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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 Haringey is to ensure that the number of Electors represented by each Councillor on the Borough Council is as near 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 Haringey. 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 Haringey because:

- in two of the 23 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough, with three wards projected to exceed 10 per cent by 2003.

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2, and paragraphs 96-97) are that:

- Haringey Borough Council should be served by 57 councillors, two less than at present;
- there should be 19 wards, four fewer than at present, which would involve changes to the boundaries of 22 existing wards, with Noel Park ward remaining unchanged.

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- In all of the 19 wards, the number of electors per councillor would vary by 5 per cent or less from the borough average.
- This improved electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 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 23 March 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Constituent areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alexandria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alexandra ward; Fortis Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bounds Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bowes Park ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bruce Grove ward; West Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Archway ward (part); Crouch End ward (part); South Hornsey ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fortis Green ward (part); Highgate ward (part); Muswell Hill ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green Lanes ward (part); Harringay ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Archway ward (part); Highgate ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hornsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crouch End ward (part); Hornsey Central ward; Hornsey Vale ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Muswell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Archway ward (part); Crouch End ward (part); Muswell Hill ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Northumberland Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coleraine ward (part); Park ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St Anns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Green Lanes ward (part); Tottenham Central ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Seven Sisters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seven Sisters ward; South Tottenham ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Streous Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hornsey Vale ward (part); South Hornsey ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The Hale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coleraine ward (part); High Cross ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tottenham Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Cross ward (part); South Tottenham ward (part); Tottenham Central ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Green ward (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 White Hart Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Park ward (part); White Hart Lane ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bowes Park ward (part); Woodside ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Haringey

<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 Alexandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bounds Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,505</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,918</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,559</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,751</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Highgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,889</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,608</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hornsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7,482</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Muswell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,787</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Northumberland Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 St Anns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,756</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Seven Sisters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,934</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Streous Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,871</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,844</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The Hale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,615</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,786</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tottenham Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,522</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,561</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 White Hart Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,597</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 57 146,481 — — 145,789 — —

Averages — 2,570 — — 2,558 —

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

Notes: 1. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2. Alexandra ward does not include 525 electors initially projected for the Holloway Park development site. Having sought advice from officers of the Council, we understand that the planning application relating to this area has been rejected and that no attempt will be made to appeal against the decision. The electorate totals for Alexandra ward and the borough as a whole therefore differ from those initially submitted by the Borough Council.
1. INTRODUCTION

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

2 In undertaking periodic electoral reviews, we must have regard to:
   • the statutory criteria in section 13(6) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
     (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
     (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
   • the Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix B).

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

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

The London Boroughs

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

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

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

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

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Submission of proposals to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Commission’s analysis and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

11 Haringey is situated in the centre of north London and its name originates from the mediaeval form of the name 'Horns'. It has a large and culturally diverse population and although mainly residential, also contains some light industry, principally in Tottenham, within the valley of the river Lee. There is good access to central London, via the Victoria and Piccadilly Underground lines, as well as train services running into Liverpool Street, King's Cross and Moorgate stations. The borough lies just inside the North Circular Road and the M25 motorway is within easy reach.

12 A number of major landmarks are located within the borough, including Alexandra Palace in the west, opened in Victorian times as an educational and recreational centre and known for being the original home of BBC television. Bruce Castle, which is now a museum of the borough, was once the home of the postal reformer Sir Rowland Hill. The borough also contains the busy shopping centre of Wood Green, which is one of the largest shopping and service centres in London.

13 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'.

14 The electorate of the borough (February 1998) is 146,481. The Council currently has 59 councillors who are elected from 23 wards (Map 1 and Figure 4). Thirteen wards are each represented by three councillors and ten wards elect two councillors each. As in all London boroughs, the whole council is elected together every four years.

15 Since the last electoral review, there has been a decrease in electorare in the borough, with around seven per cent fewer electors than when the last review of the borough was carried out (in 1977) by our predecessor the Local Government Boundary Commission.

