

338. However, on the basis of evidence put to us during the final consultation, we have decided to modify some of our proposed constituency names as part of the final recommendations. We recommend that: the Ealing and Acton constituency is renamed Ealing Central and Acton to reflect the name of the existing constituency; the Greenford and Sudbury constituency is renamed Ealing North and Sudbury as we accept the argument put to us that this better reflects the communities included in this constituency; the Hillingdon and Uxbridge constituency is renamed Uxbridge and Northolt to better reflect the towns in the constituency; and the Kilburn constituency is renamed Paddington and Queen's Park as this better reflects the constituency.
339. Our final recommendations in this sub-region are for constituencies of: Cities of London and Westminster, Ealing Central and Acton, Ealing North and Sudbury, Feltham and Hounslow, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow North, Harrow South and Kenton, Hayes and Harlington, Isleworth, Brentford and Chiswick, Kensington and Chelsea, Paddington and Queen's Park, Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner, Southall and Heston, Twickenham, Uxbridge and Northolt, Wembley, and Willesden and Shepherd's Bush.
340. These constituencies are listed in Volume two and shown on the maps in Volume three of this report.

## **South Thames**

### **Initial proposals**

341. Of the existing 28 constituencies in this sub-region, six have electorates within the permitted electorate range: Croydon Central, Dulwich and West Norwood, Kingston and Surbiton, Richmond Park, Tooting, and Vauxhall. Of the remaining constituencies, 18 have electorates that are below the permitted electorate range, and four are above. In developing the proposals for the South Thames sub-region, we proposed to retain as wholly unchanged the constituencies of Kingston and Surbiton, and Richmond Park.
342. In the boroughs of Merton and Wandsworth, we proposed a Wimbledon Common and Putney constituency, which included all six wards from the existing Putney constituency, and the two Merton borough wards of Wimbledon Park and Village from the Wimbledon constituency. We also proposed a Merton and Wimbledon Central constituency, which included eight wards from the existing Wimbledon constituency and four wards from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency. Our Tooting constituency retained all seven of its existing wards and added Graveney ward from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency. Our Battersea constituency included all seven of its existing wards and was brought into the permitted electorate range by adding the Lambeth borough ward of Thornton from the existing Streatham constituency.
343. In the Borough of Sutton, we proposed a Sutton and Cheam constituency that included eight wards from the existing constituency and the two Merton borough wards of Lower Morden and St. Helier from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency. Our proposed Carshalton and Wallington constituency remained as is, with the addition of the Belmont ward from the existing Sutton and Cheam constituency.
344. In the Borough of Croydon, we were able to retain three constituencies with minor reconfiguration. The proposed Croydon South constituency retained five of its wards and added three wards from

the existing Croydon Central constituency; our proposed Croydon Central constituency included three wards from the existing constituency, three from Croydon South, and one ward from Croydon North; while the proposed Croydon North constituency retained six of its wards, adding the Borough of Bromley ward of Crystal Palace from the existing Lewisham West and Penge constituency, and the Woodside ward from the Croydon Central constituency.

345. In the centre of the South Thames sub-region, we proposed a number of cross-borough boundary constituencies to ensure that all constituencies were within the permitted electorate range. The proposed Streatham and Mitcham constituency included four wards from the existing Streatham constituency, the Norbury ward from the Croydon North constituency, the Lambeth borough ward of Knight's Hill from the existing Dulwich and West Norwood constituency, and three Merton borough wards from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency.
346. In the Lambeth and Southwark boroughs, the electorate of the existing Dulwich and West Norwood constituency was within the permitted electorate range. However, minor changes were required to ensure that the electorates of adjacent constituencies were also within the permitted electorate range.
347. The proposed Dulwich and West Norwood constituency included six of its existing wards, the Lambeth borough ward of Tulse Hill from the existing Streatham constituency, and the Southwark borough ward of South Camberwell from the Camberwell and Peckham constituency. We further proposed a Clapham North and Stockwell constituency, which included five wards from the existing Vauxhall constituency, the Coldharbour ward from the existing Dulwich and West Norwood constituency, and the Brixton Hill and Clapham Common wards from the existing Streatham constituency. We proposed a Camberwell and Vauxhall Bridge constituency, which included five wards from the existing Camberwell and Peckham constituency, the Lambeth borough wards of Prince's and Vassall from the existing Vauxhall constituency, and the Newington ward from the existing Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency.
348. Our proposed Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency retained eight of its wards and added the Lambeth borough ward of Bishop's, which provided a link to the adjacent Cathedrals ward of the Borough of Southwark. We also proposed a Peckham and Lewisham West constituency, which included three wards from the existing Camberwell and Peckham constituency, three wards from the Lewisham West and Penge constituency, and two wards from the Lewisham, Deptford constituency.
349. In the east of the South Thames sub-region, we formulated constituencies that were within the permitted electorate range in the boroughs of Bromley, Bexley, Greenwich, and Lewisham, but doing so required significant changes to the existing constituencies. We were able to retain three constituencies in the Borough of Bromley. The Orpington constituency included all seven of its existing wards with the Cray Valley West ward from the existing Bromley and Chislehurst constituency. Our proposed Bromley and Chislehurst constituency included the remaining five wards from the existing constituency, and the Bromley Common and Keston, and Hayes and Coney Hall wards from the existing Beckenham constituency. Our proposed Beckenham constituency included four wards from the existing constituency, the Clock House, and Penge and Cator wards from the existing Lewisham West and Penge constituency, and the Croydon borough ward of Shirley from the existing Croydon Central constituency.

