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PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF WANDSWORTH

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

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

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

4. On 2 February 1976 Wandsworth Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 21 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 60 members.

5. The Borough Council included with their submission copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations and a tentative draft scheme which had been prepared by the Chief Executive of the Council. We received proposals for alternative and different schemes from a local political association, a political party and a local resident. We also received letters objecting to the draft scheme from two other political associations and a local organisation, and a further letter from a resident who considered the proposed representation in the Putney Parliamentary Constituency area unsatisfactory.

6. We studied the Council's draft scheme together with the alternative schemes and the comments which had been made. We considered that none of the alternative schemes offered arrangements which were a substantial improvement over the Council's scheme. Accordingly, although we had doubts about the forecast figures on which the Council's scheme was based, considering them optimistic in relation to earlier trends, we decided to adopt the Council's draft scheme as the basis for our draft proposals.

7. We noted that the standard of representation of the draft scheme was fairly even but that there was some imbalance between the areas of the Parliamentary Constituencies. We decided, to allocate an additional councillor to the Putney Parliamentary Constituency area and to redraw the proposed wards in that area.
This increased the size of council to 61 members. We also made a series of adjustments between the Queenstown, Shaftesbury, St John, Fairfield and Earlsfield wards involving the transfer of a councillor from the Fairfield to the Earlsfield ward. These modifications breached the boundary between the Battersea North and Battersea South Parliamentary Constituencies and had the effect of achieving greater equality of representation between the Constituency areas. After consulting the Ordnance Survey we made a small number of minor modifications to ward boundaries.

8. Subject to the amendments mentioned in paragraph 7 above, we decided that the Council's draft scheme provided a satisfactory basis of representation in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and with our guidelines. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

9. On 20 September 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 15 November 1976.

10. Wandsworth Borough Council accepted our proposal for a council of 61 members but modifications were suggested to the proposed Northcote, Balham, Roehampton, West Putney, St Mary's Park,Latchmere, Queenstown, Shaftesbury and St John wards.
11. The Chief Executive of the Council notified us of a recent planning decision which had the effect of reducing considerably the forecast electorate of the proposed Fairfield ward. He suggested modifications to the proposed Fairfield, St John and Shaftesbury wards to take account of the lower predicted electorate. Mr Hugh Jenkins MP and a local political party advocated an adjustment to the proposed boundary between the Roehampton and West Putney wards which was similar to that suggested by the Borough Council. A local political association submitted two sets of plans for the area of the proposed St Mary's Park, Latchmere, Queenstown, Shaftesbury and St John wards. The political association which had previously submitted an alternative scheme put forward a revised version of that scheme and also challenged the forecast figures, provided by the Council, on which our draft proposals were based. Two other local political associations supported their submission. The political party and local resident who had also earlier forwarded alternative schemes to us reaffirmed those schemes. Finally, we received letters from four other residents objecting to various aspects of our draft proposals.

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

13. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at the Town Hall, Wandsworth on 19 May 1977. A copy of his report to us, is at Schedule 1 to this report.
14. At the local meeting the Borough Council produced revised figures which they had prepared because of the criticisms made of their forecast electorates and of the accuracy of the current figures. The Assistant Commissioner accepted the Council's revised figures and, in the light of these, the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the areas concerned, he recommended that the proposed boundary between the West Hill and Parkside wards should be modified to secure greater electoral equality; that the proposed West Hill/East Putney boundary should be realigned to provide a technically better boundary; that the proposed Fairfield, Earlsfield, Springfield and Nightingale wards should be redrawn to take more account of community ties and provide better boundaries (this change also involves reducing the representation of the Earlsfield ward from 3 councillors to 2); that the boundary between the proposed Balham and Northcote wards should be realigned and the representation of the latter increased from 2 councillors to 3; and that the proposed Shaftesbury, Latchmere, St Mary's Park and Queenstown wards should be modified to avoid dividing housing estates and to provide better boundaries. For the remaining 9 wards, namely, Thamesfield, Roehampton, West Putney, Southfield, St John, Tooting, Graveney, Bedford and Furzedown, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed without alteration.

15. After the local meeting had been held, we received a letter from a local political party criticising the revised forecast electorate figures provided at the meeting by the Borough Council. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of this letter, the other comments which we had received and the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We concluded that the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted and we formulated our final proposals accordingly.

16. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries are defined on the attached map.
17. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Wandsworth Borough Council and will be available for inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.
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4 August 1977
The Chairman,
The Local Government Boundary Commission
for England,
20, Albert Embankment,
London, S.E.1.

Sir,

London Borough of Wandsworth

I have the honour to report that on 19th May at the Town Hall Wandsworth, pursuant to my appointment under Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act, 1972, I held a local meeting to carry out an investigation of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Wandsworth.

The issues raised by the proposed electoral arrangements had aroused interest that was politically centred and the meeting was actively attended only by those with predominantly political interests.

In opening the meeting I emphasised that I was anxious to hear the views of everyone who wished to speak. In discussing the procedure at the meeting I suggested that the speakers might wish to discuss the issues raised in particular areas of the borough before the meeting entered upon a discussion of the more general matters that I understood Mr. Hosking and the liberal party were raising.

No one was legally represented. Eighteen different persons addressed the meeting, all of whom, save for Mr. White, the borough's chief executive, identified themselves with a political
party. A number spoke on more than one occasion. During the meeting several speakers handed in documents. To identify those to which I refer I have marked them with a prefix, according to their source, and a number. The prefixes are 'C' for the council, and 'M' for the conservative party.

THE HEARING

1. Mr N.B. White, chief executive of the borough, outlined the programme that his borough had endeavoured to follow. He said the timetable had slipped, and they were most concerned at the little time now available to prepare registers and polling districts for 1978 elections. He hoped everything would be done by the Commission to expedite their final decision, and that it could be published at least in August. In 1975 he had prepared a draft scheme based on figures in the February 1975 register. In addition to meeting the statutory requirements he had endeavoured to avoid any drastic change of boundaries that were well-established with the public, to avoid disrupting the existing political party organisation, and to avoid anything leading to a fundamental change of polling districts, and thus a costly reproduction of the electoral register, which was computer based. A majority of the political parties had endorsed his view that more equitable representation should be achieved by minimal change rather than a fundamental re-drawing of boundaries, and by the end of 1975 the council's proposals were settled. They provided for a council of 60 councillors returned from 21 wards. The Commission's proposals, which were published
in 1976, were not materially different from the council's scheme, although membership was increased to 61, and there were 22 wards.

Four members of the council, two members coming from each of the political parties represented on the council, and with the authority of the whole council, had considered the Commission's scheme. They agreed with the proposal for 61 councillors and with 13 of the 22 proposed wards. There were differing views on the other 9 wards and the details were set out in his letter to the Commission of 15th November 1976. These differences would no doubt be aired at the meeting by others. He was here to assist, not to argue a case. The accuracy of electoral figures prepared by his staff was challenged by Mr. Hosking. He was prepared to reply to any challenge but it would no doubt be preferable to hear the challenge first. When he came to deal with figures, he would tell me that figures upon which the Commission's proposals were based had had to be adjusted in the light of new circumstances, and some mistakes in the original figures would need to be corrected.

2. Mr. K.B.M. Hosking represented the combined liberal associations in Wandsworth. He had started by looking at the Local Government Act, 1972. Its provisions were perfectly clear. First one must determine what the facts would be in 1980. That was the end of the 5 year period from 1975, which was the date to which the figures with which he had been supplied related. When the figures had been ascertained, then equality of electorate should be achieved but absurd results must be avoided. The words 'as nearly as may be' in para. 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 of the Act were not to
be treated as a let-out. The figures should be as nearly equal as was possible in practice. If there were competing schemes then the Commission should opt for the scheme with least inequality, or offer a new scheme with better equality. He agreed with Mr. White's view about avoiding alteration, but it was very much a secondary matter. In assessing a scheme it was essential to make sure that its 'facts' were correct, and then competing schemes must obviously be assessed by the same objective methods. The next step was to ensure that the boundaries were not absurd, or at least no more absurd than in any other scheme. But boundaries were only a 3rd factor and very much a subsidiary factor. His party had some 70 or 80 criticisms of the draft proposals. They ranged from the trivial to the gross, in the latter case involving 1800 electors who did not exist. There was thus initially a very substantial factual issue to be resolved. His party had then evaluated the relative equality of the various schemes. They had used a statistical approach which he would explain. They had put forward a scheme which was different from the others because it had 1 member per ward. This had provoked discussion, but it was an entirely separate issue from his criticism of the council's scheme. He would deal with detail after particular areas of the borough had been discussed. His submission would take time and there were people who wanted to present a case and get away.

Mr. Hugh Jenkins, M.P. said that as well as being member of parliament for the Putney constituency he was a member of the labour party and a resident of the borough. He had looked
at the proposals and discussed them and had written to the Commission. He thought that a ward in the Roehampton area should bridge the G.L.C. estate and the village wherever possible. It was a matter of social policy to get residents of both areas to think of themselves as living in Roehampton, and they had had some success, though not as much as might be wished. If the areas were in different wards he thought it would be a backward step. The area was an important part of the Putney constituency and he put forward his views as a representative of the whole constituency and not as a politician. The proposed wards created an unsatisfactory division whereas there was a satisfactory division. Mrs. Tarry would deal with the details.

