

**Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.533**

Review of Electoral Arrangements

INNER LONDON

EDUCATION AUTHORITY

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 533

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN Mr G J Ellerton CMG MBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr J G Powell FRICS FSVA

MEMBERS Lady Ackner

Mr G R Prentice

Professor G E Cherry

Mr K J L Newell

Mr B Scholes OBE

TO THE RT HON DOUGLAS HURD MP
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
INNER LONDON EDUCATION AUTHORITY

BACKGROUND

1. Part III of the Local Government Act 1985 provided for the establishment of a new Inner London Education Authority. Under the provisions of the 1985 Act members of the new authority were to be directly elected. The first elections were to take place in 1986 and every fourth year thereafter. The initial elections held on 8 May 1986 were for 58 members, two for each of the existing parliamentary constituencies in inner London. We were required under the Act to complete a review of the new Inner London Education Authority's electoral divisions so that second and subsequent elections could be held on the basis of single member divisions. The criteria to be observed in preparing a scheme of representation were set out in Part II of Schedule 9 to the 1985 Act.

2. We decided to approach the review in a manner similar to that in which we carried out electoral reviews of districts and counties under the Local Government Act 1972. We consulted the Inner London Education Authority and the appropriate local authority associations about our intention and received no other suggestion.

3. The 1985 Act established an Inner London Interim Education Authority to prepare matters for the new Authority coming into existence by direct elections in May 1986. In a joint consultation letter dated 12 September 1985, we informed both the Inner London Education Authority and the Inner London Interim Authority, because of their co-existence at that time, that we proposed to conduct the

review, and invited them to submit to us, in collaboration, a single draft scheme of representation for the Inner London Education Area by 12 February 1986. In our letter we indicated our intention to seek at a later stage in the review the views of the Inner London Education Authority to be elected in May 1986. Copies of our letter were sent to all Inner London Borough Councils and the Town Clerk of the Common Council of the City of London, to the MPs representing the constituencies concerned, to the headquarters of the main political parties and to the editors of national and local newspapers circulating in the area, and of the local government press. Notices in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.

4. On 24 February 1986 the Inner London Education Authority and the Inner London Interim Education Authority submitted to us a draft scheme in which they suggested 58 electoral divisions for the Inner London Education Area, each returning one member. At the same time they sent us comments which they had received on the scheme; we also received some comments direct.

DRAFT PROPOSALS

5. We examined the draft scheme, a copy of which is attached, together with the views expressed on it. We first considered the appropriate size of the Authority. Part II of Schedule 9 to the Local Government Act 1985 provides that the number of members of the Inner London Education Authority shall be not less than 48 or more than 58. The draft scheme proposed 58 members; this is the maximum allowed by the Act, and is also the number of members elected at the initial elections in May 1986, which were based on two members for each Parliamentary constituency in the Inner London Education Authority area. The

Inner London Education Authority argued that there would need to be very strong reasons to depart from this figure. They pointed out that the Authority was the largest Local Education Authority in the country in terms both of the population served and of the wide variety of educational institutions provided. They stressed that the Inner London Education Area suffered from acute social and educational problems, to the relief of which many of their services and initiatives were directed. They considered, therefore, that there was a continuing need for an Authority of at least the same size when elections were held in 1990 and thereafter.

6. We took the view that an Authority with 58 elected members was not unreasonable given the scale of the Inner London Education Authority's operations, particularly when compared with the sizes of other large local education authorities in England, the problems of which could hardly match those of the Inner London Education Authority in scope and complexity. We were prepared, therefore, to accept an authority size of 58 when formulating our draft proposals.

7. We looked carefully at the draft scheme against the criteria set down in Part II of Schedule 9 to the Act. We noted that it would produce a reasonable degree of electoral equality; that it deliberately avoided crossing ward boundaries; and that it had been prepared taking account of local ties. We therefore concluded that overall the scheme represented a satisfactory basis for our own draft proposals.

