

## Submissions for Lewisham East constituency

### 1. Cllr Kevin Bonavia

My name is Kevin Bonavia. I am a councillor in the London Borough of Lewisham. I am also a Labour-elected councillor. I represent the ward of Blackheath. My working address is Catford Town Hall. I have been representing the Lewisham ward of Blackheath since 2010. I can tell you from my personal experience how that interrelates with our Members of Parliament who also represent Blackheath. Blackheath in its wider sense currently has three Members of Parliament, so in a sense you could say we are well represented in Parliament. Currently, we have three MPs for Lewisham East, Greenwich and Woolwich, and Southern Blackheath is covered by the Eltham constituency. It is not so much having Blackheath's voice in Parliament; it is what Members of Parliament can do with residents in Blackheath. Because we are split between two boroughs, Lewisham and Greenwich, as I am sure has been alluded to previously, what happens is that on occasion one borough gives and another takes away. To give an example, given the funding cuts over the past six years, Lewisham closed a library in Blackheath Village, which is split between the two boroughs, but was able to reopen its library service across the boundary in Greenwich in a place called Age Exchange, which previously had been funded by both boroughs. However, at the same time Greenwich borough had decided it no longer wanted to fund that, so that caused us a problem when we tried to move there. It would have been very helpful at the time to have one Member of Parliament making the case to both boroughs. This issue was picked up very much by the Blackheath Society a few years ago when the Boundary Commission was looking at proposals at that time. The society very strongly argued for one MP with feet in both boroughs who could make the case for general cross-Blackheath issues to both boroughs so we did not lose on the one hand when something is given elsewhere. That is my main argument for supporting the principle of the initial proposal to have at least Blackheath Westcombe and Blackheath wards kept together with one Member of Parliament resident in both. I see the Labour Party's counter-proposals. I would be very happy with those, too, but certainly from a Blackheath perspective I would strongly argue we need one Member of Parliament to cover the wider area.

I do not know whether you have ever visited Blackheath, but, to give you a feel for what it is, it is often seen by many people as not just an area but a concept. It is very green and people often see it as a very middle-class leafy area, but it is very varied. The central focus point is the village and heath itself. The borough boundary cuts across the heath on the A2, Shooters Hill Road, so south of that is currently in Lewisham East; north of that is Greenwich, which is currently the Greenwich and Woolwich parliamentary constituency. The boundary then goes south through Blackheath Village itself. That is where you have the issue; you have a lot of people who are not quite sure which borough they are in, but if they had a Member of Parliament who could speak for them that would go down very well in Blackheath locally with local businesses in Blackheath Village, many residents and community groups. I mentioned Age Exchange earlier. We have Blackheath Halls which is also on the boundary. That is in Greenwich but is funded by Lewisham council. We also have the conservatoire which provides music lessons for the children of Blackheath. I mentioned the Blackheath Society itself. We also have faith groups in Blackheath. We have the Catholic churches on the Greenwich side; the main Church of England churches are on the Lewisham side, but we all have to work together. I accept that so far the two Members of Parliament have cordial relations; they do get on, but it would be useful to have a Member of Parliament who had a good knowledge of the councils they have to work with.

I grew up on the Ferrier council estate on the Greenwich side. It has been demolished; it is now in the Eltham constituency. I grew up with an understanding of Greenwich. Having moved, I became a Lewisham councillor. They are both Labour councils but for historical reasons they have different

working cultures. I expect any Member of Parliament worth their salt to be a great advocate for causes in Parliament, but I also expect them to be great advocates for the local community. I expect a Labour or Conservative Member of Parliament, dealing with the same party in power locally, to have that arm's-length approach and be able to speak some uncomfortable truths to that borough, but it should be done from a position of knowledge and also standing. Obviously, if an MP represents the same people the borough has to cater for that person has standing. I am speaking here with my Blackheath hat on. Blackheath would certainly benefit from a strong advocate who had a locus with both boroughs.