4. Mrs. D. Tarry was an active member of the Putney labour party. The effect of the proposals was to cut the Alton estate off from the village and join it with the Lennox and Woking Close estates, which properly belonged to Richmond or Putney and with which the Alton estate had no affinity and no historical connection. Local people had been successful in some ways in joining the Alton estate and the village and it would not preserve a community if they were divided. She suggested the boundary should be Bank Lane, Priory Lane, Clarence Lane, Crestway, Putney Park Lane and Putney Heath Road. Such a boundary would not disturb an existing community, and on 1981 figures there would be an overall loss of 300 electors on the Commission's proposals for Roehampton ward, and West Putney ward would be 300 more. This produced a ward with less electors than there were in the proposed Furzedown ward and so was within the Commission's tolerances.
Lady Mitchell said she had lived in Roehampton since 1948. She was a member of the labour party. The people who lived in Roehampton were different from those who lived in Putney. Within Roehampton there was still a feeling of resentment in the area, which made the growth of a community difficult, because the Roehampton Village Association had tried and failed to stop the development of the new estates. Cohesion had been gradual and painful. A shared library had helped, but there was a choice of most shops on both sides of the main road which separated the estate and the village, and there was still a feeling of people being 'old' and 'new'. However there was a genuine community and it would be socially divisive and disastrous if they were in separate wards.

Mrs. R. Freedman said she lived in Alton Road. She was a member of the labour party. She shopped both in Danebury Avenue and in Roehampton High Street, as did others. Some shops were not represented in Danebury Avenue. It would be a great pity to take the High Street away from the Roehampton ward.

Miss J.M. Lucas said she was secretary of the Putney Conservative Association and a member of the co-ordinating committee of the Putney and Wandsworth Conservative Associations. She supported the Commission's proposals for Putney and Roehampton. The figures in the proposed wards were correct as Roehampton was still growing, particularly around the Lennox estate. Roehampton Lane was a 4 lane major highway and took A3 traffic to London. It was difficult to cross and traffic was fast-moving and dangerous. The communities were not particularly well integrated and the
shopping was virtually duplicated, so people did not cross the road. There was a link between the Lennox and the Alton estates through their tenants associations, and there was a festival in which both participated.

8. **Mr. J.L. Harris** said he was a conservative councillor and a recently elected G.L.C. councillor for Putney. He thought the main road in Roehampton was a natural boundary for a ward to follow. There were several separate communities to the west of the road and they worked closely together and had a community spirit. There was a spirit on the east side as well but the spirit did not bridge the natural division of the main road. He thought the Crestway would be an unfortunate boundary. It lay between Roehampton village and the Dover House estate, to its north, which was a relatively old and pre-war estate which had coalesced with the older housing south of the Crestway.

9. **Mr. C.R. Chope** was also a conservative councillor. He was chairman of Putney Conservative Association. He said the natural boundaries in the area ran north-south, and not east-west. The Lennox estate was associated with Danebury Avenue, which was in the centre of the new Roehampton community, and the Dover House estate was associated with Roehampton village. If an electoral boundary could be socially divisive, then the Crestway was. In the whole of Roehampton there were enough electors for 1 1/2 wards, which was too many for 3 councillors. The Lennox estate could not be regarded as part of West Putney. The Commission's proposals provided the best solution.
10. **Mr. White** said he had checked the figures for the wards proposed in the Roehampton area by the Labour Party. Because of expected development in the area that the Labour Party proposed should be transferred to West Putney, which included the Lennox estate, there would be an increase of 545 electors by 1982, whereas in the area to be transferred to Roehampton there would be a decrease of nearly 200. The effect would be to create wards which were unbalanced electorally.

11. **Mrs. Tarry** in reply said she did not consider that the Dover House estate, which was very long, was part of Roehampton, nor was the Lennox estate part of Roehampton. The figures were confusing. She had used council figures and she did not know why they were different from Mr. White's. The important point was to preserve the integrity of the community around the village, and if her West Putney ward was too large, a part of it towards Woodborough Road, where the boundary was ill-defined, could be transferred to East Putney.

12. **Mr. M. Ward** was a councillor for the Balham ward, an officer of the Balham Labour Party and a resident of Balham. The proposed Balham ward had 3 councillors and Northcote ward had 2. He suggested this distribution should be reversed by putting the KA polling district into Northcote ward together with the peninsula formed by Montholme Road and Wroughton Road. The boundary would then be Broomwood Road, Montholme Road, Thurleigh Road, Ramsden Road and Nightingale Lane. Nightingale Lane was the natural and historic boundary. It used to separate the areas
of 2 borough councils. Local ties also indicated it should be
the boundary. The area north of Nightingale Lane did not consider
itself part of Balham. He had analysed the complaints made to
him as a councillor for the existing Balham ward. Of 204
complaints, 70 came from outside his ward, and of the balance
of 134 only 16 came from north of Nightingale Lane. He lived
within 100 yards of Nightingale Lane which made the difference
all the more striking. The people north of Nightingale Lane did
not look to Balham for advice. Nor did they shop in Balham.
They went to Northcote market. There was no public transport
link across Nightingale Lane. The area to the north was even
in a different area for council services. The planning districts
were different, and so were the housing management divisions.
Ideally there should be one ward for the area from Battersea Rise
to Nightingale Lane, but it was too large, even for 4 councillors.
The boundary he suggested produced wards with electorates of
10,540 and 6,600 on 1980 figures, which were acceptable.

Mr. D. Mallam represented Nightingale ward and he
was leader of the conservative opposition on the council. He said
that in the Balham and Northcote area 3 communities had to be put
into 2 wards. The hinterland north of Nightingale Lane did not
particularly lie in the Balham or Northcote areas. It shopped in
both. For transport it went to Balham. Nightingale Lane was
not a major road, although it was a convenient road for commuters,
and he suggested the Commission's boundary was satisfactory.
Mr. Ward in reply agreed that, as Mr. Mallin had pointed out, there were difficulties, but Nightingale Lane was a more suitable boundary than Broomwood Road. It carried buses, it had busier traffic, there was a filling station. I could see it on my view.

Mr. Hosking said that what had been said about these 2 areas showed how difficult it was to decide where a community ended. It had to be a secondary consideration. In the Balham and Northcote area the suggested transfer improved the electoral equality, so it was to be preferred as both Nightingale Lane and Broomwood Road were natural boundaries. In Roehampton the problem was more complex. The area was fragmented and the Lennox estate had nothing to do with Roehampton or Putney. If the Alton estate and the village were combined, the area around Bristol Gardens, which was part of Putney, could be transferred if that would help electoral equality. He opposed any suggestion that made the electoral equality worse. He observed that Mr. Saxby's submission to the Commission dealt with the Putney area. Mr. Saxby was a member of the Putney Liberal Association, but he had produced an independent scheme.

Mr. Peter Gerhold was here as a resident. He was a member of the Liberal Association. There was a closely knit community in the vicinity of Howards Lane. He had been born there and he lived there. The proposed boundary was purely statistical. The only reasonable boundary west of Putney Hill was the north-south boundary of Putney Park Lane.
Mr. Hosking put his general case. He said the council's proposals, upon which the Commission's scheme was based, started from the parliamentary constituency boundaries. This was an unnecessary, irrelevant and fatal restriction. The parliamentary boundaries did not allow electoral equality with 60 councillors, and the differences in each constituency became exaggerated within the wards. The situation was further complicated by omissions and by errors. Development proposals in North Battersea had disappeared and there were new schemes in Putney. The Commission's scheme had allowed for some of these alterations but had not always taken into account the more significant ones. Moreover their scheme had made electoral equality in the borough worse.

The liberal approach was to obtain 3 areas in the east of the borough bounded by the lines formed by the Clapham-Wimbledon railway line in one direction and the Wandsworth Bridge Southern Approach Road continued by the Clapham Junction to Balham railway in the other. In the west, Putney Heath and West Hill provided a similar major boundary. There were then further obvious sub-divisions. Tooting Road divided one area. They had calculated the electorates and found that 59 councillors allowed arithmetical equality. They had sub-divided further, but at this stage had considered natural boundaries less important than the figures. They had found 59 approximately equal areas and most were within ± 2½% of the norm and only one was outside their target of ± 5%. They had concentrated on figures but had respected their major boundaries, and the scheme could be used as the building-blocks for multi-member wards.
To calculate electorates they had to take into account future development. They had only taken into account development which would be in use by October 1979, as only that would appear on the 1980 register. The council's approach was wrong. It was proved to be wrong as the overall electorate, in an area of decreasing population, was already lower than the council's 1980 projection. He could point to other errors. Developments had been put in wards which belonged to other wards. The 1975 register, which had been the starting point, had mis-stated the numbers of electors in some of the proposed wards.