8. We issued our draft proposals on 29 May 1985. These incorporated in large part the former Authorities' draft scheme, subject to certain modifications, the aim of which was to produce a better standard of representation and to adopt for some divisions names which were likely to mean more to the electorate of those divisions. We also considered that in those instances where the name of a division included a point of the compass, the name of the borough should be prefixed. Our modifications were:-

a. Borough of Greenwich

The renaming of all divisions in the draft scheme as follows:-

Bostall	to	Woolwich East
College	to	Greenwich West
River	to	Woolwich West
Central	to	Greenwich Central
Rochester Way	to	Greenwich East
Eltham Palace	to	Eltham

b. Borough of Hackney

The renaming of the North West division as Hackney North West

c. Borough of Islington

The addition of the prefix Islington to all four divisions

d. Borough of Lambeth

The adoption of an alternative scheme of representation to provide a better electoral balance.

e. Borough of Lewisham

- (i) the adoption of an alternative scheme of representation, again to provide a better electoral balance; and
- (ii) the use of the name Lewisham as a prefix instead of as a suffix in all divisions

f. Borough of Southwark

The renaming of the West division as East Dulwich

g. Borough of Wandsworth

the renaming of:-

- (i) the North Clapham division as Battersea South; and
- (ii) the East division as Wandsworth East.

h. City of Westminster and City of London

- (i) the replacement of the proposed Oxford Street division, and the City of London and Westminster Riverside division, with an alternative arrangement of two divisions to provide a better electoral balance; and
- (ii) the adoption of the names City of London and Oxford Street and Pimlico and Belgravia, for those alternative divisions.

9. Our draft proposals were sent to the newly elected Inner London Education Authority and to all those who had received our consultation letter or commented on the former Authorities' draft scheme. Notices were inserted in the local press announcing that our draft proposals had been issued and could be inspected at the offices of the Inner London Education Authority or at the main office of any of the Inner London Borough Councils or the Common Council of the City of London.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT PROPOSALS

10. We received comments in response to our draft proposals from the Inner London Education Authority, five borough councils, 22 political organisations, four Members of Parliament, Thamesmead Town Limited and one private individual.

11. The comments we received can be summarised as follows:-

(a) Borough of Camden

Sir Geoffrey Finsberg MP and Camden Conservative Committee supported the draft proposals for the Hampstead Heath and West

Hampstead divisions. Holborn and St Pancras Conservative Association and Camden Conservative Committee objected to the draft proposals for the Kentish Town and Euston divisions and submitted an alternative arrangement. They considered that the alternative gave a better balance on existing electorates, with no significant alteration to that balance likely in their view in the next five years. They were of the opinion that it would create more compact divisions. They also considered that the arrangement would confirm well-established and acknowledged local boundaries.

(b) Borough of Greenwich

- (i) the Inner London Education Authority suggested that the Eltham and Greenwich Central divisions be renamed Eltham South and Eltham North respectively, pointing out that the former Education Authorities' proposals had avoided using names which duplicated those of wards or parliamentary constituencies. Therefore, they considered that the two divisions in the Eltham parliamentary constituency should be referred to by reference to points of the compass.
- (ii) Woolwich and Eltham Labour Party suggested that the Eltham and Greenwich Central divisions be renamed Eltham East and Eltham West respectively, to ensure consistency within the overall pattern of names that had been used for the borough.
- (iii) Greenwich Borough Council objected to the name of the Greenwich Central division because it was also that of a parliamentary constituency with which it did not share the same boundaries. They suggested that it should be named Central.

(iv) Thamesmead Town Limited objected to the draft proposals because the Thamesmead development would be split between the Woolwich East and Woolwich West divisions. They were opposed to this split, pointing out that the philosophy behind the concept of Thamesmead Town was that it should develop into a single balanced community. They suggested that the part of Glyndon ward situated in Thamesmead be transferred to the Woolwich East division, making all of the town within the borough wholly within one division.

(v) We consulted the Inner London Education Authority and Greenwich Borough Council about this suggestion. We also received comments on it from the Woolwich and Eltham Labour Party. All opposed the suggestion made by Thamesmead Town Limited. The Inner London Education Authority referred to advice given by the Members' Working Party at the start of the review that in their view it was important to retain ward boundaries intact. Greenwich Borough Council and Woolwich and Eltham Labour Party pointed out that responsibility was already split between two education authorities: the Inner London Education Authority for that part of Thamesmead in Greenwich, and Bexley Borough Council for the remainder.

