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Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in 2012.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 June 2012</td>
<td>Consultation on council size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 September 2012</td>
<td>Submission of proposals of ward patterns to the LGBCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 2012</td>
<td>LGBCE’s analysis and formulation of draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2013</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 2013</td>
<td>Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3.5% between 2012 and 2018. Having considered the evidence provided by the Council regarding developments, we are of the view that these projections are the best available at the present time. These figures form the basis of the draft recommendations.

Council size

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea currently has a council size of 54 councillors. Following preliminary discussions between the Commission and the Council, the Council proposed a council size of 51.

Having considered the evidence received, we were minded to consult on a council size of 51. We received seven submissions during this consultation period. Broadly speaking, respondents supported a council size of 51. However, three respondents
proposed a further reduction with one local resident proposing a significant reduction to between 35–45 members.

We considered all evidence received relating to council size and decided to propose a council size of 51 for Kensington & Chelsea. We then invited warding patterns based on this number.

During the consultation on warding patterns, the Labour Group proposed a council size of 50 and submitted a borough-wide warding pattern based on this number. We noted a council size of 50 would provide a better allocation of members throughout the borough, particular in the north of the borough. We are of the view that a council size of 50 would not impact adversely on the governance arrangements of the Council and we have therefore based our draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea on a council size of 50 members.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during the consultation on warding patterns, we have developed proposals for the borough based broadly on the borough-wide schemes received from the Labour Group and the Conservative Group, subject to modifications in some areas to provide clearer boundaries and reflect evidence of community identity received from other local interests.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea contained in the report. We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals. We will take into account all submissions received by 10 June 2013. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

Review Officer
Kensington & Chelsea Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

You can also view our draft recommendations for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk
1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea’s electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on ward arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea in autumn 2013.

What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure ‘electoral equality’, which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Kensington & Chelsea?

6 Based on the December 2010 electorate figures, 44% of wards in the council had a variance of more than 10%.

How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change as a result of our recommendations.

1 Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.
8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the
draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community,
regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft
recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the
importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather
than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 10 June
2013. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are
due to publish in autumn 2013. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on
page 19 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk. You
can also view our draft recommendations for the Royal Borough of Kensington &
Chelsea on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for
England?

9 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent
body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and
Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall
2 Analysis and draft Recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed ward boundaries and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea is to achieve a level of electoral equality – that is, each elector's vote being worth the same as another's. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

12 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

13 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral equality is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over a five-year period.

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received

---

seven submissions during the council size consultation stage and 16 submissions during our consultation on warding arrangements. All submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

16 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our draft recommendations.

Electorate figures

17 As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3.5% over the six-year period from 2012–18.

18 The growth in the electorate is forecast to occur relatively evenly throughout the borough. However, increased growth is due to occur in Golborne, World’s End and Abingdon. In the Abingdon area in particular, significant residential building work is currently taking place.

19 During the consultation stage, the Council advised us that further growth in the borough was anticipated. This was due to planned building on the former Kensington Gas Works site in Kensal Town. However, the Council confirmed this would not come on stream until after 2018, after the period five years subsequent to the scheduled end of the electoral review to which we must have regard for electorate forecasts. Consequently, the Council did not have regard for the planned development in this specific area while producing its electorate forecasts for the borough.

20 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are therefore content to use their figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

21 The Council currently has 54 councillors elected from 18 three-member wards. During preliminary discussions, the Council proposed a council size of 51, a reduction of three from the existing number of elected members.

22 During the consultation on council size, we received seven submissions. Submissions were received from local residents and local organisations.

23 Broadly speaking, respondents supported a council size of 51. Two local residents proposed a further reduction. One of the local residents did not specify what this should be while the other proposed a significant reduction to between 35–45 members. A further local resident proposed the existing council size of 54 be retained.

24 The local resident who proposed a significant reduction in council size argued that the Council is over-represented in contrast to other inner London boroughs.
However, we would not normally consider the appropriate council size for a local authority by making a direct comparison with other councils.

25 The local resident commented on the “tri-borough” shared services agreement with the neighbouring London boroughs of Westminster and Hammersmith & Fulham. The local resident suggested that the impact of the shared services agreement was not reflected in the modest reduction in council size proposed by the Council.

