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PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the City of Westminster in accordance with the requirements of section 50(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for the City.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 10 June 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Westminster City Council, copies of which were circulated to the Greater London Council, the London Boroughs Association, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.

3. Westminster City Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.
4. On 9 December 1975 Westminster City Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the City into 23 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 60 members.

5. We also received an alternative scheme for the City submitted by a local political party. We considered this together with comments which had been sent to the City Council about the Covent Garden and Soho areas.

6. In examining the Council's draft scheme and the alternative scheme, we noted that there was considerable disagreement about the forecast electorate and its likely distribution throughout the City. In particular, the alternative scheme proposed that the Paddington Parliamentary Constituency area should be represented by a total of 24 councillors, one more than proposed in the Council's draft scheme. We concluded that there was merit in formulating a compromise scheme and we decided to adopt the eight wards in the Paddington Constituency area proposed in the alternative scheme and to adopt the City Council's draft scheme for the rest of the City, with modifications to the St James's, St George's and Palace wards in the Westminster South Constituency area. The modifications included a reduction in the representation of the Palace ward from 3 councillors to 2 and the re-naming of the ward Belgrave. We decided to realign the boundary between the Cavendish and Baker Street wards in order to improve the standard of representation and we also adopted a minor boundary modification recommended by the Ordnance Survey. Subject to these modifications, we decided that the compromise scheme would provide a satisfactory basis for the future representation of the City in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and with our guidelines. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

7. On 24 June 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals and the accompanying map
which defined the proposed ward boundaries available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 2 September 1976.

8. Westminster City Council accepted the draft proposals but suggested that the names of the proposed Maida Vale North, Maida Vale South and Regent wards should be altered to Maida Vale, Little Venice and West End respectively.

9. The political party referred to in paragraph 5 above objected to our draft proposals and asked that further consideration should be given to those parts of their alternative scheme which we had not adopted. A local political association wrote suggesting that the boundary between the proposed Baker Street and Cavendish wards should be realigned along Harley Street and that, in consequence, the wards should be represented by 3 and 2 councillors respectively, instead of by 2 and 3 councillors as in our draft proposals.

10. In view of these comments, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr S Astin, MBE, was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

11. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Westminster on 29 March 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

12. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to modification of the boundary between the proposed Hamilton Terrace and Lords wards and changing the names of the proposed Maida Vale North, Maida Vale South and Regent wards to Maida Vale, Little Venice and West End respectively.

13. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the amendments recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. Subject to these modifications, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals.
14. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

15. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Westminster City Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.
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16 June 1977
In accordance with the instructions contained in the Commission's letter of 3rd February 1977, I conducted a Local Meeting as Assistant Commissioner at the Westminster City Hall on Tuesday, 29th March, 1977, to hear and discuss representations with regard to future electoral arrangements in the City of Westminster.

1. ATTENDANCES

I attach as Appendix 'A' a list showing the names and addresses of the persons attending the meeting and the interests they represented.

2. COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

The Commission's Draft Proposals for the City of Westminster set out in the Commission's letter to the City Council of 24th June 1976 proposed 23 wards returning 60 Councillors (14 wards each returning 3 Councillors and 9 wards each returning 2 Councillors).

It should be noted that the City of Westminster is split up into three Parliamentary Constituencies, namely, Westminster South, Paddington and St. Marylebone, and in all the ward arrangement schemes considered and also in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals the boundaries between these three Parliamentary Constituencies had been retained. In the Commission's Draft Proposals, the area of the City comprised in the Westminster South Parliamentary Constituency had 8 wards returning 19 Councillors (5 wards of 3 Councillors each and 5 wards of 2 Councillors each); the Paddington Parliamentary Constituency area had 8 wards each returning 3 Councillors, a total of 24 Councillors; and the St. Marylebone Parliamentary Constituency area had 7 wards returning 17 Councillors (3 wards of 3 Councillors each and 4 wards of 2 Councillors each).

Prior to the formulation of the Draft Proposals, the Commission had received from the City Council a draft scheme providing for a Council of 60 members, to be elected from 23 wards, but differing from the Draft Proposals later made by the Boundary Commission in that the City Council's draft scheme suggested 8 wards in the Westminster South Parliamentary Constituency area returning 20 Councillors, 8 wards in the Paddington Parliamentary Constituency area returning 23 Councillors and 7 wards in the St. Marylebone Parliamentary Constituency area returning 17 Councillors.

The Commission had also had before it an alternative scheme submitted by the Westminster Local Government Committee of the Labour Party representing the three Constituency Labour Parties of St. Marylebone, Paddington and Westminster South. This alternative scheme envisaged 22 wards returning 60 Councillors, with 8 wards returning 19 Councillors in the Westminster South area, 8 wards returning 24 Councillors in the Paddington area and 6 wards returning 17 Councillors in the St. Marylebone area. Only one of the 22 wards in the Labour Party's alternative proposals was the same as a ward in the Council's proposals. The remaining 21 wards were drawn differently. Furthermore, the Labour Party had strongly questioned the City Council's calculation of the projected 1980 electorate for the various
wards in the Council's proposals and had put forward to the Commission alternative suggested 1980 electorate figures. Copies of a fairly lengthy correspondence with the City Council on this matter had been forwarded to the Commission.

The Boundary Commission also had before them comments from:

(a) The Covent Garden Community Association and Mr. B. Lake suggesting that the Soho and Covent Garden areas should be linked to form one ward; and

(b) Mr. David Alexander opposing the above suggestion.

In considering the formulation of their Draft Proposals, the Commission noted that the City Council had predicted a quite considerable decline in the electorate of the City by 1980 (by just over 8,000 electors), and that on the basis of the Council's 1980 projected electorate figures the Council's draft scheme was a fairly good one with only one ward (namely the Cavendish ward) giving rise to concern as to the ratio of electorate to elected members. The Commission also considered that the Labour Party scheme was fairly good, the Labour Party, however, contending that the City Council had over estimated the decline in the electorate, particularly in the area of the Paddington Parliamentary Constituency. The Commission had some sympathy with this view and they concluded that there was some merit in adopting a compromise scheme. Accordingly they decided to adopt the Labour Party's proposed wards for the Paddington Parliamentary Constituency and to base the rest of their draft proposals (namely in St. Marylebone and Westminster South) on the City Council's scheme.

Since adoption of the Labour Party's suggested wards in the Paddington area involved an additional Councillor (the Labour Party provided for 24 Councillors to represent the 8 wards in the Paddington Constituency whilst the City Council scheme provided for only 23), the Commission decided to propose an adjustment to the Council's suggested St. James's Ward, St. George's Ward and Palace Ward. These proposals involved the transfer of 847 electors from Palace Ward to St. James's Ward, and 559 electors from Palace Ward to St. George's Ward. The resulting Palace Ward was re-named Belgrave Ward (by the Commission) and its representation reduced from 3 Councillors to 2, thus reducing the total size of the City Council back to 60 (which was the maximum number the Commission were prepared to accept for the Westminster City Council).

The Commission also decided to adjust the boundary between the proposed Cavendish Ward and the proposed Baker Street Ward, thereby transferring some 134 electors from Baker Street Ward to Cavendish Ward. This gave an improved standard of equality of representation in the two wards.

The Commission had also considered the comments submitted by the Covent Garden Community Association and Mr. B. Lake but had considered that any local ties between the Covent Garden and Soho areas were not sufficiently strong to justify a change to bring about their amalgamation into one ward. Finally, the Commission had decided to adopt one minor modification to a ward boundary which had been recommended by Ordnance Survey in the interests of a technically better boundary.

3. OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS received before Local Meeting

- From the Chief Executive, Westminster City Council, advising that the City Council, by a majority decision, had agreed to accept the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals, subject to the names of the following three Wards being changed to avoid confusion:-
The Council had also submitted some notes and figures as to 1980 projected electorate figures for the City Council's original scheme, the Labour Party's scheme and the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals.

- From Councillor Tim Daniel, of Westminster Local Government Committee of the Labour Party, representing the three Constituency Parties of St. Marylebone, Paddington and Westminster South, restating the views expressed in the earlier letter of 14th January 1976 and also stating that the Committee felt the Draft Proposals (a) failed to provide sufficient representation in the proposed Church Street Ward; (b) seriously under-represented the expected electorate in the Millbank Ward; and (c) failed to recognise the arguments in favour of the Soho and Covent Garden areas being joined to form one ward, and the arguments against the proposed Regent Ward and St. James's Ward.

- From Mr. John Bates, Secretary St. Marylebone Liberal Association, referring to the proposed Baker Street Ward and Cavendish Ward, suggesting an alternative boundary between the two Wards, namely, Harley Street, instead of Marylebone High Street, Thayer Street, Mandeville Place and James Street - this amended boundary would then mean that Baker Street Ward would return 3 Councillors (instead of 2 Councillors as at present proposed) and Cavendish Ward would return 2 Councillors (instead of 3 Councillors as proposed).

4. **Submissions** made at the Local Meeting

(Note: In writing this Report it would normally have been my aim to deal with separate issues wholly in separate sections of the Report, but on account of the manner in which the Meeting proceeded, and particularly because the parties present submitted written evidence, I was precluded from following my usual practice. The following is a report of the Meeting as it progressed. As some aid, I have introduced sub-headings for identification of subjects.)

(1) **Introduction**

In my preliminary introduction at the commencement at the Meeting, I outlined the purpose of the Meeting, namely, to seek local views as to the appropriate ward arrangements for the City, thereafter to enable the strength of those views and the arguments put forward to be assessed and to enable me to make recommendations to the Boundary Commission thereon. I then outlined a suggested method of proceeding with the business of the Meeting and intimated that after the Meeting it was my intention to visit various parts of the City and, in particular, those areas referred to in our discussion affecting ward boundary differences or difficulties in voting arrangements. I hoped that the Meeting would agree that I could be accompanied on those visits by Mr. K. F. Pettifer, Chief Assistant in the Chief Executive's Department, but if other persons wished
specifically to accompany me on the visits then appropriate arrangements would be made.

I then referred to the various comments which had been made to the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals (these being listed in paragraph 3 of this report) and said that no doubt an important part of our discussion at this Meeting would be on the question of the compilation of the projected 1980 electorate figures for the various wards of the City as proposed in the alternative schemes under consideration.

Mr. J. E. Langley, Chief Assistant City Solicitor, introduced Mr. K. F. Pettifer to make a short general statement as to the relevant action taken by the City Council in the procedure for the review of electoral arrangements. Mr. Pettifer said that in June 1975 the Boundary Commission gave notice of its intention to review electoral arrangements for all London Boroughs and called upon the City Council to prepare a draft scheme. The Commission indicated that a Council of between 50 and 70 members should apply for each of the Boroughs in London; that the number of Councillors per ward should not exceed 3 and that the ratio of electors to each Councillor should be about 2,500. Draft schemes should have regard to any changes in the distribution of electors likely to take place within a period of five years i.e. up to 1980.

Mr. Pettifer said that the Council's Chief Planning Officer, using the demographic projections of population prepared by the Greater London Intelligence Unit, had estimated that the total number of electors in the City in 1980 would be some 139,000. This figure would have given the City Council a membership of 56 members but the Boundary Commission had accepted that, with the special circumstances applying in Westminster, a Council of 60 members was justified. Subsequently, the members of both political parties represented on the City Council had agreed certain principles relating to the preparation of a draft scheme, namely, that the boundaries of the new wards should be defined within the respective boundaries of the three Parliamentary Constituencies of the City; that wards should be represented by 2 or 3 members; and that there should be no single member wards. Mr. Pettifer then outlined the draft scheme prepared by the Council which was adopted by a majority decision of the Council in December 1975. He said that the Labour members of the Council did not regard the scheme as properly representing the distribution of the projected electorate and that they had submitted their own scheme to the Commission.

In June 1976 the Boundary Commission, after having studied the various proposals and comments, had prepared their own Draft Proposals (described earlier in this report).

He then said that subsequently the Council had decided, again by a majority decision, to accept the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals subject only to changes of names of 3 of the proposed wards. The Council suggested that the Maida Vale North Ward should be called Maida Vale Ward and that the Maida Vale South Ward should be called Little Venice Ward, for this would avoid having two "Maida Vale" wards and avoid some possible confusion. The Council also suggested that the Regent Ward should be called West End Ward, for as there was also a proposed Regents Park Ward there would have been two "Regent" wards.

He then referred to the other comments submitted to the Boundary Commission, namely, from the Westminster Local Committee of the Labour Party and also the St. Marylebone Liberal Association. He said that the further representations and
objections had led to the convening of the Local Meeting being held today.

