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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 The Commission decided to conduct its electoral review following a formal request from the council to address increasing levels of electoral inequality across the borough. Electoral inequality is a situation in which some councillors represent many more - or many fewer - voters than others. This means that the value of your vote - in borough council elections - varies depending on where you live in Croydon.

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 26 wards should change; two will stay the same.

We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Croydon.
What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

6 The members of the Commission are:

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

- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

This electoral review was 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?

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

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

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

This review was 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>4 July 2017</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

12 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward, and, in some cases, which parish or town council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and final recommendations

13 Legislation states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors 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.

14 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.

15 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>264,151</td>
<td>281,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>4,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 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.

17 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

18 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

Electorate figures

19 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 the significant development underway in the urban centre of the borough.

---

3 Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
20 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 final recommendations.

**Number of councillors**

21 Croydon Borough Council currently has 70 councillors. We 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.

22 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.

23 We did not receive any submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on our draft recommendations. We have therefore maintained 70 councillors for our final recommendations.

**Ward boundaries consultation**

24 We received 103 submissions to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included five 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. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

25 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, to different degrees. We also considered that they generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

26 We broadly based our draft recommendations on the scheme submitted by the Croydon Conservative Group. While all of the submitted full schemes provided for acceptable levels of electoral equality, they 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, as we considered that the use of the main railway line in the north made it a stronger scheme than the other proposals; we considered that this railway line provided for a strong and identifiable boundary, and access from one side of this high-speed line to the other can be limited. In light of the conflicting proposals received, we considered this railway line provided for the strongest boundary.

27 Across the borough, we considered local evidence received, which provided evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas, we proposed our own boundaries that we considered provided for 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.

28 Our draft recommendations were for 14 two-councillor and 14 three-councillor wards. We considered that our draft recommendations provided for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests.

29 During the consultation on the Commission’s draft recommendations, the Chief Executive of Croydon Borough Council requested that we reconsider the proposals that were put forward by the Council during Stage One of the review. The submission made during this first stage of consultation was considered in detail as part of the process of drawing up a warding pattern, and was considered against our three statutory criteria. The conclusion was made that while the scheme provided did meet the statutory criteria, there was a different scheme that followed stronger and more identifiable boundaries. This decision was explained in full in the Draft Recommendations report.

30 The letter from the Council’s Chief Executive, received after the publication of the draft recommendations, expressed a desire that the draft warding pattern be reconsidered; the Commission’s Chief Executive responded to this letter explaining the level of scrutiny applied to the previously received submissions, and laying out the process for the remainder of the review. The Council’s Labour Group subsequently made a submission as part of the consultation process on the draft recommendations. This submission was scrutinised alongside the other submissions received and examined against our statutory criteria, and all of the evidence received was used to inform our final recommendations for Croydon. Each aspect of the Labour Group’s submission at this stage was considered in full, and the elements that were included are discussed in the ‘Final Recommendations’ section of this report.

Draft recommendations consultation

31 We received 457 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included submissions from MPs, political groups, councillors, local organisations and local residents. The majority of the submissions focused on specific areas, particularly our proposals in Addiscombe, which were the focus of over 60% of submissions received.

32 Our final recommendations are based on the draft recommendations with a modification to the wards in the Addiscombe, Bensham Manor and South Croydon areas. These changes are based on the evidence submitted in representations received during the consultation on the draft recommendations. We also make minor modifications to the boundaries in Coulsdon and New Addington, as a result of evidence received during consultation.
Final recommendations

33 Pages 10–26 detail our final recommendations for each area of Croydon. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

34 Our final recommendations are for 15 three-councillor wards, 12 two-councillor wards and one one-councillor ward. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

35 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on page 27 and on the large map accompanying this report.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Palace &amp; Upper Norwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbury &amp; Pollards Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbury Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood**

36. We received two responses relating to this ward in response to our consultation on the draft recommendations. One of the submissions supported the proposed Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood ward. One submission expressed concern over the inclusion of the park in the South Norwood ward, rather than in Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood; however, no alternative was provided. We are not proposing to make any alterations to this ward, and we are confirming this ward as part of our final recommendations.

