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Summary

Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

2 Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority’s electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Croydon?

4 We are conducting a review of Croydon Borough Council as the value of each vote in borough council elections varies depending on where you live in Croydon. Some councillors currently represent many more or fewer voters than others. This is ‘electoral inequality’. Our aim is to create ‘electoral equality’, where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

Our proposals for Croydon

- Croydon should be represented by 70 councillors, the same number as there are now.
- Croydon should have 28 wards, four more than there are now.
- The boundaries of all wards should change, none will stay the same.

Have your say

5 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for an eight-week period, from 14 March to 8 May 2017. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to contribute to the design of the new wards – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the views we received.

6 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.
You have until 8 May 2017 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 25 for how to send us your response.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

8 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)
- Alison Lowton
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Sir Tony Redmond
- Peter Knight CBE, DL

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

9 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Croydon are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

What is an electoral review?

10 Our three main considerations are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

11 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

12 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Croydon. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

13 This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2016</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 September 2016</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 2016</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2017</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2017</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 2017</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

14 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation\(^2\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^3\) there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

16 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

17 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Croydon</td>
<td>264,126</td>
<td>281,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>4,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electors per councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. All of our proposed wards for Croydon will have good electoral equality by 2022.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

20 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

Electorate figures

21 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2022, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2017. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 7% by 2022. This growth is driven mainly by significant development in the urban centre of the borough.

\(^3\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
22 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

Number of councillors

23 Croydon Borough Council currently has 70 councillors. We have looked at evidence provided by the Council and have concluded that keeping this number the same will make sure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

24 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 70 councillors – for example, 70 one-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

25 We received one submission about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. The submission did not, however, provide an alternative number of councillors, and we therefore based our draft recommendations on a 70-member council.

Ward boundaries consultation

26 We received 103 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included five detailed borough-wide proposals from the Council and a number of political groups. All of the submitted schemes were based on a pattern of wards to be represented by 70 elected members.

27 The five borough-wide schemes each provided for a mix of two- and three-councillor wards for Croydon. These schemes were submitted by Croydon Council, Croydon Labour Group, Croydon South Labour Group, Croydon Conservative Group, and UKIP Croydon. We carefully considered the proposals received and concluded that each of these proposals would provide good levels of electoral equality. We also considered that they generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

28 Our draft recommendations are broadly the same as the scheme submitted by the Croydon Conservative Group. Whilst all of the submitted full schemes provided for acceptable levels of electoral equality, all the schemes varied significantly from one another. This made it very difficult to put together a coherent warding pattern across the borough using parts of each proposal. We decided to use the Conservative Group’s scheme as the starting point for our proposed pattern of wards for Croydon because we consider that the use of the main railway line in the north made it a stronger scheme than the other proposals; we consider that this railway line provides for a strong and identifiable boundary, more so than other railway lines across the borough, and access from one side of the high-speed line to the other can be limited. While we recognise that there are other railway lines across the borough which we are proposing to divide, we consider this railway line provides for the strongest boundary and is a good starting point for the review, in light of the conflicting proposals.
29 In 2011, the Council proposed a series of ‘places’ in Croydon, each roughly delineating a community area, and it was expressed by respondents that the schemes put forward by the Council and by the Labour groups did not represent these ‘places’ adequately. The scheme submitted by the UKIP Group also did not represent these ‘places’. Respondents overwhelmingly stated that this definition of the areas of Croydon as ‘places’ was important locally. We do not take a strong position on these ‘places’; however, we acknowledge that the use of the ‘places’ has generated strong feeling locally and was referred to by multiple respondents.

30 Whilst we accept that the scheme submitted by UKIP provides for acceptable electoral equality, the boundaries used in this scheme were based on polling districts. Polling district boundaries are not usually indicators of community identity, and when putting together the draft recommendations it was clear Croydon’s existing polling districts do not provide for strong ward boundaries. Similarly, the scheme provided by the Croydon South Labour Party did not use boundaries as strong as those in the scheme that we have gone on to adopt.

31 Across the borough, we have taken into account local evidence that we received, which provided evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas, we have proposed our own boundaries as we consider they provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria. We also visited the area to look at the various different proposals on the ground. This tour of Croydon helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

32 Our draft recommendations are for 14 three-councillor wards and 14 two-councillor wards. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

33 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on pages 27–9 and on the large map accompanying this report.