16 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,483 electors, which the Council forecasts would decrease slightly to 2,471 by the year 2002 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 two of the 23 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. The worst imbalance is in Bowers Park ward, where each of the three councillors represents on average 14 per cent more electors than the borough average.
### Figure 4:
**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 Alexandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,721</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Archway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bowes Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,468</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,281</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,256</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coletane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,256</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,141</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Green Lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 High Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Highgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hornsey Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,271</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hornsey Vale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4,705</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Muswell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,142</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,897</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Seven Sisters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 South Hornsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 South Tottenham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tottenham Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,204</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7,197</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,158</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,136</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 White Hart Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4 (continued):
**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>23 Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,010</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>6,919</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>146,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145,789</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes: 1. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1998, electors in White Hart Lane were relatively over-represented by 13 per cent, while electors in Bowes Park were relatively under-represented by 14 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2. Alexandra ward does not include 525 electors initially projected for the Holloway Park development site. Having sought advice from officers of the Council, we understand that the planning application relating to this area has been rejected and that no attempt will be made to appeal against the decision. The electorate totals for Alexandra ward and the borough as a whole therefore differ from those initially submitted by the Borough Council.
3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

24 At the start of the review, we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Haringey Borough Council. 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.

25 We received 23 representations during Stage One. The Council put forward a borough-wide set of proposals, while the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups on the Council and the Green Party put forward a jointly agreed borough-wide scheme, submitted as a Cross Party submission. These representations, with accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Council and the Commission by appointment.

Haringey Borough Council

26 The Council proposed that it should in future be served by 57 members, rather than the present 59, and that the number of wards should be reduced by four to facilitate three-member wards throughout the borough. Under its proposals, the number of electors per councillor in all wards would vary by no more than 7 per cent from the borough average initially and by no more than 5 per cent by 2003. It proposed modifications to all but two wards, Harringay and Noel Park, and proposed retaining the main King’s Cross railway line (which bisects the borough) as a boundary between wards.

Haringey Borough Council Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups and the Green Party

27 The Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups on the Council together with the Green Party put forward a joint set of borough-wide proposals (the Cross Party plan) involving council size being reduced by 11 councillors to form a 48-member authority. The proposals would revise all 23 existing wards and result in 16 new three-member wards. Like the Council’s proposals, the main King’s Cross railway line would be retained as a boundary between wards under the Cross Party plan. The number of electors per councillor in all proposed wards would vary by 6 per cent or less from the borough average, both initially and by 2003.

Member of the European Parliament

28 Pauline Green MEP expressed support for the proposals submitted by the Council, stating that its scheme “has the virtue of retaining a considerable number of existing ward boundaries and appears ... to be the best in terms of respecting the geography of local communities”.

Other Representations

29 We also received 20 other representations, the majority of which commented on the Council’s proposed Highgate and Muswell Hill wards. Many respondents stated that the Archway Road currently acts as a focus for the local community and that it would not be appropriate for this road to be used as a boundary between wards. The Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee gave examples of the community links which exist in the Archway Road area, stating that “the Council’s proposals do not appear to reflect this unique situation.” The Holmesdale and Orchard Roads Residents’ Association stated that to use either the Archway Road or the neighbouring Parkland Walk as ward boundaries “would be a very arbitrary split of what is essentially a single community”. It considered that, if ward boundary changes were necessary, it would be more appropriate for the existing Archway ward to be combined with the present Highgate ward.

29 The Priory Gardens Residents’ Association opposed the Council’s proposals on the grounds that electors in their local area share closer ties with Archway than with Muswell Hill. The Southwood Hall Residents’ Association stated that “whichever new ward we are to be part of should retain ‘Highgate’ as part of its name.” The Highgate Society opposed the Council’s proposed Highgate
and Muswell Hill wards, stating that the scheme
"splits the Archway community, which we are all
aware considers itself [united by] common identity,
interests and problems".

31 The Jacksons Lane Community Centre stated
that "the shared experience of fighting road
widening proposals [in relation to the Archway
Road] for over twenty years has brought people
together in a unique way", while the New Archway
Road Residents' Association expressed concern
regarding proposals for a ward comprising parts of
the existing Highgate and Archway wards, stating
that "the specific needs and interests of the
Archway Road area [would] be neglected [in such
a ward]". The Hornsey Lane Association, the
Rotary Club of Islington & Highgate and 11 local
residents also expressed concerns that dividing the
Archway Road between different wards could have
an adverse effect on local community ties.

4. ANALYSIS AND DRAFT
RECOMMENDATIONS

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

33 However, our function is not merely
arithmetical. First, our recommendations are not
intended to be based solely on existing electorate
figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in
the number and distribution of local government
electors likely to take place within the ensuing five
years. Second, we must have regard to the
desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries, and to
maintaining local ties which might otherwise be
broken. Third, we must consider the need to secure
effective and convenient local government, and
reflect the interests and identities of local
communities.

34 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.