(c) Borough of Hackney

(i) Hackney Conservative Associations objected to the draft proposals and submitted an alternative scheme for four of the five divisions in the borough. They considered that the draft proposals were unacceptable because of the variation in size between the smallest and largest divisions. They also

considered that it was possible that the disparity would worsen because of Council action to stop overcrowding in an area in the smallest division, and also an increase of population in the largest division because of new housing.

- (ii) We consulted the Inner London Education Authority and Hackney Borough Council about the suggestion. The Inner London Education Authority objected to the alternative scheme, pointing out that the Stamford Hill, Hackney Downs and South East Hackney were all relatively narrow east to west divisions which ran right across the borough. They conceded that the electoral balance in the alternative scheme was better than the draft proposals but this seemed to be outweighed by the adverse effect of the alternative on community ties. Hackney Borough Council preferred the draft proposals because they defined areas which were socially and geographically coherent whereas in their view the alternative scheme did not give sufficient weight to community ties.

(d) Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

- (i) The Inner London Education Authority suggested that the Hammersmith North and Fulham South divisions be renamed Hammersmith and Fulham, since there were no other divisions in the borough with names including compass point references.
- (ii) Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Council and Hammersmith and Fulham Conservative Association objected to the provision in the draft proposals of three divisions for the borough; both submitted an identical scheme for four divisions. The Borough Council opposed the reduction from the present

level of representation that would result from our draft proposals. The Conservative Association agreed with a recommendation made by the Finance and General Purposes Committee of the previous Council which was that if the ILEA membership were fixed between 48 and 53 the borough would be adequately represented by three members, but on the basis of the scheme for 58 members the three divisions in the borough would each have an electorate in excess of 30,000. The Committee had considered that the borough would thus be significantly under-represented.

(e) Borough of Islington

The Inner London Education Authority and Mr Chris Smith MP suggested that Islington South East division be renamed Islington South East and Finsbury, because of the distinguished local history and associations of the former borough of Finsbury.

(f) Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Kensington Conservative Association objected to the provision in the draft proposals of three divisions for the borough and considered that there should be four, so that the borough would continue to have four representatives as under the existing arrangement.

(g) Borough of Lambeth

(i) The Inner London Education Authority objected to the draft proposals and stated that it had been the view of the former Authorities that it was necessary to respect parliamentary boundaries. They considered that the draft scheme was preferable to the draft proposals.

(ii) Lambeth Borough Council objected to the draft proposals and supported the draft scheme submitted by the former education authorities. They objected on the grounds that the Commission had not taken account of the rules that regard must be had to the desirability of fixing boundaries which are, and will remain, easily identifiable, and to any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary. The Borough Council noted that, with regard to the Brixton, Clapham Common and West Norwood divisions, the boundaries crossed parliamentary constituency boundaries which were well established. They also gave examples where the draft proposals had little or no regard to existing community patterns within the borough. The Borough Council pointed out that parliamentary constituency boundaries were required to, and did, reflect the community patterns within the borough. They also considered the names proposed to be particularly inappropriate in some cases and supported the names suggested by the former education authorities in their draft scheme. The Borough Council noted that the draft proposals provided to some extent a more equitable balance of electorate but considered that the damage done to communities by taking divisions across parliamentary constituency boundaries, thereby splitting those communities and the local ties within them, could not be justified by the minimal advantages achieved in electoral equality. Thornton Ward Labour Party, Vauxhall Labour Party, and Lambeth Labour Party Local Government Committee, supported the objections made by Lambeth Borough Council.