34 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

Draft recommendations

35 The tables and maps on pages 8–22 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Croydon. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory\(^4\) criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

### Ward name | Number of Cllrs | Variance 2022
--- | --- | ---
Bensham Manor East | 2 | -1%
Bensham Manor West | 2 | 2%
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood | 3 | -2%
Norbury & Pollards Hill | 2 | 4%
Norbury Park | 2 | 2%
Selhurst | 2 | 0%
South Norwood | 3 | -6%
Thornton Heath | 3 | -2%
West Thornton | 2 | 5%
Woodside | 3 | 5%
Bensham Manor East and Bensham Manor West

36 Apart from the borough-wide schemes, we did not receive any submissions directly relating to this area. The proposals put forward by the borough-wide schemes in this area differed significantly, with a number of them crossing the railway line. On our visit to the area, it became clear that the railway line forms a strong boundary, and it has limited crossing points. For this reason, we have adopted the Conservative scheme in this area; the proposed wards provide for good electoral equality, while following strong and identifiable boundaries.

Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood

37 We did not receive any submissions directly relating to this area, aside from the borough-wide schemes. The southern boundary of our proposed ward is similar to that proposed by both the Council and the Labour Group; however, our proposed warding pattern transfers Biggin Hill and the surrounding roads to the proposed Norbury Park ward. This was proposed as part of the submission by the Conservative Group, and provides for better electoral equality overall.

Norbury & Pollards Hill and Norbury Park

38 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received one submission referring to the Norbury area. This submission requested that the Thornton Heath area remain separate from Norbury, as proposed here. The Council’s proposed ward in this area crossed the railway line, and did not have any road links between the north and the south of the ward. On our visit to the area, we noted that the railway line forms a strong boundary between the north and south in this area. We consider that the Conservative scheme, putting forward two two-member wards, provides for the strongest boundaries in the area and also provides for good electoral equality.

Selhurst and South Norwood

39 We received one comment regarding this area, in addition to the borough-wide schemes. A local resident expressed concern that proposals did not account for the communities in the area, and requested a ward more joined up with the northern areas of the borough. However, this would have significant knock-on effects on the electoral equality across the borough. The Selhurst depot and the surrounding railway lines form a strong barrier, and we have therefore decided to draw the boundary between South Norwood and the proposed Selhurst ward along the railway line.

40 Our proposed South Norwood ward crosses the railway line in the north-east of the ward, by Norwood Junction railway station. If we had used the railway line in this area, South Norwood ward would have a variance of -21% and the neighbouring Woodside ward would have a variance of 22%. We consider, having toured the area in question, that the area to the east of the railway has a strong road link to the western part of South Norwood and its inclusion in this ward provides for good levels of electoral equality. However, we would welcome comments on these wards, and this inclusion in particular, during consultation on the draft recommendations.

Thornton Heath

41 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received four submissions. One of these submissions, from a political group, put forward strong evidence regarding the Thornton Heath ward, and opposed the Council’s proposal whilst proposing a ward
that mirrors the existing arrangements, with minor additions. A submission from a local organisation submitted the same proposal. The evidence provided in the submissions we received was compelling, and demonstrated the strong community identity of the Thornton Heath area.

42 When putting together a pattern of wards, it is necessary to look at the borough as a whole. It is therefore necessary, in order to better adhere to the statutory criteria, to make some amendments to the existing Thornton Heath ward. Our proposed Thornton Heath ward is very similar to the existing ward in this area, with the addition of the area to the east of Ross Road and north of Canham Road, and the movement of the Grange Hill area to the proposed Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood ward. This allows for the ward to follow a stronger boundary, and improves the electoral equality of the proposed Thornton Heath ward.

West Thornton
43 Aside from the borough-wide schemes, we did not receive any submissions directly relating to the West Thornton area. Our proposed West Thornton ward is based largely on the proposal received from the Conservative Group. However, to effect better electoral equality in this and the neighbouring wards, we have placed the cemetery and the roads immediately surrounding it in our proposed Broad Green ward. We also note that this change allows access to the area north of Mitcham Road to be maintained, which would not be the case if the area was placed in West Thornton as proposed by the Conservative Group’s submission. We consider that the proposed ward reflects the statutory criteria; however, we would welcome submissions commenting on the proposed ward during the consultation on the draft recommendations.

