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average in all 20 wards. This level of electoral equality was projected to remain constant over the next five years. The Liberal Democrats’ proposals are summarised in Appendix B.

Harry Cohen MP

37. Harry Cohen, Member of Parliament for Leyton & Wanstead, generally supported the Borough Council’s proposals, but advocated that Lea Bridge Road should become the boundary between Leyton and Lea Bridge wards.

4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

38. As indicated previously, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Waltham Forest 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”.

39. However, our function is not merely arithmetic. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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

42. The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2003, projecting an increase of around 800 electors from 157,622 to 157,910 over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003, with no areas experiencing significant change. The Council has estimated rates of change and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

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

Council Size

44. 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. Waltham Forest Borough Council currently has 57 members. Over the past 20 years the borough has experienced a small reduction in electorate, while over the next five years it is forecast to remain stable. The Borough Council, Liberal Democrat and Conservative groups all proposed that council size should increase from 57 to 60. The Council argued that this proposal was put forward having regard to the Government’s recently issued White Paper, Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People, which proposed a system of elections by thirds for London. In order to maximise accountability, it argued that each ward would best be represented by three councillors, rather than a mixture of two and three councillors as at present.
We recognise that there is significant support for an increase in council size, with all three boroughs providing proposals suggesting such a change, and we also note that such an increase would enable a pattern of three-member wards throughout the borough. While there has been a decrease in electorate overall for the borough over the past 20 years, change has not been evenly spread. Indeed, some parts of the borough have witnessed an increase in electorate. We consider that, in this instance, the best method of reflecting changes in the distribution and total electorate in this area is to provide additional representation for those areas, particularly in the north of the borough, which have witnessed growth over the past 20 years, rather than to reduce the level of representation for those areas which have witnessed a relative decline. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would be best met by an increase in council size from 57 to 60.

Electoral Arrangements

We have carefully considered all the representations received, including borough-wide schemes from the Borough Council and the Conservative and the Liberal Democrat groups on the Council. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have informed us when preparing our draft recommendations.

First, the current electoral arrangements provide for predominantly three-member wards in Waltham Forest, although there are also three two-member wards. Having regard to the Government’s White Paper, *Modern Local Government - In Touch with the People*, both the Council and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups all submitted proposals based on a similar pattern of three-member wards for the borough. In addition, all three representations also proposed to increase council size to 60 members, by allocating one additional councillor to each of the three existing two-member wards. In light of this consensus over the number of wards and the number of councillors that should represent each ward, and in view of the local support for an increase in council size (which is within the size range outlined in our *Guidelines*), we are proposing a pattern of 20 three-member wards for the borough.

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

Finally, all three borough-wide schemes would provide improved electoral equality. Under all three proposals the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough would reduce from four to zero, both currently and in 2003.

We have sought to build on these proposals in order to put forward electoral arrangements which would achieve yet further improvements in electoral equality, while also seeking to reflect the statutory criteria. Where it exists, we have sought to reflect the consensus among representations forwarding arrangements in particular parts of the borough. Inevitably, we could not reflect the preferences of all the respondents in our draft recommendations.

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

**Leyton and Leytonstone**
- Cann Hall and Cathall wards;
- Lea Bridge, Leyton and Grove Green wards;
- Leytonstone and Forest wards;

**Walthamstow**
- St James’ Street, Hoe Street and Wood Street wards;
- Higham Hill, Lloyd Park, High Street and Chapel End wards;

**Chingford and Highams Park**
- Hale End, Hatch Lane and Larkwood wards;
- Chingford Green, Endelbury and Valley wards.

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

**Leyton and Leytonstone**

Cann Hall and Cathall wards

Cann Hall and Cathall wards are situated in the far south of the borough, bordering the boroughs of Redbridge, Hackney and Newham. At present, both wards are represented by three councillors and have some 8 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, respectively, both improving to 7 per cent below average by 2003.