- (iii) Norwood Labour Party objected to the draft proposals as they considered that the former Inner London Education Authorities' draft scheme met the objectives set out in Schedule 9 to the 1985 Act, and kept intact local ties.
- (iv) Streatham Labour Party, the South St. Leonards Branch of the Streatham Labour Party, and Streatham Wells Ward Labour Party all supported the draft proposals. Streatham Wells Ward Labour Party objected to the name of the Streatham Spa division in the Inner London Education Authorities' draft scheme and stated that if this scheme were adopted the division should be named Lambeth South West. The Lambeth Conservative Co-ordinating Committee and the Streatham Conservative Association supported the draft proposals and suggested that the West Norwood division be renamed Lambeth South East. The SDP/Liberal Alliance Group on Lambeth Council supported the draft proposals for the north of the borough but had reservations about the Streatham area. They suggested a revised grouping of wards for one division.
- (v) A private individual suggested that the Waterloo division be renamed Kennington and Waterloo, in order to give a more accurate description of the area contained within its boundaries.

(h) Borough of Lewisham

- (i) Mr John Maples MP suggested that the Whitefoot ward be excluded from the Lewisham South division and the St Andrew ward from the Lewisham North East division

substituted. He stated that when proposals for a directly elected Inner London Education Authority were announced the first election was to be based on parliamentary constituencies and he considered this was a fundamental principle, to be maintained in the new arrangements by dividing each parliamentary constituency in two. West Lewisham Conservative Association fully supported Mr Maples's suggestion.

- (ii) East Lewisham Conservative Association objected to the draft proposals for the Lewisham Central and Lewisham South divisions, on the grounds that one of them was unnecessarily larger than the other, and submitted an alternative arrangement which involved exchanging the Blythe Hill and Rushey Green wards between the two divisions. They also considered that the exchange would produce two divisions which were more homogeneous in nature. They further suggested alternative names for all six divisions in the borough, which they claimed would provide some meaning in terms of local features. They stated that if their alternative scheme was unacceptable they would support the draft proposals. The Lewisham-Deptford Conservative Association forwarded the same re-arrangement for two divisions, and name changes for all divisions, citing the same grounds
- (iii) We consulted the Inner London Education Authority and Lewisham Borough Council about these suggestions. The Inner London Education Authority objected to the alternative.

arrangement submitted by East Lewisham Conservative Association although they conceded that it would slightly improve the electoral balance. They considered that there was little evidence to show that under the new arrangement there would be significantly strengthened community links.

- (iv) Lewisham Borough Council also objected to the alternative arrangement. They reminded us that in the draft proposals there were only two divisions which did not contain wards wholly within an individual parliamentary constituency, adding that this had been done to achieve electoral balance. The Council pointed out that the number would increase to three if the alternative were adopted, and that the division affected would comprise wards from three parliamentary constituencies. They also challenged the claim that the exchange of the wards between the two divisions would produce divisions which were more homogeneous in nature. They further objected to the Conservative Association's suggested names for all six divisions in the borough, adding that they had proposed names by geographical association to avoid further confusion for the electorate.

(i) Borough of Southwark

- (i) Southwark Borough Council objected to the draft proposals and submitted an alternative scheme. They considered that the draft proposals possibly did not produce the most equitable distribution of electorate, nor fully reflect

the distribution of different communities in the borough, and did not appear to conform fully to the Commission's guidelines for defining electoral areas. Their principal reason for devising their alternative scheme was that the electorates would be closer to what they called the target quota. Also, it would reflect local communities (defined in terms of household characteristics, economic status and wealth) at least as well if not better than our draft proposals. They considered that their divisions would be more clearly focused on the main centres of activity.

- (iii) Southwark and Bermondsey Conservative Association supported in principle the splitting of the Southwark and Bermondsey parliamentary constituency but pointed out that one ward would be excluded, and one ward from another constituency would be included, in one of the divisions.

(j) Borough of Tower Hamlets

- (i) Bethnal Green and Stepney Labour Party objected to the draft proposals for the Bethnal Green and Stepney divisions and suggested an alternative arrangement for two divisions. They considered that the draft proposals did not reflect the natural communities which existed in the area. They were concerned about the special needs of the Bangladeshi residents and considered that their alternative arrangement would allow the member "to develop strategies more responsive to the needs of the Bengali community."