Councillor Tim Daniel, representing the Westminster Local Government Committee of the Labour Party then interposed and said that his Party had no objection to the suggested changes of ward names. The Labour majority had suggested the two wards Maids Vale North and Maids Vale South and were happy at the new suggested names of Maids Vale and Little Venice. With regard to the Regent Ward set out in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals, if that were to remain, the Labour Party would be happy with the newly suggested name of West End Ward, but it should be noted that the Labour Party were suggesting a different ward pattern in this area with the names of Mayfair Ward and Charing Cross Ward.

(2) Calculation of Projected 1980 Electorate for City and for Individual Wards

It had already been noted that there was considerable difference in the submissions made by the Westminster City Council and the Westminster Local Government Committee of the Labour Party as to the projected 1980 electorate figure for the various wards which were now under consideration and Mr. Langley then introduced Mr. Drew Stevenson, Senior Assistant in the Planning Department of the City Council, to make a statement as to the method used in carrying out projections of the numbers eligible to vote.

Mr. Stevenson then described in considerable detail the method used in July 1975 to arrive at the 1980 estimates of the population eligible to vote, by wards. He said the method of projection covered five main stages.

Stage 1

The first step was to decide how the population of the City as a whole would be projected to 1980. He said one of the four Greater London Council 1980 projections (adjusted for 1980) was used. The GLC had made these four alternative projections for each London Borough as a whole and took into account migration, fertility and mortality rates. The projection chosen as most suitable for Westminster was the higher of the two mid-range estimates for 1981, then adjusted to give the 1980 figure. This estimate was based on a low fertility and a low migration rate. The 1980 estimate for Westminster on this basis was 184,000, which had subsequently been accepted by all parties concerned as a suitable basis for the ward calculations.

Stage 2

The next step was the selection of an appropriate distribution for the total population at 1980 i.e. distributing the projected City wide population amongst the 18 wards. This was done initially in two different ways for each ward.

(a) The first method was based on the 1971 census distribution of ward population. The method assumed that the percentage distribution of the total City population between wards in 1971 would be the same in 1980.

(b) The second method was based on trends for the population of each ward between the 1961 and 1971 censuses. To do this a straight line projection was taken for each ward between 1961 and 1971 and projected to 1980.
Both of these distributions were later refined, as explained in stage 3 below and finally at stage 4 below the distribution felt most appropriate to each ward was selected. The total 1980 population arrived at in this way was then adjusted to the agreed 1980 total and the ward projections adjusted accordingly.

Stage 3

At this stage adjustments were made for major housing changes, and information on planned major housing changes between 1971 (census date) and 1980 was then used to refine the projected distributions. The changes considered were only major ones which it was thought would affect the distribution at ward level.

Mr. Stevenson then went on to outline major housing changes which had been estimated, viz:

(A) Local Authority housing (both new development by the Westminster City Council and the Greater London Council) and major rehabilitation schemes by Westminster City Council (the population calculation had been made at 2.5 persons per dwelling) - also allowance was made for clearance and decanting (a figure of 3.26 persons per dwelling being used).

Allowances were then made for rehousing and waiting list allocations, with appropriate apportionment of the waiting list rehousing figures between the wards.

(B) Private Sector housing. Note had been taken of proposed changes in the large private estates but only increases in accommodation of the Grosvenor Estate (502 people in Belgravia and 171 people in Mayfair) were considered significant and, in the absence of any detailed evidence, it was assumed that these people would come equally from the 18 wards in Westminster.

Then the total change in population due to housing changes by wards was calculated on this basis up to 1980, and used to modify the two projections made at stage 2.

Stage 4

This stage was to select the more appropriate projection for each ward from the two alternatives explained at stage 2, as refined due to housing changes in stage 3. The two 1980 projections for each ward were considered and the likelihood of current trends continuing was assessed. To aid this decision additional information from the 1961 and 1971 censuses and the ward totals from the 1975 electoral register were considered, together with local knowledge of changes likely to take place in each ward. On this basis the figure thought most appropriate for each ward was chosen; all were then summed and redistributed on a percentage basis to reach the control total of 184,000.

Stage 5

Having obtained the total population for each ward, the final stage was to identify those who would be eligible to vote. It was assumed that the percentage of those under 18 would be the same in 1980 as it was in 1971 in each ward, and that percentage was subtracted from the total 1980 population projected for each ward. Finally, this figure was adjusted to
give the eligible voting private population for 1980 resident in each ward. This was similarly done on the basis that the percentage of eligible voting private population in each ward would be the same in 1980 as it was in 1971.

Mr. Stevenson then referred to the objections made by the Labour Party to the method of projection used by the Westminster City Council, and the Labour Party's contention that a more accurate way of assessing any expected increase or decrease in the electorate within the following five years from 1975, would be to start from the current electorate rather than census figures, which they pointed out were now some years out of date.

The Labour Party had said that, in making their calculations, they had taken the estimated total electorate in 1980 (obtained from the GLC Intelligence Unit figures) and apportioned this figure amongst existing wards in the ratio of the electorates in the current register and then adjusted those figures for new residential development under construction and proposed between October 1974 and 1980).

Mr. Stevenson said there were three reasons for believing the method of projection used by him to be more accurate than other possible methods based on the electoral register. First the scheme should be designed to give all people eligible to vote an equal opportunity for representation. Calculations based on the electoral register could not achieve this; for example in 1971 the proportion of people who actually put their name on the register varied between 100% and 82% in different wards. The lack of proper representation that such variations could cause was shown by an example as follows - in two wards each with 2,500 people on the register, ward A with 100% registration would contain 2,500 people eligible to register and ward B with only 82% registration would contain 2,000 people eligible to register. Secondly, the census, apart from giving information on those "eligible to register" as opposed to those "registered" was more rigorously carried out than the survey for the electoral register and hence was more accurate. Thirdly, a control total for the exercise was needed and, as agreed by all parties, the GLC projections were the only figures available and were considered suitable. These projections were based on the census. To get direct comparability, the census basis had to be used throughout or assumptions had to be made about the proportion who were likely to put their names on the register in each ward. A reasonable estimate of this was obtainable for 1971 but there was no basis for making assumptions about what it would be in 1980, especially as it varied so much between wards in 1971.

He went on to say that, therefore, the census was felt to be both more appropriate and more accurate, as well as being statistically more compatible with the GLC projections. He pointed out, however, that the electoral register had been used, but more as a check on deciding whether the higher of lower of two projections was to be chosen, rather than as the basis of the projection. When it was used as a check, the register trends between 1971 and 1975 were considered, not just the 1975 figure.

He considered that the fundamental flaw in the method used by the Labour Party in their proposals was that it took no account of trends, by being based solely on the 1975 register. It ignored the fact that any one ward could be gradually becoming a greater or smaller proportion of the total in the
City. It had assumed that, subject to housing changes, it would remain at whatever proportion it was in 1975. He considered the problems that this created could be illustrated by using the same method for the 1975 register and then for the 1977 register, to project the 1980 register and noting the differences. He said that in the Labour Party's projections presently before us, based on the 1975 register, Baker Street Ward was shown as having 8,204 electors, but using the same method and using the 1977 register figure, a dramatic drop was suggested to 7,360. The two calculations produced results which varied by nearly 8% over a two years period. If such a variation were maintained over a five years period, 1975 to 1980, the calculations would show a 20% difference. The main argument for using the 1975 register was that it was the most up to date information at that time and should therefore be used. He said presumably the calculation based on the 1977 register should now be believed because that was now the most up to date. What the figure did show was that using the electoral register in the way suggested, the projections for 1980 could vary considerably, depending on which year was used as the starting point.

Mr. Stevenson then turned to the consideration of two wards where the 1980 projected electorate figures had been queried by the Labour Party.

(3) Church Street Ward

The first was Church Street Ward, where the Labour Party said the draft proposals failed to provide sufficient representation. He said that the Labour Party's method of calculation based on the 1975 register suggested a 1980 electorate figure of some 350 electors more than the City Council's figure, but if the Labour Party had based their calculation on the 1977 register their figure would have been reduced by some 650, namely, 300 less than the Westminster City Council's figure. He submitted a graph showing a steep rise of electorate from 1973 to 1976 with a much more gradual rise from 1976 to 1980.

(4) Millbank Ward

He then referred to the Millbank Ward where the Labour Party had said that the Commission's Draft Proposals seriously under-represented the expected electorate in the ward. He said that the City Council's estimate for this ward in 1980 was 4,780, whereas the Labour Party's figure based on the 1975 register was 5,560, but similar calculations based on the 1977 register suggested a lower figure of 5,441. He suggested that the electorate figure in this ward had risen to a peak of 6,500 in 1975, but he accepted that the Westminster City Council's figure could have been under-estimated, having regard to the fact that development in the Lillington Gardens area had been occupied after 1971 and also about that time there had been a very high level of vacancies in Millbank (a percentage of 13.7% as compared with 8.5% in the City as a whole) and the City Council now felt that possibly there ought to be added some 700 additional electors to the 4,778 originally projected to give a new figure of 5,478.

Councillor Tim Daniel, representing the Westminster Local Committee of the Labour Party, then sought to cross-examine Mr. Stevenson on the statement which he had made and reiterated to Councillor Daniel that it was my hope that the Local Meeting would not take the form of a Local Inquiry (with
evidence given and cross-examination following) but that our meeting would be an informal meeting and that our proceedings would take more a form of discussions of the various problems and points of view. Nevertheless, I said that, if Councillor Daniel wished to have some further explanation of statements made by Mr. Stevenson, I would have no objection to a limited number of questions. It may be that Councillor Daniel was not too happy at my reply, but I allowed him then to question Mr. Stevenson on points which he had made.

(5) Calculation of 1980 projected City and Ward electorate

Councillor Daniel then referred to the calculation of the overall projected population figure for the City of Westminster and said that the control figure of 184,000 was agreed. As also was the overall 1980 projected electorate figure for the City as approximately 140,000. As was known, however, the Labour Party had differing ideas as to the distribution of this overall figure in the various wards of the City as would be shown later in the detailed discussion as to the accepted electorate figure for the Millbank Ward and Church Street Ward.

He then referred to the statements made as to adjustments for major housing changes in the first stage of the City Council's method of calculation, and on this point Mr. Stevenson replied that for local authority housing, both Westminster City Council and Greater London Council, figures had been taken for the years 1971 to 1975 from completions of major housing schemes (1975 being the date of consideration of this matter in the earlier stages) and for the years 1975 to 1980 details of approved housing programmes had been taken.

Councillor Daniel then asked if at any of the stages of consideration of numbers of families on the housing waiting list, particularly consideration had been given to those families that had been accorded priority through medical certificates and also homeless families. Mr. Stevenson replied that these had not been taken into account.

Councillor Daniel then asked if note had been taken of GLC major housing schemes projected in the City and Mr. Stevenson confirmed that these had not been ignored. Councillor Daniel then went on to refer to detailed schemes in the Church Street area and also in the Millbank Ward, both as to evidence of occupation of completed dwellings and also as to decanting schemes.

Councillor Daniel then referred to selection of ward projections and the assessment of current trends in each ward and he asked detailed questions to which answers were given as to Council action for slum clearance; overcrowding; increased vacancies being filled in the Baker Street area; hotelisation; resident staff of hotels; Childrens Homes in the City; and also foreign nationals in residence in the City.

I then invited Councillor Daniel to address the meeting on behalf of the Westminster Local Government Committee of the Labour Party.

Councillor Daniel, submitting and reading a written statement, said that he was accompanied at the meeting by Alderman H. Garside and Councillor J. Hegarty (both members of the Westminster City Council) and Mr. B. E. Carpenter, Labour Party Agent.
He first referred to the request of the Boundary Commission that the City Council, in preparing the draft scheme, should have regard to any expected increase or decrease in electorate within the following five years, and without such a condition the scheme would of course have been based on the register of electors for the City in June 1975. He said that the Labour Party agreed for the City as a whole the projection of the 1980 electorate calculated from the 1981 GLC population projections and adjusted to 1980. The larger the geographical area covered by the projections the more accurate they were. Conversely, he said, the smaller the area the more there were likely to be discrepancies. He said the Labour Party did not agree with the method used by the Council to distribute this total figure across the wards. In essence, the Council had distributed the 1980 total on the same basis as the 1971 census population figures for each ward, thereby projecting the distribution trends from the 1961 census to the 1971 census on to 1980. Adjustments had then been made for housing changes and finally the Council had reduced the population figures for each ward to achieve the electorate figures.