At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed relatively few changes in relation to these two wards. It proposed that a small section of Cathall ward, containing 300 electors, west of the London Underground Central line and M11 extension, should be transferred to Grove Green ward, and that a small area containing no electors should be transferred from Leyton ward. The effect of these boundary changes would be to make the ward’s western boundary discontinuous with the M11 extension. It also proposed that Cann Hall remain unchanged. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats supported the Borough Council’s proposals in this area. The proposals would provide Cann Hall and Cathall wards with 4 per cent and 9 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average currently on the basis of the revised council size of 60, reducing to 2 per cent and 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2003.

We consider that the proposal by the Borough Council, Conservatives and Liberal Democrats for Cann Hall and Cathall wards represent the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria available. The M11 extension together with the London Underground Central line provides a significant barrier between Cathall and Grove Green wards, and we consider that the area to the west of this development would be best incorporated into Grove Green ward. The north-eastern boundary of Cathall ward follows the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line and viaduct, which we consider provides a strong boundary for the ward. While we note that the level of electoral inequality for Cathall ward is relatively high, we also note that it is projected to improve over the next five years. We also consider that the existing boundaries of Cann Hall ward are easily identifiable, and produce a reasonable level of electoral equality and should not therefore be changed as part of this review.

Lea Bridge, Leyton and Grove Green wards

At present, Lea Bridge, Leyton and Grove Green wards are each represented by three councillors and contain 5 per cent, 4 per cent, and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. The three wards centre around High Road, Leyton and the Lea Bridge Road, and are bounded in the east by the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line and in the west by the River Lea.

The Borough Council’s submission proposed minimal changes to Leyton and Grove Green wards. As outlined above, it proposed that the southern boundary of Leyton and Grove Green wards should become the M11 extension. This would entail 300 electors being transferred to Grove Green ward from Cathall ward and no change to the electorate of Leyton ward. The resultant Leyton and Grove Green wards would have equal to the average and 3 per cent more than the average electors per councillor respectively (with both expected to have 8 per cent more than the average by 2003).

The northern boundary of Lea Bridge ward would experience a more visible change under the Borough Council’s proposals. However, the effect would be relatively modest, with 406 electors transferring from St James’ Street ward to Lea Bridge ward. The Council argued that its proposal would reduce the level of over-representation in St James’ ward, by transferring Markmanor Avenue, Bridge Road, Samantha Close and Theydon Street which are predominantly accessed from Lea Bridge ward due to traffic management schemes in the area. It also proposed that the industrial estates, whose primary access is from Lea Bridge Road, should be transferred to Lea Bridge ward. The effect of the proposals would be that Lea Bridge ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently, and in 2003.

The Liberal Democrats supported the Borough Council’s proposals in their entirety, while the Conservatives supported the Council’s proposals for Leyton and Grove Green wards. In relation to Lea Bridge ward, however, the Conservatives proposed that the ward should remain unchanged. This would provide a more equal level of electoral equality for Lea Bridge ward, which would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor compared to the borough average, both now and in 2003.
We also received a representation from Mr Harry Cohen, Member of Parliament for Leyton & Wanstead regarding Lea Bridge ward. He argued that this was a significant boundary which should be reflected in the electoral arrangements. He proposed that the southern boundary of Lea Bridge ward should be altered so that Lea Bridge Road acts as the boundary between Leyton and Lea Bridge wards.

There is a degree of consensus in relation to Grove Green and Leyton wards. The M11 connection forms a significant boundary between communities in this area, with only two crossing points, and we consider that it should be respected in our recommendations. We have, however, decided to make one further modification with regard to Grove Green ward. Currently, the boundary between Grove Green ward and Leyton and Grove Green ward follows the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line for most of its duration, before running to the rear of properties on Grove Green Road. As a result, properties to the west of the railway line on Madeira Road form part of Leyton ward, although the only access to their properties is via Grove Green Road in Grove Green ward. We decided that following the railway line in its entirety would provide a better boundary for the two wards as well as better reflecting community ties. The resultant Leyton and Grove Green wards would have equal to 4 per cent more than the borough average number of electors per councillor respectively, and 3 per cent and 4 per cent more than average in 2005.