(k) Borough of Wandsworth

- (i) Wandsworth Borough Council objected to the draft proposals on the grounds of the disparity in the size of the electorates; that the boundary between the Putney Heath and Park divisions was unnatural and meaningless, and that the names of some divisions were inappropriate. The Borough Council called for a local inquiry to hear representations on the objections it raised.
- (ii) Putney Conservative Association submitted an alternative arrangement, to replace the Putney Heath and Park divisions by two divisions named Elliott and Southfields. They claimed that under their arrangement there would be a natural boundary between the two divisions, as opposed to that in the draft proposals which they considered to be untidy and meaningless. Wandsworth Conservative Group supported Putney Conservative Association's arrangement for two divisions, but preferred that there should be six divisions in the borough, respecting existing parliamentary constituency boundaries. They considered that some of the names of the divisions in the draft proposals were inappropriate and suggested that the Battersea South division be renamed either Clapham Junction or Wandsworth Town, and that the Wandsworth East division be renamed Clapham South. They called for a public inquiry into the draft proposals.
- (iii) We consulted the Inner London Education Authority and Wandsworth Borough Council on the Conservative Association's suggestion. The Inner London Education

Authority and Wandsworth Borough Council supported the alternative arrangement to replace the Putney Heath and Park divisions suggested by Putney Conservative Association. The Inner London Education Authority suggested that the name Southfields for one of the divisions should be avoided because of possible confusion with the Southfield ward.

(1) City of Westminster and City of London

Mr John Wheeler MP suggested that the Westbourne Green division be renamed either Paddington, thus preserving the name of the former borough, or alternatively, Bayswater, which would have more meaning for local people. The Cities of London and Westminster Conservative Association suggested that the City of London and Oxford Street division should be named City of London and Marble Arch.

FINAL PROPOSALS

12. We have come to the following conclusions taking into consideration all the comments we received on our draft proposals. We also took note of a formal objection put to us by Ms. Harriet Harman MP to the Authorities' draft scheme so far as it applied to the parliamentary constituency of Peckham which lies within the borough of Southwark.

(a) Borough of Camden

The alternative arrangement for the Kentish Town and Euston divisions devised by the Holborn and St Pancras Conservative Association, and the Camden Conservative Committee, would produce an inferior standard of representation compared with our draft proposals, and did not appear to have any advantages in any other respects. We have therefore concluded that we should adhere to our draft proposals for this borough.

(b) Borough of Greenwich

The suggestion made by Thamesmead Town Limited to bring the whole of the Thamesmead development in Greenwich within the Woolwich East division would split the Glyndon borough ward between two divisions. There was strong opposition to it for this reason. It was also pointed out that the Thamesmead development was already split between two education authorities, the London Borough of Bexley and ILEA. We were nevertheless mindful of the imminence of our review of the boundaries of London boroughs, which could itself have implications for ward boundaries and the pattern of ILEA divisions in the area of Thamesmead. We decided therefore to adhere to our draft proposals except to rename the Eltham and Greenwich Central divisions, Eltham East and Eltham West respectively, as suggested by Woolwich and Eltham Labour Party.

(c) Borough of Hackney

Although the alternative scheme devised by Hackney Conservative Associations provided for some improvement in electoral equality, it did not seem to be as soundly based where community ties were concerned as did our draft proposals. We concluded that in this instance community ties were the more important consideration and that we should adhere to our draft proposals.

(d) Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

We considered the requests made by Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Council, and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservative Association, that the number of divisions for the borough be increased from three to four. On the basis of a total membership of 58, for the authority we were satisfied that the borough had been allocated the correct

number. We decided to adhere to our draft proposals, other than to rename the Hammersmith North and Fulham South divisions, Hammersmith and Fulham respectively as suggested by the Inner London Education Authority.

(e) Borough of Islington

There have been no objections to our draft proposals and we have therefore decided to adhere to them apart from renaming the Islington South East division, Islington South East and Finsbury, as suggested by the Inner London Education Authority and Mr Chris Smith MP.

(f) Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

We have considered the argument put forward by the Kensington Conservative Association to increase the number of divisions in the borough from three to four. As in the case of Hammersmith and Fulham we were satisfied that the borough had been allocated the correct number. We have therefore decided to adhere to our draft proposals.