**Norbury & Pollards Hill and Norbury Park**

37. In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received seven submissions relating to these wards, one of which supported the draft recommendations. The other submissions all requested that the Norbury area be contained within one ward. However, this would result in a variance of 40%, significantly outside of what would be considered acceptable, and would also necessitate the redistribution of councillors across the borough. We do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify a change here.

38. We are proposing to make a minor alteration to the southern boundary of the proposed Norbury & Pollards Hill ward, to run the boundary along the centre of Strathyre Avenue; this is due to the alterations to the Bensham Manor ward (see paragraphs 41-44). Aside from this alteration, we are confirming these wards as part of our final recommendations.

**South Norwood and Thornton Heath**

39. We received four submissions relating directly to the proposed South Norwood and Thornton Heath wards. One of these submissions expressed concern over the inclusion of the park in South Norwood; however, no alternative was provided and we are therefore not proposing any alterations to the proposed South Norwood ward.

40. Three submissions were made in relation to the proposed Thornton Heath ward, all of which supported our draft recommendations. We are therefore confirming our proposed Thornton Heath ward as part of the final recommendations.
West Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensham Manor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selhurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Thornton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bensham Manor and West Thornton**

41 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 37 submissions relating to the three two-councillor wards initially proposed in this area – Bensham Manor East, Bensham Manor West and West Thornton. The submissions received came from local residents, local organisations and political groups. All of these submissions opposed the draft recommendations, and many put forward their support for a proposal based largely on the existing wards in this area.

42 The submission made by the Croydon Conservative Group proposed a significant change to the draft recommendations, moving back to an arrangement of two three-councillor wards that differ significantly from both the draft recommendations and the existing arrangements. However, this proposal was not backed up by any evidence of community identity, nor was it supported by any other respondents to the consultation. We have therefore decided not to adopt this scheme here.

43 A submission made by a group of six borough councillors, which was also submitted by the Labour Group and a number of others, proposed maintaining two three-councillor wards which are very similar to the existing warding arrangements in Bensham Manor and West Thornton. The submissions state that the two proposed three-councillor wards allow for the maintenance of community identity in the area; little evidence of the communities was provided, but we note the broad range of respondents supporting the proposals here.

44 We note that our draft recommendations were universally opposed and we are therefore persuaded to adopt an alternative warding pattern in this area. We have decided to recommend the existing ward boundaries in the Bensham Manor and West Thornton wards as part of our final recommendations. This would also impact on the neighbouring Broad Green ward; as part of the draft recommendations, we proposed transferring the cemetery into Broad Green. However, as part of the final recommendations, we propose that this area should remain in West Thornton, as in the existing arrangements. We consider that the existing arrangements provide for good electoral variances, and follow strong and identifiable boundaries that are recognised locally.

**Broad Green**

45 In addition to the submissions outlined above, which also have an impact on the proposed Broad Green ward, we received one other submission referring to this area. This submission requested that the area around Wandle Park be moved out of the proposed Waddon ward into the proposed Broad Green ward. However, access to the park lies predominantly to the south, and we do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify an alteration here.

46 The draft recommendations included the area north of Mitcham Road and west of Thornton Road, around the cemetery, in the proposed Broad Green ward. As part of the proposals outlined in paragraphs 41-44 this area will remain in West Thornton, and the area south of Campbell Road and west of Lodge Road will be included in the proposed Broad Green ward.
47 We consider that the Broad Green ward proposed as part of the final recommendations follows strong and identifiable boundaries, whilst allowing for good maintenance of community identities across this area of the borough.