The electorate generated by new development had been mis-calculated, for a figure of 2.2 electors per unit had been used even where the development included 'bedsitters'.

The first point was to decide how many electors there would be on the 1980 register. The council's figure was 207,500. He did not know how it was calculated, but it was wrong and he could identify 3 areas of probable error. First, the G.L.C. confirmed that only about 94% of the predicted adult population of an area appeared on the electoral register. He did not know why this was so, and perhaps the reasons did not matter. To get the figure for the 1980 register one must take the 1979 predicted adult population, and then take 94.2%, which was the exact percentage. It had worked for the last few years. The 1980 electoral figure became 197,500. The second error was in identifying areas where there was development and in deciding how to treat them. The council had used the prediction figure for the future electorate only in those areas which were not being developed. Where there was
development they had subtracted the total of any areas to be cleared and had added back the total expected from the development. The result had been to create too large a figure for the borough, for if new development was completely filled, as was likely, the figures in other areas should have been scaled back. To achieve an overall decline of 9%, non-developed areas had to show a greater percentage decline. The council's approach resulted in a decrease of only 1.4%. Thirdly the increase from new development was not 2.2 electors a dwelling. He had put in the increase at the actual capacity of the dwellings.

His committee had a 4 page list of all developments in the borough upto 1980. It set out the effect of the development on the council's proposals. There was then a 2 page list of errors in the council's 1975 electoral figures, and the supporting documents were included. Many developments had been included in the council's figures which would not be filled by October 1979 and so were not in the timescale. The Morgan site and Phillips Mill were 2 substantial examples. Other developments had been put in the wrong ward. The development in Lurline Gardens was an example. It should not be in St. Mary's Park ward. In Putney Park Avenue, single person sheltered housing had been included at 2.2 persons a dwelling. There were substantial errors in the 1975 electoral figures. In Latchmere ward for example there was a substantial error in the Kambala Road electorate, where 389 electors had been moved and not 116.

His next document showed his calculations for the total number of electors in each ward by 1980. He had applied a factor
of about 89% to the electorate of a ward which was unaffected by
development, for on the basis of his development figures, this
was the correct factor to achieve the G.L.C. forecast overall
reduction of 9%. The columns on the right hand side of the page
set out the results of his statistical approach, which was the
objective method by which he had assessed his scheme. The
mathematics of calculating a standard deviation, as it was called,
and what it signified, were set out in some further documents
and also in his written submissions to the Commission. The
figures of his wards were far preferable to those of the Commission's
wards.

18. **Mr. White** in reply complimented Mr. Hosking on the
work he had carried out. His researches had disclosed areas where
Mr. Hosking's criticisms were justified. The council had made a
mistake in the Kambala Road area. The council had also had to
re-appraise their approach to the overall future electorate of the
borough, for as Mr. Hosking had pointed out, the electorate was
already lower than their 1980 prediction. As a result both the
1975 and the future electoral figures had been re-assessed.
However he did not accept Mr. Hosking's overall approach. Mr. White
had been 30 years in his job and he had known the borough for 50
years. The liberals' scheme neither preserved community ties nor
selected definite boundaries, yet it ignored well-defined features.
He pointed out a number of examples and mentioned proposed liberal
wards nos. 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 24, 28, 29, 42, 48 and 50.
He observed that Mr. Gittins' scheme also had unacceptable features.

One reason for the disparity between the sets of 1980
electoral figures was that the council had decided to keep to the 1975 figures which were their starting point, and not to alter the forecasts as policy changes occurred. In the 2 years there had however been many changes. Local Authority development had veered from redevelopment to rehabilitation. Schemes had been affected by the economic climate. Mr. Hosking had altered his figures as he picked up these changes. Mr. White accepted that the council's figures should be kept up-to-date. A significant recent alteration had been the abandonment in Fairfield ward of the gasworks scheme for 1000 electors, because the ground was polluted. He had taken seriously Mr. Hosking's detailed criticisms set out in paragraph 2.2 and 2.3 of his written submission and he had had all the points checked. He by no means accepted all of the criticisms but there were some omissions and errors in the council's figures which Mr. Hosking's researches had revealed. He dealt with the criticisms, and where there were concessions, with them also, in detail.

For the future, he had adopted a new approach for forecast figures. He put in a bundle of documents, marked NW/1 to 6 (C2), which set out a number of new figures. His original approach to the overall 5 year decrease had been very crude. The G.L.C. had forecast a 12% to 16% reduction in the period 1971-81. However the rate of increase had fallen off in 1974 and 1975, as NW/1 showed, and it indicated that the overall projections might be inaccurate. He had accordingly taken 14% as the mid-figure for the overall decrease, and as about 5% of that had occurred by 1975, he had discounted 9% for the remainder of the period and had then added back the effect of new dwellings.
This gave an overall decrease of about 2% in the following 5 years. However as NW/1 also showed, the picture by 1977 was again different. There had been a 2.7% reduction in just 2 years. The average decrease was running at 1.2%. He had projected that to 1982. This gave a 1982 electorate of about 193,000. If one took 1982 it accorded with the 5 years mentioned in the statute, and it would include developments in the pipeline which Mr. Hosking had excluded as they would not be filled by October 1979. The next step was to apply this reduction to individual wards. He had reduced the electorate of all areas by a factor of 85% and had added back new development of 13,800: see NW/4. The overall effect for 1982 was not very greatly different from Mr. Hosking's overall reduction on the basis of 89% by 1980.

He did not accept Mr. Hosking's criticism of his factor of 2.2 for electors in new dwellings. NW/2 showed that the range in the borough was from 2.08 to 2.31. A survey had been undertaken of the Winstanley and the East Hill estates. NW/3 set out the details on the East Hill estate. Clearly 2.2 was the correct overall figure.

The figures in NW/5 and 6 showed the results of his reassessment and the new figures were set out in detail. He drew my attention to West Hill and Parkside wards where there had been an error or misunderstanding in the figures given to the Commission. The projected figures for Latchmere and Fairfield wards were also significantly different. In Fairfield ward he had produced a plan (C1) showing 2 alterations which he suggested could cope with the 1000 'lost' electors on the gasworks site. The discrepancy in Latchmere ward came from a combination of errors and unrealised
forecasts. His plan (C1) also showed the suggested alteration of Balham and Northcote wards and a possible reorganisation of Queenstown and its neighbouring wards.

19. **Mr. Mallam** observed that there were a few electors in the south-eastern corner of the Commission's Fairfield ward, or what would be the southern tip of Mr. White's suggested Fairfield ward, in Windmill Road whom all agreed should be in Earlsfield ward.

20. **Mr P Bowdage** represented Earlsfield ward liberals. He said the existing Earlsfield ward was no more than a number of small units pieced together for an electoral equality which no longer existed. The opportunity to re-arrange matters to achieve realistic boundaries had not been taken. There were 3 distinct communities south of the Clapham-Wimbledon railway line. Everyone in the area would say that the railway, which ran unbridged for nearly a mile through the ward, was an ideal boundary. The council's planning department also considered it a boundary and he quoted from the district plan. North of the railway line he identified 6 communities. He could only think the Wendlesworth estate had been moved from Fairfield to Earlsfield ward to achieve equality of electorate and because there was no alternative, yet the haphazard southern boundary showed this could not be the reason. The railway should be a boundary, and there should be a rational boundary in the southern part of the existing ward.
Mr. Harris wanted this time to say something about North Battersea. The Commission's proposals were not satisfactory. The western tongue of Queenstown ward, which included Warriner Drive, had an affinity with St. Mary's Park ward. Parma Crescent should be in Shaftesbury ward, and the boundary there should be St. John's Road. Latchmere ward should not include parts of old Battersea, which was near the river. His party had produced an equitable scheme, which was shown on a plan (M1) which he produced, and which superseded the maps sent to the Commission. He produced a petition from some residents in part of the Doddington estate who did not want the Commission's proposed boundary to divide their estate. The only community split by his scheme was the community which would soon move into the new Kambala Road development. He had a plan which showed the detail of the boundary. The dwellings were divided by reference to their best access road. He put in a table (M2) showing his figures were better than those in the Commission's proposals. He explained that the projecting western tongue of Park ward contained a general improvement area. There was similarly a good reason for the odd shape in the south-western corner of Queenstown ward. There were 2 estates there which had access to Queenstown ward but not to Lavender Hill.

Mr. A. Wells was from North Battersea Conservative Association. He endorsed Mr. Harris' proposals. The Doddington estate should not be divided, and Alexandra Avenue was not a suitable boundary, for it divided Warriner Gardens.
23. **Miss B. Hayr** also represented North Battersea Conservative Association. She lived in Altenburg Gardens. In 1964 it had been artificially put in St. John's ward. However that area had nothing to do with the areas beyond Clapham Junction.

24. **Miss Lucas** said everyone had had great difficulty in drawing boundaries in North Battersea. The conservatives had managed to preserve communities of interest with 2 member wards, and their scheme had the support of the residents. It was better than the Commission's scheme.