## 2. Andrew Lee, Conservative Party

Andrew Lee

Chairman, East Lewisham

Type of respondent

Official response from the Conservative party

Counter-proposals for proposed Lewisham & Catford and Greenwich & Deptford seats

I write on behalf of the above Association in reference to the proposals for the revision of Parliamentary boundaries relating to the above proposed seats, published on September 13th 2016.

East Lewisham Conservative Association considered the Commission's proposals at a meeting comprising Conservative representatives from across the present East Lewisham Constituency.

It was strongly felt that the Commission's proposals would damage established community links and historic boundaries and we therefore wish to present an alternative plan.

Our proposals are that the Blackheath and Lee Green wards, currently in Lewisham East, be switched from the proposed new Greenwich & Deptford seat and incorporated in the new Lewisham & Catford seat.

We further propose that, to keep within the quota in both Parliamentary seats, the Ladywell and Lewisham Central wards (in the current Deptford seat) be moved from the proposed new Lewisham & Catford seat into the proposed new Greenwich and Deptford seat.

This would mean a change in the electorates of both seats of:

Greenwich & Deptford: 77,005 (under Commission proposals) changes to 78,401

Lewisham & Catford: 72,781 (under Commission proposals) changes to 71,385

The effect of these changes would be to keep 2 historically Lewisham wards together in the same Parliamentary Constituency. The Lee Green and Blackheath wards would then continue to form part of a wholly Lewisham constituency.

The Ladywell and Lewisham Central wards are both currently in the existing Deptford constituency and it would make sense to incorporate them in the new Greenwich and Deptford seat as they are both a better fit with the other Deptford Wards and, in particular, Ladywell ward has been a Deptford ward since the boundary changes in the early 1970's.

Similarly, both Lee Green and Blackheath have been in the existing East Lewisham seat over the same time period.

These changes do not involve any disturbance in the proposals for any other seat, fall within the electoral quota, make much more sense on the ground and help maintain the long-established affiliation of wards and activists.

These proposals have been incorporated into the Conservative Party's formal counter-proposals for London and we would therefore like to formally add our support to that submission.

### 3. Simon Parlett

My comments relate to the 3 constituencies you initially propose within the London Borough of Lewisham.

As a Forest Hill resident, my priority is to retain a constituency that unites the closely connected Forest Hill, Sydenham and Bell Green communities. This area is covered by the 4 Lewisham Borough wards of Forest Hill, Perry Vale, Bellingham and Sydenham and all these wards are in the current constituency of Lewisham West & Penge.

I suggest 3 Lewisham Borough wards are moved between constituencies to better reflect community links and, in particular, enable Bellingham ward to be re-united with Forest Hill, Perry Vale and Sydenham.

Change 1. Move Bellingham ward from the proposed Lewisham & Catford constituency into Peckham & Lewisham West. I note that, in the abandoned 2013 boundary review, Lewisham Council argued for Bellingham to be placed in a constituency with Forest Hill, Perry Vale and Sydenham due to strong community links.

Change 2. Move Telegraph Hill ward from Peckham & Lewisham West into Greenwich & Deptford. This would have the advantage of re-uniting the New Cross area and most of the Brockley area into one constituency and would follow the Lewisham/Southwark borough boundary between Telegraph Hill and Nunhead wards.

Change 3. Move Lee Green ward from Greenwich & Deptford into Lewisham & Catford. I am not familiar with the Lee Green area and propose this purely as a consequential change to enable each revised constituency to contain the required number of electors. However, I note that Lee Green ward is currently linked in the same constituency as Grove Park ward so re-uniting these seems logical.

Under my proposed changes, Peckham & Lewisham West would have 76,551 electors, Lewisham & Catford would have 72,944 electors and Greenwich & Deptford would have 77,647 electors.

As mentioned earlier, my priority is to argue for Forest Hill, Perry Vale, Bellingham and Sydenham wards to be retained in one constituency. I do not think there are many community links between this area and Peckham, so I'd be happy to support any alternative constituency proposal, so long as these 4 wards remain together.