We recognise that marginally better electoral equality would be achieved under the Conservative scheme for Lea Bridge ward, which proposed that the ward boundaries be left unchanged. Despite this, we consider that we should redraw the boundaries of Lea Bridge ward. Markmanor Avenue and Bridge Road cannot be accessed from St James’ ward due to traffic calming measures. We also recognise that the proposal would unite Hither Green Road in one ward, and that Thevenon Street shares a similarity with these areas to its south. We have decided not to transfer Samantha Close, which is a self-contained area accessed from Markmanor Road. The new Lea Bridge ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, both now and in 2003.

We have given consideration to the views of Mr Harry Cohen MP, who argued that Lea Bridge Road should be used as a ward boundary. Although Lea Bridge Road is a major route, if it were to be used as a ward boundary we would need to redraw a number of wards in both Leyton and Walthamstow. We have not been persuaded that such a change would better reflect community identities in the borough as a whole, and have therefore decided not to make such a change.

Leytonstone and Forest wards

Leytonstone and Forest wards are both three member wards situated in the south-eastern part of Waltham Forest borough, neighbouring the borough of Redbridge. All three borough-wide schemes proposed that Leytonstone and Forest wards remain unchanged.

We can see no convincing argument for changing the boundaries of Forest ward, which are identifiable and provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality, and therefore there is no need to make any change to this ward as part of our draft recommendations. The same is true for Leytonstone ward, with the exception of the minor boundary change with Grove Green ward, outlined in the section Grove Green ward. The proposed ward would have 1 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average.

Walthamstow

St James’ Street, Hoe Street and Wood Street wards

The three wards of St James’ Street, Hoe Street and Wood Street encompass the residential areas of Walthamstow to the east and south of the central shopping area. Currently, all of these wards return three councillors and have a degree of under-representation; St James’ Street has 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the average, while Hoe Street has 9 per cent and Wood Street has 4 per cent more than the average.

St James’ Street and Hoe Street wards would undergo significant changes under the Borough Council’s proposals. As detailed above, the Borough Council proposed transferring an area west of Markmanor Avenue from St James’ ward to Lea Bridge ward. In addition, it proposed that an area east of the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line, and south of Queens Road containing 1,300 electors (polling district UD), be transferred to Hoe Street ward. This would result in the new ward having 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average and, according to the Council, would transfer a part of the ward which “has closer ties with the Hoe Street area than St James’ Street.” The Borough Council also proposed that the ward be renamed Markhouse ward to recognise the fact that Markhouse Road is prominent in the ward, whereas only a small part of St James’ Street is actually in the ward.

The addition of 1,300 electors from St James’ Street ward increases the level of electoral imbalance in the ward. To compensate, the Borough Council proposed transferring the north-western corner of Hoe Street ward, the area to the west of Hoe Street and north of Hathery Road (polling district V) to Lloyd Park ward. In order to improve electoral equality in Wood Street ward, the Council proposed transferring an area to the north of Hoe Street ward, together with the east side of Bealul Road and Summit Road to Hoe Street ward. These changes would improve the level of electoral equality for Hoe Street ward to within 3 per cent of the borough average and, according to the Council, would "have the effect of creating a more equal balance". The proposed ward would have 5 per cent more electors per councillor than average and 4 per cent by 2005. The Liberal Democrats supported the Borough Council’s proposals in their entirety.