26 In considering the political management structure of the Council, the local resident argued that a council size of 51 would leave a large number of backbenchers, regardless of the size of its cabinet. He instead suggested that the Council could effectively function with significantly fewer members.

27 We considered the local resident’s comments regarding the tri-borough arrangement. However, having met with the Council, its cross-party working group for the electoral review elaborated on the impact of the tri-borough arrangement with regard to workload. Members of the working group clarified that the tri-borough arrangement has no bearing on the sovereignty of the respective councils and has, it was argued, generated further workload for the Council’s scrutiny function.

28 While the local resident proposed a significant reduction in council size, he did not provide evidence to support a specific number and did not have sufficient regard for the Council’s political management structure and member workload. Conversely, the Council’s submission clearly outlined how a council size of 51 would operate effectively.

29 Having considered the evidence received, we were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 51 and invited proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors. However, we also explained that this figure could be slightly adjusted in order to provide a warding pattern that better reflects the statutory criteria.

30 During the consultation on warding arrangements, the Conservative Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and a local resident all submitted borough-wide proposals based on a council size of 51. However, the Labour Group submitted borough-wide proposals based on a council size of 50.

31 In formulating a warding pattern for Kensington & Chelsea as part of our draft recommendations, we considered that a council size of 50 would provide a better allocation of members throughout the borough. This is particularly applicable in the north of the borough, as proposed by the Labour Group.

32 We are of the view that a council size of 50 would not impact adversely on the governance arrangements of the Council, and would better reflect our statutory criteria. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea are based on a council size of 50 members.
Electoral fairness

33 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

34 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (109,637 in 2012 and 113,500 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 50 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 2,193 in 2012 and 2,270 in 2018.

35 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed 18 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Kensington & Chelsea.

General analysis

36 We received four borough-wide proposals, from the Conservative Group, the Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and a local resident. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we are of the view that all four of the borough-wide submissions provide good electoral equality and would use relatively clear boundaries. However, the schemes were supported by limited evidence of community identity and instead largely referred to socio-economic and historical factors which, in isolation, the Commission cannot consider when seeking to reflect its statutory criteria.

37 Consequently, we have based our draft recommendations on a combination of the borough-wide proposals received, subject to modifications. Broadly speaking, we have adopted the Labour Group’s proposals in the north of the borough while we have adopted the Conservative Group’s proposals in the south. However, we note that both proposals are similar in a number of areas with the Liberal Democrat Group’s and the local resident’s proposals, in some instances proposing identical warding patterns.

38 In the absence of evidence relating to community identity, our proposals are based on providing clear and strong ward boundaries and good electoral equality. Where we have proposed modifications, these are to provide clearer boundaries. Our proposed changes to ward names also reflect evidence of community identity received from other local respondents and apparent community identities observed while touring the borough.

39 Our proposals would result in four two-member wards and 14 three-member wards. A summary of the proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table 1 and detailed in Appendix A.
Our proposals would result in one ward, Holland, with an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the borough average based on the 2012 electorate figures. However, all of our proposed wards are forecast to have electoral variances within 10% of the borough average by 2018.

Electoral Arrangements

This section of the report details the submissions received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of Kensington & Chelsea. The following areas are considered in turn:

- North Kensington (pages 9–12)
- Central and South Kensington (pages 12–14)
- Chelsea (pages 14–16)

North Kensington

North Kensington is the most northerly part of the borough and broadly comprises the areas of Ladbroke Grove and Notting Hill. North Kensington currently has six three-member wards and has a distinct character, particularly in the Ladbroke Grove area, from South Kensington and Chelsea to the south of the borough. The area has a clear north-to-south boundary in Ladbroke Grove and the east-to-west boundaries of the Westway and the railway lines running parallel to it, and Notting Hill Gate/Holland Park Avenue.

In addition to the borough-wide schemes discussed in paragraph 36, we received three submissions in relation to this area. A local resident also submitted proposals for north-west Kensington which were identical to the Labour Group’s proposed warding pattern in this area. With the exception of the Conservative Group’s proposal, the borough-wide schemes all proposed a pattern of two- and three-member wards in North Kensington. Furthermore, the Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and the local resident’s schemes all shared some similarities in this part of the borough.

