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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 Ealing 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 Ealing. 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 Ealing:

- in five 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;
- by 2003 electoral equality is expected to show no overall improvement, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in four wards, and by more than 20 per cent in one ward, Dormers Wells.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figure 1 and paragraph 119) are that:

- Ealing Borough Council should be served by 69 councillors, compared to 71 at present;
- there should be 23 wards, two fewer than at present, involving 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 22 of the 23 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 7 per cent from the borough average, with Norwood Green ward varying by 12 per cent.
- This level of electoral equality is forecast to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 3 per cent from the average for the borough in 2003.

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

- We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 26 January 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

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

- It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations.

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Constituent areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cleveland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Argyle ward (part); Hobbayne ward (part); Pitshanger ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dormers Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dormers Wells ward (part); Hobbayne ward (part); Mount Pleasant ward (part); Wadlow ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ealing Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Argyle ward (part); Ealing Common ward (part); Hanger Lane ward (part); Pitshanger ward (part); Wadlow ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ealing Common</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ealing Common ward (part); Hanger Lane ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 East Acton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hanger Lane ward (part); Springfield ward (part); Vale ward (part); Victoria ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ethorne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethorne ward; Dormers Wells ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Glebe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glebe ward (part); Dormers Wells ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Greenford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Costons ward (part); Ravenor ward (part); Wood End ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hanger Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hanger Lane ward (part); Pitshanger ward (part); Springfield ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Heathfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heathfield ward (part); Springfield ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hobbayne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hobbayne ward (part); Argyle ward (part); Dormers Wells ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hornsden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hornsden ward (part); Wood End ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lady Margaret</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant ward (part); Wadlow ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mandeville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mandeville ward; Wood End ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Northcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northcote ward; Mount Pleasant ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Northfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northfield ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Norwood Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dormers Wells ward (part); Glebe ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Perivale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perivale ward; Argyle ward (part); Costons ward (part); Hornsden ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ravenor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ravenor ward (part); Costons ward (part); Wadlow ward (part); West End ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Southfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southfield ward; Vale ward (part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Springfield | 3 | Springfield ward (part); Heathfield ward (part); Victoria ward (part) |
22 Walpole     | 3 | Walpole ward (part); Northfield ward (part)                        |
23 West End    | 3 | West End ward (part); Ravenor ward (part)                          |

Note: The large map in the back of the report illustrates the proposed wards outlined above.
1. INTRODUCTION

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

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 2).

The London Boroughs

5 Our programme of periodic electoral reviews of all 386 local authorities in England started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

The 1992 Act requires us to review most local authorities every 10 to 15 years. However, the Act is silent on the timing of reviews of the London boroughs. (The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London).

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

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

Figure 2:
Stages of the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Submission of proposals to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Commission's analysis and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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, Ealing 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 PER programme, including the London boroughs, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State the Commission would continue to maintain the approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 Guidance. Nevertheless, we added that local authorities and other interested parties would no doubt wish to have regard to the Secretary of State's intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. Our general experience 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 Ealing

13 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements for Ealing. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBK), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1977 (Report No. 209).

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

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

2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

18 The borough of Ealing is situated in the west of London and has a population of around 275,000 covering approximately 5,550 hectares. There are several distinct local areas in the borough, including Acton, Ealing, Greenford, Harrow, Northolt, Perivale and Southall. The borough contains significant areas of industry and commerce, including the industrial area at Park Royal and the major shopping centres found in central Ealing and Acton. A significant amount of new development has been earmarked for the Glade Lane/Toplocks and Wemmill Park developments in the south-west of the borough. The borough also contains around 376 hectares of parks and open spaces (Municipal Year Book). The borough has good communication links, being served by the Great Western mainline railway and the London Underground, and it is linked to the M4 and M40 motorways.

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 210,753. The Council currently has 71 small wards vary in size from 298 to 5,066. The council currently has 71 councillors who are elected from 25 wards (Map 1 and Figure 3). Twenty-one wards are each represented by three councillors, and four wards elect two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.

21 Since the last electoral review there has been a small increase in electorate in the borough, with around 2 per cent more electors than two decades ago.

22 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,068 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,356 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 five of the 25 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. The worst imbalance is in Vale ward, where each of the two councillors represents on average 14 per cent fewer electors than the borough average.
Map 1: Existing Wards in Ealing

Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Argyle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,465</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,440</td>
<td>3,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Coosons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,152</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>2,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dormer Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,890</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,367</td>
<td>3,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ealing Common</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,031</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,925</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Elthorne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,208</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>3,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Glebe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,980</td>
<td>3,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hanger Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,962</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Heathfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,841</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,871</td>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hobbayne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>2,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hornsden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mandeville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,848</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>7,817</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,595</td>
<td>3,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Northcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>8,442</td>
<td>2,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Northfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,837</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Perivale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pitsanger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,553</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,878</td>
<td>3,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ravenor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,461</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>2,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Southfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,397</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td>2,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Springfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,854</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>2,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Vale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Victoria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>2,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Walpole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,920</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,846</td>
<td>3,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued overleaf
### Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Number of councillors (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Wexford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,839</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 West End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Wood End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>210,753</td>
<td></td>
<td>212,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: The 'variances 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 Vale ward were relatively over-represented by 14 per cent, while electors in Ealing Common ward were relatively under-represented by 13 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3. Representations Received

23 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 Ealing Borough Council.

