



General Purposes Committee
31 October 2018

**Report from the Chief Executive
and Returning Officer**

**Electoral Boundary Review ward pattern proposals for the
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
(LGBCE)**

Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Non key
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: (If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)	Open
No. of Appendices:	<p>Nine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Ward Boundaries • Revised proposal 1 - full borough map • Revised proposal 1 - individual ward maps • Revised proposal 1 – ward figures • Revised proposal 2 - full borough map • Revised proposal 2 - individual ward maps • Revised proposal 2 – ward figures • Variation 1 - Barnhill / Chalkhill • Variation 2 - Kensal ward proposal
Background Papers:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electoral Boundary Review Council size submission for the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (Brent Full Council 9 July 2018) • Electoral Boundary Review ward pattern proposals for the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (Brent General Purposes Committee 17 October 2018) • LGBCE Electoral Reviews: Technical Guidance • LGBCE Electoral Figures
Contact Officer(s): (Name, Title, Contact Details)	<p>Matt Willis Principal Electoral Services Manager Tel: 020 8937 1375 Email: Matt.Willis@brent.gov.uk</p> <p>Thomas Cattermole Head of Executive and Member Services Tel: 020 8937 5446 Email: Thomas.cattermole@brent.gov.uk</p>

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the General Purposes Committee with an update on the Electoral Boundary Review ward pattern proposals as considered by the General Purposes Committee on 17 October 2018.

2.0 Recommendation(s):

- 2.1 That the General Purposes Committee considers the comments made by Councillors on the draft warding pattern proposals;
- 2.2 That the General Purposes Committee considers and comments on the draft warding pattern proposals, and proposals for ward names;
- 2.3 That the General Purposes Committee decides, or not, to submit draft warding pattern(s) to the LGBCE as an agreed Council position.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The Council, at its meeting held on 9 July 2018, unanimously authorised the Chief Executive to make a submission on a future council size of 57 Councillors to the LGBCE.
- 3.2 The LGBCE announced in August 2018 that it was minded to make a recommendation of a future council size of 57 councillors to the LGBCE.
- 3.3 In proposing a reduction in Councillors, the Council and Commission took into account the workload of Councillors, the changing way in which people access information and the governance arrangements of the Council.
- 3.4 The LGBCE is currently consulting on ward patterns for a council size of 57 Councillors. The Council is not legally required to put forward a proposal.
- 3.5 The Chief Executive, in her role as Returning Officer, developed two ward pattern proposals for consideration, and these were considered by the General Purposes Committee meeting held on 17 October 2018. Comments received during this meeting are outlined in section 4.4 and in the draft minutes attached.
- 3.6 Since the General Purposes Committee on 17 October 2018, Executive and Member Services staff have met with Councillors individually to discuss the two proposals and to look at any amendments proposed by Councillors. The comments and suggestions made during these meetings are shown in section 4.4.
- 3.7 In considering proposed amendments to the pattern of electoral wards, Council officers have been mindful that the Commission must balance its three statutory criteria, and have therefore maintained a ward pattern accordingly. It is worth noting that a number of comments received would have jeopardised the electoral parity of the wards, which is one of the LGBCE's primary concerns and which triggered this review. It is important to remain mindful of these criteria when considering or incorporating any changes to the proposals.

The three main elements of the criteria that must be followed are:

- **Delivering Electoral Equality for Local Voters** – Ensuring that each councillor represents roughly the same number of voters so that the value of each vote in the same regardless of where a voter lives within the Borough. Based on the forecast electorate figures for 2024 published by the LGBCE, this would equate to a targeted average electorate of 4,311 per councillor
- **Interests and Identities of Local Communities** - Establishing electoral arrangements which, as far as possible, avoid splitting local ties and where boundaries are easily identifiable. The Council has considered physical barriers marking the boundary between different communities, such as major roads, rivers or railway lines.
- **Effective and Convenient Local Government** – Ensuring that the wards can be represented effectively by their elected representative(s) and that the new electoral arrangements as a whole, including both the council size decision and the warding arrangements, allow the local authority to conduct its business.