As discussed in paragraph 37, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in the borough-wide proposals received, we have sought to propose a warding pattern across the borough which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore broadly adopted the Labour Group’s proposals within North Kensington, subject to some modifications.

Ladbroke Grove

The Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and the local resident proposed similar warding patterns in Ladbroke Grove. Most notably, their proposed Golborne ward was identical. This was also supported by the Golborne Forum, a local community group.
Conversely, the Conservative Group’s proposal in this area largely retained the existing warding pattern, subject to modifications to improve electoral equality. The Conservative Group’s proposed Golborne ward would straddle the clear boundary provided by Ladbroke Grove. Its proposed Golborne ward would therefore comprise the largely non-residential Kensal Town area which includes Kensal Green Cemetery, the former Kensington Gas Works and Sainsbury’s supermarket.

As discussed in paragraph 19, the Council advised the Commission that the electorate in the Kensal Town area is due to significantly increase following development on the former gas works site. However, this is not due to commence until after 2018. During the five years from the scheduled end of this review, the electorate in Kensal Town is forecast to be largely static.

Kensal Town does not appear to share a community focus with the Golborne area. Indeed, this area looks more to its north and the adjacent boroughs of Brent and Westminster. The Golborne Forum stated ‘Ladbroke Grove is a key psychological as well as physical boundary and we submit that it should revert to being the ward boundary between Golborne and [the existing adjacent ward] St Charles’.

We therefore propose a three-member Golborne ward as proposed by the Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group, the local resident and the Golborne Forum. We are confident that the proposed Golborne ward will reflect local community identities in this area and provide clear ward boundaries. Under our proposed council size of 50 members, Golborne ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the borough by 2018.

To the west of Golborne, the borough-wide schemes received proposed varying warding patterns in the St Charles and Latimer area. However, with the exception of the Labour Group proposal, which was supported by a local resident, these warding proposals would straddle the Westway. While we acknowledge the Westway does not present a physical barrier as a bypass, it nonetheless provides a clear and defining boundary in the area that is commonly regarded as such locally. We therefore propose adopting the Labour Group’s proposed two-member Dalgarno ward and two-member St Helen’s ward with equal to and 3% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

Where the Labour Group’s proposed boundary between Dalgarno and St Helen’s wards follows St Quintin Avenue, we explored moving this boundary to the north, instead following Barlby Road. However, the Labour Group’s proposed warding pattern reflects identities and interests of residents on Barlby Road and the surrounding streets. Their focus is largely eastwards toward Ladbroke Grove or to the west outside of the borough. Furthermore, St Quintin Avenue and St Charles Square provide clear boundaries that reflect a natural divide in this area, largely due to Kensington Memorial Park and the non-residential properties within St Charles Square.

We do, however, propose St Helen’s ward be named St Charles, the existing ward name used in this area. We note this area is locally known as St Charles and comprises St Charles Square and St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College. We are
therefore of the view that St Charles would provide a more appropriate ward name to reflect the area it comprises.

**Notting Hill**

53 The Labour Group and the local resident proposed an identical warding pattern in the east of Notting Hill. The proposed three-member Colville and two-member Pembridge wards would be bounded by Notting Hill Gate, Ladbroke Grove and the Westway/Hammersmith & City/Circle tube lines. These wards would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor and 3% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively. The Labour Group’s and the local resident’s proposed warding pattern would effectively modify the existing boundary between the wards to achieve good electoral equality.

54 Conversely, the Conservative Group’s and the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposed warding pattern would create wards that would straddle Ladbroke Grove and Notting Hill Gate. Both the Conservative Group and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed two three-member wards for this area. However, under a council size of 50 members, this area is allocated five members, as in the Labour Group’s and the local resident’s proposed warding patterns.

55 The Conservative Group argued that its inclusion of the area west of Ladbroke Grove within its proposed Pembridge ward was due to it sharing a ‘similar character to the rest of the Ladbroke Estate (and Conservation area)’. Yet the Conservative Group did not provide evidence of community identities to support the commonality it suggests exists between these areas.