Woodside
44 Apart from the borough-wide schemes, we did not receive any submissions directly relating to the proposed Woodside ward. We have adopted the Conservative proposals here, as the proposed Woodside ward aligns well with the other wards proposed in this area; this allows for good adherence to the statutory criteria across the borough.

45 We note that the proposed ward excludes an area to the east of the railway line, instead joining this area with South Norwood. If we had used the railway line in this area, South Norwood ward would have a variance of -21% and the Woodside ward would have a variance of 22%. We consider, having toured the area in question, that the area to the east of the railway has a strong road link to the western part of South Norwood and its inclusion in this ward provides for good levels of electoral equality. Our proposed Woodside ward is similar to the existing ward in this area, with the addition of the Alderton Road area in the south. This ward follows strong and identifiable boundaries, and has good levels of electoral equality.
## Central Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiscombe East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiscombe West &amp; Park Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addiscombe East and Addiscombe West & Park Hill

46 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received four submissions relating to the Addiscombe area of Croydon. Two of these submissions referred to the Whitgift estate area of Addiscombe, requesting that it remain wholly within an Addiscombe ward and objecting to the Council’s proposal for a Coombe ward, splitting this area off from Addiscombe. One respondent suggested the use of Shirley Road as a strong boundary to the east of Addiscombe. This was also suggested by respondents concerned with the Shirley wards (see paragraph 52). The railway line forms a strong boundary to the west of the Addiscombe area, and we consider that Coombe Road forms a strong southern boundary, as suggested by the Conservative Group and a member of the public.

47 Our proposed pattern of wards in this area keeps the Addiscombe area intact, and is supported by evidence received by members of the public. We are therefore proposing a three-councillor Addiscombe East ward and a three-councillor Addiscombe West & Park Hill ward as part of our draft recommendations.

Broad Green

48 Our proposed ward in the Broad Green area is based largely on the proposal received from the Conservative Group. However, to effect better electoral equality in this and the neighbouring wards, and to maintain access to the area north of Mitcham Road, we have placed the cemetery and the roads immediately surrounding it in our proposed Broad Green ward, as opposed to in West Thornton as proposed by the Conservative Group’s submission.

49 We received a number of submissions relating to the Wandle Park area. Respondents put forward evidence that this area should be part of Waddon, rather than part of Broad Green as proposed by the local authority (see paragraph 54 for more detail). We have included the Wandle Park area in our proposed Waddon ward, instead of in the proposed Broad Green ward.

Central

50 The area between East Croydon and West Croydon railway stations is forecast to undergo large-scale development over the next five years. As a result of this, there will be a significant increase in electorate in this central area.

51 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received seven submissions relating to this area. These submissions took the significant forecast growth into account, and suggested that the current Fairfield ward would need to be split up – maintaining the existing Fairfield ward would lead to an electoral variance of 51% by 2022, significantly outside what would be considered acceptable. All of the full schemes received put forward warding arrangements for the centre of Croydon that had acceptable electoral equality. However, three of the schemes split the main shopping area in half. On our visit to the area, we observed that the pedestrianised part of North End is the focus of the area, rather than a dividing line between two areas. The Conservative proposal and the Croydon South Labour Party submission both left this central area intact, using instead Roman Way and the high-speed railway line as the west and east boundaries respectively. We consider that this retains a strong ‘town centre’ as a whole, as opposed to splitting it in two. We
propose the name ‘Central’ for this ward, as put forward by the Council, albeit for a slightly different area.

**Shirley North and Shirley South**

52 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received 16 submissions relating to the Shirley area, including six from local organisations and community groups. All of these submissions presented evidence regarding the external boundaries of the Shirley area, which they explained should follow Shirley Road and the boundary of the Shirley Park Golf Club. We consider that this is a strong western boundary. The submissions received also provided evidence as to the cohesiveness of the Shirley area, and strongly objected to the Council’s proposal to put part of Shirley in a ward with Addington as this would fragment local communities and would not respect locally acknowledged boundaries between the two places. Respondents demonstrated their strength of feeling regarding the Shirley area’s distinctiveness, and suggested Wickham Road as a possible boundary between a Shirley North and Shirley South ward.