Selhurst
48 We received four submissions that related directly to the Selhurst ward as proposed as part of the draft recommendations. The submissions requested that Selhurst either retain its existing boundaries or its three councillors. To retain the existing ward boundaries in Selhurst would result in a variance of 61%, and to allocate three councillors would require a substantial re-warding of the north of the borough. We do not feel that sufficient evidence has been received to justify this level of alteration here, and we are therefore confirming our proposed Selhurst ward as part of the final recommendations for Croydon.
### Ward name

<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>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiscombe West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill &amp; Whitgift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addiscombe East, Addiscombe West and Park Hill & Whitgift

We received 292 submissions regarding the Addiscombe and Park Hill areas of Croydon during the consultation on our draft recommendations. The majority of these submissions objected to the two Addiscombe wards put forward as part of the draft recommendations – Addiscombe West & Park Hill and Addiscombe East. The objections received centred around the fact that the Park Hill and Whitgift areas in the south are very different from the Addiscombe area in the north and should therefore not be combined with them.

The Labour Group put forward an alternative pattern of three wards for the areas, with boundaries that differed significantly to those proposed as draft recommendations. The arrangement for Addiscombe was proposed as two wards, using Addiscombe Road and the tramline as the southern boundary, and extending north to Bywood Avenue in the east. The submission proposed a ward in the south, covering the Park Hill and Whitgift areas, that would also cover part of Shirley. A number of submissions stated that they favoured the Labour proposal, but the majority of these referred only to their support for the two Addiscombe wards. The majority of respondents considered that the proposal put forward by the Labour Group reflected the Addiscombe community better than our draft recommendations. The submissions we received in support of this scheme put forward evidence of community links within the Addiscombe area, with regard to where residents shop, eat and socialise, as well as the number of active residential associations in the area. Respondents generally considered that Addiscombe Road is the boundary of Addiscombe.

Whilst we accept the strength of both the local feeling and the evidence with regard to the Addiscombe community, the proposal put forward by the Labour Group resulted in a variance of 34% for the proposed Addiscombe East ward, 25% for the proposed Addiscombe West ward and -26% for the proposed ward covering the Park Hill area. These variances are significantly outside of the levels considered as acceptable, and no compelling evidence was provided for the shape of the proposed southern ward, which would include parts of neighbouring communities.

However, given the evidence and support for revised Addiscombe wards, we are proposing alternative wards as part of our final recommendations to reflect the community evidence received from residents, local groups and councillors, alongside the Labour Group’s proposals. Our proposed wards are based on the proposals received, with a number of alterations to ensure that the wards provide a satisfactory level of electoral equality.

Our proposed Addiscombe West ward will include the area south of Northway Road, east of the main railway line and East Croydon station, west of the dismantled railway line and Clyde Road, and north of the A232.

Our proposed Addiscombe East ward will use Addiscombe Road as its southern boundary, and Shirley Road and Chaucer Green as its eastern boundary. The ward will include Ashburton Park, as we received convincing evidence from residents regarding the use of this park for various events by the Addiscombe community. We also received compelling evidence regarding Elgin Road, and the importance of the road remaining in the same ward as the other streets within the
HOME Residents’ Association – for this reason, Elgin Road will form the western edge of the proposed Addiscombe East ward. We looked in detail at the possibility of including the Shirley Park Road area in the proposed Addiscombe East ward, as we received a number of submissions on this area; however, this would result in a variance of 12%, and we do not consider that sufficiently compelling evidence was provided to justify this alteration to the eastern boundary of the ward.

55 In the south of this area, we are proposing a single-member Park Hill & Whitgift ward, encompassing the area south of Addiscombe Road and the A232. The ward will cover the Whitgift and Park Hill estates, areas that were referred to by a number of respondents as being separate from Addiscombe. This ward follows strong and identifiable boundaries; in addition to the northern boundary, mentioned above, the proposed ward is bounded in the west by the railway line, and in the south by Coombe Road. The eastern boundary remains the same as proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

56 Our final recommendations are for a two-councillor Addiscombe East ward, a three-councillor Addiscombe West ward and a single-councillor Park Hill & Whitgift ward. We consider that these wards take into account the evidence received during the consultation, and reflect our statutory criteria.