He said that the Labour Party believed that this method suffered because of various defects, viz:-

(a) The 1971 census was based on the population as at 26th April 1971. The information was therefore over four years out of date in June 1975, whereas the 1975 register was only 8 months out of date in June 1975.

(b) The use of trends between the 1961 and the 1971 census could be positively misleading if used to try to obtain a 1980 population figure. Those trends were a decade out of date. He gave an example of Baker Street Ward which had undergone major changes since 1971 partly due to the decline in furnished rented accommodation. The Council had said that each ward was examined to see if the 1961-71 trends were likely to continue and had said that in some cases those trends were used but no indication had been given as to which were the Wards where these trends were used. The Council referred to decisions taken "in the light of local area knowledge". He hoped to comment later with regard to the Council's knowledge of the wards in which certain housing estates were situated. Also he believed the Council had not taken into account the proposals for the Crown Estate Commissioners, Millbank Estate and the WPHT Housing Association's Pimlico Triangle.

(c) The Commission had asked for an estimate of "electorate" in 1980. The Council had said that the census returns gave a more accurate figure of those "eligible to vote" as opposed to those who "registered". In fact, it was his submission that the census was also open to errors as to the method of collection of information, was not infallible. For many reasons the census returns and the registers could not be validly or accurately compared. The census returns, for example, included a number of aliens and short stay visitors and people in hotels, whilst the register did not. Another point worth remembering was that it was possible for a person to be properly on two registers but only on one census return.

(d) In any event, even with these differences, the aim should be to estimate the electorate in 1980. The register was the measure of "the electorate". The census was not even a measure of those "eligible" to be registered. At any given time the best measure of the
electorate was the current register - that was now the 1977 register but in 1975 it was the 1975 register. It was the register which indicated who could vote.

He said that the safest way was to take the Control Total and make deductions to convert it from population to electorate (and the Labour Party accepted that this involved many estimations and assumptions necessary in both their method and the Council's method) - then the electorate figure should be apportioned across the wards in the ratio of ward electors in the register - and adjustments could then be made for known housing changes.

He then quoted figures for the existing Regent Street Ward and Millbank Ward from 1970 to 1977 and then compared these with (i) the Westminster City Council's 1980 forecasts and (ii) the Labour Party's 1980 forecasts based on both the 1975 register and the 1977 register. (These two wards are exactly the same areas as two suggested wards in the Boundary Commission's Proposals, viz. Regent Ward (now suggested to be named West End Ward) and Millbank Ward.) In the Regent (West End) Ward there was some 1,200 difference in the two forecasts, whereas with the amendment given at the Meeting by Mr. Stevenson the two forecasts for the Millbank Ward were very similar.

Councillor Daniel claimed that the figures which he had submitted for the Regent Street Ward showed trends of population and electorate which indicated that they would continue to fall as the Labour Party predicted and not rise as the Council suggested. He then went on to say that further discrepancies arose if one started to consider the number on the register as against a calculated figure of the persons eligible to vote but not necessarily on the register. These figures produced widely different electorate and estimated electorate figures and emphasised the error which they believed had been shown in the Council's method.

The Labour Party felt that their method was more accurate and it was on the basis of their method that the Labour Party proposed their draft plan to the Commission. With regard to the Commission's Proposals, they accepted, as did the Council, the proposed wards for the Paddington constituency and they also accepted the number of Councillors for St. Marylebone constituency area and Westminster South constituency area.

Councillor Daniel then submitted a table showing the suggested wards as set out in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals with total electorates for each ward taken from the 1975, 1976 and 1977 register of electors and he went on to show that in the Paddington constituency (where the Boundary Commission had suggested wards in accordance with the Labour Party scheme) the electorates from the register of electors for 1977 showed quotas of electors per Councillor very much approximating to the 2,313 which he said was the specified quota of electors per Councillor for the City for 1980. He went on to say, however, that in the St. Marylebone and Westminster South constituency areas of the City, these figures showed that from the register of electors the quota figures were at much wider variance and he claimed that current housing developments would substantially widen the figures.

I have to record that at various stages of Councillor Daniel making this fairly lengthy statement, questions and comments were interposed by Council representatives and by myself (for example, when Councillor Daniel said that the 1971 census was some 4½ years out of date, comment was made that however the census was considered to be more accurate than the
compilation of the register of electors; also a reply was made that the Council had taken into account the proposals of the Crown Estates Commission for Millbank Estate and also the WPHT Housing Association's Pimlico triangle; reference was also made to the amended Westminster City Council's 1980 forecast for the Millbank Ward; and comment was made that, so far as the electoral register was concerned, there was evidence that in the Westminster South constituency there was a change over of electors of approximately 25% of the electorate every year.) Although there had been these comments and questions whilst Councillor Daniel made his statement, there was no further questioning when he had completed that part of his statement.

Councillor Daniel then went on to say that there were three specific objections that the Labour Party had made so far as the St. Marylebone and Westminster South areas were concerned and these three objections related to (a) Church Street Ward and the boundaries of wards in the St. Marylebone area; (b) the representation of the proposed Millbank Ward and Regent (West End) Ward; and (c) the proposed boundary between the Regent (West End) Ward and the St. James's Ward.

(6) Ward arrangements for the St. Marylebone area, with particular reference to Church Street Ward

Councillor Daniel said there were two schemes to be considered for St. Marylebone, the Boundary Commission's scheme (which had followed the Westminster City Council's draft scheme for that area) and the Labour Party Scheme. As to the Boundary Commission's scheme, he referred to the statement which he had previously introduced which showed the 1975, 1976 and 1977 register of electorate figures for the 7 wards suggested by the Commission and then, with regard to the Labour Party's scheme, he went on to outline the 6 different wards suggested by the Labour Party, with details of the 1976 electorate, and also 1980 forecast electorate for the wards based on the 1976 figures and allowing for known housing changes (these 1980 figures having been provided by the City Council who had said that they were unable at the present time to supply similar figures based on the 1977 register).

For the purpose of this report I now set out Table 1 which shows the 1975, 1976 and 1977 register electorate figures for the 7 wards suggested in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals (these being taken from the statement submitted by Councillor Daniel). For the purposes of this report, however, I have added to this table, in column 6, the Westminster City Council's 1980 projected electorate for these 7 wards. As will be seen the tables show the electorate for each ward, the quota per Councillor and an entitlement figure. I have done this because the Westminster City Council and the Labour Party submitted their statements giving quotas, whereas I am aware that the Boundary Commission normally consider these matters by reference to the entitlement per ward for the stated electorate.

In Table 2 I have set out the 6 wards suggested for the St. Marylebone area by the Labour Party and for the purpose of this report I have added columns 3, 5 and 7 to the information submitted by Councillor Daniel, for this completes the picture and incorporates information originally submitted to the Boundary Commission in respect of this scheme. In this Table I have used mainly entitlement figures, although I have inserted quota figures where these were available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,492</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>8,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>6,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Councillor for Whole of City (60 Members)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. BOUNDARY COMMISSIONS DRAFT PROPOSALS
ST. MARYLEBONE AREA
(Which followed Westminster City Council's Scheme)
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electorate</td>
<td>electorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>on basis of 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>register submitted by Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8310</td>
<td>8167</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>7088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7728</td>
<td>7333</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5137</td>
<td>5829</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>6586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5251</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7914</td>
<td>7980</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>7102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8368</td>
<td>8150</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>7007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average per Councillor for Whole of City (60 Members): 2450, 2426, 2313, 2313, 2313
Councillor Daniel then went on to say that looking at the Boundary Commission's scheme of wards, there were three wards which greatly varied from the average, these being Hamilton Terrace Ward, Regent's Park Ward and Bryanston Ward, and he pointed out that a major housing development was taking place in Wharncliffe Gardens in the proposed Hamilton Terrace Ward which would make this ward even further in excess of the average. The only other known planned housing changes were in the proposed Church Street Ward and Cavendish Ward. To summarise, he said the net effect was that the proportion of the electorate north of Marylebone Road, already under-represented in the Commission's scheme on the basis of the 1977 figures, was likely to grow, and that the electorate south of the Marylebone Road which was already over-represented, was likely to fall. In the Labour Party's view, the population and the electorate south of Marylebone Road/Old Marylebone Road justified only 6 Councillors and, although the Labour Party proposals had suggested two fairly equal three members wards, the Labour Party would not object to alternative proposals which sought to preserve a community of interest in part of the area, if these were viable on grounds of equality of representation.

Perhaps it should be noted for the purposes of this report that the Labour Party had referred to a Boundary of Marylebone Road and Old Marylebone Road making two wards south of that line, whereas the Boundary Commission (and the Westminster City Council) had envisaged a boundary line of the Outer Circle, York Gate and Marylebone Road to the Edgware Road - in other words, they had included in the area (split up into three wards) south of the Marylebone Road and the Outer Circle (Road) the triangle area bounded by Old Marylebone Road, Edgware Road and Marylebone Road. This area comprises 565 electors.

Councillor Daniel then referred to the 1980 projected electorate estimated by the City Council for their proposed Hamilton Terrace Ward (electorate 4,965 entitlement 2.15) and said that this figure was considered by the Labour Party to be a substantial under estimate, because of a major error in calculation (by the method used by the City Council) in apportioning across the proposed Bryanston Ward, Hamilton Terrace Ward, Lords Ward and Church Street Ward, the expected increase by 1980 of the electorate of the existing Church Street Ward. For instance the Hamilton Terrace Ward had been apportioned only a small part of the increase in the Church Street Ward electorate, whereas, in fact, the larger part of the development which would effect this increase of electorate by 1980 was situated within the area of the new Hamilton Terrace Ward. The Labour Party submitted, therefore, that in fact by 1980 the Hamilton Terrace electorate would be very much higher than the projected figure of 4,965 and its entitlement would be very much higher than the proposed number of Councillors for that ward.

He then turned to the Labour Party's scheme which envisaged 6 wards in the St. Marylebone area. He claimed that more accurate account had been taken of the proposed developments in this area in forming these 6 wards. Only one ward, namely the Labour Party's Church Street Ward (which differed radically from the Boundary Commission's Church Street Ward) gave a variation of more than 10% of the quota. He pointed out, however, that by 1976 (on which the latest 1980 forecast had been calculated by the Westminster City Council) there had still been no occupation of a number of dwellings.
that were projected in this area. He submitted that when all these were completed, the Labour Party's Church Street Ward would be a viable ward with an entitlement which would merit three Councillors.

Councillor Daniel then turned from consideration of electorate figures to consideration of the boundaries of wards. He said that most of the boundaries surrounding the Labour Party's proposed Church Street Ward and Bell Street Ward were busy roads and most of them bus routes. In contrast he said that the Commission's proposals used Regent's Canal and the railway as boundaries. He submitted that the Canal was underground for part of its length and covered by a minor side street, and the railway boundary had to be projected along minor side streets to meet Marylebone Road. He said that Marylebone, Old Marylebone Road, Edgware Road and St. John's Wood Road were traditional ward boundaries and remained ward boundaries in the Labour Party's scheme. Broadley Street, Broadley Terrace and Rossmore Road were existing polling district boundaries and became ward boundaries in the Labour Party's scheme.

As to polling districts and polling stations, the electors between Park Road/Baker Street and the railway had for many years voted at a polling station in the present Church Street Ward and the Labour Party's proposals, therefore, did not make voting any more difficult for the electors. If the Labour Party's Church Street Ward were approved, the voters would vote at a station within their own ward.

Councillor Daniel then referred to the area comprising the Labour Party's suggested Church Street Ward and Bell Street Ward (which was the area of the existing Church Street Ward plus an area to the east bounded by Park Road and Baker Street) and explained that there was a social cohesion in this area. People living there, even on the edges of the area, tended to look towards the centre of the area for services, shopping facilities and schools. He said that these facilities could almost always be reached without the need to cross a major road. He claimed that the new part of Marylebone Road by the Edgware flyover could be crossed conveniently at two points. In fact a recent proposal before the City Council had suggested that residents in a new development in the heart of the proposed Bell Street Ward south of Marylebone Road could readily park their cars in a garage north of it. There was close association between the Lisson Green Estate and the area north of the Canal.

Finally, he said that the Labour Party felt that their scheme of ward arrangements for the St. Marylebone area was the only practicable one on the grounds of community interest, ward boundaries and maintaining equality of Councillors per electorate.

(7) The Westminster South area and particularly to the representation of the proposed Millbank Ward and Regent (West End) Ward

Councillor Daniel said that the Labour Party believed that Millbank Ward should be enlarged slightly and that it should have three Councillors instead of two and that Regent (West End) Ward should have two Councillors instead of three.