(g) Borough of Lambeth

One of the objections to our draft proposals was on the grounds that they crossed parliamentary boundaries and thereby broke local ties. We were aware however, that our draft proposals had the advantage of eliminating the smallest division in the Inner London Education Authority's draft scheme thereby promoting greater electoral equality. We took the view that equality of representation was of more importance than the arguments about local ties. We have therefore decided to adhere to our draft proposals, but to rename the Waterloo division, Kennington and Waterloo, as suggested by a private individual.

(h)

Borough of Lewisham

In order to accommodate the suggestion made by Mr John Maples MP, it would be necessary to have a rearrangement which would also involve the Lewisham East division, resulting in a slight deterioration in the standard of representation. We noted the argument put forward that we should have regard to parliamentary constituency boundaries but this is not one of the statutory criteria. We decided not to adopt this suggestion. While the suggestion submitted by East Lewisham Conservative Association would improve the standard of representation, the Borough Council had submitted a detailed case to show that the suggestion would not produce two more divisions which were, as had been claimed, homogeneous but would in fact weaken local ties. We concluded that the Borough Council had put forward a convincing counter argument and decided to adhere to the draft proposals.

(i)

Borough of Southwark

We noted that the alternative scheme suggested by Southwark Borough Council would produce an inferior standard of representation compared with our draft proposals which were based on an original scheme devised by the Council for the Inner London Education Authority. We were not convinced by the arguments put forward in the alternative scheme about social and community identities. We have therefore concluded that we should adhere to our draft proposals.

Ms. ~~Barriet~~ Harman MP had asked us to notify her of the appropriate stage to make objections; we did so but she did not add any specific reasons for her own objection.

(j) Borough of Tower Hamlets

We noted that the alternative arrangement devised by the Bethnal Green and Stepney Labour Party was said to cater for the special needs of the Bangladeshi community, but there had not been a similar request from the Inner London Education Authority, the Borough Council, or, indeed from the community itself. In the circumstances we have therefore decided to adhere to our draft proposals.

(k) Borough of Wandsworth

(i) We noted that there was support from both the Inner London Education Authority and Wandsworth Borough Council for the alternative scheme for two divisions suggested by Putney Conservative Association, and that it offered a significant improvement in terms of community ties. We decided to adopt it for our final proposals. In view of the comment made by the Inner London Education Authority that there could be confusion with the name of Southfield Ward, we decided that the division should be named Wandle to reflect the name of a local feature, the River Wandle.

(ii) We also decided to adopt the suggestion made by Wandsworth Conservative Group to rename the Battersea South and Wandsworth East divisions, Clapham Junction and Clapham South, respectively.

(l) City of Westminster and City of London

There have been no objections to our draft proposals and we have therefore decided to adhere to these but to rename the Westbourne Green Division, Paddington, as suggested by Mr John Wheeler JP MP and to rename the City of London

and Oxford Street division, City of London and West End, which we considered a more accurate description of the area comprising that division.

13. We accordingly confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals for all boroughs in the Inner London Education Area subject to:-

- (i) in the borough of Greenwich, the renaming of the Eltham and the Greenwich Central divisions, Eltham East and Eltham West respectively (paragraph 12(b));
- (ii) in the borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the renaming of the Hammersmith North and Fulham South divisions, Hammersmith and Fulham respectively (paragraph 12(d));
- (iii) in the borough of Islington, the renaming of the Islington South East division, Islington South East and Finsbury (paragraph 12(e));
- (iv) in the borough of Lambeth, the renaming of the Waterloo division, Kennington and Waterloo (paragraph 12(g));
- (v) in the borough of Wandsworth, the adoption of an arrangement for two divisions to replace the Putney Heath and Park divisions to be named Elliott and Wandle, and the renaming of the Battersea South and Wandsworth East divisions, Clapham Junction, and Clapham South, respectively (paragraph 12(k));
- (vi) in the City of Westminster and the City of London, the renaming of the Westbourne Green, and City of London and Oxford Street divisions, Paddington, and City of London and West End, respectively (paragraph 12(l)).