25. **Mr. White** said that though table M2 contained 1982 electoral figures which he had supplied, the entitlements had not been calculated by the conservatives on the correct overall average figure, which was 3169 and not 3142. He read out the correct entitlement figures which I have written onto M2. The differences are small.

26. **Mr. D. Ellwand** represented the communist party in Wandsworth. He dealt with fundamental questions raised by boundary revisions as well as with detail. The selection of boundaries was an important matter and should involve more than just drawing a line on a map. The position of boundaries both affected and should involve the elector's participation in and access to local government. These matters were more important than mere electoral equality. First there was a relationship between local government wards and parliamentary constituencies. Wards should not straddle constituencies, and if there had to be alterations, it should not
be done in 2 stages as at present. Boundaries should not be allowed to get out of step. Secondly he was concerned that in the 20 month long procedure leading to this meeting, the only question had been where the lines should be drawn. That should only be the 2nd stage of consultation. The first stage was to decide whether all wards should return the same number of councillors, what that number should be and what was the optimum size of the council. These matters had not been separately considered. He did not quarrel with the limits of 50 to 70 for the council, but thought it should be at the upper end of the bracket. Aldermen were anachronistic and should be replaced by elected councillors, but there should not be an overall reduction in the size of the council. The work load and strain on councillors was increasing and electors would suffer from a reduction in the overall number. The national trend, which had caused 11,000 council seats to disappear, should be reversed. The number of councillors in each ward should be 3. That was the figure indicated by decades of local government and it was the tradition in Wandsworth. With 1 or 2 councillors an elector had less choice, and there was less chance for a ward to be represented on a key committee. If there were to be 2 councillor wards, how did one decide where to have 2 and where 3 councillors. It was said to be related to the question of community representation, but it was very difficult, save in purpose-built estates, to say where communities started and finished. Each party interpreted the community boundary for its own ends, and so used a selection of 2 and 3 member wards which favoured its chances. This was
gerrymandering. If all wards had 3 members this practice at least would be avoided. The next point was that, save in the few instances where major changes were occurring, future calculations were meaningless. Existing figures alone should be used.

The effect of his suggestions in Wandsworth was that the wards should be contained within the existing constituency boundaries, and each ward should have 3 councillors. He had produced a map of possible wards with each councillor representing about 2,500 electors, in 23 wards. It had only taken him 10 minutes. He had sent it to the Commission. It was the biggest surprise of his life when he saw how close his wards were to the Commissions. He did not ask me to choose his wards, but to endorse his approach and to ask the council to produce a new scheme on that basis.

27. Mr. Hosking wished to summarise the issues. He thought it was a mistake to take 1982 figures. Anything ahead of 1980 meant taking into consideration changes when plans did not even exist for what was suggested. The Morgan site might or might not be filled anytime between 1982 and 1987. One should not take relatively large scale development into account when it was not fully planned. On community of interest, he said it was unwise to treat it other than as a subsidiary consideration in an urban area. The Act made it a subsidiary matter in any event.

He accepted that ward 9 was not ideal in his scheme. It was more difficult to identify single member modules which always represented communities than it was 3 councillor wards. His wards 7, 8 and 10 were natural communities. In East Putney
the council's scheme was absurd. The criticism of his wards 19 and 42 arose because numbers forced divisions upon him. He considered back-fence boundaries were often preferable so as to keep 2 sides of a residential street in the same ward. He had used them 10 or 11 times but these boundaries could be altered if they were unacceptable. He did not want his scheme rejected on that basis.

He thought the conservatives were wrong about the estates at the west end of their Queenstown ward. The only access was from Lavender Hill and not from the east.

The prime factor in any scheme was equality, and his scheme had a marked superiority, whether judged by standard deviation or by percentage variation from the average. Moreover his wards avoided some of the particular absurdities of the Commission's scheme. He instanced Earlsfield and Springfield which were divided by a railway and hospital respectively. No scheme could have ideal boundaries throughout.

His request for single-member wards was a separate issue. It was a mockery to have electoral equality and then find that a small percentage of the poll gave a large majority of seats in the council. That could happen with 3 councillor wards. It was not a party political point. Single member wards gave a better chance of reasonable representation. If they were unacceptable, then a 2 and 3 councillor ward scheme could be constructed from his wards. He had devised such a scheme and he gave me a map setting it out (L5). However the Commission's proposals contained too much inequality, and it would need pressing reasons to reject his scheme.
28. Miss Hayr disagreed with Mr. Hosking about the way the estates at the west end of Queenstown 'faced'. They faced east.

29. Mr. Mallam put forward the case for multi-member wards. There were some wards in the borough which returned councillors from differing parties. He emphasised there was a massive degree of urgency to reach and publish a decision on what the wards were to be.

30. Mr. B. Eberli was a member of the Putney liberals. The original reason for single member wards was to overcome the feeling of alienation of the non-political elector from the party and multi-member system, which was reflected in a poor level of turn-out by only 50% of the electorate. This could be done with 3000 electors for each councillor.

31. Mr. Gerhold also supported single-member wards. A 3 councillor ward distorted the democratic result and for electors it was like being represented by a committee. He would prefer proportional representation, or annual elections by thirds. There was no disadvantage on the G.L.C. or in Parliament in being a single member, and a single councillor had a better opportunity of knowing his ward and his electors.

32. Mr. D. Patterson was chairman of the Earlsfield Ward Liberals. He emphasised the unfairness of the present system and he referred me to the details set out in his association's written submission which had been sent to the Commission. They showed that a small percentage majority of votes could be reflected in a substantial
majority of councillors, and at the other end of the scale, a significant minority vote, even of the order of 10% of the electorate, did not achieve any representation on the council. In individual wards there were several wards in the borough where a vote that was significantly below 50 per cent of those who voted was nevertheless sufficient to secure all 3 seats for a single party.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Before the meeting the Commission had been sent several written submissions affecting substantial areas. Unfortunately these submissions could not be explained to the meeting as their protagonists were unable to attend.

33. Wandsworth Common People was a non-party-political group of residents in Earlsfield and Fairfield wards. They objected to the proposed wards in this area, which neglected the boundary presented by the railway line yet preserved the constituency boundary which divided a community. The suggestion of 59 single-member wards might have advantages.

34. Mr. J. Saxby was concerned with the electoral arrangements for Putney. The constituency area, on population trends, was entitled to 20 councillors, and not the 18 proposed by the council nor the 19 proposed by the Commission. His scheme provided for a council of 62 members, with 8 wards in the Putney area. His Roehampton ward combined the village and the Alton estate in a 3 member ward, adopted the Crestway as a boundary and put the Lennox estate in a West Putney ward.
Mr. C.V. Gittins made his contribution as an individual although he had participated in liberal politics in the borough for some years. He supported the liberals' proposals but with the serious and fundamental reservation that there should be multi-member wards. He adopted the liberals' proposals insofar as he suggested a scheme which was an amalgamation of liberal wards and so produced a council of 59 members. His boundaries could be more logical and his electorates were less vulnerable to substantial alteration. He had not followed parliamentary boundaries. They should follow ward boundaries.

**VIEW**

On 26th May I was accompanied by Mr. L.N. Millings and Mr. P.R. Ward of the administration department of the council on an extensive view of the borough. I looked at all the parts of the borough I wished to see and I visited most of the wards, omitting only some of those which had not been discussed. I revisited the borough on my own on 25th June to look at some further areas. The impressions I formed and the conclusions I reached are set out in the appropriate parts of my appraisal.

After my view I obtained electoral figures from the council for a number of further areas in the borough so that I could consider alternatives.
General Issues. The approaches to producing a new ward scheme covered the spectrum from altering the existing wards as little as possible, by way of altering the wards but preserving the constituency boundaries, to scrapping all the existing arrangements and devising a completely new scheme which paid no regard at all to the preservation of any existing ward boundaries. Some of the matters that were urged upon me would lead me into direct conflict with the rules in the Local Government Act 1972 if I were to accept them. I was variously asked to neglect communities, to work only on existing figures and neglect all but major changes in the future, and to allow considerations of electoral equality, in effect, to override the selection of readily identifiable boundaries. Without offending the statute, I was asked both to preserve and to ignore constituency boundaries. I was asked to recommend a system of nothing but single-member wards, of nothing but 3 member wards, and a mixture of 2 and 3 member wards. On the size of the council alone was there reasonable agreement, the suggestions varying between 59 and 69. Neither Mr. White nor any of the councillors who addressed me, who of course are the persons who have immediate experience of the number of councillors necessary for a borough of the size of Handsworth, made any criticism of the suggestion for 61 councillors, but then neither did they criticise the other figures.

There was however a deal of criticism of the suggestion that there should be single member wards. Mr. Hallam,
who has experience on the council, Mr. Gittins, and Mr. Saxby in one of his letters, set out the objections to single-member wards.