35 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

36 At the commencement of the review, the
Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year
2003, projecting a very marginal decrease in the
electorate from 146,481 to 146,314 over the five-
year period from 1998 to 2003. It estimated rates
and locations of housing development with regard
to structure and local plans, the expected rate of
building over the five-year period and assumed
occupancy rates. However, during the course of
Stage One, a proposed development planned for the
Hollickwood Park site in Alexandra ward was
rejected at a planning enquiry on the grounds that
the site was not suitable for housing. The
boroughwide proposals received from the Council at
the end of Stage One included 525 electors for this site
in its electorate projections for the proposed
Alexandra ward, although under the Cross Party
plan the proposed Alexandra ward excluded these
electors.

37 Given the different approaches to this issue, we
sought advice from officers of the Council. Their
correspondence stated that the "Hollickwood Park
development plans have not been accepted and are
unlikely to be the subject of an appeal. This
development will therefore not proceed."

38 Given this advice, we are content that the
proposed development on the Hollickwood Park
site will not take place and we have therefore
revised the projected electorate total for the current
Alexandra ward (and the borough as a whole)
to exclude the projected 525 electors. This
modification to the electorate forecast results in the
projected electorate for the borough as a whole
being 145,789 by 2003. We accept that forecasting
electorates is an imprecise science, and, having given
consideration to the Council's forecasts, are
content that, with the modification mentioned
above, they represent the best estimates that can
reasonably be made at this time.
Council Size

40 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.

41 Haringey Borough Council currently has 57 members. Over the past 20 years the borough has experienced a seven per cent decrease in electorate, a trend forecast to continue (more marginally) over the next five years. The Council proposed a 57-member council size, rather than the present 59, while the Cross Party plan proposed reducing overall council size by 11 to form a 48-member authority. As stated in our Guidance, we will not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but we are prepared to consider the case for change where there is strongly persuasive evidence and a degree of local support.

42 The Cross Party plan stated that an overall reduction in council size of 11 members "would be more efficient and would save money compared with the current 59-member council". The submission argued that fewer councillors would also result in "more efficient meetings", and that "under the proposed local government reforms, there will be less work for back bench councillors, and therefore a smaller group will be much more efficient and effective". It cited as further justification for the proposed reduction in the number of councillors that the Greater London Assembly would "reduce the workload for [borough] councillors which suggests that fewer would be more appropriate". The Cross Party plan added that "in practice it was easier to fit Haringey communities into larger wards."

43 Although the Council's proposals would also provide for an overall decrease in council size (although only by two), it stated that as the borough has reasonably good levels of electoral equality in a number of existing wards, any proposals would be based on minimal change to the three-member wards where appropriate, and that "existing boundaries should be retained as far as possible".

44 As we indicate in our Guidance, we are always prepared to consider innovative proposals in respect of council size, intended to facilitate the implementation of models of local authority management, insofar as they are compatible with our statutory obligations. We therefore welcome the proposition for a 48-member council size contained in the Cross Party plan. However, we are wary about recommending a substantially different council size without evidence of general support locally.

45 While we acknowledge the validity of the Cross Party plan, which would achieve similarly good levels of electoral equality to the Council's proposals, we do not believe that sufficient local support for a reduction of 11 councillors has been demonstrated. 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 57 members. We would particularly welcome any further views on this issue, including any from the Council, during Stage Three.

Ward Names

46 We have carefully considered the representations we have received in respect of ward names. We would wish to reflect local preferences wherever possible but, where differences of view have been expressed, we have had to make a judgement. We note that there is already agreement between the borough-wide submissions on a number of ward names and, where this is the case, we have reflected these views. However, differences of opinion do exist in certain areas, we have proposed names which, in our view, reflect local community identities. We would welcome views on our proposed ward names during Stage Three and would particularly appreciate recommendations. The Cross Party plan added that "in practice it was easier to fit Haringey communities into larger wards."

47 Both schemes provided similar improvements in the overall levels of electoral equality. As stated earlier, the Council put forward proposals for a three-member ward pattern based on a council size of 57. The number of electors per councilor in all but one of its 19 wards would initially vary by no more than 5 per cent from the borough average, with its proposed Highgate ward at 7 per cent above that average. In 1992 the level of electoral equality was expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards varying by no more than 5 per cent from the average.

48 As also stated earlier, the Cross Party plan put forward a three-member ward pattern based on 48 councillors. The number of electors per councilor in 14 of its proposed 16 wards would vary by no more than 5 per cent from the average, with the remaining two wards varying by 6 per cent. By 2003, the number of electors per councilor in all but one of its proposed wards would vary by 5 per cent or less from the borough average, with its proposed Cross Green ward projected to be 6 per cent below the average.