24 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 most grateful to all concerned for their cooperation and assistance. We received three representations during Stage One: the Borough Council, the Conservative Group on the Council and a local resident, Mr Harris, all submitted borough-wide schemes. These, with accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

### Ealing Borough Council

25 The Borough Council submitted a scheme which would provide for 69 councillors representing 23 three-member wards, which it stated would achieve "a high level of electoral equality without crossing the [river] Brent". The Council argued that this council size "would avoid the need to change the boundaries between Acton and Ealing wards, and could allow a minimal change option to be developed for South Ealing and South Hanwell". The Borough Council’s submission referred to the support of Liberal Democrat councillors for a number of specific warding proposals within the borough, including in Hobbyne and Southfield wards.

26 In the east of the borough, the Borough Council proposed the merger of much of the existing two-member wards of Vale and Victoria, together with small parts of Hanger Lane and Springfield wards, to form a new three-member ward. In the north of the borough the Council proposed that the other two two-member wards of Horsenden and Perivale should each be expanded to become three-member wards.

27 In the centre of the borough the Council proposed a new Ealing Broadway ward formed from parts of the existing Argyle, Ealing Common, Hanger Lane, Pinchanger and Waltham wards to cover the "core Ealing Broadway area". It proposed that a new Hanger Hill ward should cover parts of the existing Hanger Lane and Pinchanger wards, while a new Cleared ward should comprise parts of the existing wards of Argyle, Hobbyne and Pinchanger.

28 In the west of the borough the Council proposed a new Greenford Green ward, comprising parts of the existing Contons, Ravenor and Wood End wards. It proposed a new Norwood Green ward to cover the south of the existing Dormers Wells ward, together with a small part of the Glebe ward, while the remaining northern part of the existing Dormers Wells ward would be combined with parts of Mount Pleasant and Wexford wards from a revised Dormers Wells ward. It proposed that a new Lady Margaret ward should comprise parts of the existing Mount Pleasant and Wexford wards. The Council proposed changes to the boundaries and names of the wards of Argyle, Contons, Hanger Lane, Mount Pleasant, Pinchanger, Vale, Victoria, Wexford and Wood End. It proposed modifications, of varying degrees, to the boundaries of the remaining wards in the borough.

29 Under the Council's scheme, the number of electors per councillor would vary by less than 10 per cent from the average in all but one ward, Norwood Green, which would vary by 12 per cent. However, as a result of housing development forecast in the proposed Norwood Green ward and changes in the distribution of the electorate throughout the borough, no ward is expected to vary by more than 5 per cent from the average in 2003.

### Ealing Borough Council Conservative Group

30 In its submission the Conservative Group on the Council argued that "the main boundary in the Borough is the River Brent". Consequently, it concluded that the provision of 23 three-member wards would allow the use of the River Brent as a boundary, and would facilitate the formation of wards based on existing communities elsewhere in the borough.
4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

38 However, our function is not merely arithmetical. First, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on considerations 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 fixed 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.

39 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.

40 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 electorate. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or reain, 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

41 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2003, projecting an increase in the electorate of around 1 per cent from 210,753 to 212,708 over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. It expected most of the growth to be in Dormers Wells, Gilead and Northolt wards, while it forecast that Hainger Lane and Northfield wards would both experience a notable decline in electorate. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plant, 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.

42 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. We welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

43 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.

44 Ealing Borough Council currently has 71 members. The Borough Council and the Conservative Group on the Council both proposed a council of 69 members, a reduction of two. Mr Harris proposed an increase in council size from 71 to 72.

45 In their submissions both the Borough Council and the Conservative Group stated that a pattern of 23 three-member wards would allow the River Brent to be used as a boundary for its entire length.
(except in the Trummers Lane industrial area which contains no electors). Such a boundary would provide the four-member wards of the west of the river and 12 three-member wards to the east, providing an appropriate level of representation across the borough. Furthermore, a council size of 69 would have the support of the majority of members on the council.

46 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would best be met by a council of 69 members.

Ward Names

47 In its submission the Borough Council stated that it “has proposed indicative ward names at this stage, largely based upon current ward names, pending wider consultation”. In our draft recommendations we have decided to consult on the indicative ward names which the Borough Council provided as they would appear to reflect the views expressed. We have also given details of alternative names which have been put forward for consideration, where appropriate. We welcome further views on ward names during Stage Three.

Electoral Arrangements

48 We have carefully considered the three borough-wide schemes which we received from the Borough Council, the Conservative Group and Mr Harris. We are grateful for the positive approach taken by the respondents, who each submitted detailed borough-wide proposals for change to the present electoral arrangements. From these representations some considerations have emerged which have informed us when preparing our draft recommendations. As noted above, there was a consensus among the majority of members of the Council for a small reduction in council size to 69.

49 Second, the current electoral arrangements provide for predominantly three-member wards in Ealing, although there are also four two-member wards. All three schemes were based on a pattern of predominantly three-member wards for the borough; the Borough Council and Conservative Group each proposed 23 wards while Mr Harris proposed 24 wards.

50 Third, there was consensus between the two submissions based on 69 members – from the Borough Council and the Conservative Group - for the proposed boundaries of the nine wards in the west of the borough. There was also some broad agreement between these two schemes on the warding arrangements for the remainder of the borough. However, since Mr Harris’ scheme was based on a different council size and included a proposal for a ward which would straddle the River Brent, his detailed boundaries were substantially different across the borough. In putting forward a council size of 69, it has not generally been possible, therefore, to adopt Mr Harris’ proposed boundaries.

51 Fourth, we noted the arguments put to us about community identities in the borough. We have tried to reflect such considerations in our draft recommendations where it would be consistent with our objective of electoral equality, although we note that there is not consensus locally on the precise boundaries of such communities.

