
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2013 10:21
To: FOI@ (LGBCE)
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear LGBCE,

I am writing with an updated follow up to the request (copied below) that I made and you answered two years ago.

I would like to request the reports LGBCE (13) 62 ("Review Programme 2014-2015") and LGBCE (13) 66 ("Council Size Determination") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 9th April 2013. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs, other than the three London Boroughs currently being reviewed, and the latest local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

Please feel free to contact me for any clarification.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Vallotton, Sarah [mailto:Sarah.Vallotton@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 25 August 2011 11:11
To: phil@east-acton.com
Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [REDACTED],

I have asked our Freedom of Information Team to look into why you did not receive a response to your Fol request of 31 May.

They have informed me that a full response was sent to you by email on 13 June 2011. I am forwarding that response to you.

The only explanation I can offer as to why you did not receive the response is that it was sent to your "gmail" address rather than your "east-acton" address. Your "gmail" address was the first shown on your original Fol request, and it was for this reason that the Fol Team used that address to respond. I am sorry for any inconvenience this may have caused.

I hope that the email and attachments shown below are helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Kind regards

Sarah Vallotton

From: Knag, Daniel
Sent: 13 June 2011 15:30
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [REDACTED]

Our Ref: FOI 12/11

Thank you for your email of 31 May 2011 requesting information about reviews of London Boroughs under the Freedom of Information Act. You requested:

I would like to request report LGBCE (11) 36 ("Electoral Review Programme 2011/12 and 2012/13") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 8th March 2011. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs - not just the two London Boroughs referred to within the minute on the item - including the local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

I have attached the report requested (LGBCE(11)36) which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England considered at its meeting on 8 March 2011. I have also attached the ward data in an excel pivot table that is the basis on which the Commission decided which authorities to review in its 2011 – 2013 work programme for London.

The report itself sets out the Commission's approach. However, in brief, the Commission receives ward and division level data for all local authorities in England on an annual basis. This is provided by the local authorities themselves and compiled by Local Government Chronicle Elections Centre at Plymouth University. The data in question is usually from December of each year. The Commission has an intervention criteria for determining which authorities should potentially be subject to an electoral review. Furthermore, the Commission receives quite a number of requests from local authorities seeking an electoral review, to the extent that, in formulating its programme, it has had to prioritise them.

In order to meet its objectives, the Commission has looked first to address those review requests from local authorities where electoral variances are such as to meet its criteria for an electoral review. Therefore, if either of the following conditions are found to exist, then consideration is given to the need for a review:

- Any local authority with a division or ward that has an electoral variance in excess of 30%. This means a division or ward having at least 30% more (or less) electors in it than the average for the authority as a whole; and/or
- Any local authority where more than 30% of the divisions or wards have an electoral variance in excess of 10% from the average for that authority.

As you will see from the data, only the three London Boroughs listed in the work programme qualified under the criteria and were therefore selected by the Commission to be reviewed.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our response, please write to:

Freedom of Information Officer
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

If you are not happy with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision; details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Yours Sincerely,

Daniel Knag
Implementation Officer
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Implementation Team
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
Tel: 020 7664 8521
Fax: 020 7296 6227
www.lgbce.org.uk



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 10.0.1392 / Virus Database: 1520/3855 - Release Date: 08/24/11

From: Vallotton, Sarah
Sent: 26 June 2013 12:58
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST
Attachments: LGBCE (13)62 - 2014 2015 Review Programme - 2013-04-09.doc; LGBCE (13)62 - 2014 2015 Review Programme - Appendix A - 2013-04-09.xls; LGBCE (13)66 - Appendix C - Draft Guidance on the determination of Council Size - 2013-04-09.docx; LGBCE (13)66 - Council size Part 1 - A Structured Consultation - 2013-04-09.docx; LGBCE (13)66 - Council Size Part 2 – A New Approach - 2013-04-09.doc; LGBCE (13)66 - Council Size Part 2 – A New Approach - Appendix A - 2013-04-09.docx; LGBCE (13)66 - Council Size Part 2 – A New Approach - Appendix B - 2013-04-09.pdf

Dear [REDACTED]

Our ref: 06/13

Thank you for your email of 31 May 2013, requesting information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

You have requested:

“the reports LGBCE (13) 62 (“Review Programme 2014-2015”) and LGBCE (13) 66 (“Council Size Determination”) as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 9th April 2013. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs, other than the three London Boroughs currently being reviewed, and the latest local government electorates by ward for each London Borough”

The Commission does hold information relevant to your request. Please find attached a list of all documents released along with the information you have requested.

There is a further attachment not included with this email. This is a large spreadsheet that contains the latest information we have on electorates by ward for each London Borough. Because it is such a large file, we will send this by a separate email in the hope that this will make both sending and receiving the attachment as simple as possible. Please look out for a second email from me, with this spreadsheet attached.