I do not know the Peckham area that well, but it appears that you are proposing to divide Peckham town centre in two. I imagine Peckham residents will find this unpopular and will be making their own revised proposals anyway.

Finally, I will cover constituency names. I understand you like to retain existing constituency names where possible and the current constituency includes the name 'Lewisham West' which you propose retaining within the new name.

However, I believe Lewisham Borough's 3 existing constituency names are fairly unusual in referring to the Borough name, rather than the town/area name.

Lewisham 'town' is a specific area of the Borough and you propose placing the whole of it in a Lewisham & Catford constituency. This name is clearly referring to Lewisham 'town' and Catford 'town'.

As there will no longer be a Lewisham East or Lewisham Deptford constituency, I propose removing the name 'Lewisham West' as well to be consistent.

I suggest replacing your proposed name ending "& Lewisham West" with "& Sydenham", e.g. "Peckham South & Sydenham" or "Peckham Rye & Sydenham".

#### 4. Andrew Scott

The proposed boundaries are based on electoral register data that is now out of date as it is from December 2015. Lewisham has seen a massive increase in population since this time and we will, therefore be under represented in the House of Commons. This will be exacerbated by the area's relatively poor level of voter registration.

I urge the commission to reconsider these changes using up to date population data rather than the electoral register.

#### 5. Janice Senior

First of all not very helpful website. I put my postcode in to get the proposed change. Was surprised to say the least as my part of Peckham has been moved into Lewisham with an extremely odd shaped constituency with areas which have virtually nothing in common. Noting your notes about the criteria for deciding on boundary changes I clicked on the data button to find out why I had been moved. Again I was asked to supply my postcode which had not changed in those few minutes. Unfortunately the constituency which came up had. Not mine.

Therefore unable to look at your data. So have to make comments based on what the new boundary appears to be about. A short history lesson, I have lived in this immediate area since 1976. At that time I was in the Dulwich constituency. We were moved into Peckham in what appeared to have something to do with gerrymandering. There was a Conservative government who amazingly won Dulwich at the next election. My wards were always Labour. I am now moving into a constituency with areas very unlike us who may be not Labour voters. Gerrymandering again? Oh it's a Conservative government again. I object to the proposed change to my constituency.

#### 6. Dame Helen Reeves, Chair, Blackheath Society

Dear Boundary Commission,

I am writing on behalf of the Blackheath Society. Our Society has been established in Blackheath for 80 years and we currently represent a membership of 850 households. We have been closely

involved with every aspect of planning and community development throughout our history and we naturally we have an interest in the current boundary proposals.

Our committee is anxious to reinstate and to maintain the integrity of Blackheath as a single community. We are very happy to be identified with Greenwich with whom we share many facilities and common interests but we are concerned that a significant area of Blackheath has been sectioned off and included in an adjacent constituency. In terms of local understanding and community interests this division makes no sense at all.

We would like to propose that the southern limit of the new constituency should be the main route known as Lee High Road to the west and Eltham Road to the east and in the southern part of the constituency the eastern boundary should be Kidbrooke Park Road.

Finally we are concerned that Blackheath seems to have disappeared altogether and we wondered about naming the constituency Greenwich, Blackheath and Deptford?

We would be grateful if these views could be given serious consideration.

7. Paul Regan

This site is extremely poor and from it I am unable to understand how the proposals affect me or my immediate surrounding area. Please tell me how I can get more information. Thank you.

8. Tim Wakefield

I am concerned at the changes to boundaries for my constituency. London and this area of Lewisham has seen great population growth and is forecast to increase considerably over the next few years. Given the proposed electoral size, I believe the majority of constituencies will be above the proposed sizes by the time of the changes.

It is therefore my view that the London constituencies, and my current constituency Lewisham West and Penge, remain as they are and are not amended. Urban areas are growing faster than rural areas and the electoral commission must recognise this.

9. Nicola Peers

I like the proposal that Blackheath should join Greenwich however can you add Blackheath Park as well so that Blackheath village is reunited?