52 Fifth, all three borough-wide schemes would provide improved electoral equality, although to varying degrees. Under the three schemes of both the Borough Council and the Conservative Group, the number of wards where the electoral variance would be more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough would reduce from five to one. By 2003, under the Borough Council’s scheme no ward would vary by more than 5 per cent from the average for the borough, while under the Conservative Group’s scheme no ward would vary by more than 3 per cent from the average. Under Mr Harris’ scheme, which only included borough-wide figures for 2002, no ward would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.

53 We have sought to build on both the Council’s and Conservative Group’s 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 tried to reflect the consensus between the two schemes for warding arrangements in particular parts of the borough. The following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- Glebe and Northcote wards;
- Dormers Wells, Mount Pleasant and Wexlow wards;
- Horsenden, Mandeville, Ravensthorpe, West End and Wood End wards;
- Cottesmore and Perivale wards;
- Argyle, Hanger Lane, Hobbayne and Pinner wards;
- Ealing Common, Elthorne, Northfield and Wallpoe wards;
- Southfield, Vale and Victoria wards;
- Heathfield and Springfield wards.

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

Glebe and Northcote wards

55 The two wards of Glebe and Northcote are situated in the south-west of the borough and are currently served by three councillors each. The number of electors per councillor is 3 per cent above the borough average in Glebe ward (11 per cent in 2003) and 10 per cent below the average in Northcote ward (6 per cent in 2003).

56 In order to address the relative under-representation in Glebe ward which is forecast to worsen, the Borough Council proposed transferring the area east of Merrick Road from Glebe ward to a new Norwood Green ward (detailed later). It stated that this would reflect community identities in this area. The Council also proposed that the area south of the High Street and the Uxbridge Road, currently in Mount Pleasant ward, should form part of a modified Northcote ward in order to unite the “South Road shopping and entertainment area” in one ward, while improving electoral equality in Northcote ward. The Conservative Group accepted the Borough Council’s proposals for this area. Under the Council’s scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent below the borough average in Glebe ward and 4 per cent below the average in Northcote ward, figures which are forecast to improve further by 2003 when both wards would achieve electoral equality.

57 Furthermore, the Borough Council supported the retention of Glebe as the indicative name for the ward but stated that other modifications could include Southall Green, Old Southall and South Southall. It stated that it had considered alternative names for the modified Northcote ward, including

Southall Broadway, Southall Central, Southall Hambrough and Southall Town, but proposed retaining Northcote as the indicative ward name.

58 In view of the consensus on the proposed wards of Glebe and Northcote, based on a council size of 69, the good electoral equality which would be achieved and the clear boundaries, we have decided to adopt these proposals as part of our draft recommendations, subject to two minor amendments. First, following advice from Ordnance Survey, we recommend an incidental modification to the boundary of Glebe ward in the area of the Grand Union Canal which would affect no electors but would provide a clearer boundary. Second, we note that the mapping which accompanied the Borough Council’s submission included properties on the north of Spikes Bridge Road in Northcote ward, but its electorate figures did not accurately reflect this. This transfer would include an additional 69 electors in Northcote ward, and we are putting it forward as part of our draft recommendations. The number of electors per councillor in Northcote ward would be 3 per cent below the average (1 per cent above in 2003).

Dormers Wells, Mount Pleasant and Wexlow wards

59 In the south-west of the borough, Dormers Wells ward is served by three councillors who each represent 11 per cent more electors than the average for the borough. As a result of the significant new development earmarked for this ward, particularly the Glade Lane/Toplocks and Windmill Park developments, the level of electoral inequality is expected to worsen by 2003 when each councillor is forecast to represent 26 per cent more electors than the average.

60 Mount Pleasant and Wexlow wards are situated generally to the west and north respectively of the existing Dormers Wells ward and each are represented by three councillors. The number of electors per councillor is 5 per cent above the borough average in Mount Pleasant ward (7 per cent above in 2003) and 1 per cent below in Wexlow ward (1 per cent above in 2003).

61 In order to address the electoral imbalance in Dormers Wells ward, which is expected to worsen over the five-year period to 2003, the Borough Council put forward a modified three-member Dormers Wells ward comprising the northern part of the existing ward together with part of Mount
Pleasant and Wadow wards, and a new three-member Norwood Green ward covering the southern part of the existing ward together with part of the Norwood Green ward. The Council proposed that the boundary between Dormers Wells and Norwood Green wards should follow the Uxbridge Road in the west and, broadly, the railway line until it meets the River Brent. The western boundary of the new Norwood Green ward would be as for the existing Dormers Wells ward (along Green Drive, the railway line, The Green, part of King Street and part of Havelock Road), but modified to take in the area east of Merrick Road, currently in Cetele ward. The proposed boundary between Norwood Green ward and Ethorne ward would follow the River Brent and then the railway line until it reaches the borough boundary in the south. The Council stated that while it proposed that the indicative name of the ward should be Norwood Green, other possible names included Havelock, Orleym, Southall Havelock, Three Bridges or Windmill Park.

Under the Borough Council's scheme the area covered by the existing Mount Pleasant ward would be divided between the three proposed wards of Dormers Wells, Lady Margaret and Northcote, while the existing Wadow ward would be divided between the three proposed wards of Dormers Wells, Lady Margaret and Ravenor.