56 Similarly, the Liberal Democrat Group provided socio-economic factors to support its proposed Notting Hill Gate ward that would straddle Notting Hill Gate. The Liberal Democrat Group did not, however, provide evidence of community identities to support its proposals.

57 We consider Ladbroke Grove and Notting Hill Gate to be sufficiently clear boundaries in this area. We are of the view that in the absence of evidence to the contrary, both streets would provide the clearest ward boundaries in this area. We have therefore adopted the Labour Group’s and the local resident’s proposed Pembridge and Colville wards, subject to minor modifications.

58 Where the boundary between these wards runs via Kensington Park Gardens and Chepstow Villas, we propose the boundary instead follow the backs of properties to the south, encompassing both streets within Colville ward. This would reflect the shared community focus of the properties on both streets. Consequently, the proposed Colville and Pembridge wards would have 2% more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

59 To the west of Ladbroke Grove, we again sought to use the boundaries of the Westway, Ladbroke Grove and Holland Park Avenue. However, of the borough-wide schemes received, this was only reflected in the Labour Group’s proposals. The Labour Group proposed a three-member Notting Dale ward and a two-member
Norland ward with 9% fewer and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

60 We received a further submission in this area from the Allom & Barlow Residents’ Association. The Residents’ Association argued that the Allom and Barlow Estate shared no commonality with the Norland area to its south. The Residents’ Association provided some evidence of shared community identity within the Notting Barns area, which it identifies with, and mentioned a ‘summer Funday’ and two Queen’s Diamond Jubilee Festivals organised with the adjacent estates.

61 Given the Labour Group’s proposed warding pattern in this area provides the clearest boundaries and, in the absence of further evidence of community identity beyond that provided by the Residents’ Association, we have therefore adopted the Labour Group’s proposal in this area, subject to a minor modification.

62 Where the boundary between the proposed Notting Dale and Norland wards runs via Wilsham Street, we propose the boundary instead follow the backs of properties to the south, encompassing Wilsham Street within Notting Dale ward. This would reflect the shared focus of the properties on Wilsham Street. Consequently, the proposed Notting Dale and Norland wards would have 7% fewer and 2% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the borough average by 2018.

Central and South Kensington

63 Central and South Kensington broadly comprises Holland Park, Earl’s Court, South Kensington and Hans Town. The area currently has nine three-member wards and encompasses the museums of South Kensington, Kensington Gardens and Holland Park. The area has clear east-to-west boundaries provided by Kensington High Street, Cromwell Road, Old Brompton Road and Fulham Road.

64 In addition to the borough-wide schemes discussed in paragraph 36, we received five submissions in relation to this area. The Conservative Group and the Liberal Democrat Group both proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area while the Labour Group and the local resident proposed a pattern of two- and three-member wards.

65 In the absence of evidence of community identity to support the borough-wide proposals received, we have sought to propose a warding pattern across the borough which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore adopted the Conservative Group’s proposals within Central and South Kensington without modification. However, in formulating our draft recommendations in this area, we did consider some alternative options. We have also proposed a ward name change.

Holland Park and South Kensington

66 The Conservative Group and the local resident proposed identical three-member Holland and Campden wards. The boundary between these wards would follow Holland Walk, the pathway that runs to the east of Holland Park. We
considered this to be a clear boundary that would reflect the access routes and the apparent focus of streets either side of the park.

67 The Labour Group’s proposed warding pattern would largely follow Campden Hill Road which runs parallel to Holland Walk. While we considered this to be a reasonably clear boundary, we did not consider it would necessarily reflect transport and communication routes for the Campden Hill and Duchess of Bedford’s Walk which do not share clear vehicular access with the area to their west.

68 The Liberal Democrat Group’s proposal also partly followed Campden Hill Road. However, its proposed Notting Hill Gate ward would straddle Notting Hill Gate which we did not consider would provide for clear ward boundaries in this area.

69 To the west of this area, the Conservative Group and the local resident did not use the entirety of Kensington High Street as their proposed ward boundary. The Conservative Group and the local resident instead proposed that an area to the south-west of Kensington High Street lie within the proposed Holland ward rather than Abingdon ward to its south.