4.0 Proposed warding patterns

- 4.1 Two initial warding patterns proposed by the Council were outlined in detail in the report to the General Purposes Committee on 17 October 2018. Proposal 1 and proposal 2 have been amended since the General Purposes meeting on 17 October 2018 following feedback received by Councillors.
- 4.2 Proposal one remains comprised of 19 wards in total with each ward being represented by 3 Councillors.
- 4.3 Proposal two remains comprised of 20 wards in total, with 17 wards being represented by 3 Councillors and 3 wards being represented by 2 Councillors.
- 4.4 The Executive and Member Services staff have met with Councillors so that Members could put forward suggestions and potential amendments to the existing proposals.
- 4.5 The warding patterns as outlined in the General Purposes Committee on 17 October 2018 remain largely intact, but all comments have been incorporated where community identity was a factor and the initial proposals jeopardised the cohesion of the proposed ward or a proposed community, but did not compromise the electoral equality for voters.
- 4.6 In response to Members' feedback, Northwick Triangle has been put back in the proposed Northwick Park Ward (as now). In the previous proposals, it had been included in the proposed Kenton ward. This, in response to feedback, reflects the community identity of that area and does not compromise electoral parity.
- 4.7 In an amendment to the previous proposals, Wembley Stadium is now in the proposed Wembley Park ward, which does not compromise electoral parity.
- 4.8 In addition to proposals 1 and 2 a number of requests for alternative warding patterns were put forward by elected members. These have been modelled and are attached for discussion.

4.9 These additional models include:

- The retention of a ward reflecting the community identity of the Kensal Green/Rise area;
- The creation of a ward reflecting the historical Barnhill area.

4.10 The following comments were received from Councillors up until Thursday 25 October 2018. Any additional comments or proposals received since then will be verbally reported and tabled to the General Purposes Committee on 31 October 2018.

In the table below it is explained whether the comment has been incorporated into the proposals and the reasons for this decision.

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
Ward Councillor, Kenton Ward	Expressed support for the logic of the proposed Kenton Ward, but also advised that the Conservative Party intended to submit separate proposals to the LGBCE which would be based on a three member Ward configuration and would incorporate the creation of a Preston North and Preston South Ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No changes required, supports proposal for the proposed Kenton Ward
Ward Councillors, Sudbury	<p>Barley Close is a small cul-de-sac that was divided between Sudbury and Northwick Park.</p> <p>Stilecroft Gardens should also be moved into Northwick Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The entirety of Barley Close has now been moved into Northwick Park. - Due to the geographical location of Stilecroft Gardens, this has also been moved into Northwick Park.
Ward Councillors, Northwick Park	<p>Amendments were suggested to the proposed Northwick Park Ward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move Stilecroft Gardens into Northwick Park - Keep Woodfield Avenue in Northwick Park – it is part of the Sudbury Court Resident’s Association (based in Northwick Park), whereas the rest of the area is the Sudbury Town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stilecroft Gardens has been moved into Northwick Park - Woodfield avenue will remain in Northwick Park

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
Ward Councillor, Dudden Hill	<p>The proposed Neasden Ward (Ward number 16) fails to fully reflect the existing Neasden community. Suggested that the name of the Ward be changed if the proposal is not changed in the council submission.</p> <p>Retain the existing Dollis Hill Ward but add polling districts CDU1, CDU2 and WH6.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retaining the existing Dollis Hill Ward but add polling districts CDU1, CDU2 and WH6 makes that ward over 20% too large and creates an island effect for the remaining CDU3.
Ward Councillors, Stonebridge	<p>Expressed support for proposal one, as the three member Wards would enable greater diversity of representation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No changes proposed, supports original proposal 1 for Stonebridge Ward – a 3 member ward
Ward Councillor, Dudden Hill Ward	<p>Disagreed with the suggested dissolution and division of the current Dudden Hill Ward.</p> <p>The proposed Neasden Ward (Ward number 16) included in both proposals did not incorporate the centre of the Neasden Community – the Dollis Hill area next to The Crest Academy. He suggested a revision of the boundaries for Ward number 16.</p> <p>It was suggested that community factors such as places of worship influence the final Ward boundaries.</p> <p>Suggested that a new Ward could be created called Gladstone Ward, which would comprise of the area within the following streets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The railway from Walm Lane (A407) to Neasden Lane (B453) - Neasden Lane (B453) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While looking at the possibility of incorporating these, and other suggestions regarding Neasden, Dollis Hill and Dudden Hill, it was necessary to look at the surrounding areas to fully understand any potential knock-on effect. - Initially the possibility of converting the proposed Mapesbury Ward (Ward number 3) and the Dollis Hill Ward (Ward number 14) into two member Wards was looked into. - Due to the natural geography and physical boundaries, it was not possible to make this add up numerically.