10. Gerald Bates

There are thousands of extra units currently being built and planned on the peninsula - have these been taken into account? If not the 5% differential you are working on will have certainly been breached by the time this comes into force. May I suggest a bit of Deptford joins with Lewisham to allow for this?

11. Anthony Power

As a Beckenham resident for many years I fully support the proposals for the Beckenham constituency.

The new boundaries form a much more logical area than previously when areas that were clearly part of Bromley were included in Beckenham and it is good that this is now going to be rectified. On the western side notwithstanding the local authority boundaries Spring Park Ward is closer to Beckenham than Crystal Palace Ward in that it abuts onto the current Beckenham constituency unlike Crystal Palace.

I strongly support the proposals.

#### 12. Jacqueline Latraille

I have looked at my local proposed change and the first thing that immediately hit me was the fact that the more wealthy parts Blackheath and Hithergreen has been cut out of my constituency. This would clearly indicate to me that the new proposed boundaries are segregating the poor from the wealthy and frankly is disgusting.

#### 13. Ann Brandon

I think the proposed boundaries are too confusing. This is because they don't follow borough boundaries. I understand where my home and community is - it's Deptford Constituency in Lewisham. I identify with that. It's my community and part of my identity. Artificially changing that (in my view to give the Tories electoral advantage) is a clumsy way of sorting out a problem that I don't think exists - or could be solved in other ways. And it's based on out of date population figures anyway.

#### 14. P Knight

Under the proposals, Lee Green ward (in Lewisham Borough and currently in Lewisham East constituency) would form a southerly "outcrop" of a new Greenwich and Deptford constituency. This takes insufficient account of the boundaries of existing constituencies and the local ties that would be broken by the proposed change for Lee Green ward. Lee Green ward (in terms of transport links, facilities and local services) is linked much more closely to Lewisham than to Greenwich and Deptford, and I consider that it should remain part of a constituency focused on Lewisham.

This is relevant for the ability of an MP to represent constituents in Lee Green ward – constituents in the Greenwich/Deptford area will have some quite different concerns from those in the Lewisham area, and an MP which primarily receives correspondence relating to issues affecting Greenwich and Deptford is unlikely to represent Lee Green ward as effectively as an MP who receives correspondence relating primarily to issues affecting Lewisham. For example, major concerns recently have been local hospitals and train services, on which local MPs have raised queries ministers in the Department of Health and Department for Transport. Greenwich and Lewisham are served by different hospitals and by different train lines, with different issues arising in each case. An MP focussed on Greenwich would naturally be inclined to prioritise the concerns of the majority of their constituents who use the Greenwich services rather than the small number of constituents who use Lewisham services.

There are, however, links between Lee Green and Blackheath (which is also proposed to be transferred from the existing Lewisham East constituency to a Greenwich and Deptford constituency). If it proves impossible to include Lee Green in a constituency focused on Lewisham, the southern parts of the proposed constituency (Blackheath and/or Lee Green) should be acknowledged in the name of the constituency, to give constituents and MPs an indication that the constituency includes these areas.

15. Edward Walkington

As someone who lives in Deptford but in Greenwich borough, I like your Deptford and Greenwich constituency as this unites areas that are arbitrarily divided by borough boundaries.

However, I disagree with Lee Green ward being included in this constituency.

Lee and Hither Green nothing in common with Deptford and Greenwich - they are the other side of Lewisham town centre. There are no direct bus links between Lee / Hither Green and Greenwich or Deptford.

You've also split the New Cross and Brockley areas unnecessarily.

It would be more far more sensible if Lee Green were included in the Lewisham and Catford constituency, Ladywell included in the Peckham and Lewisham West constituency, and Telegraph Hill included in Greenwich and Deptford.

16. Pauline Mallory

I suggest The boundary runs along Lee Park or second best would be Lee High Road.

Or rename the new constituency as we are proud To be Lewisham And are certainly not 'Greenwich And Deptford'.