350. In the Lewisham and Greenwich boroughs, we proposed a Lewisham and Catford constituency, which included five wards from the existing Lewisham East constituency, the Bellingham ward from the existing Lewisham West and Penge constituency, and the Ladywell and Lewisham Central wards from the existing Lewisham and Deptford constituency. We proposed a Greenwich and Deptford constituency, which included three wards from the existing Greenwich and Woolwich constituency, three wards from the existing Lewisham, Deptford constituency and two wards from the existing Lewisham East constituency. Our proposed Eltham constituency retained all seven of its wards and added the Woolwich Common ward from the existing Greenwich and Woolwich constituency.
351. We further proposed a Woolwich constituency, which included three wards from the existing Greenwich and Woolwich constituency, four wards from the existing Erith and Thamesmead constituency, and the Bexley borough ward of St. Michael's from the existing Bexleyheath and Crayford constituency. Our proposed Old Bexley and Sidcup constituency included all eight of its existing wards and the Danson Park ward from the existing Bexleyheath and Crayford constituency. We also proposed an Erith and Crayford constituency, which included four wards from the existing Erith and Thamesmead constituency, and six wards from the existing Bexleyheath and Crayford constituency.

### **Consultation on the initial proposals**

352. In response to the consultation on our initial proposals in the South Thames sub-region, we received some support for our proposed constituencies of Battersea, Beckenham, Kingston and Surbiton, Orpington, Richmond Park, Streatham and Mitcham, Tooting, and Wimbledon Common and Putney (although there were also some strong objections to the last constituency).
353. However, our proposed Merton and Wimbledon Central, and Streatham and Mitcham constituencies were strongly opposed. There were concerns that, under the initial proposals, the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency had been divided between four constituencies and that the Borough of Merton had been divided between five constituencies. Those commenting on the proposed Streatham and Mitcham constituency were also concerned that it divided the town of Mitcham between the Streatham and Mitcham, and Merton and Wimbledon constituencies. We received a larger number of representations commenting on this issue than any other in the region, including several letter-writing campaigns and petitions. The main objection to our proposed Merton and Wimbledon Central constituency was that it did not include the Borough of Merton wards of Wimbledon Park and Village which, under our initial proposals, had been included in the Wimbledon Common and Putney constituency. Residents of these wards considered that the initial proposals divided Wimbledon between constituencies and that they relied on the centre of Wimbledon for many of their services including transport.
354. We received a number of counter-proposals that sought to address the objections to our proposed Wimbledon constituencies. Some counter-proposals suggested the inclusion of both the Wimbledon Park and Village wards in a constituency with other Wimbledon wards but proposed also that the Borough of Wandsworth ward of Roehampton and Putney Heath be included in the constituency. We also received some counter-proposals that only included the Village ward in a proposed Wimbledon constituency. A number of counter-proposals were also submitted to address the concerns with the proposed Streatham and Mitcham constituency. Many of these did not divide Mitcham between constituencies and sought to

propose a constituency that included as many wards as possible from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency.