I consider that, for a borough such as Wandsworth, in any event, where there has been a tradition of multi-member wards, it would be wrong to accept single-member wards. There are more councillors with a direct interest for an elector to approach in a multi-member ward system. There is less chance of no representation if a councillor is ill, and there is more chance of a ward being represented on a variety of committees. Nor could I see a good reason for adopting only 3 member wards when a mixture of 2 and 3 member wards is both wanted by all those with council experience and when it is permissible. To reject such a mixture would be to lose a degree of flexibility. For example, if the area lying west of the natural boundary provided by the River Wandle has an entitlement of 19 councillors on a 61 member council, rigid adherence to a 3 member ward system means either that such an area would have to be under or over-represented, or the natural boundary would have to be rejected.

A more fundamental issue was whether the existing wards and boundaries should be preserved where possible or whether a new scheme should be devised from first principles. In deciding that in Wandsworth there was a deal of merit in keeping the existing ward pattern and ward boundaries when reasonably possible does not mean that I consider Mr. Hosking's overall approach to working out a new scheme was anything other than sound or that the work he did played anything less than a very valuable part in the process of knowing when to accept and when to reject the existing pattern.

Mr. Hosking's contribution was especially valuable when it came to
considering electoral figures. However Wandsworth elects 60 councillors at present and each of its wards returns 3 members. Some of these wards can remain unaltered or substantially unaltered. Thereby the electors are not confused, and local political organisations do not have to be re-arranged. These must be advantages. Mr. Hosking made much of the fact that his electoral figures were an improvement on any others, and from that he argued that his scheme should either be adopted or used as the basis for a multi-member scheme. I am neither convinced that assessment of a scheme by the statistical use of the standard deviation test provides the proper approach nor that because one scheme has 'better' electoral equality than another, then it must be chosen. I do not doubt the validity of the standard deviation test for determining many aspects of our social life, nor that it showed his scheme had 'better' figures, though I do not pretend I could check the arithmetic involved. However I do not accept it is the correct approach when as few as 20 or 30 wards have to be compared, and when there are the other important matters of identifiable boundaries and community of interest to take into account. The statisticians approach is interesting, but I remain unconvinced it is helpful in the context of this inquiry. In preserving the existing pattern so far as possible, I necessarily reject also Mr. Hosking's and Mr. Gittins' schemes. Apart from being a new scheme, each also had wards which had, in my view, unsatisfactory features. In Mr. Gittins' scheme his Springfield, Parkfield and Thameside wards united areas that seemed to be materially separate from one another. In Mr. Hosking's scheme I thought there were less
than satisfactory boundary lines in the Balham, Putney and Battersea Rise areas.

39. **The Existing Pattern.** There are 2 areas where I think improvements could be made to the existing pattern. In the area of the Wandsworth Bridge Southern Approach Road, a new elevated dual carriageway has been driven through an area that was once housing. The existing boundary of course takes no account of the road, which was not in existence and probably not even planned when the boundary was determined. Although the council's proposals also ignored this road as a boundary, the Commission's proposals put that right and adopted the road as a boundary. However the recent abandonment of housing development on the gasworks site in Fairfield ward has led Mr. White on behalf of the council to suggest that the road should be abandoned as a boundary and the existing constituency boundary to its east retained as a ward boundary. I found the road so striking a feature in this northern area that I consider that, unless figures altogether militate against it, it should be a boundary. I do not consider that a constituency boundary has, by reason of being a constituency boundary, any claim to remain a ward boundary.

I found the rejection of the Clapham Junction - Wimbledon railway line between Wandsworth Prison and Earlsfield Station as a boundary difficult to accept. Figures may have militated against it at the last review. However neither the council nor the Commission proposed it as a boundary. What I heard, read and saw convinced me that if possible it should be a ward boundary rather than a division across a ward. Mr. Hosking, in both his single-member
ward schemes as well as in his multi-member ward scheme (15), Mr. Gittins in his scheme, the Earlsfield liberals and the Wandsworth Common People all suggested it should be a ward boundary.

An area where I thought the constituency boundary could be properly retained as a ward boundary throughout its length was along the River Wandle. Save towards its northern end, where the road pattern predominates, and where the constituency boundary follows the road pattern, the river is a convenient boundary.

40. **Electoral Figures.** A large part of Mr. Hosking's case consisted of querying the council's figures. The council had adopted what might be called a 'broad brush' approach. Mr. Hosking looked at the fine print. Confronted with such interest in the detail, the council's officers understandably re-assessed the figures they had already produced, brought up to date their consideration of future developments and, most importantly, entirely revised their approach to calculating future electorates. This only left one major area of dispute between Mr. Hosking and the council on figures, although a number of minor disagreements remained unresolved. Mr. Hosking considered that the only development which should be taken into account was development that was completed and filled by October 1979 so that the electors would be on the 1980 register. The council, in recalculating all the figures it had hitherto produced, took note of the fact that the meeting was considering electoral arrangements in mid-1977, and so produced figures for 1982. Again, without detracting from the value of Mr. Hosking's
contribution, which I saw as participation and involvement in local government seen at its best, I thought the council's approach was preferable. A ward scheme should have some permanence. Although everybody was perforce working from 1975 'existing' figures, it being too substantial a task to produce 1977 figures, if Mr. Hosking's approach was adopted, then for the future one would be looking little more than 2 years ahead, for his guillotine fell in October 1979. I do not think that is common-sense, and I doubt that it would be compliance with the 1972 Act. Matters for late-1979 are of course more certain than for 1982, but ward boundary schemes are to some extent necessarily based on informed guesses rather than exact predictions.

In the circumstances the figures I have chosen to use are those recalculated by the council and set out in NW/5 and 6 of C2. I suspect that the overall future electoral figures for 1982 may, if the G.L.C. population predictions are accurate, still be rather high. However the reduction has been applied on a constant basis throughout the borough, and if the factor of 85% is too high, then all wards in 1982 will be less by the same percentage, so the entitlements should not be affected save where there is very substantial new development. NW/5 shows that nowhere is the new development so substantial as materially to distort the entitlements if the factor of 85% turns out to be inaccurate by a few percentage points. There is in my view more likely to be distortion because the factor is applied across the board, for the population reduction will almost certainly not take place at the same rate in all wards; but no one suggested how the reduction could be applied selectively and the G.L.C. prediction figures are
purposely not produced below borough level. In choosing the council's figures, I have by implication accepted their case on the other issues which Mr. Hosking raised. I think the degree of accuracy which can be obtained in future figures is not high when a quite substantial population decrease factor has to be applied consistently in every ward, and that making alterations to accommodate varying numbers of electors in different types of new dwellings, or omitting some developments because the time scale is not yet certain, is no more likely to produce accurate figures than is the council's approach.

41. **Putney. The Major Issue.** The Commission had allocated 19 councillors to the area west of the Wandle. The figures - and in mentioning figures hereafter I shall refer to the recalculated figures in C2 - are 66,437 in 1975 and 61,150 for 1982, giving entitlements on a 61 councillor basis of 19.20 and 19.30. Accordingly I consider the area is entitled to 19 councillors and not 20 as Mr. Saxby suggested.

The main dispute centre on whether Roehampton Lane should be a boundary as the Commission proposed, or whether Roehampton village to its east should be in the same ward as the Alton estate to its west. I looked carefully at the area. I see that Mr. Gittins, Mr. Saxby and Mr. Hosking, in his multi-member ward scheme, all put the village and the Alton estate in the same ward. The conservatives supported the Commission's proposal and the labour party opposed it. I preferred the Commission's proposal. Although the forging of links between village and new estate is obviously a desirable local objective, from what I heard I was not persuaded that there were
yet many links. I thought a councillor could far more capably represent the electors of the Alton estate and of the estates at the north end of Priory Lane than he could the obviously differing interests of the electors of the Alton estate and the village. Moreover I thought the electors in the estates at the north end of Priory Lane would be better represented by councillors who also represented the Alton estate than by councillors from West Putney. Also the busy road between the Alton estate and the village provides an obvious boundary. Another significant feature was that of the two wards affected by the labour party's proposal, West Putney was the larger and the labour party's proposal in effect transferred to it the area at the north end of Priory Lane, which shows a substantial electoral increase because of the Lennox and Woking Close estates, in exchange for Roehampton village, which shows no increase. The figures, which are set out in a letter from the council to myself of 26th May 1977 in pursuance to my request for detailed figures, and with entitlements in brackets, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Labour Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roehampton</td>
<td>9986 (2.89)</td>
<td>9700 (3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Putney</td>
<td>10,964 (3.17)</td>
<td>9850 (3.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the possible alternatives in this area, I considered carefully whether some re-arrangement might be possible which avoided the rather tortuous eastern boundary of West Putney ward, which Mr. Gerhold criticised and which might enable the preferable lines of Putney Park Lane or Putney Hill to be used as boundaries. I spent some time considering alternatives but I could
not find a satisfactory re-arrangement. I consider in this area that both the arguments I heard and the electoral figures I set out above indicate that the Commission's wards are to be preferred.