The Council proposed a revised Dormers Wells ward comprising the northern part of the existing ward, together with parts of the existing Mount Pleasant ward and Wadow wards. It proposed that the boundary of Dormers Wells' ward with Northcote would extend westwards along the Uxbridge Road, the High Street and The Broadway and then north along Northcote Avenue. The boundary between Dormers Wells ward and Lady Margaret ward would follow the reversion of properties on the north side of Carlyle Avenue, as far as Lady Margaret Road, then to the south of Carlyle Avenue as far as Wadworth Road, continuing east along Barns Avenue, turning north to follow a footpath and Allenby Road, then generally east along Manzell Road and the northern boundary of Greenford Park Cemetery. The boundary would continue east to Greenford Road, turning south and then east again until it joined the River Brent which would form the eastern boundary of the ward. It was noted that it had considered other possible ward names including Greenford Park, Southall North East and Southall Golf Links in this area, but decided that Dormers Wells was the most appropriate.

Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent below the borough average in Dormers Wells ward (2 per cent below in 2003) and 12 per cent below the average in Norwood Green ward (1 per cent above in 2003). The Conservative Group accepted the Borough Council's proposals for the wards of Dormers Wells and Norwood Green.

In view of the agreement between the Borough Council and the Conservative Group in this area, and the improved electoral equality which would be achieved, we are consulting on the proposals for Dormers Wells and Norwood Green wards, subject to three amendments. First, following advice from Ordnance Survey, we propose to modify the southern boundary of Dormers Wells ward to follow the railway line itself, which would not affect any electors. Second, we propose to clarify the boundary between Dormers Wells and Lady Margaret wards so that it would follow the centre of Carlyle Avenue, rather than deviating from the north side to the south side. Third, we note that the mapping provided by the Borough Council proposes including an area on the north of Spikes Bridge Road as part of the ward. This transfer would involve some 68 electors from Dormers Wells ward and we have modified the figures accordingly.

Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the average in Dormers Wells ward (3 per cent below in 2003) and 12 per cent below the average in Norwood Green ward (1 per cent above in 2003). Although a degree of electoral inequality would persist in Norwood Green ward, the growth forecast in the Glade Lane/Toplarks and Windmill Road areas would result in considerable improvement in electoral equality over the five-year period.

As noted above, under the Borough Council's scheme the remainder of the existing Mount Pleasant ward, together with part of Wadow ward would form a new Lady Margaret ward. In addition to the proposed boundary with Dormers Wells ward described above, the southern boundary of Lady Margaret ward with Northcote ward would run to the north of properties on Spikes Bridge Road as far as the boundary. Its northern boundary would include the properties on Hillside Road, Ernmore Road, Towers Road, Avon Road, Garrick Road, Ellismere Road and Portland Crescent in the new Lady Margaret ward, with the area to the north and east forming part of Ravenor ward. The Borough Council stated that the new Lady Margaret ward would include "the communities on both sides of Lady Margaret Road, and most of that around Manzell and Mornington Roads". Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the new Lady Margaret ward would be equal to the borough average (1 per cent above the borough average in 2003). The Conservative Group accepted the Borough Council's proposals for this ward.

As noted above, the Borough Council proposed that the indicative name of this ward should be Lady Margaret. It did not consider the name Wadow to be appropriate, but suggested Southall North and Southall North-West as other possible names for this ward.

In view of the good electoral equality which would be achieved in this area, we are putting forward the proposed Lady Margaret ward as part of our draft recommendations, subject to the modifications to its southern boundary along Carlyle Avenue detailed earlier. Under our proposals the number of electors per councillor would be below the average in Lady Margaret ward (1 per cent above in 2003).

Horsenden, Mandeville, Ravenor, West End and Wood End wards

These five wards are situated in the north and west of the borough and each is represented by three councillors, except Horsenden which is a two-member ward. The number of electors per councillor in Horsenden ward is 5 per cent below the borough average (6 per cent in 2003), 12 per cent below in Mandeville ward (13 per cent in 2003), 5 per cent below in Ravenor ward (6 per cent in 2003), 1 per cent below in West End ward (2 per cent in 2003) and 8 per cent below in Wood End ward (unchanged in 2003).

In addition to its proposed boundary with the new Lady Margaret ward, the Borough Council proposed making further modifications to Ravenor ward so that "Greenford Town Centre will be united in the new Ravenor". The proposed ward would combine the majority of the existing Ravenor ward, that part of Wood End ward generally west of North Road, together with those roads in the Hazlemere Road area of West End ward which can only be accessed from Kensington Road. The Council argued that its proposals would utilise natural boundaries and minimise the impact of the proposed boundary on the regeneration of Greenford town centre. It proposed Ravenor as the indicative name for this ward, although alternatives could include Greenford Broadway, Greenford Town and Rainhill Road.

In addition to the transfer between Ravenor and West End wards, detailed above, the Borough Council proposed a further change to the boundary between the two wards. It proposed transferring part of Ravenor ward which lies west of Broadmead Road to West End ward, arguing that this would rationalise the boundary. The Council's indicative name for this ward was West End, although another suggestion was Northolt West End. The number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the borough average in Ravenor ward both now and in 2003, and 1 per cent above the average in West End ward (equal to the average in 2003). The Conservative Group accepted the Borough Council's proposals for these two wards.

In view of the good electoral equality which would be achieved under these proposals, both in these two wards and in neighbouring wards, and the agreement between the Borough Council and the Conservative Group, we are consulting on the proposals.

In its submission the Borough Council recognised the relative over-representation which exists in the existing Mandeville ward. The borough boundary formed part of the existing ward, and the Council considered that the clarity of the southern boundary along the A40 necessitated an amendment to the ward's eastern boundary. Consequently, it proposed including an area which lies generally to the west of Grifton Close, Grifton Road and Newham Gardens and to the south of Whittington Avenue West, currently in Wood End ward. It proposed that Mandeville should be retained as the indicative name for this ward, but added other possible names of Northolt Central, Northolt Manor, Northolt Park and Northolt Town.