355. The proposed Carshalton and Wallington, and Sutton and Cheam constituencies received some opposition during the initial and secondary consultation periods. The objections to these constituencies mainly focused on the exclusion of the Belmont ward from the Sutton and Cheam constituency. Some counter-proposals attempted to include the ward in the Sutton and Cheam constituency. This either required the division of the Borough of Merton between another constituency or the inclusion of Borough of Croydon wards, specifically in the Coulsdon area of the Carshalton and Wallington constituency.
356. In the Borough of Croydon, the proposed Croydon South constituency and our decision to include the Shirley ward in the Beckenham constituency were both opposed. Many representations objected to the wards of Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, and Kenley being included in the Croydon South constituency, with opponents citing that the links of all three wards were to the north with Purley. The representations commenting on the inclusion of the Shirley ward in a Beckenham constituency considered that the initial proposals divided the Shirley area between constituencies, therefore breaking local ties. We received a number of counter-proposals that sought to address these issues.
357. Towards the north of this sub-region, we received support for our proposed Battersea constituency; however, some respondents considered that the constituency should also include the Borough of Lambeth wards of Clapham Common, Clapham Town, and Thornton.
358. In the centre of this sub-region, we received opposition to our proposed Dulwich and West Norwood constituency. Our proposals to divide the existing Vauxhall constituency between constituencies was also largely opposed, with many respondents objecting to the Borough of Lambeth ward of Bishop's being included in the Bermondsey and Old Southwark constituency.
359. In the east of the sub-region, our proposed Woolwich, and Erith and Crayford constituencies were both opposed, with concerns focusing on the inclusion of the Borough of Bexley wards of St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey in the Woolwich constituency. Many representations considered that these wards had links to Erith and Crayford and a number of counter-proposals were received that reflected these views. Some of these counter-proposals suggested that the Lesnes Abbey ward could be divided between constituencies.

### **Revised proposals**

360. In view of the considerable objections to our initial proposals and the variations in a number of the counter-proposals, our assistant commissioners visited many of the areas of contention, to observe for themselves some of the links between areas that had been suggested. In particular, they visited the Roehampton and Putney Heath, and Village wards and travelled to the centre of Wimbledon. In their view, they considered that both the Village and Wimbledon Park wards were an integral part of the Wimbledon constituency. They also noted that the open space of Wimbledon Common was used by residents in the boroughs of Merton and Wandsworth, on both sides of the common, and that the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in particular had links to the common and Village ward. They therefore considered it appropriate to include the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in a revised Wimbledon constituency, in order to allow for a better pattern of constituencies across Wandsworth and Merton boroughs. We accepted

their recommendation, agreeing that it would help address the substantial objections with the initial proposals in the Mitcham area (discussed below). We therefore proposed a Wimbledon constituency that included all wards from the existing constituency, Colliers Wood ward from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency, and Roehampton and Putney Heath ward from the existing Putney constituency to bring it into the permitted electorate range.

361. In view of the significant opposition to our proposals for Merton and the division of Mitcham in particular, and the consequent changes proposed in the Merton borough, our assistant commissioners visited the area to observe the community links and the different counter-proposals received. As a result, they recommended a pattern of constituencies that divided the Borough of Merton between three constituencies – rather than the five under our initial proposals – and a Mitcham and Norbury constituency that included seven of the 10 wards from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency and the three Croydon borough wards of Broad Green, Norbury, and West Thornton. As part of their site visit, it was observed that these wards had links to the west.
362. The reconfiguration of the Wimbledon, and Mitcham and Norbury constituencies required us to make changes to adjacent constituencies. During their site visit, the assistant commissioners observed the links between the Earlsfield ward, the Southfields ward, the Fairfield ward and the area of Putney. They considered that including all three wards in a revised Wandsworth and Putney constituency more closely reflected the statutory criteria. We agreed with their recommendation and included this constituency as part of our revised proposals.
363. We were not persuaded by the arguments to include the Belmont ward in a revised Sutton and Cheam constituency. We noted the objections to the initial proposals but were concerned that the counter-proposals either divided the Borough of Merton between a further constituency or required the inclusion of the Coulsdon area in the Carshalton and Wallington constituency, which did not reflect the evidence received. We therefore decided to propose no changes to either of our initially proposed Carshalton and Wallington, and Sutton and Cheam constituencies.
364. The evidence received in the Borough of Croydon was that the initial proposals broke community ties, particularly in the areas of Coulsdon, Kenley, and Shirley. Our assistant commissioners investigated the counter-proposals and recommended that the Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, and Kenley wards should be included in a revised Croydon South West constituency, as the evidence received indicated community links between these wards and Purley. They addressed the concerns about the division of Shirley between constituencies by recommending a Croydon South East constituency that included the Ashburton, Shirley, and Heathfield wards, which were identified as comprising the Shirley area. They proposed that the remaining wards in the Borough of Croydon be included in a revised Norwood and Thornton Heath constituency.
365. As a result of the changes proposed in the Borough of Croydon, as part of our revised proposals we were able to propose three constituencies (Beckenham, Bromley and Chislehurst, and Orpington) that were all wholly contained within the Borough of Bromley.
366. In the east of the sub-region, we noted the objections to the exclusion of the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards from the Erith and Crayford constituency. Our assistant commissioners visited the area to observe the evidence received and the counter-proposals. They noted that one counter-proposal suggested that the Lesnes Abbey ward could be divided between