49 The choice between the two borough-wide submissions was a difficult one. We consider that, overall, the Council's proposals provide a marginally better balance between achieving reasonable electoral equality and reflecting the statutory criteria. However, we recognize the validity of the proposals put to us under the Cross Party plan and the comments received from other interested parties locally, particularly in relation to the west and south-west of the borough.

50 We are therefore proposing substantial modifications to the Council's proposals in the area to the west of the King's Cross railway line, to secure better levels of electoral equality and, in our view, to better reflect local community identities. We also propose modifying the Council's proposals (to a lesser extent) in the centre and east of the borough, affecting three proposed wards. We value the contribution that the Cross Party plan has made to the preparation of our draft recommendations and would welcome any further views its authors and others may have during Stage Three.

51 Given that the Cross Party plan was based on a substantially different council size to that put forward by the Council, the two schemes are not compatible as the proposed ward sizes are different. As we have decided to keep the Cross Party proposals to the Council's scheme for 57 members, we have not detailed the Cross Party plan in the following paragraphs. However, for ease of reference, the Cross Party proposals are listed in Figure A2 in Appendix A.

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

(a) Alexandra and Fortis Green wards;
(b) Archway, Highgate and Muswell Hill wards;
(c) Crouch End, Hornsey Central, Hornsey Vale and South Hornsey wards;
(d) Bowes Park, Harringay, Noel Park and Wood Green wards;
(e) Green Lanes, High Cross, Seven Sisters, South Tottenham and Tottemham Central wards; and
(f) Bruce Grove, Coleherne, Park, West Green and White Hart Lane wards.

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

56 These two wards are in the north-west of the borough. Each currently returns three councillors, and both wards are over-represented at present. The number of electors per councillor in the two wards is 10 per cent and 7 per cent below the borough average respectively, projected to be 9 per cent below and 6 per cent below by 2003. The figure for the Alexandra ward excludes the (rejected) Hollickwood Park development (see also paragraphs 36-38).

57 In order to improve electoral equality, the Council proposed that 1,111 electors should be transferred from Muswell Hill ward into Fortis Green ward, and that 604 electors should be transferred from Fortis Green ward into Alexandra ward. However, as explained earlier, the Council’s submission for this area was based on the assumption that 525 extra electors would be resident in Alexandra ward by 2003. The number of electors per councillor in its proposed Alexandra and Fortis Green wards would initially be 5 per cent below and 4 per cent below the borough average respectively. By 2003 its proposed Alexandra ward would remain at 5 per cent below the average (using the revised electorate forecast), while its proposed Fortis Green ward would improve to 3 per cent below the average.

58 The only other specific representation we received in respect of these wards was the Cross Party plan which took into account the fact that the Hollickwood Park development had been refused planning permission. However, due to the Cross Party plan being based on an alternative council size, its proposals for this area are not compatible with the Cross Party plan made in response to the public consultation. We have attempted to secure a reasonable level of electoral equality, having regard to the revised electorate projections for Alexandra ward. Alexandra Palace and its grounds (Alexandra Park) form Alexandra ward’s southern boundary, while the main King’s Cross railway line forms its eastern boundary. The borough’s external boundary is the ward’s north-western boundary. Options are therefore limited and the only area where we are realistically able to modify the boundary to include additional electors in Alexandra ward, in order to improve electoral equality, is along its boundary with Fortis Green ward.

59 We propose the following: that a total of 823 electors should be transferred from Fortis Green ward from the present Highgate ward, and that 798 electors should be transferred into Fortis Green ward from Muswell Hill ward. These transfers of electors into Fortis Green ward would then enable a total of 967 electors to be transferred from that ward into Alexandra ward to improve overall levels of electoral equality. As a result of these boundary alterations, the number of electors per councillor in the revised Alexandra and Fortis Green wards would be almost equal to the average and 2 per cent below the average respectively, both initially and by 2003.

60 We acknowledge that electors around Cherry Tree Hill and Woodside Avenue may share closer ties with the Highgate area than with the proposed Fortis Green ward. However, in order to achieve a good level of electoral equality we propose wards in the west and south-west of the borough, and to reflect community identities and interests across as wide an area as possible, we are of the view that transferring these electors into Fortis Green ward is the most appropriate option. The external borough boundary and the local geography of this area severely limit options when seeking to establish three-member wards of the appropriate size (approximately 7,700 electors) under this scheme.