He suggested that the enlargement of Millbank Ward should be by the addition of the Council's Vauxhall Bridge Road development now being constructed in the area of Tachbrook Street, Charlwood Street, Vauxhall Bridge Road and Warwick Way.
He said that the housing development here was an extension of the Council's Lillington Gardens Estate, immediately to the south-east in Millbank Ward. The development comprised 249 dwellings (although there was now some doubt as to whether 22 of the dwellings would be built) and this development was due to be completed by 1979/1980, giving an additional electorate of some 400 persons. This site was being built in similar style to Lillington Gardens and no doubt the existing Tenants Association would cover this extension to their Estate. As a result, it would be more convenient if the new development was in the same ward and therefore added to Millbank Ward.

(For the purpose of this report it should be noted that the Labour Party in their calculation envisaged that their suggested Millbank Ward would have a 1980 projected electorate of 6,900 (entitlement 2.94) whilst the City Council considered that the 1980 electorate for the Labour Party's enlarged Millbank Ward would be no more than 5,878 (entitlement 2.54).)

Councillor Daniel said that in St. George's Ward the resulting loss of the 400 electors would be partly offset by the major rehabilitation of about 100 dwellings in the Denbigh triangle (many of these properties were empty) by the WPHT Housing Association. The Labour Party also suggested some amendment of the boundary between Churchill Ward and St. George's Ward. The Churchill Ward had a high electorate and could afford to lose some part of its electorate.

Councillor Daniel went on to say that, even without the addition of the Vauxhall Bridge Road site, Millbank Ward would be well over quota. Furthermore, he suggested that there should be added a further number of electors, having regard to the proposals of the Crown Estates Commissioners in the development of their Millbank Estate which he believed would take place before 1980. He submitted a copy of a letter of 29th September 1975 from the Crown Estates Commissioners which outlined their proposals and predictions for the development of this Estate. This letter was addressed to Alderman Garside (Councillor Daniel's colleague) and first it said that it was quite impossible for the Commissioners to give predictions of population figures of the Crown's Millbank Estate in the future for the levels of population would depend on the stage the development had reached at the various years which in turn hinged on the date on which planning permission was obtained and a start on the scheme made. The letter, however, went on to say that at the end of phase 1, which would take some six years to complete, the population of the Estate should be about 1,250. At the end of phase 2, which would take a further three years, it would be 1,500 and at the end of the final phase in an additional two years, the total residential population should be in the order of about 1,836. These figures showed a fairly even housing gain for each phase of the development for the current population of the Estate was between 700 and 800.

Mr. Stevenson interposed at this stage and told the meeting, in answer to a question, that there had been outline permission but no detailed permissions for this development. There would of course be decanting of population whilst development was being carried out and he felt that up to 1980 there would be no significant difference in population and electorate on account of this scheme.

Councillor Daniel, however, insisted on his point of view that development here would create an increased electorate, and
certainly, with the addition of the new Council development in Tachbrook Street, adding 400 electors, the Millbank Ward would justify three Councillors. He said that, even if the Millbank Ward were unchanged from the Boundary Commission's Proposals, that Ward would still justify three Councillors.

He then referred to Regent (West End) Ward and said that this ward on the other hand, was over-represented with three Councillors. This ward as proposed by the Boundary Commission was almost exactly the same ward as the existing Regent Street Ward whose electorate on the 1975 register was 6,366, in 1976 was 6,103, and in 1977 was 6,079. (Note: the Labour Party's 1980 forecast for this ward was 5,378 with entitlement of 2.32 (based on the 1975 register) and 5,660 entitlement 2.44 (based on the 1977 register) whereas the City Council's 1980 projected electorate figure was 6,850 giving an entitlement of 2.96.) Councillor Daniel claimed that the Council's estimate was very much an over-estimate, partly because it assumed that the private Grosvenor Estate increase in population would take place, whereas he submitted (i) that the plans had now substantially altered so that there would be a rehabilitation rather than a redevelopment resulting in a reduction of the population; and (ii) that the estimate assumed that decanting from all the Council's development schemes in the ward between 1974 and 1980 had already taken place, whereas the decanting of some 90 dwellings in Sandringham Flats, 18 dwellings in Greens Court and 20 in Archer Street had yet to start. Furthermore, it was well known that the population of the existing Regent Street Ward was declining fast, this being a general trend in the Ward.

Having agreed that the Westminster South constituency area should have 19 Councillors, the Labour Party therefore proposed that the Regent (West End) Ward should have two Councillors only, instead of three, and that the Millbank Ward should have three Councillors, instead of two.

At this stage, Mr. John Bates, the Secretary of the Marylebone Liberal Association, interposed to ask Councillor Daniel if it was the aim of the Labour Party in presenting their scheme it was to increase in the Labour representation on the City Council. Councillor Daniel reacted strongly to this question and asked me to rule that the question was out of order, and also any other matters raised relating to party political advantage.

I had then to inform Councillor Daniel that I felt it was not possible for me to rule questions of this nature out of order for almost inevitably the formulation of ward schemes raised considerations of possible party political advantage. I said that, if anybody was seeking to carve up the City into wards for political advantage, I would wish to reject those proposals. If anyone had allegations that proposals were being put forward for political expediency then it was right that the matter should be raised and openly discussed and opportunity given to reject the allegations.

I said that, in my limited experience of conducting nine previous local meetings of this nature, political considerations had on a number of occasions been raised, with allegations made by one or other of the political parties against opposing political parties.

I emphasised, however, that this worked both ways and, in answer to a question from Councillor J Hegarty, I readily agreed that I had taken full note of the fact that the draft scheme put forward by Westminster City Council was from a Conservative controlled Council.
Councillor Daniel was obviously very dissatisfied with my reply and my ruling and asked formally that I should record in my report a specific complaint. This I agreed to do and he formally submitted "that I should not hear evidence on the effect of proposals on the political representation of the Council". In reply, I said that I would also wish to record "that I had to reject this and said that these were considerations to which I had to have regard although the importance of such evidence would have to be weighed by me on its merits".

I then invited Councillor Daniel to continue his submission and he then turned to his third point which was with regard to the boundary between the Regent (West End) Ward and St. James's Ward. He said that, as a result of the Labour Party's proposals for the Millbank Ward and the Regent (West End) Ward, Regent (West End) Ward would have two Councillors, as did St. James's Ward. He said that the Labour Party proposed that the boundary between these two wards should run north to south down Regent Street, Cockspur Street and Northumberland Avenue (instead of east to west along Piccadilly) and the Labour Party's proposal was that these two east and west wards should be Charing Cross Ward and Mayfair Ward, the Charing Cross Ward having 4,792 electors on the 1975 register, 4,867 on the 1976 register and the Labour Party's forecast of the 1980 electorate for this ward was 4,323 (entitlement 1.86), and for the Mayfair Ward the 1975 register showed 5,086 electors, 1976 register 4,777 with the Labour Party's forecast of the 1980 electorate at 4,215 (1.82 entitlement). He said that it was clear that these two wards would be of similar electoral size and the Labour Party's main argument for the new boundary was on the basis of local ties and community interest. In the two proposed wards there were four clearly recognisable sub-areas readily identifiable by name, viz: Mayfair; St. James's; Soho; and Covent Garden. He claimed that there were considerable similarities between Mayfair and St. James's on the one hand, and between Soho and Covent Garden on the other, but the Boundary Commission's Proposals paired them off as Mayfair and Soho; and Covent Garden and St. James's. He claimed that the Labour Party proposals created more suitable wards.

Councillor Daniel then submitted, in support of his case, a copy of a letter to the Westminster City Council from the Covent Garden Community Association of 14th January 1976 making the same point that Soho and Covent Garden should be joined together to form a ward. He went on to give a description of the various areas and made a particular point that Soho and Covent Garden shared similar housing problems; Covent Garden residents did most of their shopping in Soho; and many of the Covent Garden's younger children used the school in Soho; and many Catholic children in Soho attended a school just over in the Covent Garden area. He also submitted that the shape of the wards would be more convenient, for St. James's Ward, as at present formulated, was extremely long (2 miles) in central London terms.

As at the end of this statement Councillor Daniel had introduced a letter from the Covent Garden Community Association, I felt that I should also inform the meeting that in the earlier stages when the Boundary Commission had been considering this matter, they had also received a letter from Mr. David Alexander, a resident of Covent Garden for the past 14 years and a Warden of St. Paul's Church in Covent Garden. In his letter he had said that it was from experiences of an attempt to run the two Parishes of St. Paul's Covent Garden and St. Anne's Soho in tandem that he felt qualified to put forward views on proposals.
to link these two areas. He had said that during the six years of the linkage between the two Parishes they tried in many ways to promote a union of the two by joint meetings, communal effort, social welfare work, interchange of church services, etc. but despite much effort the two areas remained different and separate. He felt that the Charing Cross Road was a strong frontier. The two communities really had little in common. Some thought that a common bond existed between craftsmen practising in the two areas, but he did not share this view. He felt that the Soho craftsmen, mainly connected with the tailoring profession, were allied to the larger establishments of Mayfair, whilst he had to say that Covent Garden craftsmen did not appear to be allied to any particular area.

I said, of course, that there were other letters which supported the joining together of Soho and Covent Garden and no doubt later in the meeting we would hear from Mr. John Monahan of the Covent Garden Community Association.

Councillor Mrs. T. Seear, Conservative Councillor for the existing Regent Street Ward, said that, in preparing their initial draft scheme, it had been the aim of the Westminster City Council that the boundaries of the Council's existing wards should be retained as far as possible, since they had existed for many years and therefore should not be altered unduly unless changes in the distribution of the electorate indicated that this was necessary. This policy aim had been referred to by Mr. Pettifer in his initial statement. She said that the Boundary Commission had preferred the Labour Party's scheme for the Paddington area and that had the effect of increasing the number of Councillors to be elected from that area from 23 to 24. Consequently the Boundary Commission had reduced the number of Councillors to represent the Westminster South area from 20 to 19 - probably the loss of one Conservative seat. There then followed some discussion as to the present make up of the existing Council and the likely effects of the new ward arrangements.

(8) Bryanston Ward, Baker Street Ward, Cavendish Ward

I then invited Mr. John Bates, the Secretary of the St. Marylebone Liberal Association to speak to the official representations which his Association had sent to the Boundary Commission against the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals.

In short, the Boundary Commission (and the Westminster City Council) had taken the area of the existing Cavendish Ward and Baker Street Ward plus the area within the triangle of Marylebone Road/Old Marylebone Road and Edgward Road to form in future three wards, namely, Cavendish Ward (returning 3 Councillors) Bryanston Ward (returning 2 Councillors) and Baker Street Ward (returning 2 Councillors). The Liberal Association's representations to the Boundary Commission, however, suggested that Baker Street Ward and Cavendish Ward should have a different boundary, namely, Harley Street, Cavendish Square and Holles Street instead of Marylebone High Street, Thayer Street, Mandeville Place and James Street. This would have the effect of making Baker Street Ward the larger ward returning 3 Councillors, and Cavendish Ward smaller returning only 2 Councillors.

Mr. Bates said that his Association calculated that the proposed change of boundary would affect some 2,450 people (nearly a third of those in the existing Cavendish Ward) (this was later said to be 1,650 electors). In many of the recent reports on inner city areas, one of the main reasons for the
decline in the last 10 to 20 years was the lack of community spirit. He felt that the best solution to this problem was to form Neighbourhood Councils. This was Liberal policy and there were already some 200 such Councils in the country, and in the areas of the proposed new Bryanston Ward local residents had formed the Seymour Village Association. However, such Councils were likely to be formed within existing ward boundaries (or at least a community that was divided by ward boundaries was likely to face more difficulties in setting up such a Council). The Liberal Association felt that the area surrounding Marylebone High Street formed such a community which could set up a Neighbourhood Council, given encouragement and time, and they saw the continuation of using Marylebone High Street as a boundary as being against the best interests of the community. They therefore asked that the ward boundary should be moved to Harley Street.

On questioning, he admitted that Harley Street was not entirely satisfactory, but nevertheless, the Liberal Association felt that this was preferable to Marylebone High Street.

Councillor J. Hegarty, Labour Councillor for the Church Street Ward, said that the Labour Party had suggested that this area south of Marylebone Road should be represented by only 6 Councillors, and not 7 Councillors as recommended in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals (which admittedly included some small additional areas). He said the Labour Party would be happy with any agreed suitable boundary dividing this area.