**Shirley North and Shirley South**

57 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 15 comments on the proposed Shirley wards. Of these, 10 supported the draft recommendations, stating that the proposed wards reflected the cohesiveness and the uniqueness of the Shirley area. Other submissions focused on the Shirley Park Road area, and requested that it be included in Addiscombe East; however, as referenced in paragraph 54, this would result in a variance outside of what is considered acceptable. We are proposing to include Ashburton Park and Chaucer Green in Addiscombe East ward, as a result of evidence received. Aside from this alteration to the north of Shirley North, we are confirming both Shirley North and Shirley South as part of our final recommendations.

**Woodside**

58 We received four submissions relating to the proposed Woodside ward. These submissions referred to Canal Walk, and put forward evidence that the whole of Canal Walk should be located in Woodside; the draft recommendations split the road between Addiscombe West and Woodside. We consider that moving Canal Walk allows for better access, and are therefore making this alteration.
Central Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Croydon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fairfield**

59 We received five submissions that related directly to this ward, all of which expressed their support for the proposed boundaries. The name proposed for this ward, which covers the commercial centre of Croydon, at the draft recommendations stage was ‘Central’. However, all the submissions about this ward expressed a view that this name was too impersonal, and three of the submissions proposed Fairfield as a name more representative of the area. We consider that good evidence was provided to support this name change, and we are proposing to adopt the name Fairfield as part of the final recommendations.

**South Croydon**

60 We received 46 submissions referring, wholly or in part, to the proposed South Croydon ward. These submissions focused on two distinct areas – the south-east of the ward, at the boundary with Sanderstead, and the south-west of the ward, at the boundary with Waddon.

61 With regard to the boundary with Sanderstead, the submissions received requested that the Essenden Road area be transferred from the Sanderstead ward into the South Croydon ward. The evidence provided centred around the community identity of residents who consider themselves to be part of South Croydon. This alteration also provides for improved levels of electoral equality for both the Sanderstead and South Croydon wards. The proposed alteration will include the area north of Essenden Road in the South Croydon ward. We consider that this proposal is an improvement to our draft recommendations and we are proposing to include it as part of our final recommendations.

62 With regard to the boundary with Waddon, we received a number of submissions regarding the Pampisford Road area, stating that this area identifies strongly with the South Croydon area, rather than with Waddon. Transferring the lower part of Haling Park Road, Pampisford Road and the surrounding streets into South Croydon also improved the electoral variance in both South Croydon and Waddon. For these reasons, we are proposing to make this alteration as part of the final recommendations.

63 A number of submissions requested that the entirety of the area south of Warham Road, including Whitgift School, should be included in the proposed South Croydon ward. However, this would have a negative effect on the electoral equality of both wards and we are not persuaded that the evidence justifies this. We are therefore not proposing to make an alteration here.

**Waddon**

64 We received 31 submissions that related, wholly or in part, to the proposed Waddon ward. Support was given in a number of submissions to the northern boundary of the Waddon ward, and we are not proposing any changes here.

65 As mentioned above, we received a number of submissions regarding the Pampisford Road area, stating that this area identifies strongly with the South Croydon area, rather than with Waddon. Transferring this area also improved the electoral variance in both South Croydon and Waddon. For these reasons, we are proposing to make this alteration as part of the final recommendations.
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>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Addington South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderstead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</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>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Addington North and New Addington South**
66 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations for the New Addington wards, we received two submissions. Both submissions were generally supportive of the proposed wards, but requested that the boundary between the wards be amended to include the entirety of the historic Boot’s Estate in New Addington South, by including the whole of Wolsey Crescent. This alteration was also suggested in both the Conservative and Labour responses to the consultation.

67 While we accept that the alteration will affect the electoral equality in both wards – New Addington North will change from -6% to -9% and New Addington South will change from -6% to -2% – we consider that the evidence provided is persuasive with regard to the identity of the area. We are therefore including this alteration as part of our final recommendations.