53 As a result of the evidence received, and backed up by our visit to the area, we propose to adopt a pattern of wards in Shirley that follows the boundaries put forward by community groups, taking the tramline to the north of Long Lane as a strong northern boundary, creating a three-councillor Shirley North ward and a two-councillor Shirley South ward. The boundary between these proposed wards follows Wickham Road, with the Nursery Lane area moving into the proposed Shirley North ward.

**Waddon**

54 In addition to the borough-wide schemes received, we received eight submissions relating to the proposed Waddon ward. These submissions stated that the Wandle Park area should be included in a Waddon ward, rather than in Broad Green. Respondents put forward evidence that the Whitestone Way development and the surrounding residential area identified more closely with Waddon, and that they were separated from Broad Green by the industrial park. As a result of the strong evidence received from residents, we are proposing to adopt the Conservative Group’s proposed three-councillor Waddon ward, which includes the Wandle Park area. This ward also follows strong boundaries and provides for good electoral equality.
## South-east Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Addington North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Addington South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderstead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsdon &amp; Addington Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsdon Vale &amp; Forestdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Croydon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Addington North and New Addington South

55 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received two submissions relating to this area. One requested that the New Addington area retain its own representation, and one suggested that King Henry’s Drive form a boundary between the north and the south of the New Addington area. The schemes from the Council, both Labour groups, and the Conservative Group kept this area either exactly as it is currently, or deviated from the existing warding pattern in a minor way. We consider that the existing boundaries, also proposed by the Council, provide for good electoral equality, and are proposing largely to maintain them here. This area is currently the only part of Croydon represented by two-councillor wards, and we do not propose to alter the councillor numbers here. We are therefore proposing two two-councillor wards in New Addington, closely mirroring the existing boundaries, with a minor alteration to the western boundary of New Addington South to run along a footpath.

Sanderstead

56 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received seven submissions relating to the Sanderstead area specifically. All of the submissions received supported keeping the Sanderstead area in one ward, and a number of submissions requested that Sanderstead be separate from Riddlesdown which, it was put forward, should join Purley (see paragraph 66). The submissions put forward strong evidence regarding the community links within Sanderstead, the active nature of the local organisations and associations, and the strong boundary formed by Upper Selsdon Road.

57 Of the five borough-wide schemes that we received, three schemes split the Sanderstead area, putting the northern part of the area into a Croham ward. The scheme put forward by the Conservative Group kept the Sanderstead area intact, maintaining the internal community links described in the submissions received. We have therefore based our proposed Sanderstead ward on the submission from the Conservative Group. We consider that this ward adheres well to the statutory criteria and accurately reflects the local community.

Selsdon & Addington Village and Selsdon Vale & Forestdale

58 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received nine submissions regarding these areas, including two from borough councillors and two from local organisations. These submissions argued for wards based on the Council’s ‘places’, and provided evidence to support the inclusion of Forestdale with Selsdon. A number of these submissions explicitly supported the proposal put forward by the Conservative Group, which joins the Forestdale area with the southern part of Selsdon, and includes Addington village with the north of Selsdon. Evidence received from a councillor stated that this proposal reflects the ‘places’ of Croydon more clearly. We consider that the Conservative proposal for this area adheres well to the statutory criteria, and we are therefore adopting it as part of our draft recommendations.

South Croydon

59 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received three submissions directly relating to the South Croydon area. One submission focused on the importance of South Croydon railway station staying in any proposed South Croydon
ward, and one expressed a concern that Purley Oaks station remain in a Purley ward, and not in South Croydon.