The Conservatives, like the Borough Council, proposed renaming St James’ Street ward as Markhouse ward, but suggested different warding arrangements in order to improve the level of electoral equality in the ward, the Conservatives proposed transferring an area to the south and west of St James’ Street railway station, containing 560 electors, from St James’ Street ward to High Street ward. In addition, they proposed that an area to the east of Hoe Street and south of Grove Road be transferred to Hoe Street ward. To improve the level of electoral equality in Hoe Street and Wood Street wards, the Conservatives proposed transferring an area north of Maynard Road and west of Serratt Road containing some 685 electors to Hoe Street ward from Wood Street ward. In turn, as with the Borough Council’s proposals, it proposed transferring an area to the west of Hoe Street itself from Hoe Street ward to Lloyd Park ward. Under the Conservative scheme, all three wards would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average currently (and no more than 4 per cent more than average by 2005).

All three borough-wide submissions recognised the need to improve electoral equality in St James’ Street ward. The Conservatives’ scheme was the only one to propose changes to the northern boundary of St James’ Street ward, by proposing an area around the railway station to High Street ward. Upon inspection, we consider that the area concerned has a greater similarity with the area to its south and we have not been persuaded that we should make such a change. All three schemes also proposed transferring an area to Hoe Street ward. However, while the Borough Council and Liberal Democrats proposed a new boundary of the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line, the Council proposed using Hoe Street. We consider that either boundary could be used in this area. However, as we have decided not to amend the northern boundary of St James’ Street ward, we note that the Borough Council’s proposal to use the Gospel Oak to Barking railway line would provide the better level of electoral equality for St James’ Street ward. We have therefore decided, on balance, that we should put this forward as part of our draft recommendations.

All submissions proposed that St James’ Street ward be renamed Markhouse ward as Markhouse Road is a major feature. We have no objection to this change and put it forward as part of our draft recommendations.

All of the submissions agreed that the area of Hoe Street ward to the west of Hoe Street and north of Hathery Road should be transferred to Lloyd Park ward. We consider that such a change would improve electoral equality and would provide more recognisable boundaries for Hoe Street ward itself, and permit it forward as part of our draft recommendations. There was no agreement, however, as to the most appropriate boundary between Hoe Street and Wood Street wards. In order to improve the electoral equality of both wards, all three submitted plans proposed transferring a small area from Wood Street ward to Hoe Street ward. However, while the Conservatives proposed transferring an area to the north of Maynard Road and west of Serratt Road, the Borough Council and Liberal Democrats proposed transferring the west side of Beulah Road, the area to the south of Grove Road and Summit Road. We consider that both of these proposals have merit, but in the absence of any convincing support for argument, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Borough Council’s scheme as it unites the properties on either side of Beulah Road and provides for better electoral equality for Hoe Street ward. We have proposed...
two minor amendments, however. We propose that all properties on Shornhill Street south of the Liverpool Street to Chingford railway line should remain in Wood Street ward, and that St Stephen Avenue should form part of Wood Street as it does now; and it is from Beulah Road. However, we would welcome further views and evidence on this issue at Stage Three. The resultant Hoe Street and Wood Street wards would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than average, while Markhouse ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than average.

Highham Hill, Lloyd Park, High Street and Chapel End wards

75 Highham Hill, Lloyd Park, High Street and Chapel End wards are in the centre and west of Wanstead, and currently all contain fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. While Lloyd Park, High Street and Chapel End wards all return three councillors, Highham Hill is currently represented by two councillors.

76 All three schemes proposed enlarging Highham Hill ward by including part of Lloyd Park ward and increasing the size of all three. The Borough Council proposed transferring the area of Lloyd Park ward to the west of Highham Road, containing some 1,085 electors. In order to improve electoral equality it also moved the boundary between Highham Hill and Lloyd Park wards northwards to Carlton Road, transferring 430 electors from Lloyd Park ward to Highham Hill ward. Lloyd Park ward, as indicated earlier, would expand southwards to include part of the current Hoe Street ward, in addition to Mansfield and Elmfield Roads from High Street ward. The Borough Council further proposed transferring the whole of Omnibus Way to Chapel End ward. Under the current arrangements, the road straddles the Lloyd Park/Chapel End ward boundary. This alteration is the only change proposed to Chapel End ward by the Borough Council. Under the Borough Council’s proposals, Lloyd Park and Highham Hill wards would have 2 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. (3 per cent and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2003). The High Street ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2003), while Chapel End ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (both now and in 2003).