Mr. Langley, for the Westminster City Council, now asked that Mr. Pettifer should make a statement setting out the City Council's views on the Liberal Association's proposals.

Mr. Pettifer said that the map submitted with this proposal indicated that the northern boundary of the proposed reduced Cavendish Ward should be Marylebone Road, whereas in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals, that northern boundary was the Outer Circle of Regents Park. Although not specifically indicated, it was assumed that the area north of Marylebone Road was proposed by the Liberal Association to be transferred to the Regents Park Ward.

(At this point (as to the area north of Marylebone Road had not been referred to by Mr. Bates in his statement at the meeting) Mr. Bates informed the meeting that this was not an important point, the northern boundary could remain as suggested by the Boundary Commission. What was important was that the eastern boundary of Baker Street Ward should be removed further east to the Harley Street line.)

Mr. Pettifer said that, if the area north of Marylebone Road, were left in Cavendish Ward, the suggested change would have the effect of transferring some 1,650 electors from Cavendish Ward into Baker Street Ward. The projected electorate in 1980 and the number of electors per Councillor in the two wards should be compared as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary Commission's Scheme</th>
<th>1975 Register</th>
<th>1980 Projected Electorate</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street</td>
<td>4798</td>
<td>4544</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>7684</td>
<td>6246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liberal Association's Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975 Register</th>
<th>1980 Projected Electorate</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs.</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street</td>
<td>6448</td>
<td>5881</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>6034</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He said that Marylebone High Street had existed as a ward boundary for a very long time and, from the 1980 projections and entitlement calculations shown above, it appeared that the Liberal Association's proposals were not as satisfactory and as equitable as the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals. Furthermore, he had to inform the meeting that there were, so far as was known, no proposals in the area for the creation of Neighbourhood Councils and in fact the London Boroughs Association had unanimously decided to inform the Department of the Environment that their view was opposed to the setting up of such Councils but not, of course, Residents Associations.

There was then some discussion as to the suitability or otherwise of the Marylebone High Street, Thayer Street, Mandeville Place, James Street line as a suitable boundary. Councillor W. H. Kearney, a Conservative Councillor representing Cavendish Ward, said that Marylebone High Street was a natural boundary for there were differing areas on each side of this highway. There was no community association at present centred around the Marylebone High Street.

Reference was then made as to whether or not Harley Street was a good boundary. It was pointed out that Harley Street was itself the centre of the Consultant medical profession and as such it appeared not to be a very satisfactory boundary.

(9) Soho and Covent Garden

I then called on Mr. John Monahan, the Vice-Chairman of the Covent Garden Community Association, who wished to speak in support of the letter sent originally to the Westminster City Council on 14th January 1976 and forwarded to the Boundary Commission as to ward arrangements affecting the Covent Garden area. He first referred to the community of interest within the Covent Garden area and described how the area was sadly split into a variety of different areas. Part of it was in the Borough of Camden and part in the City of Westminster. The GLC was the planning authority and the situation was also further confounded by the fact that the Westminster City Council's boundaries split part of the Covent Garden neighbourhood. Nevertheless, he said the neighbourhood was considered as a distinct area in planning terms but people who lived in Covent Garden had extremely close ties, both social and historical with other parts of the immediate surrounding area.

Hence the Association viewed with some concern the proposals by the majority party of the Westminster City Council that would make Covent Garden an appendage to St. James's and would make Soho an appendage to Mayfair. It was the view of the Association that the similarity of Soho and Covent Garden would justify considering the two areas being formed as one ward, and the areas of Mayfair and St. James's being brought together to form another ward. He claimed that the problems of Soho and Covent Garden were very similar and the social contact between the two areas was very well established both as to shopping and schools and there were family ties well established between the two areas. The Association therefore proposed an amendment of the ward pattern here, to form a Mayfair Ward with
Mayfair and St. James's brought together, and a Charing Cross Ward bringing Soho and Covent Garden together (each ward to have two Councillors) and no doubt a suitable boundary line between the two would be found along the Regent Street line.

Mr. Monahan spoke at some length on this scheme, referring also to similar housing conditions in Soho and Covent Garden, similar planning considerations and similar resources.

Reference was also made to a letter from Mr. Brian Lake of Penfold Place, London, N.W.1, to the Boundary Commission in February 1976, in which he suggested that it would seem more sensible to combine Soho and Covent Garden into one ward. These were both central areas with similar problems, and both attempting to maintain housing levels and improve housing standards. He felt that to form a ward of St. James's and Covent Garden would be a strange proposition, the two areas having very little in common.

Further reference was made to Mr. David Alexander's letter in March 1976 when he represented to the Boundary Commission against the idea of the actual link of Soho and Covent Garden. Councillor Angela Killick (a member for Charing Cross Ward) said that she thought the present Incumbent in the Parish Church would agree with Mr. David Alexander.

Councillor Mrs. T. Seear, Conservative Councillor for the present Regent Street Ward (which would form the proposed Regent (West End) Ward) said that Soho was a very closely knit self-contained unit with a very strong community spirit. There was a Soho Civic Society. Soho had probably the strongest urban community, but it tended to be somewhat of a separate entity. As to planning issues there was a separate Soho Conservation Area. If anything, it was more "West-end" in character, looking in that direction for entertainment etc., and its problems were more akin to the West End. Certainly, if there were craftsmen occupational links, those links were between Soho and Mayfair, for example with the Savile Row Tailors. She felt that Soho was also electorally linked with Mayfair and that Piccadilly was the natural boundary of Mayfair, St. James's having its own separate identity.

References were then made to the electorates of Regent Street Ward shown in the registers of electors for 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977, which showed a gradual reduction of electorate from 7,132 to 6,079, but Mrs. Seear thought that in the future this electorate might increase, for it was the Council's policy against the renewal of temporary office planning consents in the Mayfair area, and towards the refusal of change of use from residential to other uses. Finally, she said she favoured the ward arrangements as set out in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals.

Councillor Daniel then noted that in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals the 1980 projected electorate for the Regent (West End) Ward was 6,850, some 800 more than in the 1977 register and he asked what housing changes there were likely to be in this ward which would bring about an increase of electorate of some 800? He went on to say that the only major housing development likely was a GLC scheme (102 dwellings) and that was in the Covent Garden area, namely, in the Boundary Commission's proposed St. James's Ward.

Councillor Angela Killick, Councillor for Charing Cross Ward, then referred to the Covent Garden area as an individual area with its own Community Association and also its own
Housing Association. Alderman Garside, who said he served on a Special GLC Committee with regard to Covent Garden, said that the Council's document did not take account of the likely new development in Covent Garden. He suggested that the ward arrangements ought to be looked at with a view to seeing which of the alternative schemes broke local ties.

Finally, Mr. Langley introduced Mr. Pettifer to make a statement on behalf of the Westminster City Council on this matter. Mr. Pettifer said that the proposals for the joining of Soho and Covent Garden to form one ward was to move the boundary between St. James's Ward and Regent (West End) Ward to a line of Regent Street and Northumberland Avenue. He said it was assumed that the basis for this change was the suggestion of some community of interest between the two areas but the validity of such a proposition was open to question. The boundary between the two areas had been Upper St. Martin's Lane and Cranbourne Street for a long time and Soho had always maintained a separate identity. Various community associations had recently been formed with the object of fostering a separate Covent Garden identity, which in fact crossed the boundary into the neighbouring Borough of Camden. However, for the purpose of ward representation, Covent Garden and St. James's areas were at present combined, as also were Soho and Mayfair and this had presented no difficulty. The fact that the proposed St. James's Ward covered a large area was governed by two factors - (1) Piccadilly was the natural southern boundary of the Mayfair area; and (2) the large open spaces of Green Park and St. James's Park were included in the wards. Any changes to create a ward with sufficient electors to meet the Commission's requirements for approximately the same representation per Councillor over the whole City must in this particular instance involve changes of area. (The Labour Party had brought in a new ward boundary, the Mall, and had added an area south of the Mall into the Victoria Ward and re-named it Abbey Ward)

Mr. Pettifer said that the changes proposed by the Labour Party would have the following effect on the Boundary Commission's scheme, using the 1975 register figures:--

(a) It would reduce St. James's Ward by 238 electors.
(b) It would reduce Regent (West End) Ward by 1503 electors.
(c) It would increase Victoria Ward by 811 electors.

He went on to say that for the two alternative schemes the projected electorates in 1980 and the number of electors per Councillor in the three Wards would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975 Register</th>
<th>1980 Projection</th>
<th>Quota Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Cllrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James's</td>
<td>5053</td>
<td>5077</td>
<td>2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent (West End)</td>
<td>6366</td>
<td>6850</td>
<td>2283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>2323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Labour Party Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. James's (Charing Cross)</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>5181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent (Mayfair)</td>
<td>5063</td>
<td>5448</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria (Abbey)</td>
<td>5911</td>
<td>4977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(It should be noted that, in comparing the above two schemes, the three wards in the Boundary Commission's scheme (on the 1975 register) total some 730 electors more than the three wards in the Labour Party scheme. This is because a further area comprising some 730 electors, was transferred under the Labour Party scheme into the proposed Palace Ward.)

Finally, Mr. Pettifer said that the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals with a Regent (West End) Ward and a St. James's Ward would enable the existing polling districts and polling arrangements, particularly those in the Soho and Mayfair areas to be retained.

(X) St. Marylebone Wards

Mr. Langley then asked that Mr. Pettifer should make a statement setting out the Westminster City Council's views as to the Labour Party's proposals for a Church Street Ward and a Bell Street Ward in the St. Marylebone area of the City.

Mr. Pettifer said that the Labour proposal was to enlarge the existing Church Street Ward area by absorbing part of the Regent Park Ward and then to divide the area into two wards, namely, a new Church Street Ward (with 3 members) and a Bell Street Ward (with 2 members). The eastern boundaries of the two new wards would then follow the line of Park Road and Baker Street, transferring (on the 1975 register figures) some 320 electors into Church Street Ward and some 2087 electors into Bell Street Ward. Church Street Ward would also retain the area north of the Canal up to St. John's Wood Road (which under the Boundary Commission scheme was partly in Hamilton Terrace Ward (579 electors) and partly in Lords Ward (534 electors)). Bell Street Ward would also retain the area south of Marylebone Road in the small triangle made by Marylebone Road—Edgeware Road—Old Marylebone Road (which under the Boundary Commission's scheme became part of Bryanston Ward (665 electors)).

He then outlined the effect of the proposals on the various wards as compared with the wards of the Boundary Commission's scheme and, as to projected electorates, he accepted most of what Councillor Daniel had said earlier as to the effect of likely housing developments in this area. He, nevertheless, claimed that in the wards suggested in the Labour Party's scheme there would be a disproportionate representation as compared with the ward scheme in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals. Furthermore, the Labour Party scheme gave one additional Councillor for the St. Marylebone area north of Old Marylebone Road and Marylebone Road and suggested one Councillor less for the area south of Marylebone Road.
Mr. Pettifer went on to say that if account were taken of the Boundary Commission's requirements on boundaries, the Canal appeared to form the natural northern boundary for Church Street Ward. He said that any community interest of the electors north of the Canal (principally the large blocks of luxury flats in St. John's Wood Road) lay within the area immediately to the north, i.e. in Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward. Similarly, the Council felt that the railway running north from Marylebone Station formed a natural east/west boundary, any community interest of the electors in the area to the east of the railway being in the Regents Park area rather than in Church Street or Bell Street.

Councillor J. J. Walker-Smith (Regents Park Ward) said that he considered that the Church Street area was a closely knit community and confirmed the view that the community of interest of the area north of the Canal was towards St. John's Wood. He also commented as to the community of interest in the south west corner of Regent's Park Ward. He said that quite clearly the railway was a boundary and the people west of the railway in the Church Street area seemed to have no real connection with the area to the east.

There was then some discussion as to the area of the existing Lords Ward which, after adding the area between the Canal and St. John's Wood Road, in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals, had been divided into two separate wards, namely, Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward, the division line being mainly the polling district division line of the existing ward. In the Labour Party ward scheme for this area, a Lords Ward had been retained and the eastern part of the existing Lords Ward had been added to a differently shaped Regent's Park Ward and, as stated earlier, the area between the Canal and St. John's Wood Road had been added into the Labour Party's proposed Church Street Ward.