constituencies; however, they considered that the argument for splitting a ward in this part of London was not compelling, nor necessary in formulating a pattern of constituencies that reflected the evidence received. After investigating the different counter-proposals, our assistant commissioners recommended revised constituencies of Bexley and Sidcup, Eltham and Welling, Erith and Crayford, and Woolwich. As part of this pattern of constituencies, the proposed Erith and Crayford constituency included both the St. Michael's and Lesnes Abbey wards. In order to include both these wards in this constituency, it was proposed to include the Christchurch and Barnehurst wards in a revised Bexley and Sidcup constituency. We agreed with their recommendation, noting that this pattern of constituencies better reflected community ties in the area.

367. In the north and centre of the sub-region, our assistant commissioners recommended a number of modifications be made to the initial proposals. They considered that the evidence of community ties between the wards of Bishop's, Prince's, and Oval was persuasive, and they therefore recommended that all three wards be included in a revised Brixton and Vauxhall constituency.
368. We received multiple representations supporting a counter-proposal to include the Borough of Lambeth ward of Clapham Common in a Battersea constituency, and our assistant commissioners recommended that this alteration should be made. However, other changes would be required to this constituency to ensure that it was within the permitted electorate range. There were counter-proposals that recommended that the Clapham Town ward should also be included in this constituency as this would avoid splitting the Thornton and Clapham Common wards. Some of the representations received indicated that there was some ongoing major development at the Clapham Park Estate which straddles the two wards east and west of Clarence Avenue. It was felt that this solution would bring the Lambeth and Clapham wards together for the first time in many years. We therefore proposed a constituency that included five wards from the existing Battersea constituency, Clapham Common, and Thornton wards from the existing Streatham constituency, and Clapham Town ward from the existing Vauxhall constituency. To reflect this change, we proposed to name the constituency Battersea and Clapham. As a result of these changes, our assistant commissioners recommended that the Borough of Wandsworth ward of Balham be included in a revised Tooting constituency. We agreed with this proposal and included it as part of our revised proposals.
369. As noted in the section above, we received some opposition to our initially proposed Dulwich and West Norwood constituency. The objections mainly focused on the constituency excluding wards from the Boroughs of Lambeth and the division of the Herne Hill area. We received counter-proposals suggesting that the constituency should include parts of the Boroughs of Lewisham and Southwark. Having investigated the different counter-proposals received, our assistant commissioners recommended revised constituencies of Bermondsey and Old Southwark, Camberwell and Peckham, Dulwich and Sydenham, and Streatham and Brixton South. As part of this pattern of constituencies, the revised Dulwich and Sydenham constituency included wards only from the boroughs of Southwark and Lewisham. We agreed with their recommendation and considered that it provided for an improved pattern of constituencies. We did not propose any changes to our initially proposed Lewisham and Catford constituency as part of our revised proposals.