Under the current arrangements the two-member Horsenden ward and the three-member Wood End ward are both relatively over-represented. In order to create three-member wards in this area with good electoral equality, the Borough Council proposed that the existing Horsenden ward should be expanded westwards to
include that part of Wood End ward which lies to the north of Whiton Avenue West, and the majority of the remainder of Wood End ward with the new Greendale Green ward (described below). While the Council proposed Horsenden as the indicative name for this ward, it stated that North Greenford was "the most credible alternative", and added that other possible names for this ward included Sudbury Hill and Wood End. The Conservative Group accepted the Borough Council’s proposals for Horsenden and Mandeville wards.

In view of the good levels of electoral equality and clearly identifiable boundaries which would result from the Borough Council’s proposals for this area, we have decided to consult on them. However, advice from Ordnance Survey led us to make a minor iteration to the boundary of Horsenden ward with Perivale ward, east of Sudbury Golf Course, which would affect no electors. The number of electors represented by each of the three councillors for Horsenden ward would be 1 per cent above the borough average (equal to the average in 2003) and 1 per cent below the average in Mandeville ward (2 per cent in 2003).

Costons and Perivale wards

At present, Costons ward is served by three councillors, each of whom represents 8 per cent more electors than the borough average (projected to worsen to 10 per cent by 2003), while Perivale ward is represented by two councillors, each of whom represents 8 per cent more electors than the borough average (2 per cent in 2003).

The Borough Council proposed that a new three-member Greenford Green ward should be created and that the majority of the existing Costons ward, together with the area of Wood End ward south of Whiton Avenue West and generally east of Lancaster Road, Groveville Crescent and Oriel Way, and that part of Ravenor ward west of Millett Road and north of Ravenor Park. The Council also proposed a three-member Perivale ward, comprising the existing two-member Perivale ward, plus the area of Argyle ward north of the River Brent and the properties currently in Costons ward which lie to the east of the Greenford railway branch line and Perivale Wood. The Council stated that, while it had considered the transfer of properties in the Perivale Park area to Perivale ward in order to improve electoral equality in both Greenford Green and Perivale wards, it had discounted such an option as it would have regard to community identity and would cross the strong boundary of the Greenford railway viaduct. Under the Borough Council’s scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent above the average for the borough in Greenford Green ward (5 per cent in 2003) and 4 per cent below the average in Perivale ward (5 per cent in 2003).

As noted above, the Borough Council proposed Greenford Green as the indicative name for the ward to the west, and stated that the only name which had been considered appropriate for the eastern ward was Perivale.

The Conservative Group proposed an amendment to the Borough Council’s scheme in this area so that Audley Road, Blueberries Close, David Avenue, Hicks Avenue and Leaver Gardens (comprising a total of 611 electors) would be transferred from the proposed Greenford Green ward to the proposed Perivale ward. The Group stated that this would improve electoral equality in the two wards concerned. Under the Conservatives’ scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the borough average in Greenford Green ward (2 per cent in 2003) and 2 per cent above the average in Perivale ward both now and in 2003.

Having considered the alternative proposals received for this area, we recognise the good boundaries which would result, particularly in Perivale ward, under the Borough Council’s proposals. However, we note that the Council considered that "the least worst area" for an amendment to its scheme would be in the area of Hicks Avenue and Leaver Gardens, the area which would be transferred under the Conservatives’ amendment. In view of the improved electoral equality that this further modification would achieve, which would be in line with the high degree of electoral balance achieved across the borough, we propose consulting on the Conservative’s proposed boundary between these two wards. In calculating the precise electorates for the two wards concerned we identified slightly different electorates which would not affect the overall electoral variances in the two wards.

Argyle, Hanger Lane, Hobayne and Pithanger wards

These four three-member wards are situated in the centre of the borough, north of the Great Western mainline railway. The number of electors per councillor is 6 per cent above the borough average in Argyle ward (5 per cent in 2003), 4 per cent above in Hanger Lane ward (equal to the average in 2003), 8 per cent below in Hobayne ward (unchanged in 2003) and 7 per cent above in Pithanger ward (4 per cent in 2003).

The Borough Council and the Conservative Group both proposed modifications to the boundaries of all four wards, although they differed in detail. The Borough Council proposed that the existing Hobayne ward should be modified so that its eastern boundary would run to the west of properties on Copley Close, incorporating part of the existing Argyle ward north of Borders Road. The Council stated that this would unite the whole of the Cuckoo Estate in Hobayne ward, a proposal which we understand was supported by the Cuckoo Estate Tenants’ and Residents’ Association, while uniting the whole of Copley Close Estate into one ward. The Council also proposed that both the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups on the Borough Council opposed any proposal to transfer the Churchill Close/Golden Manor area of Hobayne into Elthorne ward as it would breach existing community ties. The Borough Council stated that Stephen Round MP "strongly objected to any proposal to remove the Churchill Close community from within the Hobayne boundaries" for community reasons. The Council proposed to retain Hobayne as the ward name, adding that the only obvious alternative would be North Hanwell.

The Conservative Group proposed an alternative boundary for Ealing Broadway Ward which would run north along Argyle Road, turning east along St Stephens Avenue, north along Edgell Road, running east to follow Castlebar Hill and Montpelier Road, in a southerly direction to the east of Corfton Road a St Westbury Road, extending southwards with the boundary lying to the south of St Grove and Merton Road, continuing north at Colyers Road and along St Leonard’s Road, and finally west along the railway line as far as Argyle Road.