I can confirm that we are not currently reviewing any other London Boroughs and therefore do not have relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration to electoral reviews in the London Boroughs, other than the three of which you are aware.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our decision, you should write to me at:

Sarah Vallotton

[REDACTED]

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Vallotton

[Redacted signature block]

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 31 May 2013 10:21
To: FOI@ (LGBCE)
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear LGBCE,

I am writing with an updated follow up to the request (copied below) that I made and you answered two years ago.

I would like to request the reports LGBCE (13) 62 ("Review Programme 2014-2015") and LGBCE (13) 66 ("Council Size Determination") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 9th April 2013. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs, other than the three London Boroughs currently being reviewed, and the latest local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

Please feel free to contact me for any clarification.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

From: Vallotton, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Vallotton@lgbce.org.uk>]
Sent: 25 August 2011 11:11
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [Redacted]

I have asked our Freedom of Information Team to look into why you did not receive a response to your Fol request of 31 May.

They have informed me that a full response was sent to you by email on 13 June 2011. I am forwarding that response to you.

The only explanation I can offer as to why you did not receive the response is that it was sent to your "gmail" address rather than your "east-acton" address. Your "gmail" address was the first shown on your original Fol request, and it was for this reason that the Fol Team used that address to respond. I am sorry for any inconvenience this may have caused.

I hope that the email and attachments shown below are helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Kind regards

Sarah Vallotton

From: Knag, Daniel
Sent: 13 June 2011 15:30
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [REDACTED]

Our Ref: FOI 12/11

Thank you for your email of 31 May 2011 requesting information about reviews of London Boroughs under the Freedom of Information Act. You requested:

I would like to request report LGBCE (11) 36 ("Electoral Review Programme 2011/12 and 2012/13") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 8th March 2011. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs - not just the two London Boroughs referred to within the minute on the item - including the local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

I have attached the report requested (LGBCE(11)36) which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England considered at its meeting on 8 March 2011. I have also attached the ward data in an excel pivot table that is the basis on which the Commission decided which authorities to review in its 2011 – 2013 work programme for London.

The report itself sets out the Commission's approach. However, in brief, the Commission receives ward and division level data for all local authorities in England on an annual basis. This is provided by the local authorities themselves and compiled by Local Government Chronicle Elections Centre at Plymouth University. The data in question is usually from December of each year. The Commission has an intervention criteria for determining which authorities should potentially be subject to an electoral review. Furthermore, the Commission receives quite a number of requests

from local authorities seeking an electoral review, to the extent that, in formulating its programme, it has had to prioritise them.

In order to meet its objectives, the Commission has looked first to address those review requests from local authorities where electoral variances are such as to meet its criteria for an electoral review. Therefore, if either of the following conditions are found to exist, then consideration is given to the need for a review:

- Any local authority with a division or ward that has an electoral variance in excess of 30%. This means a division or ward having at least 30% more (or less) electors in it than the average for the authority as a whole; and/or
- Any local authority where more than 30% of the divisions or wards have an electoral variance in excess of 10% from the average for that authority.

As you will see from the data, only the three London Boroughs listed in the work programme qualified under the criteria and were therefore selected by the Commission to be reviewed.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our response, please write to:

Freedom of Information Officer
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

If you are not happy with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision; details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Yours Sincerely,

Daniel Knag



www.lgbce.org.uk



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 10.0.1392 / Virus Database: 1520/3855 - Release Date: 08/24/11

From: Faccini, Dean
Sent: 04 June 2013 10:50
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear [REDACTED],

FOI Ref: 06/12

You requested:

I would like to request the reports LGBCE (13) 62 (“Review Programme 2014-2015”) and LGBCE (13) 66 (“Council Size Determination”) as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 9th April 2013. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs, other than the three London Boroughs currently being reviewed, and the latest local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

The Commission aims to respond promptly and within the statutory deadline of 20 working days set by the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Please expect a response by **28 June 2013**.

In some cases a fee may be payable and if that is the case I will let you know. A fees notice will be issued to you, and you will be required to pay before I will proceed to deal with your request.

If you have any queries or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me on the details provided below. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

www.lgbce.org.uk



It would help us if you would take a few minutes to answer a few questions about your experience of how we dealt with you.

[How are we doing? - Click on this link to give us your views](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2013 10:21
To: FOI@ (LGBCE)
Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear LGBCE,

I am writing with an updated follow up to the request (copied below) that I made and you answered two years ago.

I would like to request the reports LGBCE (13) 62 ("Review Programme 2014-2015") and LGBCE (13) 66 ("Council Size Determination") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 9th April 2013. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs, other than the three London Boroughs currently being reviewed, and the latest local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

Please feel free to contact me for any clarification.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

From: Vallotton, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Vallotton@lgbce.org.uk>]
Sent: 25 August 2011 11:11
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [Redacted]

I have asked our Freedom of Information Team to look into why you did not receive a response to your Fol request of 31 May.

They have informed me that a full response was sent to you by email on 13 June 2011. I am forwarding that response to you.