42. Putney. Other Issues. Mr. White told me that due to a misunderstanding or error the boundary proposed by the Commission between West Hill and Parkside wards did not produce satisfactory figures. He suggested an alteration which is shown on C1, so that the boundary follows Princes Way and Windlesham Grove rather than Augustus Road and Victoria Drive, and no one objected. The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Suggested alteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill</td>
<td>(2.11)</td>
<td>(1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>(1.68)</td>
<td>(1.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider the original proposal was unacceptable on the revised figures but that the alteration is acceptable. Windlesham Grove is a satisfactory boundary. Parkside is a ward with an increasing entitlement, and although on 1975 figures it is at the extreme of the acceptable bracket, it should be above that on 1977 figures.

Another minor matter is that, as Mr. Hoaking pointed out in his written submission, the boundary at the north-eastern corner of West Hill ward follows the line of the railway where it goes underground beneath West Hill and a garage on the north side of the road. I inspected this area and after my inspection Mr. Millings sent me a note, and a copy of the 1: 1250 ordnance plan, indicating that the tunnel was well defined, that it had
presented no problem in the past as a ward boundary, and it went through no buildings. Nevertheless I did not think it was 'readily identifiable', within the meaning of the words of the Act, and it offended against the spirit, if not the letter, of the Commission's own suggestions that 'a road in a tunnel' should not form a boundary and that, in any event at district level, a boundary should not be drawn across an ownership. I recommend that the boundary should follow Lytton Grove, West Hill, Sutherland Grove and, for a matter of a few yards, Cromer Villas. The effect is to transfer 55 electors from West Hill to East Putney ward.

43. **Earlsfield and Fairfield.** There are 3 difficulties in this area. The abandonment of the plan to put 1000 electors on the gasworks site in Fairfield ward reduced its 1982 entitlement to 1,73. Secondly the western end of the boundary between the 2 wards ran along the line of the storm water relief sewer aqueduct which, as both Mr. Hosking and Mr. Gittins have noted, no longer exists. I looked at this boundary and it is far from obvious that an aqueduct had ever existed there, though the line of it can still just be seen if it is pointed out. However a new boundary line will have to be found. Thirdly the southern boundary of Earlsfield ward was criticised and it was suggested, and I agree, that the Clapham Junction--Wimbledon railway line provided a preferable boundary. The electoral figures for the area lying between the River Wandle and the Wandsworth Bridge Southern Approach Road, and north of the railway, are 14,226 for 1975 and 12,640 for 1982, giving entitlements of 4.11 and 3.99. The area can conveniently be divided into 2 wards of 2 members each along the existing boundary of Garratt Lane and
Aldfarthing Lane. The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>7324  (2.12)</td>
<td>6351  (2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlsfield</td>
<td>6902  (1.99)</td>
<td>6289  (1.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14,226 12,640

The advantage of these wards is that this arrangement keeps the Wendlesworth estate in Fairfield ward, which the Earlsfield liberals suggested, and more importantly it preserves the Wandsworth Bridge Southern Approach Road as a boundary, which Mr. White had suggested might have to be abandoned in favour of the constituency boundary. The area south of the railway line has to be incorporated into Springfield ward, and there is inevitably a domino effect beyond that. However I consider the changes can be readily accommodated. I have incorporated Mr. Mallam's suggested alteration at the south eastern corner of Fairfield ward taking the boundary from Wandsworth Common West Side along a footpath to Trinity Road.

The difficulty with Wandsworth Common West Side is that it no longer meets Trinity Road whereas the footpath meets Trinity Road where there is a substantial pedestrian underpass, and so provides a well-defined and permanent line for a boundary.

44.

Northcote and Springfield to Furzedown. Battersea Rise and Clapham Common North Side provide a suitable boundary between the group of wards to their south and the wards of Battersea North. It also happens to be the constituency boundary and is the proposed boundary. The electorate of the area to the south is 84,935 on 1975 figures and 74,660 on 1982 figures, giving it entitlements of
The boundaries of the proposed Furzedown, Graveney and Bedford wards are substantially identical to the existing wards. They contain 32,386 electors on 1975 figures and 27,950 on 1982 figures, giving entitlements of 9.36 and 8.82 respectively for their 9 councillors. Although a straightening of the boundary between Graveney and Tooting wards along Upper Tooting Road looks as if it would tidy up this boundary, the area south of Upper Tooting Road which would have to be transferred to Graveney ward contains 1400 electors and I could not find a way of satisfactorily transferring this area without doing violence to the entitlement figures. If Furzedown, Graveney and Bedford wards remain as they are in the proposals, as I consider they clearly should, albeit Furzedown ward has a relatively large electorate, then the remainder of the area has entitlements of 15.19 (1975) and 14.74 (1982). This means that it should have 15 councillors.

I think a satisfactory division can be achieved by leaving Tooting ward as it is in the proposals, by adding the area south of the Clapham Junction–Wimbledon railway line to Springfield ward and, to keep the figures within acceptable limits, taking away from Springfield ward both the area lying east of Trinity Road together with the area lying between Trinity Road and Beechcroft Road, which should be added to Nightingale ward. In turn Nightingale ward can be brought within acceptable limits by taking away from it the part lying north of Nightingale Lane. This configuration unites in one ward the areas lying south of Wandsworth Prison, as far as Fieldview, which a number of persons suggested; it avoids having a Springfield ward which is divided by the substantial area
of open space and institutional buildings marked as Springfield Hospital on the plans, but which contains schools and a college as well; and it allows the northern boundary of Nightingale ward to lie along Nightingale Lane, which the arguments I heard and which my view led me to think was a preferable boundary to Broomwood Road. Where Nightingale ward stretches across Trinity Road, the road has ceased to be a 4 lane dual carriageway and is an ordinary urban road. The figures for these wards are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Nightingale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>10,520 (3.04)</td>
<td>10,627 (3.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>10,291 (3.25)</td>
<td>9,205 (2.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of the area, which was the subject of the dispute between Mr. Ward and Mr. Mallam at the meeting, can, if it is so enlarged, be given 6 councillors and not 5, so there is no issue of how to arrange a 3-2 split. Unfortunately the figures do not allow for a boundary along the entire length of Nightingale Lane unless 3 two member wards are to be created. Although that would create a satisfactory Balham ward, for it would be the one the labour party proposed, there is not a ready division for the remainder of the area into 2 wards, Broomwood Road not being acceptable as it produces a ward to the north which would be too large and a ward to the south which would be too small. On balance I consider the better division is to form 2 three member wards with the boundary along Broomwood Road, Devereux Road, Thurleigh Road and Ramsden Road. The figures are:
In recommending these wards, I do not have to reach any decision on the Nightingale–Balham ward dispute. Nevertheless I was helped by the arguments I heard in selecting boundaries in this area.

45. Battersea North. I was confronted here with 4 suggested schemes. There were the Commission's proposals, which differed slightly from the council's proposals; there was Mr. White's suggested alteration to take into account the loss of the 1000 electors in Fairfield ward, and which he described in his letter of 3rd February 1977; there were the conservatives' proposals which were discussed at the meeting, and which in their final form are shown on plan M1; and there was Mr. White's suggested re-arrangement of the boundaries of Queenstown, Latchmere, St. Mary's Park and Shaftesbury wards, which is shown on plan C1.

The solution I have recommended for the loss of the Fairfield ward electorate, involving as it does Earlsfield and Springfield wards, means that I do not have to consider Mr. White's suggested alteration which involved what I thought was the undesirable perpetuation of the constituency boundary as a ward boundary. The Commission's proposals were in my view properly criticised for the boundary selected along Alexandra Drive and Alfreda Street. The conservatives' proposals overcame these objections but I thought had their own unacceptable features. I
do not consider the new Kambala Road development should be divided at this stage of its existence if that can be avoided. I thought the incursions, or pockets, of Queenstown ward into Shaftesbury ward, and of Park ward into River ward were unsatisfactory. The conservatives sought to justify them on the basis that they contained estates which were parts of Queenstown and Park wards respectively. I looked at them carefully on my view. I found that access to the estate around Gideon Road lay from Lavender Hill and that access from the Queenstown direction was tortuous and difficult. At Orbel Street I found that access from Park ward for motor traffic was barred and difficult, if not impossible, and that, if an estate can be said to face in any particular direction, that this one faced anywhere but east. I thought Mr. White's re-arrangement for the 4 easternmost wards, shown on plan C1, had most to commend it. By way of description, the boundary between Queenstown and St. Mary's Park wards in his suggested scheme runs along Beechmore Road rather than Alexandra Drive and continues on the west rather than the east side of Battersea Park, but this latter part of the alteration involves only the open space of the park. The boundary of Latchmere ward continues along Battersea Park Road to Queenstown Road. These 2 alterations avoid splitting the estates in this area, a proposal which had produced a petition and objections. The third variation from the Commission's proposals was to draw the boundary between Queenstown and Shaftesbury wards along Stanley Grove rather than along Emu Road. I looked at the suggested boundaries. At the northern end of Stanley Grove, the boundary can reach the railway
by following the western curtilage of No. 52 Broughton Street
where, contrary to the indication on the 6" plans, there is a
gap in the terrace housing. To the west of No. 52, Eversleigh
Road commences. In Latchmere ward, the south western boundary,
which looks tortuous on a map, makes good sense on the ground
and the street pattern shown on the plans in this area has
disappeared completely in a mixture of modern and well-spaced
high and low-rise development. These wards avoid the objections
voiced about the Queenstown ward boundary, and they have well
defined boundaries. I think the boundary between Shaftesbury
and St. John's ward should be along Parma Crescent. The best
boundary in this area is undoubtedly St. John's Road, but there
are over 1000 electors between St. John's Road and Parma Crescent,
and the figures do not allow the boundary to be moved so far.
Other boundaries are possible, but Parma Crescent was suggested
by the Commission and no one objected to it save to say that
St. John's Road was preferable, and it produces acceptable figures.
The overall figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>9618 (2.78)</td>
<td>9800 (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>10,437 (3.02)</td>
<td>9513 (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere</td>
<td>8738 (2.53)</td>
<td>9394 (2.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Park</td>
<td>9528 (2.75)</td>
<td>9501 (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>7164 (2.07)</td>
<td>6642 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall entitlement on 1975 figures is 13.15 but this should grow
to 14.15 by 1982, so 14 councillors are justified. The over-
representation on 1975 figures is most apparent in Latchmere ward.
However it should contain the highest level of increase in the borough (see NW/5). It includes the Kambala Road development, which is in the course of construction. I consider the wards are acceptable.