60 We received a submission from a borough councillor that provided strong evidence in support of the South Croydon ward proposed as part of the Conservative scheme. The submission states that this proposed ward follows more closely the ‘place’ of South Croydon as delineated by the local authority, and also keeps intact strong transport links. The evidence received was persuasive and we are therefore adopting a three-member South Croydon ward as part of our draft recommendations.
## South-west Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulsdon Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Coulsdon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purley &amp; Woodcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purley Oaks &amp; Riddlesdown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Coulson Town and Old Coulsdon**

61 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received 10 submissions relating to Coulsdon. This included three submissions from borough councillors and three submissions from residents’ associations in the area. One submission requested that the Coulsdon area be removed from the borough of Croydon and become part of Surrey; however, the alteration of the external borough boundary is outside of the scope of this review. Additionally, a number of submissions commented on the impact of any proposed warding arrangements on the future make-up of the local authority, but again this falls outside of the scope of this review. One respondent expressed concern regarding the growth that is due to occur. Coulsdon is forecast to undergo an increase in electorate over the coming years due to development across the area, particularly to the west of the railway line. Our proposed warding pattern takes this increase in electorate into account.

62 All of the submissions received regarding Coulsdon put forward the case for the area remaining separate from Purley, and a number requested a five- or six-councillor ward covering the entire Coulsdon area. However, as stated in our guidance, ‘How to propose a new pattern of wards’, we do not accept proposals for more than three councillors to represent a ward, except in exceptional circumstances. As no evidence was provided to justify the need for such a large ward, we have split the Coulsdon area into two wards. Our proposed wards follow the scheme for this area submitted by the Conservative Group; this warding pattern, puts the entire Coulsdon area into two wards. The proposed wards in Coulsdon facilitate the strong boundaries along the railway lines in the north of the borough. Whilst we looked carefully at all of the schemes received, in this area there was no alternative pattern of wards that would allow for the maintenance of the strong boundaries to the north. We also note that a pattern of wards that kept Coulsdon as a distinct area was supported by information received during the consultation from 10 respondents. Whilst we note that these boundaries differ significantly to those proposed by the local authority, we consider that the wards follow strong boundaries, and provide for good electoral equality, both in Coulsdon and in the surrounding wards.

63 Part of the proposed Coulsdon Town ward sits to the east of the railway line and the A23, which would appear to make it a natural fit with the Old Coulsdon area. However, to the east of the housing is Fairdean Downs, a large hill that forms an obstacle with no crossing points, whereas this area links well to the Coulsdon Town ward via a major road – we visited this area during the review and verified this. For these reasons, we are including this area in the proposed Coulsdon Town ward.

**Kenley**

64 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received a number of submissions relating to Kenley. All of the submissions focused on the Kenley area being distinct from Purley in the north, and provided evidence to illustrate the difference between Kenley and the surrounding area. This was backed up by our visit to the area. The Kenley area is distinct, and is extensive enough to merit its own ward. The Conservative scheme in this area follows the ‘place’ of Kenley delineated
by the local authority. We have decided to adopt this proposed Kenley ward as it provides for good adherence to the statutory criteria.

Purley & Woodcote and Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown

In addition to the full schemes, we received 24 submissions referring to the Purley area. A number of respondents stated that the ‘place’ of Purley, as defined by the local authority, should form the basis of any Purley wards and that they did not feel that the Council’s proposed wards adequately fulfilled this requirement. Three submissions put forward evidence with regard to the Woodcote area, stating that it should be in a Purley ward. All of the schemes received linked Woodcote and the rest of Purley, as the Woodcote area lies at the edge of the borough and is therefore accessed exclusively through Purley.

A number of the submissions received focused on the difference between Purley and the areas of Kenley and Sanderstead to the south and east. It was felt by respondents that Purley was distinct from these two areas, as it has its own distinct ‘town centre’, with the Purley Downs Golf Course forming a boundary between Purley and Sanderstead. Respondents also put forward evidence suggesting that Riddlesdown belongs in a Purley ward, rather than in a ward with Sanderstead as suggested in the Council’s scheme, as this is more representative of the links between communities; this was backed up by our visit to the area. One submission focused on the historic John Laing estate, and its connection with Sanderstead. However, we felt that the Conservative Group’s proposal in this area accurately reflected the views expressed in the majority of submissions received, and this was backed up by our visit to the area. We would be particularly interested in receiving comments about these proposals during the consultation period.
Conclusions

67 The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2017 and 2022 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>4,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft recommendation**
Croydon Borough Council should be made up of 70 councillors serving 28 wards representing 14 two-councillor wards and 14 three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

**Mapping**
Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Croydon Borough Council. You can also view our draft recommendations for Croydon on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk
3 Have your say

68 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole borough or just a part of it.