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dollis Hill Lane - Park Side - Path connecting Olive Road to Anson Road - Along Anson Road until Melrose Avenue - Melrose Avenue - Riffel Road - Station Parade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Officers then looked into the possibility of doing the same with proposed Dollis Hill Ward (Wards number 14) and the proposed Neasden Ward (Ward number 16) but again geography prevented a two member Ward solution. - It was then decided that it would not be practical to investigate looking at converting the proposed Mapesbury, Kingsbury, Dollis Hill and Neasden Wards (Ward numbers 3, 10, 14 and 16) into six two member Wards. - The suggestion of using three polling districts from the existing Dudden Hill Ward (CDU3, 4 and 5) to create a new two member Ward does not take into account one of the major natural boundaries (train line) that have been paramount in the production of both proposals. - It also involves taking in around a net 2000 electors into Neasden which would take it to over 20% above the average. The new two member Ward would be more than 10% under the average. - It is therefore not possible to

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
		<p>incorporate this into the existing proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Gladstone ward has been modelled which does not meet the required LGBCE criteria. The proposed area for a Gladstone ward is too large for a one member ward (5000) and too small for a two member ward.
Ward Councillor, Barnhill Ward	<p>Advised that the Barnhill community had been overlooked and disregarded, and that the current proposals were that parts of the existing Barnhill Ward should be incorporated in the proposed Neasden Ward (Ward number 16)</p> <p>Stated that the Neasden Ward did not comply with the LGBCE criteria, as there is no natural boundary, cohesive community identity, or landmark included. In addition, the obstacle of the North Circular Road which separated one section of the Ward from another appeared to have been ignored.</p> <p>Stated that the proposals should not disrupt the established community identity of the Chalkhill area who would identify with the proposed ward.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Officers looked at the possibility of moving the area between the Paddocks and Forty Lane from the proposed Ward 16 to the proposed Ward 17. This caused the number of electors in the two proposed Wards to vary greatly from the average. - The electorate per councillor for proposed Ward 17 would be 4,888 and Ward 16 would be 3,362. The targeted average number of electors per councillor is 4,311. - Incorporating the area up to Lavender Avenue into proposed Ward 16 would cause Ward 10 to have an electorate per councillor of 3,656 and 4,272 for Ward 16. - Officers have also looked at

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
		<p>extending proposed Ward 17 to the River Brent. This would cause Ward 17 to have an electorate of 5,070 per councillor, and Ward 16 to have an electorate of 3,180 per councillor. To address this, officers tried to increase the electorate in Ward 16 larger by incorporating Elthorne Road, but that cause the electorate per councillor in Ward 10 to be 3,656.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is therefore not possible to incorporate these suggestions in the existing proposals due to the effect on electoral parity. - While looking at whether it was possible to implement the suggestions it was noticed that Rook Close and a small proportion of Chalkhill Road should have been in the proposed Neasden Ward, so this has been altered in proposals 1+2. - A model of a proposed 1 member ward covering the 'Barnhill' area is attached for discussion; a 2 member ward has therefore been developed in the former welsh harp / Neasden and the Chalkhill estate

Councillor	Comments	Outcome / Response
		is now in Wembley Park now.
Ward Councillors, Kensal Green	Stated that the proposals should include a Ward that recognises the Kensal community.	<p>A model Kensal Green ward has been drawn up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three two member wards have been drawn up for consideration to reflect a Kensal ward. This impacts the proposed Brondesbury Park and Queens Park wards. - This model has not been discussed with current Queens Park or Brondesbury Park ward Councillors.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications from this report however it is estimated that if either proposal is agreed savings will be identified in the management and running of elections.

6.0 Legal Implications

- 6.1 Recommendations are made within the provisions of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 which the LGBCE must adhere to.

7.0 Equality Implications

- 7.1 Recommendations have taken into consideration the diverse make-up of the borough and the need for councillors to reflect this diversity as they carry out their representational role
- 7.2 For the above reasons, the introduction of one-member wards is not recommended in Brent to ensure that the diverse nature of representation in the borough is not impacted.

8.0 Consultation with Ward Members and Stakeholders

- 8.1 All Councillors were encouraged to provide feedback on the initial proposals ahead of the General Purposes meeting on 31 October 2018, and the comments and suggestions received by the Electoral Services Team have been outlined in the report.
- 8.2 The LGBCE initial consultation on warding patterns is open until 5 November 2018. Once the consultation closes, the LGBCE will consider all submissions and will then put forward a draft recommendation for the warding pattern for Brent. There will then be a further consultation period on the LGBCE's draft recommendations.
- 8.3 External stakeholders, including youth groups, residents' associations, cultural groups, faith communities, neighbourhood forums and other community groups have also been informed of the consultation and how to participate.
- 8.4 The Head of Executive and Member Services has presented the two original proposals at each Brent Connects meetings. No concerns were expressed about either proposal however members of the public were encouraged to consult the LGBCE portal and contribute to the consultation.
- 8.5 Furthermore, since the publication of the General Purposes Committee papers in advance of the meeting held on 17 October, a number of emails have been received from members of the public. The content of these emails relate principally to Dudden Hill and express a desire for a Dudden Hill Ward to remain. No other emails have been received.

9.0 Human Resources/Property Implications (if appropriate)

9.1 There are no direct human resources or property implications that relate to this stage in the Electoral Review Process.

Report sign off:

CAROLYN DOWNS
Chief Executive