I felt that the boundary between the two proposed wards, Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward, was not wholly satisfactory and I asked that at a later time I should be given details of the electorates in Area 1 - the area bounded by Holme Road, Grove End Road, St. John's Wood Road and Hamilton Terrace and Area 2 - in the area bounded by St. John's Wood Road, Lisson Grove, the Canal (and its extension along Aberdeen Place) and Maida Vale. (These figures were later supplied to me and in Area 1 there were approximately 1150 electors on the 1977 register (1136 on 1975 register); and in Area 2 there were 473 electors on the register in 1977 (558 on 1975 register). In Area 2, however, redevelopment of Wharncliffe Gardens (north of the Canal and between Cunningham Place and Lisson Grove) 57 electors had left before 1977 register and by 1979/80 there would be resident in the new development some 532 electors (a net gain of 475).

Finally, as to the St. Marylebone area there was some comment as to the triangular area comprised within Marylebone Road, Old Marylebone Road and the Edgware Road. A strong view was expressed that the area would be more properly included in Bryanston Ward, the Marylebone Road and the flyover there creating a definite ward boundary. A contrary view was that there was known satisfactory communication between that area and the Bell Street area, with the added point that this triangular area was at the present time in the existing Church Street Ward.
Mr. Langley then asked that Mr. Pettifer should introduce the Council's view as to the proposal for an enlarged Millbank Ward in the Labour Party's scheme. Mr. Pettifer said that, using the Labour Party method of calculation, the estimated electorate of the existing Millbank Ward for 1980 (based on the 1975 register) was 5560, and if the Millbank Ward were to be increased by adding the area between Tachbrook Street and Vauxhall Bridge Road (so adding some 400 electors) the 1980 projected figure for the enlarged ward would give a maximum total of 5960, as opposed to a figure of 6900 which had been suggested by the Labour Party as the probable 1980 electorate.

He said that the Labour Party's figure of 6500 for the existing ward was the same as the 1975 actual figure in the register. The Council claimed that it was unlikely that this figure would remain stable and pointed out that it had in fact declined to 6191 by 1977. In one year from 1975 to 1976 it declined by approximately 300.

The Labour Party representative then said that this decline had no doubt been brought about by the decanting programme which had taken place about that time and in the calculations being made by the City Council no account was being taken of likely increases in electorate because of the Crown Estates Commission development. The Council Officers, however, said that, as yet, there was no evidence of an appreciable increase in electorate on account of the Crown Estates Commissioners Scheme.

Alderman Garside said that he thought that in the future the electorate would be fairly stable with only a low steady decline.
5. ASSESSMENT OF ARGUMENTS

(A) Methods of Calculating Ward Electorates:

The problem of formulating a satisfactory Ward Scheme for Westminster has certainly been made more difficult by the conflicting arguments about the Estimates for the 1980 Projected Ward Electorates.

As will be seen from this report, there is agreement that the 1980 projected electorate for the City as a whole should be taken at approx. 139,000. (The Westminster City Council put forward a figure of 138,754 — giving an average of 2313 per Councillor for a Council of 60). Although the Labour Party at the meeting accepted this overall figure, their original figures for their suggested wards, which they still sought, totalled 140,728 — an average of 2345 per Councillor.

The overall control figure was arrived at by use of the Greater London Council population projections, with appropriate adjustments.

The Westminster City Council representatives outlined the rather sophisticated method used to arrive at figures of Ward electorates. It was an understandable approach by professional planners to solve a problem, using all available information at their disposal (Census figures, population research information, Electoral Register figures and information about housing schemes recently carried out or in future prospect). The point must be made that this provided ward figures of persons "eligible to vote" and it was a disturbing fact (shown in Westminster) that there was a marked difference — ward by ward — in the figures of those "eligible to vote" and those whose names came on to the Register as "Voters".

The Labour Party put forward a more straightforward method of distributing the agreed total 1980 projected electorate into Wards. The draft schemes had been prepared in 1975 and they had taken the 1975 Electoral Register figures and had apportioned the Control figure across the wards in the ratio of the then Ward Electorates in the Register — and had then made appropriate adjustments for known housing changes from October 1974 to 1980.

The Council's Planning Officer supported the Council's method, as against the Labour Party Method, by saying —

1) that there were wide variances, ward by ward, in the "eligible to vote" figure and the "Register" figure — everyone should have an equal opportunity for representation and the ratio of representation also should be equal (continuing to rely solely on Register figures would perpetuate erroneous calculations);

2) that the Census figures were more accurately compiled, with a more complete response than in the case of the Register of Electors; and

3) that the Control figure had been calculated with the use of G.L.C. population projections, based on Census figures and with appropriate adjustments, and similar data should be used for ward distribution. At the same time Register figures should be used as a check (e.g., deciding whether a higher or lower projection should be used) rather than as a basis of the distribution. When Register figures had been used by the Council, figures for continuing years had been used — not just the 1975 figures. (The 1977 figures in certain cases showed an entirely different proportion).

The Labour Party, however, strongly criticised the Council's method and calculations, on the grounds:

(a) that the 1971 Census information was out of date in 1975;

(b) that the use of trends between 1961 and 1971 could be positively misleading;

(c) that there was considerable doubt as to adjustments made "in the light of area (or local) knowledge";

(d) that the Census population figures were very different from electorate figures, which latter excluded aliens, short stay visitors and persons staying in hotels, whereas the Register included students who were away, people away on holiday or in hospital etc.;
(e) that the Register figures were more reliable to give the "Electorate" than figures produced as "persons eligible to vote" and
(f) some errors had been made as to housing development schemes both already carried out and likely in the future up to 1980.

First, let me say that in my experience as an Assistant Commissioner the projected 1980 Electorate figures have not previously been called in question, except of course in relation to the effect of likely future housing development, and the Westminster Meeting was also the first occasion that difficulties were pointed out as to the variance (wide in some wards) which existed between the "eligible to vote" figure and the "Register" figure. Perhaps Westminster City, at the heart of London, is somewhat unique electorally, with its extensive office and business accommodation, its many hotels, large and small, and its comparatively high proportion of short stay population, and its differing nationalities.

It is difficult to make a hard and fast choice of one or other of the 2 methods used to give the 1980 Ward Electorate figures.

On the one hand, it seems more sensible (especially for the Westminster problem) to use all the available data, with continuing appraisal year by year, to arrive at Ward figures of persons "eligible to vote". Should not this figure more properly be regarded as the Electorate figure(?) and perhaps naively should not one suggest greater effort or persuasion to achieve a higher percentage "Register" figure?

On the other hand, it has to be said that the method used by the Labour Party is the method which, I believe, has been commonly used by other Councils (including some London Boroughs), supported by evidence of trends up to the 1977 Register. There is, of course, strength in the claim that the "Register" figures show the "effective" Electorate, if not the "theoretically true" Electorate.

I am swayed, however, by the fact that the Commission are seeking to formulate a Ward Scheme for the next decade and longer (not for just one year in 1980) and it seems right to me that, if a choice has to be made, the Council's estimates, based on a wider research, should be preferred.

The differences of the Ward Electorate estimates by the two methods can only be illustrated as to Wards in the Paddington area, where the Boundary Commission, in their Draft Proposals, accepted and followed the Labour Party scheme of wards (and subsequently the Westminster City Council submitted ward figures calculated by the Council's method). These show calculations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Gate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maida Vale North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maida Vale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maida Vale South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Little Venice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>* 6526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(average 2345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* See paragraph over page)
Further difficulties then arise if these totals are shown in the following table of totals of all 3 Constituency areas which comprise Westminster City:

**Westminster City Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parliamentary Constituency</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Westminster City Area</th>
<th>Westminster City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56,061</td>
<td>23.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marylebone</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39,267</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster South</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45,400'</td>
<td>19.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>140,728</td>
<td>60.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average 2345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only major discrepancy was in the Ward figure for Harrow Road Ward (Paddington) (see * on previous page) and it must be recorded that the Boundary Commission appeared to be prepared to accept a 1980 figure more approximating to the Labour Party estimate of 6526 (entitlement 2.78) than the Westminster Council's figure of 5495 (entitlement 2.38) and also put forward the Labour Party's Paddington Wards with a total of 24 Councillors, and reduced Westminster South total Councillor representation from 20 to 19.

These proposals, as to total representation and presumably also as to the electorate for Harrow Road Ward, have subsequently been accepted by Westminster City Council and, although I favour (if only narrowly) the Westminster City Council's figures, I feel unable to recommend any change of the Commission's Draft Proposals as to the total Councillor representation for the 3 Constituencies.

(8) Ward Patterns

Having taken this decision, I then come to consideration of the individual wards in St. Marylebone and Westminster South (a) as proposed by the Boundary Commission (following but slightly amending the suggestions of the Westminster Council) and (b) as suggested by the Labour Party, the Liberal Association and others.

(1) St. Marylebone Constituency Area

Having received such strong evidence (in many ways contradictory) to support the alternative schemes submitted by the Westminster Council (noted to be Conservative Party Controlled) and the Labour Party (and with a suggested limited amendment by the Liberal Association of the Council's scheme) I felt that, in review, I should come back to the basic requirements of Schedule II of the 1972 Act as to easily identifiable boundaries and local ties (with a later look at ratio of representation).

First - the Council's Scheme (which was approved for inclusion in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals) shows a pattern of Wards on which I would comment as follows:-

(a) 3 Wards (Cavendish Ward, Baker Street Ward and Bryanston Ward) are firmly based on the Constituency boundary of Oxford Street and have clear eastern and western boundaries running south to north to Marylebone Road (again an obvious boundary) but with Cavendish Ward going further north to Outer Circle (Road) in Regent's Park (as in the existing Cavendish Ward).
(b) Cavendish Ward (3 Councillors) is almost the same area as the existing ward and its new western boundary is probably a better line. It is true that it takes in a small area between Marylebone Road and Outer Circle. At first sight this looks incongruous but there is a decided link here with Park Crescent and the Cavendish Ward and this small area would be little isolated if in the Regent's Park Ward.

(c) Baker Street Ward (2 Councillors) is almost the same area as one of the Polling Districts of the existing Baker Street Ward (which now returns 5 Councillors and obviously has to be split up).

(d) The Liberal Association suggested Harley Street as a new south-to-north boundary between these two wards, so changing the number of Councillors to be returned, but there appeared to be real purpose in this and I felt that local ties were more likely to be broken by the use of Harley Street as a boundary. Marylebone High Street is an existing boundary and accepted as such.

(e) Bryanston Ward is a new ward formed from almost the whole of the other Polling District of the existing Baker Street Ward plus the triangular area formed between Marylebone Road (flyover), Edgware Road and Old Marylebone Road (at present in the Church Street Ward) and certainly this ward, as drawn, makes a very satisfactory ward. The Labour Party sought to leave the above triangular area in the Church Street/Bell Street area and said that there was easy communication across (or under) Marylebone Road, but a glance at the map, and certainly a visit to the area, shows that this area is more properly linked into the Bryanston Ward.

(f) If one accepts these three Wards (subject, of course, to being satisfied as to representation and entitlement figures) it might be said that the remaining pattern falls into place. Certainly Regents Park Ward (3 Councillors) is almost exactly the same area as the existing ward and I feel that any changes of boundary, particularly in the south-west corner of this ward, would not be readily understood by the electors. From my knowledge of the area, I believe the electors in the northern parts of the Gloucester Place and Baker Street wards ally themselves with the Regents Park Area, rather than the Bell Street Area. I consider the Railway line and Great Central Street (to the south of Marylebone Station) to be very satisfactory as a boundary.

(g) Church Street Ward (3 Councillors) is given the natural boundary of the Regents Canal. I was concerned to see that there was easy identification here and the line of the Canal and Aberdeen Place gives a good boundary. I inspected plans of new development being carried out here to satisfy myself that this natural boundary would not be obscured.

The Labour Party commented on development north of the Canal and west of Lisson Grove (Wharncliffe Gardens) and suggested a link with Council estate development south of the Canal. This had some strength but this, I think, is outweighed by the obvious ties of the area north of the Canal, particularly the Lodge Road area, with the Lords area. Furthermore, there is a nearby Council Estate to the north in Scott Ellis Gardens which could be a link with Wharncliffe Gardens.

(h) The remaining wards Hamilton Terrace Ward (2 Councillors) and Lords Ward (2 Councillors) are viable wards. I was not altogether happy, however, about the boundary line dividing these two wards in the southern parts. The area (in Lords Ward) bounded by Hamilton Terrace, Hall Road, Grove End Road and St. John's Wood Road forms a salient into Hamilton Terrace Ward and tends to isolate in the latter ward the area west of Lisson Grove (particularly the site of Wharncliffe Gardens between Lisson Grove and Cunningham Place).
Strengthened, too, by comments made by the Labour Party and evidence of a somewhat unequal electorate, I feel that it would be an advantage to transfer this small area of Wharncliffe Gardens (by 1980 it will have 532 electors) from Hamilton Terrace Ward to Lords Ward. Hamilton Terrace Ward would have 4490 electors (entitlement 1.94) and Lords Ward 4834 electors (entitlement 2.09).