**Sanderstead**
68 We received 14 submissions directly relating to the proposed Sanderstead ward during the consultation on the draft recommendations. The submissions were generally supportive of the recommendations, but proposed a minor alteration in the north, at the boundary with the proposed South Croydon ward.

69 The submissions requested an alteration that would transfer the Essenden Road area from the proposed Sanderstead ward into the proposed South Croydon ward, as described in paragraph 61. As the change would allow for community identities in the area to be better reflected, and would improve the electoral variances in both wards, we are proposing to include this alteration as part of the final recommendations.

**Selsdon & Addington Village and Selsdon Vale & Forestdale**
70 We received 11 submissions directly relating to the proposed Selsdon & Addington Village and Selsdon Vale & Forestdale wards. Of these, 10 submissions were positive, and supported the proposed wards, on the basis that they reflected the communities in the area. One submission requested that the Bishops Walk area be moved into a Shirley ward; however, we do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify an alteration. We are therefore confirming our wards here as final.
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 Coulson
71 We received 10 submissions relating to our proposed Coulson wards during the consultation on the draft recommendations. Eight of these submissions were positive about the proposed wards, and a number requested the same two minor alterations that do not affect any electors. These changes were focused on the Ullswater Industrial Estate and the Coulsdon Memorial Ground. Respondents requested that the entirety of Ullswater Crescent and Breakfield be united in the Coulsdon Town ward; this alteration does not affect any electors, and keeps the industrial estate in one ward. We are proposing to make this alteration as part of our final recommendations.

72 With regard to Coulsdon Memorial Ground, the submissions requested that it be moved in its entirety into the proposed Old Coulsdon ward. One respondent explained that the Memorial Ground is the responsibility of the Bowls Club, located in Old Coulsdon ward. We consider that the evidence provided to make this minor alteration was sufficient, and we are therefore proposing to make this alteration.

73 Subject to these two minor alterations, we are confirming both the Coulsdon Town and Old Coulsdon wards as part of our final recommendations.

Kenley
74 We received five submissions regarding the proposed Kenley ward. Three of these supported our draft recommendations, stating that the proposals accurately reflected the area. One submission requested that the Foxley Wood boundary in the north of the ward be amended; however, the boundary used as part of the draft recommendations follows a strong feature here, and we do not consider that sufficient evidence was received to merit a change.

75 One submission agreed with the recommendations, but expressed disappointment that the ward was only to be represented by two councillors rather than three. However, if Kenley was to have three councillors, this would result in a variance of -32%, and would also necessitate significant re-warding elsewhere in order to redistribute councillors across the borough. We do not propose to make any alterations here. We are therefore confirming our draft Kenley ward as part of the final recommendations.

Purley & Woodcote and Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown
76 In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 41 submissions, of which 38 supported our draft recommendations for Purley. One submission requested that the entirety of the area covered by a Purley postcode be included in a Purley ward; however, no evidence was provided. One submission, from a residents’ association, put forward evidence that Riddlesdown Collegiate should be moved from the Sanderstead ward into the Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown ward, due to the only direct access to the school lying wholly within the Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown ward. We consider that this change would be beneficial to maintaining community identity, and does not affect any electors. We are therefore proposing to make this change. We are also proposing to move two properties at the end of Culmington Road from Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown to South Croydon to maintain access. Subject to these alterations, we are confirming the proposed Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown ward as part of the final recommendations.
We are not proposing to make any alterations to the proposed Purley & Woodcote ward. A number of respondents suggested that the Dunmail Drive area be moved into Purley & Woodcote from the neighbouring Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown ward; however, no evidence was provided to justify an alteration here. We are therefore confirming the Purley & Woodcote ward as part of the final recommendations.
Conclusions

78 The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2016 and 2022 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of electoral arrangements</th>
<th>Final recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>3,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final recommendation
Croydon Borough Council should be made up of 70 councillors serving 28 wards representing one single-councillor ward, 12 two-councillor wards and 15 three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping
Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Croydon Borough Council. You can also view our final recommendations for Croydon on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk
3 What happens next?