The Borough Council proposed that, in addition to its boundary modifications between Argyle ward and the revised wards of Ealing Broadway, Hobayne and Perivale, the eastern boundary of Argyle ward should be amended to follow Denison Road, Woodfield Road and part of...
Eaton Rise, thereby transferring an area from Pitshanger ward to Argyle ward. It proposed that Cleveland Road be the indicative name of this ward. Under the Borough Council’s scheme the remainder of Pitshanger ward would be combined with the major part of Hanger Lane ward to form a new Hanger Hill ward. The number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent above the borough average in Cleveland ward (3 per cent in 2003), 1 per cent below in Ealing Broadway ward (4 per cent in 2003) and 8 per cent above in Hanger Hill ward (4 per cent in 2003).

As noted above, the Borough Council proposed that the indicative name of the revised Argyle ward should be Cleveland, reflecting “the central position of Cleveland Road and Cleveland Park in the new ward”. It stated that other possible names for this ward could be Argyle, Cadesbar Park and North Ealing. It put forward the indicative name of Hanger Hill for the modified Hanger Lane ward, adding that alternatives such as Brentwood, Hanger Lane and Montpelier did not reflect the ward as a whole.

The Conservative Group agreed with the Borough Council’s proposed boundary between Cleveland and Hanger Hill wards. The Conservatives’ proposed Cleveland ward would cover a substantially similar area to the Borough Council’s, but with different boundaries with their proposed Ealing Broadway and North Harrow wards, as detailed above. They agreed with the proposals for a new Hanger Hill ward on the same boundaries as the Borough Council, subject to their proposals to include the Crotton Road and Westbury Road area in Ealing Broadway ward, and retain the Eaton Village area in Hanger Hill ward. Under the Conservative Group’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the borough average in Cleveland ward (1 per cent below in 2003), 5 per cent above in Ealing Broadway ward (2 per cent below in 2003) and 4 per cent above in Hanger Hill ward (equal to the average in 2003).

Ealing Common, Elthorne, Northfield and Walpole wards

These four three-member wards are situated in the south of the borough, and, overall, the area is relatively under-represented. The number of electors per councillor is 13 per cent above the borough average in Ealing Common ward (10 per cent in 2003), 3 per cent above in Elthorne ward (equal to the average in 2003), 10 per cent above in Northfield ward (6 per cent in 2003) and 11 per cent above in Walpole ward (10 per cent in 2003).

The Borough Council stated that “one of the identified advantages of a council size of 69 is that it permits minimal change in the ward boundaries in south Ealing and Harrow”. The Council considered that Elthorne ward should remain largely unchanged due to the robustness of its existing boundaries, in particular the Great Western mainline railway, the River Brent and the borough boundary, and the community identity and good electoral equality which would exist under a 69-member council. The only modification to Elthorne ward which the Borough Council proposed was to its western boundary with Northwood Green ward to include in Elthorne ward the Trumppers Way industrial estate, an area which can only be accessed from the ward and contains no electors.

In the case of Northfield ward the Council proposed the transfer of part of Cranmer Avenue, Lothair Road, Windermere Road (even numbers) and 23-28 Ealing Road from Walpole ward to Ealing Broadway ward in order to improve electoral equality in Northfield ward. Under the Borough Council’s scheme the average number of electors per councillor would be equal to the borough average in Elthorne ward (2 per cent below in 2003) and 3 per cent above the average in Northfield ward (1 per cent below in 2003).

In addition to the inclusion of the Trumppers Way industrial estate, the Conservative Group proposed three other amendments to the boundaries of Elthorne ward. First, it proposed to transfer an area around Manor Court Road and Church Road from Hlobbeyne ward to Elthorne ward, as detailed earlier. Second, it proposed to extend the southern boundary of the ward should be amended so that the area lying east of, and including, Eccleston Road and Squirrel Mews would be transferred from Elthorne ward to a new West Ealing ward. Third, it proposed that the boundary with Northfield ward should be amended to include Cavador Crescent, Cleftstone Avenue and those roads to their west in Elthorne ward.

The Group also proposed modifying the northern boundary of Northfield ward so that it followed Leighton Road as far as Northfield Avenue, turning south along the east side of Northfield Avenue, then east along the railway line until it reaches the existing boundary. It stated that these proposals would unite the Northfield Avenue shopping area in Northfield ward. Under the Conservative Group’s scheme the average number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the borough average in Elthorne ward (2 per cent below in 2003) and 1 per cent above the average in Northfield ward (3 per cent below in 2003).

The Borough Council put forward the indicative name of wards between Elthorne and Northfield, as at present. In the case of Elthorne, it stated that possible alternatives could include Harrow Broadway, Harrow Town and South Harrow, while in the case of Northfield possible alternatives could include Boston Manor, Little Ealing, Northfields and South Ealing.

While the proposals of both the Borough Council and the Conservative Group would achieve improved levels of electoral equality, both noted over the years’ time, we note that the Borough Council’s scheme would broadly retain the existing ward pattern, provide clear ward boundaries and be compatible with our recommendations for the west. Therefore we endorse the Borough Council’s proposals for Elthorne and Northfield wards as part of our draft recommendations.

The Borough Council considered that, in addition to its proposed changes to the boundary between Northfield ward and Walpole ward, Walpole’s northern boundary should be modified to “ensure that electoral equality can be achieved whilst also creating a more rational and compact Walpole ward”. The Council proposed that the boundary should follow the Usborne Road, turning south into Barnes Park, then east along part of Mattock Lane until it meets the present ward boundary. As detailed above, it proposed that the area of the existing Ealing Common ward generally north of The Grove and west of, and including, Windmere Road should form part of Ealing Broadway ward.