The only explanation I can offer as to why you did not receive the response is that it was sent to your "gmail" address rather than your "east-acton" address. Your "gmail" address was the first shown on your original Fol request, and it was for this reason that the Fol Team used that address to respond. I am sorry for any inconvenience this may have caused.

I hope that the email and attachments shown below are helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Kind regards

Sarah Vallotton

[Redacted signature]

From: Knag, Daniel

Sent: 13 June 2011 15:30

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: FOI Response 12/11

Dear [REDACTED]

Our Ref: FOI 12/11

Thank you for your email of 31 May 2011 requesting information about reviews of London Boroughs under the Freedom of Information Act. You requested:

I would like to request report LGBCE (11) 36 ("Electoral Review Programme 2011/12 and 2012/13") as considered by the Commission at its meeting on 8th March 2011. In addition, I would like to request the relevant supporting information in respect of any consideration given at officer or Commission level to electoral reviews of the London Boroughs - not just the two London Boroughs referred to within the minute on the item - including the local government electorates by ward for each London Borough (ideally in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or one of a compatible format).

I have attached the report requested (LGBCE(11)36) which the Local Government Boundary Commission for England considered at its meeting on 8 March 2011. I have also attached the ward data in an excel pivot table that is the basis on which the Commission decided which authorities to review in its 2011 – 2013 work programme for London.

The report itself sets out the Commission's approach. However, in brief, the Commission receives ward and division level data for all local authorities in [REDACTED] on an annual basis. This is provided by the local authorities themselves and compiled by Local Government Chronicle Elections Centre at Plymouth University. The data in question is usually from December of each year. The Commission has an intervention criteria for determining which authorities should potentially be subject to an electoral review. Furthermore, the Commission receives quite a number of requests from local authorities seeking an electoral review, to the extent that, in formulating its programme, it has had to prioritise them.

In order to meet its objectives, the Commission has looked first to address [REDACTED] review requests from local authorities where electoral variances are such as to meet its criteria for an electoral review. Therefore, if either of the following conditions are found to exist, then consideration is given to the need for a review:

- Any local authority with a division or ward that has an electoral variance in excess of 30%. This means a division or ward having at least 30% more (or less) electors in it than the average for the authority as a whole; and/or
- Any local authority where more than 30% of the divisions or wards have an electoral variance in excess of 10% from the average for that authority.

As you will see from the data, only the three London Boroughs listed in the work programme qualified under the criteria and were therefore selected by the Commission to be reviewed.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our response, please write to:

Freedom of Information Officer
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

If you are not happy with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision; details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Yours Sincerely,

Daniel Knag



www.lgbce.org.uk



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 10.0.1392 / Virus Database: 1520/3855 - Release Date: 08/24/11

District Name	Hackney	Meets FER Criteria? Yes/No	Yes	PER Start Date	1998-Feb	Electoral Cycle	Whole
		FER Start Date (if any)	n/a				

Is there an Elected Mayor? Yes

Sum of Electorate	Number of Councillors
Ward Name	3
Brownswood	8,175
Cazenove	8,349
Chatham	9,081
Clissold	8,717
Dalston	10,850
De Beauvoir	10,123
Hackney Central	9,150
Hackney Downs	9,139
Haggerston	9,477
Hoxton	10,786
Kings Park	7,951
Leabridge	9,781
Lordship	7,932
New River	7,504
Queensbridge	9,606
Springfield	7,317
Stoke Newington Central	8,876
Victoria	9,634
Wick	8,243

Average number of Electors per Councillor	Variance from the average	Wards +/-10% from the average	Wards +/-20% from the average	Wards +/-30% from the average	Wards +/-40% from the average
2,725	-9%	0	0	0	0
2,783	-7%	0	0	0	0
3,027	1%	0	0	0	0
2,906	-3%	0	0	0	0
3,617	21%	1	1	0	0
3,374	13%	1	0	0	0
3,050	2%	0	0	0	0
3,046	2%	0	0	0	0
3,159	5%	0	0	0	0
3,595	20%	1	1	0	0
2,650	-11%	1	0	0	0
3,260	9%	0	0	0	0
2,644	-12%	1	0	0	0
2,501	-16%	1	0	0	0
3,202	7%	0	0	0	0
2,439	-19%	1	0	0	0
2,959	-1%	0	0	0	0
3,211	7%	0	0	0	0
2,748	-8%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0
0	0%	0	0	0	0

Number of Wards > 10%	7
Number of Wards > 20%	2
Number of Wards > 30%	0
Number of Wards > 40%	0
% Wards > 10%	37%
% Wards > 20%	11%
% Wards > 30%	0%
% Wards > 40%	0%
Overall number of Wards	19
Overall number of Councillors	57
Overall Electorate	170,691
Overall Electors per Councillor	2,995
Overall number of single-member Wards	0
Overall number of 2-member Wards	0
Overall number of 3-member Wards	19
Overall number of 4-member Wards	0
Overall number of 5-member Wards	0
Overall Outlier (+)	21%
Overall Outlier (-)	-19%
Council Size	58