77 The Conservatives reached similar conclusions as the Borough Council in relation to these wards, but with some important modifications. Under the Conservative proposal, the area west of Elphinstone Road, north of Hookers Road, Blenheim Road, Queen Elizabeth Road and Omnibus Avenue would be transferred from Lloyd Park ward to Highham Hill ward. They argued that this proposal was ‘at least twice as large as the area should be transferred from the current Lloyd Park ward’. The scheme submitted, however, in which part of the ward should be transferred. We have decided, with some amendments, to base our draft recommendations on a combination of the proposals made to us for this area. We consider there is merit in the Conservative proposal to unite areas either side of Highham Road in Highham Hill ward, as it would appear that the road acts as a focus for the community. In addition, we consider that the Conservative proposal to use Hookers Road, Blenheim Road and Queen Elizabeth Road as the northern boundary for Lloyd Park ward also does merit. We consider that, in this area, the presence of the industrial estate acts as a significant boundary separating the properties from the northern side of the borough. Whereas the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats include the Priory in the revised Highham Hill ward, the Borough Council proposed its retention in Lloyd Park ward. In this area, we propose putting forward the Borough Council’s proposal as we consider that this area is conjoined, both physically and in terms of its community ties more closely with the Winsen Avenue area to its north than with the properties to its west, with which it has no linking road, or to the north.

78 In order to improve electoral equality and to achieve clear and identifiable boundaries we propose two further changes to the Highham Hill ward as part of our draft recommendations. The first is to unite the whole of North Courtess Road, Rushbrook Crescent, Billet Road and Ardleigh Road in Highham Hill ward, as currently the roads are divided between Chapel End and Highham Hill wards. We also propose modifying the ward boundary between Highham Hill and Valley wards in order to ensure that it follows the North Circular Road to its boundary with Chingford Road.

79 Further to the boundary alterations between Lloyd Park and Highham Hill wards, we propose two other changes to Lloyd Park ward. As detailed above, we propose transferring the area of Hoe Street ward to the west of Hoe Street itself to Lloyd Park ward. This recommendation is supported in all of the submissions received, and would improve electoral equality and create a more identifiable boundary. We agree that Omnibus Way, which was subject of disagreement between the different submissions, should be united in one ward rather than being divided between the two wards of Lloyd Park and Chapel End, as at present. We have decided, on balance, that Omnibus Way should be included in Lloyd Park ward, as this change would involve the least disruption to current arrangements by transferring only 13 electors, rather than 116, as would be the case if the development were to be placed in Chapel End ward.

80 Both the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives proposed changing the name of Lloyd Park ward, as under their proposals, Lloyd Park itself would be mostly contained in Chapel End ward. The choice between Greenleaf, William Morris and Lloyd Park ward is one simply of judgement. We have decided to recommend that Lloyd Park ward keep its present title because Lloyd Park is a recognisable feature of the Highham Hill area. Our draft recommendations would be wholly contained within the ward. We would, however, welcome further comments on this matter at Stage Three.

81 We have decided to recommend that High Street ward remain unchanged. We consider that the current ward boundaries provide a reasonable level of electoral equality and recognisable boundaries, and were not persuaded of the case for change.