Secondly - my comments as to the Labour Party's suggested pattern of wards are as follows:-

(i) Two wards, Bryanston Ward and Cavendish Ward each have Oxford Street as their southern boundary but the proposed dividing line between the two wards suggests what some may feel is a somewhat unsatisfactory division (especially the east/west line of Blandford Street). The northern boundary (differing from the Council's boundary for their 3 wards) follows Marylebone Road and Old Marylebone Road (so transferring the small area between Marylebone Road and Outer Circle (196 electors) to Regents Park Ward; and retaining the triangular area bounded by Marylebone Road, Edgware Road and Old Marylebone Road (665 electors) in the Church Street area - in the suggested new Bell Street Ward).

I have already commented that I favour retention of the area between Marylebone Road and Outer Circle in the Cavendish Ward and that I also favour the triangular area bounded by Marylebone Road, Edgware Road and Old Marylebone Road being linked in Bryanston Ward - the flyover is a formidable boundary.

(ii) Church Street Ward (3 Councillors) and Bell Street Ward (2 Councillors) appear on the map to be compact and closely knit wards with good main road boundaries, but on closer examination it is seen that they only become viable wards by the inclusion of what might be termed fringe areas viz. (a) the triangular area bounded by Marylebone Road (665 Electors); (b) the area east of the Railway line, Marylebone Station and Great Central Street (2407 electors from Regents Park Ward); and (c) the area north of Regent's Canal (1113 electors). I am, of course aware that areas (a) and (c) above are in the existing Church Street Ward but nevertheless, in my view, natural boundaries favour their exclusion.

(iii) Regents Park Ward (3 Councillors) is considerably changed in pattern by the taking away of the above 2407 electors from the existing ward and the addition of other areas (a) on the southern boundary (196 electors) and (b) west of Wellington Road. I have already commented against the taking in of the 196 electors in Outer Circle area and am firmly of the opinion that the Railway line, Marylebone Station and Great Central Street, is the natural western boundary (in the southern part of the ward) and that the area east of this line is more properly linked into Regents Park Ward. Furthermore, the taking into Regents Park Ward (from Lords Ward) of the area between Wellington Road, Grove End Road and St. John's Wood Road (which incidentally includes Lords Cricket Ground) seems inappropriate and unsatisfactory.

(iv) The suggested Lords Ward (3 Councillors) is the remainder of the St. Marylebone Constituency area and is the existing Lords Ward less the area described above bounded by Wellington Road, Grove End Road and St. John's Wood Road. If the remainder of the St. Marylebone Wards pattern were acceptable, this too could be approved, but no doubt there would have to be a change of ward name - the ward as drawn does not include Lords Cricket Ground.

It will be seen, therefore, as to the relative merits of the patterns of Wards in the two alternative schemes, the Draft Proposals (the Council's Scheme) appear to me to be far preferable and could, I think, be further slightly improved by a minor amendment of the dividing boundary line between Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward (which is detailed in my Recommendations in a later paragraph) but there still remains the necessity to be satisfied as to the likely 1980 Electorates and Entitlements.
Table 1 in Paragraph 4 (6) of this Report shows the Westminster Council's projected 1980 Electorates for the 7 proposed wards and, with the minor amendment I propose, the representation; 1980 Electorates; and Entitlements are as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>1980 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Terrace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4834</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7346</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6891</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38941</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The electorate and entitlement figures, if accepted, are satisfactory figures for viable wards. It must be pointed out, however, as compared with this total 1980 Electorate figure of 38,941, the Labour Party suggested a figure of 39,267. Both these figures are acceptable but the difficulty arises in comparing the 1980 Electorate forecasts for the area south of Marylebone Road.

The Westminster Council's forecast for the area is 15184 to which is added 196 giving 15380 (entitlement 5.65) for 3 wards returning 7 Councillors. The Labour Party's forecast is 14774 from which 665 is deducted giving 14109 (with an average of 2345 giving entitlement of 5.02 and with average of 2313 giving entitlement of 6.10) for 2 wards returning 6 Councillors.

Finally, on this matter, I have to say that I very much prefer the pattern of wards in the Commission's draft proposals and (if only narrowly) prefer the Council's forecasts of 1980 Electorates for the various wards.

I, therefore, recommend that, with the minor amendment of the boundary between Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward, the Commission's Draft Proposals for Wards in the St. Marylebone Constituency Area be confirmed.

(2) Westminster South Constituency Area

Now I come to review similarly the Westminster South Constituency Area with the alternative patterns of Wards, viz: the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals, which amended the Westminster City Council's scheme (the Proposals being subsequently accepted by the Council) and the Labour Party Scheme, with the added submissions as to Soho and Covent Garden.

First - the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals show a pattern of Wards on which I would comment as follows:-

(a) Knightsbridge Ward (2 Councillors) and Belgrave Ward (2 Councillors) have virtually been formed by dividing the existing Knightsbridge Ward and appear to be satisfactory and viable wards. In fact, in my opinion, the south-eastern boundary of Belgrave Ward along Ebury Bridge Road and Buckingham Palace Road is a better boundary than the previous boundary of Ebury Street.

(b) Regent (West End) Ward (3 Councillors) and St. James's Ward (2 Councillors) are the key to the pattern and must be assessed in comparison with the Labour Party's and Covent Garden Community Association's, suggested alternative of Mayfair Ward and Charing Cross Ward.
My first reaction to the problem was that I was very much impressed by the formation of Wards using as boundaries the lines of Oxford Street and Piccadilly (and perhaps to a lesser degree Victoria Street) for to me these roads appear to be basic boundary lines. (Most Londoners and indeed visitors to London would, I believe, readily accept the geography of Marylebone Road, Oxford Street, and Piccadilly as almost parallel boundaries). Accepting these boundaries, Regent (West End) Ward seemed right and logical, and equally St. James's Ward seemed most satisfactory.

Everything, however, depended on the argument about whether wards should be formed of Mayfair and Soho; and St. James's and Covent Garden; or wards of Mayfair and St. James's and Soho and Covent Garden. As this Report shows, there was lengthy discussion on this and strong argument on both sides. There was certainly no overwhelming case for the suggested Soho/Covent Garden link - indeed there was strong opposition to it - and (as was previously the opinion of the Boundary Commission) I came to the conclusion that any local ties between these 2 areas were not sufficiently strong to justify their amalgamation into one Ward.

I therefore, favour Regent (West End) Ward and St. James's Ward, as drawn in the Draft Proposals and consider Groavenor Place, Groavenor Street and Victoria Street to be a good southern boundary of St. James's Ward.

(c) Having favoured the pattern of these 4 Wards there remained consideration of the warding of the remaining Westminster South area and the only real difficulty here was the Millbank Ward (2 Councillors), for there was strong argument (1) for an enlargement of the Ward to incorporate the area bounded by Tachbrook Street, Warwick Way, Vauxhall Bridge Road and Charlwood Street, for here was being constructed Council housing development which could be said to be an extension of the Council's Lillington Gardens Estate - adding some 400 electors; and (2) for accepting a higher 1980 Electorate forecast because of likely development within the Ward, including the Millbank Estate Scheme by the Crown Estate Commissioners.

For this suggested enlarged Ward the Labour Party forecast an Electorate of 6,900 (entitlement 2.94) but the Council saw no good reason to increase the size of the Ward (and my visit to the area showed no imperative reason for it) and doubted any appreciable increase in the Electorate by the Crown Estate Commissioners' Scheme. The Council, however, amended their Electorate forecast, by an increase of 700, to 5478 (Entitlement 2.37) which should be compared with the Labour Party's estimate for the Ward as drawn in the Commission's Draft Proposals (i.e. not enlarged) of 6,500 (Entitlement - on an average of 2345 per Councillor - 2.77).

It is necessary to look at the facts and arguments about the future redevelopment of the Millbank Estate by the Crown Estate Commissioners. I have been able to study the Scheme, and Phase I (after the completion of which there would be on the Estate an estimated population of 1200 - as against an initial population of some 750) was given a possible completion date of 1980. This Scheme has, however, been very much delayed with, as yet, only outline planning consents obtained. Up to the present only some small decanting programme appears to have been carried out. The Council representatives said that this scheme was not likely to increase the Electorate in this Ward by 1980. Strictly speaking, therefore, no likely increase in Electorate should be taken into consideration, but it should be noted that this is a large scheme which is no doubt going to have some effect on the Ward Electorate figure in the next decade.
I find myself in some difficulty also on another count for, to enlarge Millbank Ward and increase its representation from 2 to 3 Councillors, would necessitate the reduction of the representation in some other ward. The Labour Party strongly argued a case for reducing the representation of Regent (West End) Ward from 3 to 2 Councillors, but the Council confidently estimated the 1980 Electorate for this latter ward at 6,850 (Entitlement 2.96).

Perhaps the difficulty is presented because the overall representation of Westminster South Constituency Area has been reduced from 20 to 19 Councillors (enabling Paddington - following the Labour Party Scheme - to have 24 Councillors) and with an estimated 1980 total Electorate of 45,574, there is an entitlement of 19.70 (Even the Labour Party's estimate is 45,400, although this with their calculation of 2345 per Councillor gives an entitlement of 19.37). It follows, therefore, that some wards will necessarily have electorates slightly higher than their representation figures.

I feel that I cannot recommend any change in Regent (West End) Ward and its representation by 3 Councillors. Furthermore, I cannot recommend an enlargement of Millbank Ward and feel I must accept the Council's 1980 Electorate forecast for this ward of 5,478 (Entitlement 2.37).

The remaining wards - Churchill Ward (3 Councillors), St. George's Ward (3 Councillors) and Victoria Ward (2 Councillors) are satisfactory wards showing slight variations of the pattern of existing wards or Polling Districts. St. George's Ward is the largest with an estimated Electorate entitlement of 3.22.

Secondly, the Labour Party's Scheme, as submitted, envisaged 8 wards quite different in pattern (except perhaps for Millbank Ward and Churchill Ward) from the Commission's Draft Proposals, but at the Meeting the main submissions were to suggest an enlarged Millbank Ward returning 3 Councillors and (instead of Regent (West End) Ward (3 Councillors) and St. James's Ward (2 Councillors)) a Mayfair Ward (2 Councillors) and Charing Cross Ward (2 Councillors).

I was somewhat sympathetic to the argument for an enlarged Millbank Ward, but, as stated above, I cannot support the scheme for a Mayfair Ward and a Charing Cross Ward. As I have said, there was no unanimous view in favour of the joining of Soho and Covent Garden to form a ward, and this, of course, would have brought about an entirely new pattern. Incidentally, on this, I was not altogether happy with the idea of Regent Street as a dividing ward boundary, for would there not have been a severance of local ties here?

I have to say, therefore, that the pattern of wards, as suggested by the Labour Party for Westminster South does not appear to me to be as viable and as satisfactory as the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals.

I, therefore, recommend that the Commission's Draft Proposals for Wards in the Westminster South Constituency Area be confirmed.

6. VISITS:

On the day following the meeting, in the company of Mr. K.F. Pettifer, Chief Assistant, Chief Executive's Department, I visited various parts of the City, including the Millbank Area, Covent Garden, Soho, Harley Street, Marylebone High Street, Old Marylebone Road and Marylebone Road Flyover, the Ball Street and Church Street Areas (particularly looking at Housing development sites and suggested ward boundary features) and the Lords and Hamilton Terrace Areas.

It is relevant, perhaps, also to state that, of the last 27 years, I have lived 26 years in different parts of London (both north and southwest) and know the Westminster City area well.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that, subject to the following amendments, the wards and ward boundaries and member representation as outlined in the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals for the City of Westminster be confirmed:

(a) The boundary between Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward be amended to be along Abbey Road, Grove End Road, Hall Road, Hamilton Terrace, St. John's Wood Road and Cunningham Place (to Regent's Canal boundary) - so taking into Lords Ward the area bounded by St. John's Wood Road, Cunningham Place, Regent's Canal and Lisson Grove, and so forming wards giving the following 1960 projected electorate figures, member entitlements and member allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Terrace Ward</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>(1.94)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords Ward</td>
<td>4834</td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For Map - see Appendix "B" and for new ward boundary descriptions - See Appendix "C").