70 We considered following Kensington High Street in its entirety but we note that this area will be subject to significant growth in its electorate due to the building of residential properties.

71 Including this area within Abingdon ward would result in Holland and Abingdon wards with 18% fewer and 14% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2018. We would not be minded to accept such variances unless there was strong and persuasive evidence to support doing so. Furthermore, having toured this area, it appears to share a community focus with Holland ward with clear access via High Street Kensington.

72 To the south, the Conservative Group and the local resident’s proposed Abingdon wards were nearly identical. The Labour Group’s and the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposed Abingdon ward was similar to the proposals of the Conservative Group and the local resident. However, given the projected growth in the electorate discussed above, adopting the Labour Group’s and the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposed Abingdon ward would have a consequential effect upon our proposed warding pattern elsewhere in the borough. On balance, we have therefore decided to adopt the Conservative Group’s proposed Abingdon ward as part of our draft recommendations.

Earl’s Court, Courtfield and Brompton

73 To the west of South Kensington, the borough-wide proposals we received were broadly similar in the Earl’s Court and Redcliffe area. We did not any receive further submissions in relation to this area.

74 To the east of this area, we received a number of submissions in relation to the proposed ward names.
Councillor Anthony Coates (Courtfield) proposed the existing ward name of Courtfield be retained. Councillor Coates argued this was a name that residents were familiar with.

The Conservative Group’s proposed warding pattern, which we have based our draft recommendations in this area on, proposed the ward name Old Brompton rather than the existing ward name of Courtfield. While the Conservative Group’s proposed Old Brompton ward is not identical to the existing Courtfield ward, it nonetheless comprises much of the same area. We also note that the proposed ward includes Courtfield Gardens and Courtfield Road. We are therefore minded to adopt the ward name of Courtfield as part of our draft recommendations.

We also received three submissions in support of retaining the ward name Hans Town. We note that, with the exception of the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposed warding pattern in this area, the borough-wide proposals received supported the retention of this ward name. Furthermore, the area comprised by this ward is locally known and regarded as Hans Town. We are therefore content to adopt this ward name as part of our draft recommendations.

In considering the proposed warding pattern in the Hans Town area, we explored whether transferring the museums and streets north of Cromwell Gardens from the proposed Queen’s Gate ward to the proposed Hans Town ward would provide a better reflection of communities in this area. This would result in the proposed Hans Town and Queen’s Gate wards having 6% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2018. Under our draft recommendations, these wards would have improved electoral equality of 3% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018. Nonetheless, we felt the Conservative Group’s proposal would provide the best use of the east-to-west boundary provided by Cromwell Road and Brompton Road.

On balance, and in the absence of evidence to support an alternative warding pattern that would provide better electoral equality, we are not minded to depart from the boundary proposed by the Conservative Group. We have therefore adopted this proposal as part our draft recommendations. However, we welcome comments on this during consultation and will take seriously any submissions received that propose an alternative that follows clearly defined ward boundaries and ensures good electoral equality.

Chelsea

Chelsea lies to the south of the borough and currently has three three-member wards. With the exception of World’s End, Chelsea is broadly similar in character and the area has clear east-to-west boundaries provided by the Fulham Road and King’s Road.

In addition to the borough-wide schemes discussed in paragraph 36, we received two submissions in relation to this area. With the exception of the Conservative Group’s proposals, the borough-wide schemes received proposed a pattern of two- and three-member wards.
The Chelsea Society proposed that the warding pattern in Chelsea should respect the boundaries of the former Metropolitan Borough of Chelsea. While our proposed warding pattern does not reflect this in its entirety, broadly speaking, this is reflected in our proposals in the area.

As discussed in paragraph 37, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in support of the borough-wide proposals received, we have sought to propose a warding pattern across the borough which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore adopted the Conservative Group’s proposals within Chelsea without modification. However, in formulating our draft recommendations in this area, we considered some alternative options in the World’s End area.

**World’s End**

The Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and the local resident proposed identical warding patterns in the World’s End area. The respondents proposed a two-member ward in this area which would separate World’s End from the area to its east by following Beaufort Street as its eastern boundary. We considered this to be a clear boundary which would reflect the apparent community of World’s End. However, adopting this warding pattern would have a knock-on effect to our proposals in South Kensington where we are satisfied that our draft recommendations provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

The Conservative Group proposed a three-member Chelsea Riverside ward which would encompass this area, plus the area to its east. The Cremorne Residents’ Association of Lots Village also proposed a three-member ward but argued that Lots Village was a distinct community in this area.