82 Our draft recommendations would provide for a much improved level of electoral equality than the current arrangements, resulting in the number of electors per councillor in Highham Hill, Lloyd Park and Chapel End wards being 4 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent below average (3 per cent, 3 per cent and 2 per cent below average respectively by 2003), while the number of electors per councillor in High Street ward would be 2 per cent above average (1 per cent above average by 2003). We recognise that these proposals are, in some areas, different from those proposed locally, and would therefore particularly welcome views from residents and interested parties at Stage Three. Our proposals are detailed in Figures 1 and 5 and illustrated in Map AI and the large map at the back of the report.
Chingford and Higham's Park
Hale End, Hatch Lane and Larkswood wards

28. The grouping of Hale End, Hatch Lane and Larkswood wards encompasses the eastern half of Chingford together with the Higham's Park area. While Hatch Lane and Hale End wards achieve a more equitable proportioning with variances of no more than 1 per cent from the average, Larkswood currently has 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average. Currently, Larkswood and Hatch Lane wards are represented by three councillors, while Larkswood ward is represented by two councillors.

29. The Council proposed only minor amendments to the existing Hatch Lane ward. It proposed that the northern boundary of the ward be altered to coincide with Whitehall Road for its entire length. The effect of this change would be to transfer Whitshill Gardens, Valence Avenue, Fivervenham Avenue and Limetree Avenue to Chingford Green ward, which it was argued would "meet the wishes of a number of local residents by re-uniting that part of the community". In order to address the issue, the original land in Larkswood ward was extended, and in preference to a pattern of three-member wards, the Borough Council proposed transferring the Higham's Park area to the west of the Liverpool Street to Chingford railway line from Larkswood ward to Hale End ward. It proposed that the area stretching from Haldan Road in the south to Fivervenham Green in the north, up to and including the Aldrich Way housing estate in the west should be transferred to Hale End ward. The resultant three-member Hale End & Higham's Park ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, and Larkswood and Hatch Lane wards would have 2 per cent and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average. The Council argued that this area is the most suitable for transfer as it is relatively self-contained and traffic management schemes at the junction of Selwyn Avenue and Nelson Road have reinforced its isolation from the rest of Larkswood ward.

30. The Liberal Democrats' proposal was similar to the Borough Council's in many ways. The Liberal Democrats agreed with the Borough Council to transfer the area to the north of Whitshill Road from Hatch Lane ward to Chingford Green ward, and also to transfer an area from Larkswood ward to Hale End ward. However, the exact area transferred differed between the two schemes. The Liberal Democrats proposed that a smaller area west of the railway line be brought into Hale End ward, retaining Kopers Avenue, Inks Green and the Cariboumanon Ground ward, but transferring the whole of Coldhurrie Avenue and surrounding roads instead. In addition, they proposed transferring the south-west part of the current Hatch Lane ward, adjacent to Higham's Park station, to Hale End, containing 188 electors. They argued that their proposal would unite the Higham's Park shopping centre and all the communities which use it within one ward. The resultant three wards would have variances of no more than 2 per cent from the borough average, and 5 per cent in 2003.

31. The Conservatives argued strongly against the Council's proposals for this area. They considered that there is no common link between the Aldrich Way estate and its surrounding roads and Hale End ward, with the two areas being divided by the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway line. In addition, they argued that the Borough Council's proposal would sever the link between the south-western areas of Larkswood and those in the north-east. They contended that the Borough Council's proposals would run contrary to the goals of reflecting local communities and achieving identifiable electoral boundaries, and had been motivated purely for party political advantage. Instead, they proposed transferring the area to the south of The Avenue, Stanwood Avenue and Cliveden Road and an area to the east of the River Ching containing a total of 2,285 electors from Hatch Lane ward to Hale End ward. To compensate for this loss, they proposed extending the northern boundary of Hatch Lane ward to the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway line and Rangers Road, transferring some 1,725 electors from Chingford Green ward. This, the Conservatives argued, was a far more logical way to use the area for the sake of electoral equality, to make significant changes to the northern boundaries of Larkswood and Hatch Lane wards. We do, however, intend to make some minor adjustments in order to create clearer boundaries in those areas. We propose a minor amendment to the boundary between Larkswood and Endleybury wards, bringing Hawkwell Court into Endleybury ward, the only ward to which this property is currently connected. In relation to the boundary between Hatch Lane and Chingford Green wards, we have decided to recommend that Whitehall Road form the boundary between the two wards, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats and the Borough Council. We consider that Whitshill Road provides a clear and identifiable boundary which would unite the properties to the north of the road in Chingford Green ward. Our draft recommendations would provide Hale End & Higham's Park ward with 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Hatch Lane and Larkswood wards would have 2 per cent more than the average.