The Council also proposed transferring Ealing Village, Hanger Lane (numbers 25 to 32), Waldgrave Road from Hanger Lane ward to Ealing Common ward, arguing that “these roads are somewhat isolated from the remainder of the current Hanger Lane ward”. It proposed retaining Walpole as the indicative name of the ward although it considered West Ealing to be a possible alternative. The Council proposed retaining the existing ward name of Ealing Common, as it was the only continuous corridor. The number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the borough average in Ealing Common ward (1 per cent in 2003) and 2 per cent above the average in Walpole ward (equal to the average in 2003).

The Conservative Group proposed a significant reconfiguration of wards in this area. It proposed a new West Ealing ward comprising parts of the existing wards of Elthorne, Walpole and Northfield. The northern boundary of the proposed new ward would follow the Great Western mainline railway, the western boundary would broadly follow the edge of Kensington Cemetery and continue southwards along Groveon Road and Seward Road. Turning eastwards, the boundary would follow Leighton Road, then southwards to follow
the eastern side of Northfield Avenue, east along the London Underground Piccadilly line, and finally continues in a northerly direction to the east of Woodchurch Avenue, Lammas Park, Culumbridge Road and along part of St Leonard’s Road as far as the Great Western mainline railway. The Conservators also proposed a minor modification to the existing ward boundary so that part of Poppy Road would be transferred from Ealing Common ward to Northfield ward.

In addition, the Conservators proposed transferring an area bounded to the east by The Mall and The Common and to the south by The Grove, from Ealing Common ward to Ealing Broadway ward. They also proposed modifying the eastern boundary of Ealing Common ward so that the area north of Uxbridge Road and east of Hangar Lane would be transferred to a modified Springfield ward. Under the Conservative Group’s proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Ealing Common ward would be 1 per cent above the borough average (1 per cent below in 2003) and 2 per cent above the average in West Ealing ward (equal to the average in 2008).

We have given careful consideration to the representations received for this area. We have concluded that while both schemes would achieve similar electoral equality, the Borough Council’s proposals would utilise, in the main, clear boundaries while involving less change to the existing ward pattern and are likely to result in less confusion locally. We are therefore adopting them as part of our draft recommendations.

Southfield, Vale and Victoria wards

The two two-member wards of Vale and Victoria and the three-member Southfield ward are situated in the east of the borough, and the area as a whole is relatively over-represented. The number of electors per councillor is 6 per cent below the borough average in Southfield ward (unchanged in 2003), 14 per cent below in Vale ward (16 per cent in 2003) and 5 per cent below in Victoria ward (6 per cent in 2005).

The Borough Council argued that Southfield ward is separated from the rest of South Acton by the North London railway, while the borough boundary forms its south and east boundaries. As a result, the Council proposed improving electoral equality in the three-member Southfield ward by extending its northern boundary to follow The Vale and the rear of properties on the east side of Dodrecht Road. It added that the Liberal Democrats supported its proposal for this area.

The Conservative Group proposed two amendments to the existing Southfield ward. First, it proposed crossing the North London railway to transfer the area generally east of Newton Avenue and south of Acton Lane from Heathfield ward to Southfield ward. Second, it proposed extending the northern boundary of Southfield ward to include an area west of Eastman Road and south of The Vale, as it argued that the area east of Eastman Road eastwards is isolated from the rest of the ward by the industrial area.

The Borough Council proposed addressing the over-representation in the two two-member wards of Vale and Victoria by combining the wards to form a new three-member East Acton ward, and modifying its boundaries. In addition to the proposed boundary with Southfield ward, detailed above, the Council proposed transferring an area around the North Acton Recreation Ground, together with an area south of Noel Road and west of Horo Lane, currently in Victoria ward, to Springfield ward. It proposed the transfer of several properties on Western Avenue from Springfield ward to East Acton ward, and the Westpoint Trading Estate industrial area from Hangar Lane ward to the new East Acton ward (the latter transfer would involve no electors).

The Borough Council put forward Southfield as the indicative name for the ward, although it stated that alternative names could include Acton Green, Bedford Park, Chiswick and Chiswick Southfield. The Council proposed the indicative name of East Acton for the ward covering much of the combined Vale and Victoria. It stated that, while it had considered North East Acton or the use of Park Royal in a possible ward name, it concluded that they were inappropriate for the ward as a whole. Under the Conservative Group’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the borough average in East Acton ward (1 per cent above in 2003) and 2 per cent above the average in Southfield ward (1 per cent above in 2003).

With regard to the Borough Council’s proposed East Acton ward, the Conservative Group stated that it agreed with the principle of the wards. However, in addition to the alternative boundary which the Conservative Group proposed with Southfield ward, it proposed modifying the boundary between East Acton and Springfield wards to follow Horn Lane, turning north-west along the Western Avenue and then south-west along the London Underground Piccadilly Line (which is above ground in this area) until it joins the existing boundary. Under the Conservative Group’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the borough average in East Acton ward (2 per cent in 2003) and 3 per cent above the average in Southfield ward (2 per cent in 2003).

Both proposals would achieve improved electoral equality, although the Council’s proposals are expected to achieve slightly better electoral equality by 2003. The Council’s proposals would follow clearly defined boundaries, including much of the North London railway and The Vale, as well as facilitating consequential changes to secure electoral equality in neighbouring wards. We are therefore adopting the Borough Council’s proposals for East Acton and Southfield wards as our draft recommendations for this area.

Heathfield and Springfield wards

The two three-member wards of Heathfield and Springfield are situated to the west of the existing wards of Southfield, Vale and Victoria and currently have good levels of electoral equality. The number of electors per councillor in Heathfield ward is 1 per cent below the borough average and is 1 per cent below the average in Springfield ward (2 per cent below in 2003).