Consequently, we have decided to adopt a three-member ward in this area, as proposed by the Conservative Group. Nonetheless, we considered a modification to the Conservative Group’s proposed Chelsea Riverside ward.

The Conservative Group’s proposed Chelsea Riverside ward would initially follow Oakley Street before running east onto Phene Street and Alpha Place, and then south via Flood Street. We toured this area and acknowledge that the proposal would provide a clear warding pattern. However, we considered following Oakley Street in its entirety could provide a clearer ward boundary. This would result in the proposed Chelsea Riverside and Royal Hospital wards having 10% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the borough average by 2018. The Conservative Group’s proposal, however, would result in electoral variances of 1% more and 5% more electors per councillor by 2018.

On balance, and in the absence of evidence to support an alternative warding pattern that would provide better electoral equality, we are not minded to depart from the boundary proposed by the Conservative Group. We have therefore adopted this proposal as part our draft recommendations but we welcome comments on this during consultation.
Elsewhere in Chelsea, and as discussed in paragraph 83, we have adopted the Conservative Group’s proposed warding pattern without modification. However, we received comments in relation to this area from the Sydney Street & District Residents’ Association.

The Residents’ Association proposed a minor modification to the existing warding pattern. It proposed that the boundary between Stanley and Brompton wards follow Pond Place rather than Bury Walk which it follows under the existing warding pattern. The Residents’ Association felt this modification would provide a better reflection of its community and argued that the current arrangements split the area it covers between two wards.

While we noted the Residents’ Association’s concerns, its comments were made in the context of the existing arrangements. Under a council size of 50 members, it has been necessary to depart from the existing warding pattern to provide good electoral equality. Consequently, the Residents’ Association’s proposed boundary is not viable under our proposed warding pattern. Nonetheless, under our draft recommendations, Guthrie Street, Stewart’s Grove, Sydney Street, Bury Walk and Pond Place (the streets covered by the Residents’ Association) lie within the proposed Stanley ward, thus reflecting the Residents’ Association’s community identity in this area.

Conclusions

Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Appendix A on pages 22–23, and illustrated on the large map we have produced. This map is also available to be viewed on our website.

Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.
Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft recommendation**

Kensington & Chelsea should comprise 50 councillors serving 18 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.
3 What happens next?

94 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 10 June 2013. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

95 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors and ward names. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during the consultation. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

96 Express your views by writing directly to:

Review Officer
Kensington & Chelsea Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

97 Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk or by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk

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

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

100 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.
101 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea in 2014.

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

Draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea

103 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Kensington & Chelsea Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Kensington & Chelsea Council.
## Appendix A

### Table A1: Draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2012)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2018)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abingdon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Campden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chelsea Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,336</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Colville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Courtfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6,915</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dalgarno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Earl's Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,934</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Golborne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hans Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,951</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7,023</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Holland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,646</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>6,681</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Norland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2012)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2018)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Notting Dale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pembridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Queen’s Gate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Redcliffe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,824</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Royal Hospital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,045</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 St Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Stanley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,747</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,637</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>113,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,193</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.

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

## Glossary and abbreviations

<p>| <strong>AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)</strong> | A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation’s interest to safeguard it |
| <strong>Constituent areas</strong> | The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either |
| <strong>Council size</strong> | The number of councillors elected to serve on a council |
| <strong>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</strong> | A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority |
| <strong>Division</strong> | A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council |
| <strong>Electoral fairness</strong> | When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s |
| <strong>Electoral imbalance</strong> | Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority |
| <strong>Electorate</strong> | People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections |
| Multi-member ward or division | A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors |
| National Park | The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a> |
| Number of electors per councillor | The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors |
| Over-represented | Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average |
| Parish | A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents |
| Parish council | A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council' |
| Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements | The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
<td>A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER (or periodic electoral review)</td>
<td>A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political management arrangements</td>
<td>The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision–making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>