Chingford Green, Endleybury and Valley wards

32. Chingford Green, Endleybury and Valley wards cover the north and west of Chingford, and are all currently under-represented in electoral terms. Valley ward currently has 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Chingford Green and Endleybury wards have 9 per cent and 14 per cent more than the borough average respectively. Endleybury ward is currently represented by two councillors, while Chingford Green and Valley wards are each represented by three councillors.

33. The Borough Council proposed altering the southern boundary of Chingford Green ward to follow Whitehall Road, transferring some electors from Hatch Lane ward (as outlined above). It also proposed modifying the boundary between Chingford Green and Endleybury wards in order to improve the level of electoral equality, and also to enable Endleybury ward to be represented by three councillors. It proposed that the area bounded by Manorfield Hill, The Ridgeway, King's Head Hill and College Gardens be incorporated into Endleybury ward. The boundary of Chingford Green ward would, as a result largely follow the A110. Endleybury ward would also expand southwards to incorporate part of Valley ward in order to improve electoral equality. The properties up to, and including Priory Avenue would form part of Endleybury ward. The Liberal Democrats supported the Borough Council's proposals, but with one exception; they proposed retaining Priory Avenue and Priory Close in Valley ward.

34. The Conservatives' submission differed from those received from the Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats. As outlined under their proposal, electoral equality was improved by transferring the area to the east of the Liverpool Street to Chingford railway line from Chingford Green ward to Hatch Lane ward. As a result they
The Conservatives also proposed significant changes to Enderby ward's southern boundary. As outlined above, the Conservatives preferred addressing the level of under-representation in Larkwood ward by transferring the area to the north of New Road to Enderby ward. They also, like the Liberal Democrats and the Borough Council, proposed amending the boundary between Valley and Enderby wards. They agreed with the Liberal Democrats that only those roads accessed from Brindwood Road should be transferred, and that Priory Avenue and Priory Court should remain part of Valley ward. They argued that the residents in these streets feel their community ties to the south and that their shopping, economic and transport links all lie in that direction.

Many of the conclusions which we have reached in this area are informed by the decisions taken in relation to the Higham’s Park area where we concluded that the under-representation in Larkwood ward is best addressed by transferring an area to Hole End ward, and that we should make only minor amendments to Hasch Lane ward. Accordingly we have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Borough Council and Liberal Democrats’ proposals for Chingford Green, Enderby and Valley wards. We consider that the proposal to transfer areas to the south of the A110 to Enderby ward, and to the north of the A110 from Hatch Lane, would give Chingford Green ward a clear and identifiable boundary while addressing the current electoral inequalities in the ward. It would also enable Enderby ward to be represented by three councillors. We have, however, decided to put forward the Conservative and Liberal Democrats’ proposal for Valley ward which would transfer the Brindwood Road area to Enderby ward, but in order to maintain community ties would retain the properties on Priory Avenue and Priory Court in Valley ward. These proposals would provide Chingford Green ward with equal to the borough average number of electors per councillor (4 per cent fewer than the average by 2003), while Enderby and Valley wards would both have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (2 per cent and 5 per cent more than the average respectively by 2003).