61 Notwithstanding the concern outlined above, we consider that our proposed Alexandra and Fortis Green wards provide a reasonable balance between securing electoral equality in the area as a whole and reflecting, as far as practicable, local community identities and interests. We put these proposals forward for consultation and would welcome views during Stage Three. Details of our proposed boundaries in this area are detailed on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Archway, Highgate and Muswell Hill wards

62 These three wards are located in the west and south-west of the borough, with Archway and Highgate wards each returning two councillors and Muswell Hill ward returning three councillors. The number of electors per councillor in these wards is currently 7 per cent above, 6 per cent below and 9 per cent above the borough average respectively (6 per cent above, 10 per cent below and 7 per cent above the average by 2003).

63 This area proved to be fairly contentious during Stage One of the review. The only Conservative and Liberal Democrat members on Haringey Council are the Highgate and Muswell Hill wards respectively, and the majority of representations received commented on the Council’s proposals for the south-western part of the borough.

64 In order to facilitate three-member wards in this part of the borough, the Council proposed that Archway ward should be disbanded, with 4,029 electors transferred into a revised three-member Highgate ward and the remaining 1,300 electors transferred into a revised Muswell Hill ward. It also proposed that a net total of 225 electors should be transferred from Crouch End ward into Muswell Hill ward, that 483 electors should be transferred from Highgate ward into Muswell Hill ward and that a total of 2,263 electors should be transferred out of the north and eastern parts of Muswell Hill ward, with 1,111 electors included in a modified Fortis Green ward (as described above) and 1,152 electors included in a new Hornsey ward. The revised Highgate and Muswell Hill wards would retain their existing names, and the number of electors per councillor in the two wards would initially be 7 per cent and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively, projected to be 4 per cent above and equal to the average by 2003.

65 In addition to the Cross Party plan, we received representations on these wards from the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the Highgate Society, the Holmesdale and Orchard Roads Residents’ Association, the Hornsey Lane Association, Jacksons Lane Community Centre, the New Archway Road Residents’ Association, Pauline Green MEP; the Priory Gardens Residents’ Association, the Rotary Club of Islington & Highgate, the Southwood Hall Estate Residents’ Association and 11 local residents (see Chapter 3). Pauline Green MEP expressed general support for the Council’s proposals but all the other representations expressed concerns over its proposals for this part of the borough.

66 Respondents argued that the Archway Road is a focal point for the local community, rather than being a boundary between communities and that splitting it between two or three different wards may dilute the sense of community felt by many people living on either side the road. A number of respondents, including Jacksons Lane Community Centre, Priory Gardens Residents’ Association and the New Archway Road Residents’ Association, also expressed concern that the Council’s proposals would include in Muswell Hill ward electors from the existing Highgate ward, which would share significantly stronger ties with the Highgate area than with Muswell Hill.

67 We have carefully examined the proposals submitted for this area and have considered the comments made in the Cross Party plan and by local organisations and residents. We consider that the Council’s proposals do not fully reflect local community identities and interests and are also of the view that the levels of electoral equality achieved under its proposals could be improved upon. For example, the number of electors per councillor in its proposed Highgate ward would be 7 per cent above the borough average and the ward would not include Highgate Wood (which would be in its proposed Muswell Hill ward).

68 We do not consider that all the Council’s proposed boundaries in this area reflect community identities and interests as well as they might. We were particularly concerned that the Council proposed including the Priory Gardens, Shepherd’s Hill and Stanhope Gardens area in a revised Muswell Hill ward; residents in this area are some distance from Muswell Hill Broadway and have no direct access to it. This area, we believe, shares many more links with Archway and Crouch End. While we acknowledge that three-member wards containing the appropriate number of electors and which also reflect community identities and interests are difficult to formulate, we believe the Council’s proposals for this area can be improved upon.

69 We propose revising the southern boundary of the Council’s proposed Muswell Hill ward in order to better reflect community identities in this area. We consider that the electors to the north of Shepherd’s Hill and Wolsely Road (including Priory Gardens and Gaslows Road), and those between Parkland Walk and Hornsey Road (including Stanhope Gardens) share significantly closer ties with Crouch End ward than with Muswell Hill ward, and therefore propose including these electors in the former. The Cross Party plan’s proposed Crouch End ward also
included these electors in a ward based on Crouch End, rather than a ward based on Muswell Hill.