The Borough Council stated that, in seeking to achieve electoral equality in Springfield ward and the surrounding wards, it had considered a number of options but “concluded that no major change option could achieve electoral equality without breaching the strong natural boundaries of Acton High Street and the London North Railway, or without splitting the core Springfield north Acton community”. Accordingly it proposed only minor boundary modifications to the existing Springfield ward. In addition to the modification between Springfield and East Acton wards, detailed earlier, it proposed transferring a total of 529 electors in Bloomsbury Close, Daniel Road, Montague Gardens, Oakley Avenue and Western Walkers, and parts of Crefield Road and Tavely Avenue, from Springfield ward to Heathfield ward.

The Council also proposed transferring an area around Steyne Road from Heathfield ward to Springfield ward, which would result in the High Street being utilised as the ward boundary for its entire length. It proposed no further modifications to Heathfield ward. Under the Borough Council’s scheme the number of electors per councillor in Heathfield ward would be 2 per cent below the borough average both now and in 2003 and equal to the average in Springfield ward (2 per cent below in 2003).

The Borough Council proposed that the existing ward names of Heathfield and Springfield should be put forward for consultation. However, it noted that in the case of Heathfield ward, South Acton Residents’ Action Group supported the name South Acton or, as a second preference, Acton South. The Council added that other alternatives could be Acton Hill, Acton Town and South West Acton. In the case of Springfield ward it stated that alternative names could include Acton Central, North Acton and North West Acton.

The Conservative Group proposed a reconfiguration of Springfield and Heathfield wards so that they would be divided on a south-west to north-east orientation, which would, it stated, produce wards with similar boundaries to those that had existed prior to the previous review of the borough’s electoral arrangements in the late 1970s. For Springfield ward, the Group argued that “ideally its boundaries would coincide with Western Avenue, Horn Lane, Steyne Road, Uxbridge Road, the Piccadilly line and the Central line”. However it acknowledged that such a ward would be too small in electorate terms and proposed combining this area with Springfield ward polling district GEA (with the exception of those properties on Western Avenue, Nemouse Road, Highlands Avenue and those properties in polling district EG north of Uxbridge Road and east of Hangar Lane.

The Group’s revised Heathfield ward would comprise the remainder of the existing Heathfield and Springfield wards, subject to the modified boundary with Southfield ward detailed earlier. Under the Conservative Group’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the borough average in both Heathfield ward and Springfield ward (2 per cent in each in 2003).

While the Borough Council’s and the Conservative Group’s proposals would achieve similar levels of electoral equality, we must consider
the impact which any changes would have on the borough as a whole. The Conservatives' proposed Heathfield and Springfield wards would adversely affect the electoral equality achieved by our proposals for neighbouring wards. The Borough Council's proposals for these two wards would, in the main, utilise clear boundaries, achieve good electoral equality while broadly retaining the existing ward pattern and accord with the proposals for neighbouring wards. We are therefore adopting them as our draft recommendations for the area.

Conclusions

We have considered carefully the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review. We commend the approach taken by each scheme to improve electoral equality. Furthermore, we welcome the consensus between the submissions from the Borough Council and the Conservative Group in the west of the borough which would achieve good electoral equality, and we have broadly adopted these proposals subject to minor amendments to the wards of Dorens Wells, Lady Margaret and Northcote wards. In the east of the borough, we concluded that the Borough Council's proposals would achieve a substantial improvement in electoral equality in the majority of wards without significantly departing from the existing ward pattern in some areas. However, we proposed two further modifications to the boundary between Cleveland and Ealing Broadway wards, and Ealing Broadway and Hanger Hill wards, and adopted the Conservative Group's proposals for Greenford Green and Perivale wards. We consider that our proposals strike a satisfactory balance of the criteria guiding our work. Overall, we propose that:

10 There should be a reduction in council size from 71 to 69.
10 There should be 23 wards, two less than at present, involving changes to the boundaries of all of the existing wards.

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.

Draft Recommendation

Ealing Borough Council should comprise 69 councillors serving 23 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 5, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of the report.

112 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Ealing and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others on the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

---

**Figure 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 arrangements</td>
<td>Draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of councillors</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of wards</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of electors per councillor</strong></td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>3,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 5: The Commission’s Draft Recommendations for Ealing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (1998)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Number of councillors (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (2003)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cleveland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,377</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,315</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dormers Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,651</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>8,988</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ealing Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ealing Common</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,413</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 East Acton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ethorne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Glead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Greenford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,091</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9,092</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hanger Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,551</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Heathfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9,019</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hoxton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,179</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Horsenden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,277</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lady Margarene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,186</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mandeville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Northcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,901</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9,446</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Northfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,452</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Norwood Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>9,374</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Perivale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,406</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ravenor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Southfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,347</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,349</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Springfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,024</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued overleaf*
5. NEXT STEPS

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

Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 0171 404 6142
E-mail: reviews@gcc.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

Ealing Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations for ward boundaries differ from those put forward by the Borough Council in respect of eight wards. Figure A1 illustrates the electoral variances in these wards under the Borough Council’s proposal.

**Figure A1:**
Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors (1998)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (1998)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Number of councillors (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor (2003)</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,614</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>3,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormers Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,736</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>9,073</td>
<td>3,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,052</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>2,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenford Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>3,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanger Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>3,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Margaret</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,143</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northolt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>9,778</td>
<td>3,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perivale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>2,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Figures are based on Ealing 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.
APPENDIX B

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 less than 10 years, and not more than 18 years, after this Commission’s predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted its initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas have been included in the Commission’s review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

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

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

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

- 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.

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