46. **Names.** There was general consensus about names. Alternatives were suggested for the Roehampton and West Putney area, but aroused no enthusiasm, and of course schemes with more than 22 wards produced other names. However the names by which I have referred to the wards in the preceding paragraphs were clearly acceptable and I recommend that they should be used.

47. **Conclusion.** I recommend that the Borough of Wandsworth should be divided into 22 wards returning 61 councillors. I have marked the boundaries in green on a 6 inch plan and I have set out the wards, together with electorates, entitlements, and number of councillors in Appendix 1 to this report.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant

[Signature]

(Michael Lewer)
## Electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of publication of register</th>
<th>Electorate at 15th February (Year)</th>
<th>Decrease over previous year</th>
<th>1970 Register = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>224,715 (1971)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>222,455 (1972)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>98.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>218,803 (1973)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>97.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>214,559 (1974)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>95.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>212,547 (1975)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>94.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>211,083 (1976)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>93.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>208,824 (1977)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>92.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>205,581 (1978)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>91.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of 1971 Census: 25th/26th April 1971
Qualifying date for 1972 Register: 10th October 1971
Average rate of fall in electorate 1970-1977: 1.22% per year
LONDON BOROUGH OF WANDSWORTH

Relationship between the number of residential hereditaments in the Borough as at 1st April to the electorate as at 15th February in the same year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hereditaments</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average number of electors per hereditament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>97,431</td>
<td>224,715</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>97,562</td>
<td>222,455</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>97,559</td>
<td>218,803</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>98,208</td>
<td>214,559</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>99,360</td>
<td>212,547</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>99,365</td>
<td>211,083</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>100,241</td>
<td>208,824</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARD BOUNDARIES

Calculations of East Hill Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom Type Proposed</th>
<th>No. of dwellings</th>
<th>Estimated Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 person 1-bedroom unit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person bedsit unit</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 person 1-bedroom unit</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 person 2-bedroom unit</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>293 (2.2 basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 person 3-bedroom unit</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>278 (2.5 basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 person 4-bedroom unit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81 (3.5 basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:- The figure of 1,048 calculated on the above basis compares with a figure of 1,050 if electorate for all 478 dwellings proposed is calculated on the basis of 2.2 electors per dwelling.
LONDON BOROUGH OF WANDSWORTH

Electorate per register published February 1975

211,083  A

Projected electorate for register to be published in February 1982 (Historical average rate of decline of 1.22% per year between 1970/77)

193,000  B

Figure in 'B' will include 14,000 electors being relocated in new development planned to take place in the Borough

B (193,000) - 14,000 = 179,000  C

Relationship of 'C' to 'A'

100 : 84.8

Therefore - calculation of estimated ward electorates for register to be published in February 1981 - before adjustment to take account of additional electorate - has been taken on basis of 85% of 1975 electorate - hence:

85% of 211,083 = 179,000
Relocation in development = 14,000
193,000 = B
LONDON BOROUGH OF Wandsworth

Calculation of electorates for the Wards as proposed by the Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975 Electorate</th>
<th>85% 1975 Electorate</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Estimated 1982 Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thamesfield</td>
<td>10,987</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roehampton</td>
<td>9,986</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>9,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Putney</td>
<td>10,964</td>
<td>9,319</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>9,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Putney</td>
<td>10,242</td>
<td>8,706</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>9,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>6,196</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>6,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>5,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>11,147</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>9,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Park</td>
<td>9,939</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>9,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere</td>
<td>8,098</td>
<td>6,883</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>8,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>7,173</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>6,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>10,657</td>
<td>9,058</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>9,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>9,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlsfield</td>
<td>10,268</td>
<td>8,728</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>9,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>6,809</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>10,622</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>9,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balham</td>
<td>10,595</td>
<td>9,006</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>8,451</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>9,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooting</td>
<td>11,015</td>
<td>9,363</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graveney</td>
<td>10,482</td>
<td>8,910</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>10,357</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furzedown</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>9,815</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

211,083  179,422  13,869  193,291
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Original estimate of electorate</th>
<th>Revised electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Councillors</td>
<td>1980 Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roehampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Putney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Putney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlsfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graveney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furzedown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Electorate per member)  (3,402)  (3,169)
## NORTH BATTERSEA

**CONSERVATIVE**

**Scheme A - Revised**  (Shown on Map 'C')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Cllr's</th>
<th>Town Hall 1982 Estimate</th>
<th>Fairfield Adjustment</th>
<th>Further Adjustment</th>
<th>1982 Proposed Electorate</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6969</td>
<td></td>
<td>-544 (i)</td>
<td>6425</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8918</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9311</td>
<td>-850 (iii)</td>
<td>+816 (ii)</td>
<td>9277</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6706</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6934</td>
<td></td>
<td>-816 (ii)</td>
<td>6118</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5995</td>
<td></td>
<td>+544 (i)</td>
<td>6539</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44833</td>
<td>-850 (i)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjustments to Scheme 'A' now proposed:

1. The inclusion of that part of the Doddington Estate previously shown in Queenstown Ward in Latchmere Ward instead. This adjustment results in the entire Doddington Estate falling within the new proposed Latchmere Ward.

2. The inclusion of part of the Kampala development in St John's Ward instead of in River Ward. A natural boundary along the horizontal spine of the development is suggested as the new boundary, and is shown on Map 'D'.

3. The effect of the Chief Executive's Proposals.
## APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of Councillors</th>
<th>Electorate 1975 / Entitlement 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thamesfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,987 (3.18) / 9,650 (3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roehampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,986 (2.89) / 9,700 (3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. West Putney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,964 (3.17) / 9,850 (3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. East Putney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,297 (2.98) / 9,647 (3.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. West Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,822 (1.97) / 6,153 (1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parkside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,234 (1.80) / 6,400 (2.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Southfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,147 (3.22) / 9,750 (3.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. St. Mary's Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,528 (2.75) / 9,501 (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Latchmere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,738 (2.53) / 9,394 (2.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Queenstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,164 (2.07) / 6,642 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shaftesbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,437 (3.02) / 9,513 (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. St. John</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,618 (2.78) / 9,800 (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fairfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,324 (2.12) / 6,351 (2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Earlsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,902 (1.99) / 6,289 (1.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Northcote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,367 (3.00) / 8,853 (2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nightingale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,627 (3.07) / 9,205 (2.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Balham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,020 (2.90) / 8,761 (2.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Springfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,520 (3.04) / 10,291 (3.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tooting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,015 (3.18) / 9,600 (3.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Graveney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,482 (3.03) / 9,000 (2.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Bedford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,357 (2.99) / 9,050 (2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Furzedown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,547 (3.34) / 9,900 (3.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>211,083 / 193,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION INQUIRY - 19th MAY 1977

Name
Michael Sand
C.T. Hope
Len Farr
R. Freedman
Christine Helfany

Representing
Battersea Labour Party

Dr. Fung
Enoch David
Dwight M. Fung

H. L. D. J. Golden

Dover Ward Lib Dems

David Patterson
Paul Bondage

Bryan Ibbot
Ken Hosking
Peter Gerhold

C.C. Councillor
Brian Keggoe

M.P.
Wandsworth Community Party

Euston Ward Lib Dems

Dulwich Ward Lib Dems

Primary Liberal Association

Combined Liberal Associations in Wandsworth

Observer.

North Battersea Councillors Association
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION INQUIRY - 19th MAY 1977

Name

Barbara Hays
Andrew Wells
Anne S. Barrow
Jean W. Lucas
Mr. J. L. Harris Q.C.
Cllr. C. A. Cloke
Stevie Malton

Representing

NHL Battersea Conservative Ass.

South Battersea Conservative Ass.
Putney Conservative Association & Wandsworth Conservative Co-ordinating Committee
Wandsworth Conservative Co-ordinating Committee
Putney Conservative Association.
Leader of Conservative Opposition in B.V.