71 However, in order to secure good levels of electoral equality in this area, we concur with the Council's proposal that Parkland Walk should be utilised as a boundary between wards. Despite the views of some respondents, we consider that the Walk represents a reasonable physical division between communities and that there is no better boundary that would secure reasonable electoral equality.

72 Having carefully considered the views expressed in relation to this area, we agree with the Council that the present two-member Archway ward should be disbanded. However, we do not concur with all of its specific ward boundary proposals in this south-western area of the borough. We are putting forward proposals that 4,029 electors be transferred to a modified Highgate ward (as suggested by the Council); that 1,060 electors be transferred to a modified Crouch End ward; and that 240 electors (to the south of Queen's Wood) be transferred to a modified Muswell Hill Ward. We also propose that 823 electors from the present Hornsey ward, and 798 electors from the present Muswell Hill ward, should be transferred into a modified Fortis Green ward (as described earlier) and that 263 electors should be transferred from Crouch End ward into the revised Muswell Hill Ward. Our proposals would, in our view, meet the need for electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests as far as practicable.

73 Under our proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Highgate and Muswell Hill wards would be 2 per cent above and 1 per cent above the borough average respectively (with both wards at 1 per cent below by 2003). Further information relating to Crouch End ward is given in the paragraphs below. Details of our proposed boundary modifications in this area are shown on the large map inserted at the back of the report. We would very much welcome further views on our proposals for this area during Stage Three.

Crouch End, Hornsey Central, Hornsey Vale and South Hornsey wards

74 These four wards are located in the south-west of the borough, and each currently returns two councillors, with the exception of Crouch End ward which returns three councillors. The number of electors per councillor in the four wards is presently 0 per cent above, 4 per cent below and 1 per cent above the borough average respectively (4 per cent below, 11 per cent above, 5 per cent below and 1 per cent above by 2003).

75 The Council proposed that a total of 223 electors should be transferred from Crouch End ward into the revised Muswell Hill ward (as mentioned earlier), and that 218 electors from Hornsey Central ward and 478 electors from South Hornsey ward should be added to a revised Crouch End ward. It also proposed that 1,152 electors should be transferred from Muswell Hill ward into a new Hornsey ward (as mentioned earlier), along with the majority of Hornsey Central ward and 1,403 electors from Hornsey Vale ward. The residual parts of Hornsey Vale and South Hornsey wards would comprise a new Stroud Green ward.

76 The number of electors per councillor in the revised Council's proposals for Hornsey Central, Stroud Green and South Hornsey wards would be 2 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively, projected to be 1 per cent below, 1 per cent above and 2 per cent above by 2003.

77 Although the Council's proposals in this area would result in good levels of electoral equality, we are unable to put them forward in their entirety due to the knock-on effect of the proposals we are making elsewhere in the south-west of the borough (see previous paragraphs). In order to better reflect local ties, and in the light of comments received, we therefore propose modifying the Council's proposals in this area. Were we to include the electors around Sunnighope Gardens and Priory Gardens in our proposed Highgate ward, as some respondents have suggested, a degree of electoral inequality would result. We are therefore unable to reflect the views put forward by Jacksons Lane Community Centre, or the Priory Gardens Residents' Association, and we propose to include these electors in a revised Crouch End ward.

78 Despite some views received in opposition to this proposal, we consider that ties do exist between these electors and the Crouch End ward. We acknowledge that the electors on Shepherd's Hill may share close ties with those near the Archway Road but are of the view that in order to balance electoral equality and community identities, it is necessary for these electors to form part of a revised Crouch End ward, an area with which they share considerable links.

79 Our proposal to modify the Council's proposed Crouch End and Muswell Hill wards necessitates consequential boundary modifications to other wards in this area. We are therefore putting forward alterations to the Council's proposed Hornsey ward in light of our other proposals for the western area of the borough that have improved electoral equality while having regard to community identities. We are putting forward the following: that a new Crouch End ward should comprise the majority of the existing ward of that name, along with 1,050 electors from Archway ward and 478 electors from South Hornsey ward; and that a new Hornsey ward should comprise all the present Hornsey Central ward, 626 electors from South Hornsey ward and 1,403 electors from Hornsey Vale ward. A new Stroud Green ward would comprise 3,350 electors from the present Hornsey Vale ward and 4,521 electors from the present South Hornsey ward, as proposed by the Council.

80 The number of electors per councillor in our proposed Crouch End, Hornsey and Stroud Green wards would be 5 per cent above, 5 per cent below and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively, projected to be 2 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 2 per cent above by 2003. We considered whether we could improve on the initial electoral imbalances (5 per cent) in the proposed Crouch End and Hornsey wards, given that one ward would be marginally over-represented and the other marginally under-represented. However, we came to the view that our proposed ward boundary in this area (along Tottenham Lane) is a strong and identifiable one.