Conclusions

We have considered carefully all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review. All three schemes would have achieved a significant improvement to electoral equality; however, there were fundamental differences in the conclusions reached by the Conservative Group’s proposal and those of the Borough Council and Liberal Democrats in the central and northern parts of the borough. Where there was consensus we have broadly accepted the proposals received; in areas of disagreement we have used a mixture of the various proposals with some modifications. We have examined alternative configurations of wards and communities in order to assess whether electoral equality could be improved further. We conclude, however, that any further improvements may be at the expense of the statutory criteria, namely the need to reflect community identities and interests and to secure effective and convenient local government. We believe that our proposals strike a satisfactory balance of the criteria guiding our work. Consequently, we propose that:

(a) there should be an increase in council size from 57 to 60 members;
(b) there should be 20 wards, as at present.

We have fully adopted the Borough Council’s proposals in Cains Hall, Cathall, Lowton, Forest, Hoe Street, Wood Street and Chingford Green wards. We propose alternative arrangements from those put forward by the Borough Council in the following:

(a) in the proposed Grove Green, Lanyonstone, Lea Bridge, High Street, Marshhouse, Chapel End, Larkwood, Valley and Enderby wards we propose minor amendments;
(b) in the proposed Lloyd Park, Higham Hill, Hole End and Higham’s Park and Hatch Lane wards we move further away from the Borough Council’s proposals.

Figure 4 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1998 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2003.

As shown in Figure 4, our draft recommendations for Waltham Forest Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor varies by more than 10 percent from the borough average from four to zero. This improved balance of representation is expected to continue in 2003. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 5, and illustrated on Map 2, at Appendix A and on the large map inserted in the back of this report.

Draft Recommendation

Waltham Forest Borough Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 5, and illustrated on Map 2, at Appendix A and on the large map inserted in the back of this report.

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998 electorate</th>
<th>2003 forecast electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current arrangement</td>
<td>Draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>2,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: The Commission’s Draft Recommendations for Waltham Forest

<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 Cann Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cathall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chapel End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chingford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Endelbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,092</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,046</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,909</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grove Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,185</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hale End &amp; Higham’s Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hatch Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 High Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Higham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hoe Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,206</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Larkwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,983</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lea Bridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Leyton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Leytonstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lloyd Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,728</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Markhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,257</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wood Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,282</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,167</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,622</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>157,910</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
5. NEXT STEPS

The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Waltham Forest. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 22 March 1999. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

Views may be expressed by writing directly to:

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

Fax: 0171 404 6142
Email: reviews@lgee.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, where 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

Draft Recommendations for Waltham Forest: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Waltham Forest area.

Map A1 illustrates the proposed ward boundary between Higham Hill and Chapel End wards.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed ward boundary between Endlebury and Valley wards.

The large map inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed ward boundaries within the borough of Waltham Forest.
APPENDIX B

Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

Waltham Forest Borough Council’s Proposal

Figure B1: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Cann Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Cathall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Chapel End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Chingford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Endlebury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,244</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,881</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Grove Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Hale End &amp; Higham's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,711</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Hatch Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,967</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 High Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,861</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,837</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Higham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7,541</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued overleaf
Figure B1 (continued):

Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Hoe Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Larkwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,936</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lea Bridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>2.757</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Leyton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Leytonstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>2.535</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lloyd Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Markhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,789</td>
<td>2.596</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>2.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wood Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,304</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>157,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

Figure B2:

Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Carn Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cathall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chapel End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,013</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chingford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Endlebury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,035</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,965</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,909</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Greenleaf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,790</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Grove Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hale End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hatch Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,785</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 High Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,965</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,955</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Higham Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,957</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hoe Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,956</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Larkwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Lea Bridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Leyton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Leytonstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Markhouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued overleaf
### Table: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,219</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Wood Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>157,621</td>
<td></td>
<td>187,907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Waltham Forest Borough Council Conservative Group's figures.
APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

The 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 later than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs, the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas have been included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:
   (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
   (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

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

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

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

4 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1972, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the "rules" set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, these provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below:

5 In relation to London boroughs:

6 Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of 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.

7 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a) above, regard should be had to:
   (b) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
   (c) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

---

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