Chief Executive, Wandsworth

Wandsworth Tooting Conservative Agent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDFORD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLSFIELD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST PUTNEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFIELD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURZEDOWN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVENEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATCHMERE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHTINGALE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHCOTE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKSIDE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSTOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROEHAMPTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JOHN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARY'S PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAFTESBURY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAMESFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOTING</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST HILL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST PUTNEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

ROEHAMPTON WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of the Borough meets Roehampton Lane, thence southwards and southeastwards along said lane to Kingston Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the road known as Wimbledon Park Side at Tibbet's Corner, thence southwards along said road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards, generally northwards and eastwards along the southern, western and northern boundaries of the Borough to the point of commencement.

WEST PUTNEY WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Roehampton Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said Borough boundary and continuing eastwards along Upper Richmond Road to Balmuir Gardens, thence southwards along said gardens to Howard's Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Coalecroft Road, thence southwards along said road to Hazlewell Road, thence westwards along said road to Castello Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to Chartfield Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to Genoa Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to Westleigh Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to the road known as Putney Hill, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing southwestwards along the road known as Tibbet's Ride to the eastern boundary of Roehampton Ward, thence southwestwards, northwestwards and northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
THAMESFIELD WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of West Putney Ward
meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards
and eastwards along said Borough boundary to the River Wandle, thence
generally southwards along said river to and continuing southwards along
Bell Lane Creek to the Clapham Junction - Barnes Railway, thence westwards
along said railway to the Putney Bridge - Putney railway, thence southwards
along said railway to Upper Richmond Road, thence northwestwards along said
road to the northern boundary of West Putney Ward, thence westwards along
said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

EAST PUTNEY WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of West Putney Ward
meets the southern boundary of Thamesfield Ward, thence generally eastwards
along said southern boundary to Putney Bridge Road, thence generally
southeastwards along said road to Wandsworth High Street, thence westwards
along said street to Merton Road, thence generally southwards along said
road to Wimbledon Park Road, thence southwestwards along said road to
Granville Road thence westwards along said road to the East Putney -
Wimbledon Park railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to
Cromer Villas Road, thence westwards along said road to Sutherland Grove,
thench northwestwards along said grove to the road known as West Hill,
thench southwestwards along said road to Lytton Grove, thence northwest-
wards along said grove to the road known as Putney Hill, thence south-
westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of West Putney Ward,
thench westwards, generally northwards and eastwards along said ward
boundary to the point of commencement.
WEST HILL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of West Putney Ward meets the southern boundary of East Putney Ward, thence northeastwards and generally southeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing southeastwards along the East Putney - Wimbledon Park railway to Augustus Road, thence generally westwards along said road to Princes Way, thence northwestwards along said way to Windlesham Grove, thence westwards along said grove to Victoria Drive, thence northwestwards along said drive to Withycombe Road, thence southwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Roehampton Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of West Putney Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

PARKSIDE WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Roehampton Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the southern boundary of West Hill Ward, thence northwards, southeastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary to the East Putney - Wimbledon Park railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

SOUTHFIELD WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Parkside Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the northeastern boundary of West Hill Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the southern boundary of East Putney Ward, thence eastwards and generally northeastwards along said southern boundary and the eastern boundary of said ward to Wandsworth High Street, thence eastwards along said street to Garratt Lane, thence generally
southwards along said lane to Mapleton Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the River Wandle, thence generally southwards along said river to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

FAIRFIELD WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Thamesfield ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said Borough boundary to Wandsworth Bridge, thence southeastwards along said Bridge and continuing along Bridgend Road to the roundabout at the junction of said road, York Road and Trinity Road, thence southeastwards across said roundabout to and southeastwards along Trinity Road to the path crossing Wandsworth Common leading from the junction of the road known as Spencer Park and Windmill Lane to the road known as Wandsworth Common West Side, thence southwestwards along said path to Wandsworth Common West Side, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing southwestwards along Allfarthing Lane to Garrett Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane to the eastern boundary of Southfield Ward, thence generally northwards and westwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of said ward to the eastern boundary of East Putney Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Thamesfield Ward, thence eastwards and northwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of said ward to the point of commencement.

EARLSFIELD WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Southfield Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Fairfield Ward, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said southern boundary to Trinity Road, thence southeastwards along said road.
to the Clapham Junction - Wimbledon Railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SPRINGFIELD WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Earlsfield Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary and continuing northeastwards along the Wimbledon - Clapham Junction railway to the road known as Battersea Rise, thence eastwards along said road to the Clapham Junction - Balham railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to Bellevue Road, thence southwestwards along said road and Burntwood Lane to Beechcroft Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of the Ernest Bevin School, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to Glenburnie Road, thence northwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Springfield Hospital, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Streatham Cemetery, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary and southwards and southwestwards along the western boundary of said cemetery to Garratt Lane, thence northwards along said lane to Wimbledon Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
TOOTING WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Springfield Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to Dalebury Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Trinity Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Upper Tooting Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Topsham Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Avoca Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Hillbrook Road, thence generally northwestwards along said road to Blakenham Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Cowick Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Upper Tooting Road, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing along Tooting High Street to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

GRAVENEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Tooting Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to Topsham Road, thence southeastwards along said road and Mantilla Road to Rectory Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Southcroft Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Mitcham Road, thence southwards along said road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
FURZEDOWN WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the
de southeastern boundary of Graveney Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward
boundary to Church Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Tooting Bec
Road, thence eastwards along said road to the eastern boundary of the Borough,
thence generally southwards and southwestwards along said boundary to and
northwestwards and southwestwards along the southern boundary of the Borough
to the point of commencement.

BEDFORD WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the
northern boundary of Furzedown Ward, thence westwards and southwestwards along
the northern and western boundaries of said ward to the northeastern boundary
of Graveney Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern
boundary of Tooting Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said
ward boundary and continuing northeastwards along Balham High Road to the
Clapham Junction - Streatham Hill railway, thence eastwards along said railway
to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said
boundary to the point of commencement.

NIGHTINGALE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Bedford Ward meets
the northeastern boundary of Tooting Ward, thence northwestwards and south-
westwards along said northeastern boundary to the eastern boundary of Springfield
Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said boundary and continuing
northeastwards along Bellevue Road and Nightingale Lane to Ramsden Road, thence
southeastwards along said road to Balham High Road, thence southwestwards
along said road to the northwestern boundary of Bedford Ward, thence continuing
southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
BALHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the northern boundary of Bedford Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Nightingale Ward, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said boundary and continuing northwestwards along Ramsden Road to Thurleigh Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Devereux Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Broomwood Road, thence northeastwards along said road to The Avenue, thence southeastwards along The Avenue to Windmill Drive, thence northeastwards along said drive to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTHCOTE WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the northern boundary of Balham Ward, thence generally southwestwards and southeastwards along said ward boundary to the northwestern boundary of Nightingale Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Springfield Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the road known as Battersea Rise, thence eastwards along said road and the road known as Clapham Common North Side to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ST JOHN WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Fairfield Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said borough boundary to a point being the prolongation northwestwards of York Place, thence southeastwards to and along said place to York Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Plough Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Fowler Close, thence northeastwards along said close to a point being the prolongation southwards of the footpath running at the rear of the
properties on the northwest side of Fowler Close to Newcomen Road, thence northeastwards to and along said footpath and said road to Lavender Road, thence eastwards along said road to Darien Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Ingrave Street, thence eastwards along said street to Falcon Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the road known as Lavender Hill, thence eastwards along said road to the road known as Lavender Sweep, thence southwestwards along said road to Eccles Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Parma Crescent, thence southeastwards along said crescent to Eccles Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Northcote Ward, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the northwestern boundary of Springfield Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Earlsfield Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Fairfield Ward to the point of commencement.

LATCHMERE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of St John Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said borough boundary to the bridge carrying the Clapham Junction - West Brompton railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to Battersea Park Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Queenstown Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the Victoria - Clapham Junction railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the northeastern boundary of St John Ward, thence generally northwestwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SHAFTESBURY WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the northern boundary of Northcote Ward, thence westwards along said ward boundary to the northeastern boundary of St John Ward, thence northwestwards, westwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Latchmere Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to a point opposite
the junction of Eversleigh Road and Broughton Street, thence southeastwards in a straight line to said junction, thence northeastwards along Broughton Street to Stanley Grove, thence southeastwards along said grove to Queenstown Road, thence southwards along said road to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ST MARY'S PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Latchmere Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said borough boundary to Albert Bridge, thence southwards along said bridge and Albert Bridge Road to Prince of Wales Drive, thence eastwards along said drive to Beechmore Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Latchmere Ward, thence southwestwards and northwestern along said boundary to the point of commencement.

QUEENSTOWN WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of St Mary's Park Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards and southwestwards along the northern and eastern boundaries of the Borough to the eastern boundary of Shaftesbury Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Latchmere Ward, thence generally northeastwards and southeastwards along the southeastern and northern boundaries of said ward to the eastern boundary of St Mary's Park Ward, thence northwestern, westwards and northwestern along said boundary to the point of commencement.