81 We are therefore prepared to accept initial electoral imbalances of 5 per cent in this area as the imbalances are projected to improve over the five-year period (both becoming 2 per cent) and an identifiable ward boundary would be secured. However, we accept that electoral equality could be improved further if more electors were transferred from our proposed Crouch End ward to our proposed Hornsey ward. We would welcome any further views on this issue during Stage Three. Our draft recommendations for new or modified wards of Crouch End, Hornsey and Stroud Green are shown in more detail on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Bowes Park, Harringay, Noel Park and Woodside wards

82 These wards are located in the centre of the borough, and each returns three councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Harringay, Noel Park and Woodside wards is currently 1 per cent above, 3 per cent above and 6 per cent below the borough average respectively (1 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 7 per cent below by 2003). Bowes Park ward currently has the worst level of electoral inequality in the borough, with the number of electors per councillor at 14 per cent above the borough average, projected to be 12 per cent above by 2003.

83 The Council proposed that 806 electors should be transferred from Bowes Park ward into Woodside ward and that no change should be made to Harringay and Noel Park wards. It also proposed that the revised Bowes Park ward should be renamed Bounds Green. The number of electors per councillor in a new Bounds Green ward and a revised Woodside ward would be 1 per cent below and 1 per cent above the borough average respectively (2 per cent below and equal to the average by 2003). Due to the revised council size, the number of electors per councillor in the unchanged Harringay and Noel Park wards would be 2 per cent below and 1 per cent below the borough average respectively (5 per cent below and 2 per cent below by 2003).

84 The only other specific representation we received regarding the wards in this area was the Cross Party Plan, but the proposals were based on a council size of 48 members, it is not compatible with the proposals put forward by the Council. The Cross Party Plan's proposed Harringay ward would be broadly similar to the Council's, but its other proposed wards in this area are significantly different due to the differing council sizes. As detailed earlier, the Cross Party Plan and the Council's proposals retained the main King's Cross railway line as a boundary between wards, and we propose reflecting this consensus in our draft recommendations.

85 We recognise that the Council's proposals provide reasonable levels of electoral equality, with each of the wards having clearly identifiable
boundaries including the railway line bisecting the borough. However, in order to improve upon the level of electoral equality in its proposed Harringay ward, having regard to the five-year forecast of electorate, we propose including in the ward 426 electorate from the neighbouring St Ann's ward (see also later paragraphs). The number of electors per councillor in the revised Harringay ward would be 3 per cent above the borough average, projected to be 1 per cent above by 2003.

As given that the Council's proposals provide reasonable levels of electoral equality subject to our modification, we are content to adopt them as our draft recommendations. We would welcome views during Stage Three, including on our proposed ward names, and details of our proposed boundaries are illustrated on the draft map inserted at the back of this report.

Green Lanes, High Cross, Seven Sisters, South Tottenham and Tottenham Central wards

87 These wards are located in the south-east of the borough. Green Lanes, High Cross, Seven Sisters and South Tottenham wards currently return two councillors, while Tottenham Central ward returns three councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Green Lanes, High Cross and Tottenham Central wards is currently 7 per cent above, 2 per cent above and 3 per cent below the borough average respectively (9 per cent above, 5 per cent above and 3 per cent below by 2003). Seven Sisters and South Tottenham wards currently vary by 1 per cent and 3 per cent from the borough average respectively, with both wards projected to equal the average by 2003.

88 The Council proposed that 2,513 electors from Tottenham Central ward should be combined with the existing Green Lanes ward to form a new St Ann's ward. The remaining electors from Tottenham Central ward would be included with 1,227 electors from High Cross ward and 1,924 electors from South Tottenham ward to form a new ward to be named Tottenham Green. Seven Sisters ward would retain its name and include the remaining electors from South Tottenham ward, while the remaining 3,833 electors from High Cross ward would be included in a new ward named The Hale (see later paragraphs in this chapter). The number of electors per councillor in each of the Council's proposed St Ann's, Seven Sisters and Tottenham Green wards would initially be 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively, projected to be 3 per cent, 3 per cent and 4 per cent by 2003.

89 The only other specific representation we received in relation to these wards was the Cross Party plan. Due to the plan being based on an alternative council size, its proposed ward boundaries in this area were significantly different to the Council's, rendering the two schemes incompatible.