14. Details of our final proposals are set out in Schedule 1 to this report. A map illustrating the boundaries of the proposed electoral divisions will be submitted with this report.

PUBLICATION

15. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report and map are being sent to the Inner London Education Authority and will be available for inspection at the Authority's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter, including all inner London boroughs and the Common Council of the City Council, and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed: G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

J G POWELL (Deputy Chairman)

JOAN ACKNER

PROFESSOR G E CHERRY

K J L NEWELL

G R PRENTICE

BRIAN SCHOLES

S T GARRISH

Secretary

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

INNER LONDON EDUCATION AREA - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

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

BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

HAMPSTEAD HEATH ED

The Camden Borough Wards of Belsize

Fitzjohn's

Frogna

Hampstead Town

Highgate

South End

WEST HAMPSTEAD ED

The Camden Borough Wards of Adelaide

Fortune Green

Kilburn

Priory

Swiss Cottage

West End

KENTISH TOWN ED

The Camden Borough Wards of Castlehaven

Caversham

Chalk Farm

Gospel Oak

Grafton

Regents Park

St John's

EUSTON ED

The Camden Borough Wards of Bloomsbury

Brunswick

Camden

Holborn

King's Cross

St Pancras

Somers Town

BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

WOOLWICH EAST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Abbey Wood

Eynsham

Lakedale

St Nicholas

Thamesmead Moorings

GREENWICH WEST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Rectory Field

St Alfege

Trafalgar

Vanbrugh

West

WOOLWICH WEST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Arsenal

Burrage

Glyndon

Plumstead Common

St Marys

Shrewsbury

Slade

Woolwich Common

ELTHAM WEST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Herbert

Middle Park

Nightingale

Sherard

Sutcliffe

Well Hall

GREENWICH EAST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Blackheath

Charlton

Ferrier

Hornfair

Kidbrooke

ELTHAM EAST ED

The Greenwich Borough Wards of Avery Hill

Coldharbour

Deansfield

Eltham Park

New Eltham

Palace

Tarn

BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

UPPER CLAPTON ED

The Hackney Borough Wards of Eastdown

Leabridge

Northwold

Springfield

HACKNEY NORTH WEST ED

The Hackney Borough Wards of Brownswood

New River

Northfield

North Defoe

SHACKLEWELL ED

The Hackney Borough Wards of Clissold

Dalston

Rectory

South Defoe

Westdown

HACKNEY MARSH AND HOMERTON ED

The Hackney Borough Wards of Chatham

Homerton

Kings Park

Victoria

Wick

HOXTON ED

The Hackney Borough Wards of De Beauvoir

Haggerston

Moorfields

Queensbridge

Wenlock

BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM.

HAMMERSMITH ED

The Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Wards of College Park and Old Oak

Coningham

Grove

Ravenscourt

Starch Green

White City and Shepherds Bush

Wormholt

BARONS COURT ED

The Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Wards of Addison

Avonmore

Broadway

Brook Green

Crabtree

Gibbs Green

Margravine

Normand

FULHAM ED

The Hammersmith and Fulham Borough Wards of Colehill

Eel Brook

Palace

Sands End

Sherbrooke

Sullivan

Town

Walham

BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

ISLINGTON NORTH WEST ED

The Islington Borough Wards of Highview

Hillrise

Junction

St George's

Sussex

ISLINGTON EAST ED

The Islington Borough Wards of Gillespie

Highbury

Mildmay

Quadrant

Tollington

ISLINGTON WEST ED

The Islington Borough Wards of Barnsbury

Hillmarton

Holloway

St Mary

Thornhill

ISLINGTON SOUTH EAST AND FINSBURY ED

The Islington Borough Wards of Bunhill

Canonbury East

Canonbury West

Clerkenwell

St Peter

BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

NORTH KENSINGTON ED

The Kensington and Chelsea Borough Wards of Avondale

Colville

Golborne

Kelfield

Norland

Pembridge

St Charles

CENTRAL KENSINGTON ED

The Kensington and Chelsea Borough Wards of Abingdon

Campden

Courtfield

Earl's Court

Holland

Queen's Gate

OLD CHELSEA ED

The Kensington and Chelsea Borough Wards of Brompton

Cheyne

Church

Hans Town

North Stanley

Redcliffe

Royal Hospital

South Stanley

BOROUGH OF LAMBETH

KENNINGTON AND WATERLOO ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of Bishop's