(b) The names of the undermentioned wards to be amended as follows:

- Maidsa Vale North Ward to be renamed MAIDA VALE Ward
- Maidsa Vale South Ward to be renamed LITTLE VENICE Ward
- Regent Ward to be renamed WEST END Ward

6. APPENDICES

The following supporting documents are appended:

Appendix "A" - Names of persons present at the meeting.

Appendix "B" - Map (scale 1:10,000) of the City showing the recommended new dividing boundary between Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward.

Appendix "C" - Amended Ward boundary descriptions for Hamilton Terrace Ward and Lords Ward and also note as to amendments on account of changes of names of wards.

May 1977.
### CITY OF WESTMINSTER - REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

**LOCAL MEETING - TUESDAY 29 MARCH 1977**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REG M FRYER</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR - CHURCHILL WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM DANIEL</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR - MAIDA VALE WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G GARSIDE</td>
<td>ALDERMAN - WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE MEGARTY</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR - CHURCH STREET WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V E CARPENTER</td>
<td>PADDINGTON LABOUR PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S THOMAS</td>
<td>CITIES OF LONDON &amp; WESTMINSTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B VILLETTE</td>
<td>CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THELMA BEEAR</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR - RECENT STREET WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS WHIPHAM</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR - BAKER STREET WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M R ROSENFELD</td>
<td>- SECRETARY - MARYLEBONE LIBERAL ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BATES</td>
<td>WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL - PLANNING DEPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WARD BOUNDARY DESCRIPTIONS

AMENDMENTS

(1) In all ward boundary descriptions, AMEND Maida Vale North Ward to READ Maida Vale Ward; AMEND Maida Vale South Ward to READ Little Venice Ward; and AMEND Regent Ward to READ West End Ward.

(2) AMEND boundary description of Hamilton Terrace Ward to READ as follows:

HAMilton TERRACE WARD
Commencing at a point where the Grand Union Canal (Regents Canal) meets the northeastern boundary of Little Venice Ward, at Aberdeen Place, thence northwesterly along said boundary and the northeastern boundary of Maida Vale Ward to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeasterly along said boundary to Abbey Road, thence southeasterly along said road and Grove End Road to Hall Road, thence southeasterly along said road to Hamilton Terrace, thence southeasterly along said terrace to St. John's Wood Road, thence northeasterly along said road to Cunningham Place, thence southeasterly along Cunningham Place to the Grand Union Canal (Regents Canal) thence southeasterly along said canal to the point of commencement.

(Note: The ward boundary description of Lords Ward does not need any amendment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanston</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Terrace</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knightsbridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Gate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Venice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maida Vale</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF CITY OF WESTMINSTER  
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

QUEEN'S PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of the Borough meets Fernhead Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Shirland Road, thence northwetwards along said road to Bravington Road, thence southwards along said road to Mozart Street, thence westwards along said street to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 9 Mozart Street, thencesouthwards to and along said boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 8-2 Lancefield Street, the rear boundaries of No 74-2 First Avenue and the eastern boundary of No 572 Harrow Road to Harrow Road, thence westwards along said road to the footbridge, across the Grand Union Canal (Paddington Branch), between Harrow Road and Wedlake Street, thence southeastwards along said footbridge to the western boundary of the Borough, thence westwards and northwards along said boundary and northeastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

HARROW ROAD WARD

Commencing at a point where Harrow Road meets the eastern boundary of Queen's Park Ward, thence northwards, eastwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary to Shirland Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Formosa Street, thence southwestwards along said street to the Grand Union Canal (Paddington Branch), thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said canal to Harrow Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.
MAIDA VALE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Harrow Road Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said Borough boundary to the road known as Maida Vale, thence southeastwards along said road to Sutherland Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Lanark Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of numbers 200 to 196 Sutherland Avenue, thence southwestwards to and along said boundaries to the northeastern boundary of number 194 in said avenue, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of numbers 194 to 190 Sutherland Avenue, thence southwestwards along said boundaries to Randolph Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to Sutherland Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Lauderdale Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of number 2 in said road, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the northeastern boundary of number 186 Sutherland Avenue, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of numbers 186 to 132 in said avenue, thence southwestwards along said boundaries, crossing Castellain Road and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of numbers 130 to 106 Sutherland Avenue to Delaware Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of numbers 104 to 86 Sutherland Avenue, thence southwestwards to and generally southwestwards along said boundaries to the northeastern boundary of Harrow Road Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HAMILTON TERRACE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Maida Vale ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Abbey Road, thence southeastwards along said
road and Grove End Road to Hall Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Hamilton Terrace, thence southeastwards along said terrace to St John's Wood Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the road known as Cunningham Place, thence southeastwards along said road to the Grand Union Canal (Regents Canal) thence southwestwards along said canal to Edgeware Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the northeastern boundary of Maida Vale Ward thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

LORDS WARD

Commencing at a point where the Grand Union Canal (Regents Canal) meets the northeastern boundary of Hamilton Terrace Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Finchley Road, thence southwards and southeastwards along said road and Wellington Road to Park Road, thence continuing southeastwards along said road to the Grand Union Canal (Regents Canal), thence southwestwards along said canal to the point of commencement.

REGENT'S PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where Marylebone Road meets Great Central Street, thence northwards along said street to Welcombe Place, thence northeastwards along said place to Boston Place, thence northwestwards along said place to Rossmore Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Marylebone to Harrow-on-the-Hill railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to the southern boundary of Lords ward thence northeastwards along said boundary and generally northwards along the northeastern boundary of said ward to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said boundary and generally southeastwards along the eastern boundary of the Borough to the road known as Outer Circle, thence westwards along said road to the road known as York Gate, thence southwards along said road to Marylebone Road, thence westwards along said
road to the point of commencement.

CHURCH STREET WARD

Commencing at a point where Marylebone Road meets Edgware Road, thence northwesterly along said road to the southeastern boundary of Hamilton Terrace Ward, thence northeasterly along said boundary and the southeastern boundary of Lords Ward to the western boundary of Regent's Park Ward, thence southeasterly along said boundary to Marylebone Road, thence southwesternly along said road to the point of commencement.

LITTLE VENICE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Church Street Ward meets the road known as Westway, thence westerly along said road to the Grand Union Canal (Paddington Branch), thence northwesterly along said canal to the southeastern boundary of Harrow Road Ward, thence northeasterly along said boundary and northwesterly along the northeastern boundary of said ward to the southeastern boundary of Maida Vale Ward, thence northeasterly along said boundary to the southwestern boundary of Hamilton Terrace Ward, thence southeasterly along said boundary and the western boundary of Church Street Ward to the point of commencement.

WESTBOURNE WARD

Commencing at a point where Chepstow Road meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence westerly and generally northwesterly along said boundary to the southern boundary of Queen's Park Ward, thence northwards and easterly along said boundary and southeasterly along the southwestern boundaries of Harrow Road Ward and Little Venice Ward to the road known as Westway,
thence westwards along said road to Lord Hills Bridge, thence southwards along said bridge to the road known as Westbourne Park Villas, thence westwards along said road to the path known as Westbourne Park Passage, thence southwards along said path to Westbourne Park Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Talbot Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Chepstow Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the point of commencement.

BAYSWATER WARD

Commencing at a point where Dawson Place meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said boundary and continuing generally northwards and eastwards along the southeastern boundary of Westbourne Ward to Westbourne Terrace (Westbourne Bridge), thence southeastwards along said terrace to Cleveland Terrace, thence southwestwards along said terrace and the road known as Cleveland Gardens to the road known as Leinster Gardens, thence southeastwards along said road to Leinster Place, thence southwestwards along said place to Porchester Terrace, thence southwards along said terrace to the road known as Porchester Gardens, thence southwestwards along said road and Kensington Gardens Square (South Side) and continuing southeastwards and southwestwards along Prince's Square (southside) and continuing southwestwards along Dawson Place to the point of commencement.

LANCASTER GATE WARD

Commencing at a point where Westbourne Street meets Bayswater Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the western boundary of the Borough, thence continuing southwestwards and generally northwestwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Bayswater Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Westbourne Terrace, thence southeastwards along said terrace to the road known as Sussex Gardens (south-west side) and Westbourne Street to the point of commencement.
HYDE PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where Bayswater Road meets the northeastern boundary of Lancaster Gate Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the northeastern boundary of Bayswater Ward to the southeastern boundary of Westbourne Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Little Venice Ward to Edgware Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Bayswater Road, thence westwards along said road to the point of commencement.

BRYANSTON WARD

Commencing at a point where Oxford Street (Marble Arch) meets the northeastern boundary of Hyde Park Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the southern boundary of Church Street Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Regent's Park Ward to Upper Montagu Street, thence southeastwards along said street, the western carriage-way of Montagu Square, Montagu Street and New Quebec Street to Seymour Street, thence southwestwards along said street to Old Quebec Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Oxford Street (Marble Arch), thence westwards along said street to the point of commencement.

RAKER STREET WARD

Commencing at a point where Oxford Street meets the eastern boundary of Bryanston Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Regent's Park Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and continuing along Marylebone Road to Marylebone High Street, thence generally southwards along said street Thayer Street, Mandeville Place and James Street to Oxford Street, thence southwestwards along said street to the point of commencement.
CAVENDISH WARD

Commencing at a point where Oxford Street meets the eastern boundary of Baker Street Ward, thence northwards and westwards along the said eastern and northern boundaries of Baker Street Ward to the southern boundary of Regent's Park Ward, thence northwards and eastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary to Oxford Street thence southwestwards along said street to the point of commencement.

WEST END WARD

Commencing at a point where Duke of Wellington Place meets Grosvenor Place, thence northwestwards along said Grosvenor Place, crossing the road known as Knightsbridge at Hyde Park Corner to Serpentine Road, thence generally northwestwards along said road and West Carriage Drive to the southern boundary of Hyde Park Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundaries of Bryanston Ward, Baker Street Ward and Cavendish Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Upper St Martin's Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Cranbourne Street, thence southwestwards along said street and New Coventry Street to Wardour Street, thence northwards along said street to Coventry Street, thence southwestwards along said street and the road known as Piccadilly to Duke of Wellington Place, thence southwards and southwestwards along said place to the point of commencement.

KNIGHTSBRIDGE WARD

Commencing at a point where West Halkin Street meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards, generally westwards and northwards along said Borough Boundary to the southern boundary of Lancaster Gate Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Hyde Park Ward.
to the western boundary of West End Ward thence southwards along said boundary and southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of said ward and Grosvenor Place to Halkin Street, thence southwestwards along said street, the northwestern side of Belgrave Square and West Halkin Street to the point of commencement.

BELGRAVE WARD

Commencing at a point where Ebury Bridge Road meets the southwestern boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Knightsbridge Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Grosvenor Place, thence southeastwards along said place and Grosvenor Gardens to Buckingham Palace Road, thence southwestwards along said road and Ebury Bridge Road to the point of commencement.

CHURCHILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Belgrave Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to Elizabeth Bridge, thence southeastwards along said bridge to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 5 St George's Drive, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary, the northwestern boundaries of No 9 Cambridge Street, the end of Cambridge Street, No 12 Cambridge Street and the rear boundaries of Nos 48-58 Hugh Street to the southwestern boundary of No 58 Hugh Street, thence southeastwards along said boundary and continuing southeastwards along Alderney Street to Lupus Street, thence eastwards along said street to Claverton Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Grosvenor Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Grid reference TQ 2937777879, thence due southwards to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said boundary and northwestern along the southwestern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.
ST GEORGE'S WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Churchill Ward, thence northwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Belgrave Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Victoria Street, thence eastwards along said street to Vauxhall Bridge Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Charlwood Street, thence southwestwards along said street to Tachbrook Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Lupus Street, thence southwestwards along said street to Aylesford Street, thence south-eastwards along said street and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

MILLBANK WARD

Commencing at a point where the south eastern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of St George's Ward, thence northwestwards and north-eastwards along said ward boundary to Vauxhall Bridge Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to Osbert Street, thence northeastwards along said street, Vincent Square, Rutherford Street and Regency Place to Horseferry Road, then eastwards along said road and Lambeth Bridge to the south-eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

VICTORIA WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of St George's Ward meets Victoria Street, thence northeastwards along said street, and the road known as Broad Sanctuary to St Margaret Street, being the eastern side of Parliament Square, thence northwards along said street to Bridge Street,
thence eastwards along said street and Westminster Bridge to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Millbank Ward, thence westwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of St George's Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ST JAMES'S WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of St George's Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Belgrave Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and the northeastern boundary of Knightsbridge Ward to the southeastern boundary of West End Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards, southwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Victoria Ward, thence westwards and southwestwards along said boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of St George's Ward to the point of commencement.

DMT