90 We acknowledge that the Council's three proposed wards in this area would secure reasonable levels of electoral equality whilst maintaining strong natural boundaries, for example the North London railway line. However, in order to improve upon the level of electoral equality in its proposed St Ann's and Tottenham Green wards, and also the neighbouring Harringay ward, we propose transferring 320 electors from its proposed Tottenham Green ward into its proposed St Ann's ward, and 426 electors from St Ann's ward into its proposed Harringay ward. Under our revised boundaries, the number of electors per councillor in St Ann's and Tottenham Green wards would be equal to the borough average and 2 per cent below the average initially, projected to be 1 per cent above and equal to the average by 2003.

91 We therefore put forward for consultation the Council's proposed Seven Sisters ward and its proposed St Ann's and Tottenham Green wards subject to slightly modified boundaries. We acknowledge that at 3 per cent above the borough average, the proposed Seven Sisters ward would have the highest level of electoral imbalance under our proposals by 2003. However, we consider this as being acceptable, given that the ward is constrained by the North London railway line to the north and the main Green Lane road to the west, which we consider to be geographical divides between communities in the city. We therefore propose retaining the external borough boundary to the south and east. We would welcome any views during Stage Three, and details of our proposed boundaries are illustrated on the map inserted at the back of this report.

Bruce Grove, Colveraine, Park, West Green and White Hart Lane wards

92 These wards are located in the north-east of the borough and each returns three councillors, with the exception of Park ward which returns two. The number of electors per councillor in these five wards is currently 1 per cent below, 4 per cent below, 5 per cent above, 10 per cent above and 13 per cent below the borough average respectively (2 per cent below, 2 per cent below, 5 per cent above, 10 per cent above and 11 per cent below by 2003).

93 The Council proposed that 577 electors from West Green ward should be transferred into Bruce Grove ward, with the remaining area of West Green forming a new ward but retaining its present name. It also proposed that 1,016 electors from Park ward should be transferred into White Hart Lane ward, with the revised ward retaining the name White Hart Lane, and that the remaining electors from Park ward should be included with 3,186 electors from Colveraine ward to form a new Northumberland Park ward. The remaining electors from Colveraine ward would be combined with 3,833 electors from High Cross ward (as mentioned earlier) to form a new ward to be named The Hale.

94 Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in its proposed Bruce Grove, Northumberland Park, The Hale, West Green and White Hart Lane wards would be 3 per cent above, 2 per cent below, 1 per cent below, 2 per cent below and 3 per cent below the borough average respectively (2 per cent above, 1 per cent below, 1 per cent above, 1 per cent below and equal to the average by 2003). The only other specific representation we received in relation to these wards was the Cross Party plan, but, as previously stated, due to the varying council size between the Council's scheme and the Cross Party plan we have not been able to reflect the boundaries proposed in the Cross Party plan.

95 In light of the clearly identifiable boundaries and good levels of electoral equality which the Council's proposals provide, we are endorsing its proposed Bruce Grove, Northumberland Park, The Hale, West Green and White Hart Lane wards. We would welcome views during Stage Three on our proposals, including ward names. Details of our proposed boundaries are illustrated on the map inserted at the back of this report.
Table 5:
Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998 electorate</th>
<th>2003 forecast electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td>recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Haringey Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from two to none. This improved balance of representation is expected to be retained in 2003. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted in the back of this report.

Draft Recommendation
Haringey Borough Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2 and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of this report.

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

101 The Commission is putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Haringey. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 17 May 1999. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

102 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

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

103 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.
APPENDIX A

Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft proposals differ from those submitted by the Council only in respect of the wards as detailed in Figure A1 below. The levels of electoral equality that would be attained under the Cross Party plan are detailed in Figure A2. Full details of each submission, including accompanying mapping, may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission by appointment.

Haringey Borough Council

Figure A1: 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>Variance from average (%)</th>
<th>Electorate (2003)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7,322</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,227</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,946</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,613</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ann's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,842</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,955</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Figures are based on Haringey Borough Council's submission.

Notes: 1. The "variance from average" column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2. Alexandra ward does not include 525 electors initially projected for the Hollowood Park development site. Having sought advice from officers of the Council, we understand that the planning application relating to this area has been rejected and that no attempt will be made to appeal against the decision. The 2003 electorate total for Alexandra ward therefore differs from the figure initially submitted by the Borough Council.
APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: The Commission’s Role

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

(a) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
(b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

---

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.