79 We have now completed our review of Croydon Borough Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2018.

Equalities

80 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

Final recommendations for Croydon Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2016)</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>2</td>
<td>8,463</td>
<td>4,232</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Addiscombe West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>11,784</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bensham Manor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,141</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Broad Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,215</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13,175</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 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>6 Crystal Palace &amp; Upper Norwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,261</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>11,816</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Fairfield</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>8 Kenley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 New Addington North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 New Addington South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,641</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Norbury &amp; Pollards Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,295</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2016)</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>12 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>13 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>14 Park Hill &amp; Whitgift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>8%</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>11,975</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td>4,088</td>
<td>1%</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>11,597</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11,933</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>-1%</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>11,461</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>1%</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>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2016)</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>26 Waddon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,527</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,047</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 West Thornton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,688</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11,929</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>264,151</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,774</strong></td>
<td><strong>281,944</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,028</strong></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

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

Political Group

• Croydon Conservative Group
• Croydon Council Labour Group
• Croydon South Labour Party
• Thornton Heath Labour Party
• UKIP Croydon

Councillors

• Bensham Manor & West Thornton Councillor Group
• Councillor H. Ali
• Councillor J. Audsley
• Councillor J. Bains
• Councillor S. Bashford
• Councillor S. Bashford
• Councillor S. Bennett
• Councillor M. Bird
• Councillor C. Bonner
• Councillor S. Brew
• Councillor A. Butler (two submissions)
• Councillor J. Buttinger
• Councillor R. Canning
• Councillor R. Chatterjee
• Councillor S. Chowdhury
• Councillor L. Clancy
• Councillor M. Creatura
• Councillor J. Cummings
• Councillor M. Fisher
• Councillor S. Fitzsimons
• Councillor M. Gatland
• Councillor T. Godfrey
• Councillor L. Hale
• Councillor S. Hall
• Councillor P. Hay-Justice
• Councillor M. Henson
• Councillor S. Hollands
• Councillor Y. Hopley
• Councillor S. Khan (two submissions)
• Councillor T. Letts OBE
• Councillor O. Lewis
• Councillor S. Mann
• Councillor V. Mohan
• Councillor M. Neal
• Councillor T. Newman
• Councillor S. O’Connell
• Councillor A. Pelling
• Councillor J. Perry (two submissions)
• Councillor J. Prince
• Councillor B. Quadir
• Councillor H. Pollard
• Councillor T. Pollard
• Councillor A. Rendle
• Councillor P. Scott
• Councillor M. Shahul-Hameed
• Councillor D. Speakman (two submissions)
• Councillor A. Stranack
• Councillor P. Thomas
• Councillor S. Winborn
• Councillor D. Wood
• Councillor L. Woodley (two submissions)
• Councillor C. Wright
• Councillor C. Young

Member of Parliament

• Mr G. Barwell MP
• Mr C. Philp MP
• Mr S. Reed OBE MP

Local Organisations

• Addington Village Residents’ Association
• Addiscombe & Shirley Park Residents’ Association
• Bishops Walk Residents’ Association
• CHASE Residents’ Association
• Croydon Lions
• Croydon Mosque & Islamic Centre (two submissions)
• East Coulsdon Residents’ Association
• East Croydon Community Organisation
• Friends of Selsdon Wood
• Hartley & District Residents’ Association
• HOME Residents’ Association
• Kenley & District Residents’ Association
• Park Hill Residents’ Association
• Purley & Woodcote Residents’ Association
• Riddlesdown Residents’ Association
• Sanderstead Residents’ Association (two submissions)
• Selsdon Residents’ Association
• Thornton Heath Neighbourhood Association
• West Thornton Residents’ Association
• Whitgift Estate (East Croydon) Residents’ Association

Local Residents

• 370 local residents
# Appendix D

## Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council size</td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</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>Electoral fairness</td>
<td>When one elector's vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral inequality</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>Electorate</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>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-represented</td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</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>Parish council</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>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</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>Parish ward</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>Town council</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>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</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>