69 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for Croydon, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

70 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

71 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Croydon)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

72 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Croydon which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

73 A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

74 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

75 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents’ association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
• Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

76 Effective local government:

• Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
• Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
• Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

77 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Millbank (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

78 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

79 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

80 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for Croydon Borough Council in 2018.

**Equalities**

81 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.
### Appendix A

#### Draft recommendations for Croydon Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2017)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2022)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Addiscombe East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,156</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>11,516</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Addiscombe West &amp; Park Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>12,054</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bensham Manor East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bensham Manor West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Broad Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,634</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coulsdon Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,794</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>11,294</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Crystal Palace &amp; Upper Norwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,261</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>11,816</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kenley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 New Addington North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,353</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>7,563</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 New Addington South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,393</td>
<td>3,697</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>7,612</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Norbury &amp; Pollards Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8,395</td>
<td>4,198</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2017)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
<td>Electorate (2022)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Norbury Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Old Coulsdon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,617</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Purley &amp; Woodcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,751</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12,488</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Purley Oaks &amp; Riddlesdown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8,499</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sanderstead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,374</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12,663</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Selhurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,636</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Selsdon &amp; Addington Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Selsdon Vale &amp; Forestdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,522</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7,713</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Shirley North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,136</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12,472</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Shirley South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>4,133</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 South Croydon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>11,107</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 South Norwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,857</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Thornton Heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,532</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11,888</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Waddon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12,689</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 West Thornton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8,496</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2017)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
<td>Electorate (2022)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,316</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12,655</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281,944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Croydon Borough Council.

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

Outline map
Key

1. Addiscombe East
2. Addiscombe West & Park Hill
3. Bensham Manor East
4. Bensham Manor West
5. Broad Green
6. Central
7. Coulsdon Town
8. Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood
9. Kenley
10. New Addington North
11. New Addington South
12. Norbury & Pollards Hill
13. Norbury Park
14. Old Coulsdon
15. Purley & Woodcote
16. Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown
17. Sanderstead
18. Selhurst
19. Selsdon & Addington Village
20. Selsdon Vale & Forestdale
21. Shirley North
22. Shirley South
23. South Croydon
24. South Norwood
25. Thornton Heath
26. Waddon
27. West Thornton
28. Woodside

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/greater-london/croydon
Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/greater-london/croydon

Local Authority

- Croydon Borough Council

Political Groups

- Croydon Labour Group
- Croydon South Constituency Labour Party
- London Borough of Croydon Conservative Group (two submissions)
- Thornton Heath Labour Party & Thornton Heath Neighbourhood Association
- UKIP Croydon

Councillors

- Councillor S. Bashford (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor S. Bennett (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor S. Brew (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor R. Chatterjee (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor L. Clancy (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Creatura (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor J. Cummings (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Fisher (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor L. Hale (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor Y. Hopley (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor D. Mead (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Neal (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor H. Pollard (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor B. Quadir (Croydon Borough Council)
- Councillor C. Wright (Croydon Borough Council)

Member of Parliament

- Mr G. Barwell MP (Croydon Central)
- Mr C. Philp MP (Croydon South)

Local Organisations

- Bishops Walk Residents’ Association
- Coulsdon West Residents’ Association
- East Coulsdon Residents’ Association
- Hartley & District Residents’ Association
• Monks Orchard Residents’ Association
• New Addington Royal British Legion
• Old Coulsdon Residents’ Association
• Purley & Woodcote Residents’ Association
• Riddlesdown Residents’ Association
• Sanderstead Residents’ Association
• Selsdon Contact
• Shirley Hills Residents’ Association
• Shirley Planning Forum
• Shrublands Residents’ Association
• Spring Park Residents’ Association
• The Bourne Society
• Thornton Heath Neighbourhood Association

Local Residents

• 62 local residents
### Appendix D

**Glossary and abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council size</strong></td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</strong></td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division</strong></td>
<td>A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral fairness</strong></td>
<td>When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral inequality</strong></td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate</strong></td>
<td>People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of electors per councillor</strong></td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish council</strong></td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also ‘Town council’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</strong></td>
<td>The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish ward</strong></td>
<td>A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town council</strong></td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance (or electoral variance)</strong></td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>