Oval

Prince's

Stockwell

BRIXTON ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of Angell

Ferndale

Larkhall

Vassal

CLAPHAM COMMON ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of Clapham Park

Clapham Town

Thornton

Town Hall

BROCKWELL ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of Herne Hill

St Martin's

Thurlow Park

Tulse Hill

LAMBETH SOUTH WEST ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of St Leonard's

Streatham Hill

Streatham South

WEST NORWOOD ED

The Lambeth Borough Wards of Gipsy Hill

Knight's Hill

Streatham Wells

BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

LEWISHAM NORTH WEST ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Drake

Evelyn

Grinling Gibbons

Marlowe

LEWISHAM CENTRAL ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Blythe Hill

Crofton Park

Ladywell

Pepys

LEWISHAM SOUTH WEST ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Forest Hill

Horniman

Sydenham East

Sydenham West

LEWISHAM SOUTH ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Bellingham

Catford

Perryhill

Rushey Green

Whitefoot

LEWISHAM NORTH EAST ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Blackheath

Hither Green

Manor Lee

St Andrew

St Margaret

LEWISHAM SOUTH EAST ED

The Lewisham Borough Wards of Churchdown

Downham

Grove Park

St Mildred

BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK

BERMONDSEY ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Abbey

Bricklayers

Dockyard

Riverside

Rotherhithe

ELEPHANT AND CASTLE ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Browning

Cathedral

Chaucer

Newington

CAMBERWELL ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Brunswick

Burgess

Faraday

Liddle

NUNHEAD ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Barset

Consort

Friary

The Lane

Waverley

EAST DULWICH ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Bellenden

Lyndhurst

St Giles

DULWICH VILLAGE ED

The Southwark Borough Wards of Alleyn

College

Ruskin

Rye

BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

BROMLEY AND BOW ED

The Tower Hamlets Borough Wards of Bow

Bromley

Grove

Limehouse

Park

BETHNAL GREEN ED

The Tower Hamlets Borough Wards of Holy Trinity

St James'
St Peter's
Spitalfields
Weavers

STEPNEY ED

The Tower Hamlets Borough Wards of Redcoat

St Dunstan's
St Katherine's
St Mary's
Shadwell

POPLAR ED

The Tower Hamlets Borough Wards of Blackwall

East India
Lansbury
Millwall

BOROUGH OF WANDSWORTH

BATTERSEA PARK ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Latchmere

Queenstown
St Mary's Park

ELLIOT ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Roehampton

Thamesfield
West Putney

CLAPHAM JUNCTION ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Fairfield

St John

Shaftesbury

CLAPHAM SOUTH ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Balham

Nightingale

Northcote

WANDLE ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of East Putney

Parkside

Southfield

West Hill

SUMMERSTOWN ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Earlsfield

Springfield

Tooting

BEC ED

The Wandsworth Borough Wards of Bedford

Furzedown

Graveney

BOROUGH OF THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER AND THE COUNTY OF THE CITY OF LONDON

ST JOHN'S WOOD ED

The City of Westminster Borough Wards of Church Street

Hamilton Terrace

Little Venice

Lord's

Maida Vale

Regent's Park

PADDINGTON ED

The City of Westminster Borough Wards of Bayswater

Harrow Road

Lancaster Gate

Queen's Park

Westbourne

CITY OF LONDON AND WEST END ED

The City of Westminster Borough Wards of Baker Street

Bryanston

Cavendish

Hyde Park

St James's

West End

and the County of the City of London

PIMLICO AND BELGRAVIA ED

The City of Westminster Borough Wards of Belgrave

Churchill

Knightsbridge

Millbank

St George's

Victoria