### **Consultation on the revised proposals**

370. The revised proposals attracted fewer comments than the initial proposals, with our modifications to constituencies across most of the sub-region being largely supported. However, the constituencies of Wimbledon, Sutton and Cheam, Carshalton and Wallington, Croydon South West, Dulwich and Sydenham, Lewisham and Catford, and Erith and Crayford did attract some opposition.
371. While the proposed Wimbledon constituency was broadly supported for uniting the Village and Wimbledon Park wards, there were some objections to the inclusion of the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in the constituency, with representations arguing that this ward has community links with Putney. A counter-proposal was received that included the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in the Wandsworth and Putney constituency, but required the splitting of the Earlsfield ward between the Wandsworth and Putney, and Wimbledon constituencies to ensure both were within the permitted electorate range.
372. Our revised Mitcham and Norbury constituency was largely supported, with representations considering it an improvement on the initial proposals. Some comments were received on this constituency that wanted us to include further wards from the existing Mitcham and Morden constituency in it.
373. We again received opposition to the inclusion of the Belmont ward in the Carshalton and Wallington constituency, with representations indicating that this ward had shared links with Sutton and Cheam. Similar counter-proposals received during the earlier consultation were put forward, which proposed that the Belmont ward could be included in the Sutton and Cheam constituency and the Borough of Merton ward of St. Helier could be included in the Carshalton and Wallington constituency.
374. Our revised proposals in the Borough of Croydon were generally supported, particularly the inclusion of the Coulsdon and Kenley wards in the Croydon South West constituency and the inclusion of the Shirley area in the Croydon South East constituency. However, some counter-proposals were received that proposed an alternative pattern of constituencies in the borough. One counter-proposal suggested constituencies of Croydon Central and Croydon South. The counter-proposal sought to reflect the existing constituencies and required splitting the Heathfield ward between both constituencies. The other counter-proposal received in the Borough of Croydon attempted to include the Broad Green ward in the Croydon South West constituency. The respondent considered that the revised proposals had divided the centre of Croydon between constituencies. This counter-proposal required modifications to be made to a number of other constituencies including the division of Coulsdon between constituencies.
375. Towards the centre of the sub-region, we received little opposition to our revised proposals; however, a counter-proposal was received for the Camberwell and Peckham, Dulwich and Sydenham, and Lewisham and Catford constituencies. It proposed that the South Camberwell ward be transferred to the Dulwich and Sydenham constituency and the Peckham Rye ward be included in the Camberwell and Peckham constituency. The respondent considered this better reflected community ties. The second part of the counter-proposal was to transfer the Crofton Park ward to the Lewisham and Catford constituency and the Bellingham ward to the Dulwich and Sydenham constituency. It was considered that this proposal better reflected community ties in the Catford area in particular. In investigating the counter-proposal, we noted that not all four ward

transfers were required to produce constituencies that were within the permitted electorate range, and that the ward transfers proposed could be considered independently from each other.

376. In the east of the sub-region, our revised constituencies of Bexley and Sidcup, and Erith and Crayford were largely supported. A counter-proposal was received that proposed the Barnehurst, Crayford and North End wards be included in a revised Bexley, Crayford and Sidcup constituency, and the Christchurch and Danson Parks wards be included in a revised Bexleyheath and Erith constituency.
377. The revised proposals in the remainder of the sub-region were all broadly supported. In a number of cases we did receive suggestions for alternative constituency names.

### **Final recommendations**

378. We carefully considered the case for the inclusion of the Roehampton and Putney Heath ward in the Wandsworth and Putney constituency, and we are not satisfied that we received persuasive evidence to justify changing this proposal. We note that the counter-proposal that aims to include this ward in a constituency with Putney results in the division of the Earlsfield ward between constituencies. We consider that the division of this ward between constituencies is likely to break community ties and does not appear to command any further local support, or offer a generally better solution in terms of the statutory criteria, and therefore consider that there is not an exceptional and compelling case to adopt this proposal.
379. We acknowledge the objections to the exclusion of the Belmont ward from the Sutton and Cheam constituency and have reconsidered the counter-proposal for this constituency that was submitted during previous consultation. We remain unpersuaded by this counter-proposal, particularly as it would result in the Borough of Merton being divided between four constituencies and would create an orphan ward. Therefore, we propose no changes to the revised constituencies of Sutton and Cheam, and Carshalton and Wallington, as part of our final recommendations.
380. We have investigated the different counter-proposals received in the Borough of Croydon and have decided not to alter the pattern of constituencies in this part of the sub-region. We are not persuaded by the counter-proposal to create constituencies of Croydon Central and Croydon South, particularly as this required the splitting of the Heathfield ward between constituencies. We consider that an exceptional and compelling case has not been made to divide this ward. We are also not persuaded by the counter-proposal that attempted to include the Broad Green ward in the Croydon South West constituency. The consequential modifications as part of this counter-proposal are not supported in representations and are likely to break community ties, particularly in the Coulsdon area. Therefore, we propose no changes to the revised proposals in the Borough of Croydon under our final recommendations.
381. In the east of the sub-region, the revised proposals for the constituencies of Bexley and Sidcup, and Erith and Crayford were both broadly supported. We noted the counter-proposal that transferred wards between both constituencies but consider that compelling evidence has not been received to recommend it. We were concerned that the counter-proposal was likely to divide parts of Bexleyheath between constituencies. Therefore, we propose no changes to the revised constituencies of Bexley and Sidcup, and Erith and Crayford under our final recommendations.