17. Peter Swallow

Blackheath is in Lewisham, is part of the Lewisham Council area and is separated from Greenwich by two massive parks. It seems the height of folly to arbitrarily stick it on the end of a Greenwich constituency. There is a reason why it currently sits in the Lewisham East constituency -- because it is in Lewisham.

This proposed boundary change would isolate Blackheath from its new constituency, cut apart its local and national government, create unnecessary confusion and fail to take into account its strong community ties to Lewisham.

18. Adrian Cooper

I reside in Lewisham & Catford borough in the existing and planned proposals. The area in which I live bears little resemblance to the rest of Lewisham and catford, having more in common with neighbouring Bromley in terms of needs. I would suggest a cleaner boundary would be to include the area south of the A205 and east of the railway line from Hither Green to Grove Park in Bromley constituency.

**Submissions for Lewisham West constituency**

19. Bruna Zanelli

Why? It makes no sense. Another crackpot idea from some under worked so called politician who needs to prove his worth. Forget it. If it isn't broken don't mend it.

We have a hard working MP, Gavin Barwell, who is always approachable and hands on. We do not need to change anything.

#### 20. Donald Harris

I was born 91 years ago so have observed Boundary Commission decisions more than once and I know what this means - it means that the people in power feel uneasy and want to make sure they stay that way by fiddling the boundaries so as to increase the likelihood - better still, make certain - that they will stay in power after the next "election". Rather like the charade which gave Clinton more votes than Herr Trumpf but secured the presidency for him - by cheating (what else is an "electoral college"?).

The Afrikaaners, in South Africa got Malan into power by similar means - by making one country vote worth several city ones.

So; I know what to expect, then.

Those that have power are resolved to keep it -AT ALL COSTS.

#### 21. Chris Brody

This review is all very well but does not in any way address the key issue of the representation of the people's will in Parliament.

We need a root and branch review of the electoral system, which currently enables minority interests to trample over the views of the majority. The review needs to consider basic constitutional issues, including the makeup of the House of Commons, the nature of the executive, and the very existence of the House of Lords. For example, proportional representation in the latter would make for a more balanced and democratic legislature. But such changes cannot be made piecemeal.

What this country desperately needs is a peoples' constitutional assembly, with a mandate to create a living, written constitution for the benefit of people and planet.

#### 22. Dylan O'Sullivan

Regardless of the changes the idea that a boundary shift can be made that clearly disadvantages one party over another without first having a general election is completely undemocratic. To simply remove a large number of Labour seats at a time when an unpopular Tory government will be given an almost uncontested power base as a result is a complete disregard for democratic process.

#### 23. Alexander Leithes

Reducing the number of constituencies in the predominantly Labour voting and controlled London sounds a lot like gerrymandering by the Tory government. Please do not allow the boundary commission to be used as a political tool for the Conservative party in a grubby scheme to maintain their control of parliament and the country. Do not reduce the number of constituencies.

#### 24. Paul Clift

I feel that this is a false exercise and that the constituency boundaries should remain as they are.

Reducing the number of elected representatives is not the way to gain greater accuracy of representation; that is only achieved by changing the electoral system from First Past The Post, which produces a zero-sum result that plasters over a complex voting pattern among the electorate to a system of Proportional Representation.



This boundary-changing is tinkering at the edges of a much more complex challenge.

25. Brendan Cuddihy

I am concerned that by basing constituency size on electors (and specifically numbers of voters registered for the 2015 general election), this does not fairly represent populations. Since elected MPs represent all of the people of their constituencies and not just registered voters, it would seem more appropriate to model constituencies around population size. The currently proposed plan will unfairly disadvantage areas where voter registration is lower.

26. Charlie Brett

2 million people are missing from the electoral register that you are using for a start. Why not use population rather than those on the electoral register.

This is just gerrymandering, you're clearly bought and paid for by the Conservative Government. If this wasn't the case why would the Conservatives, who lets face it don't do anything which might possibly harm them, love this so much.

Perhaps because they are paying for it to harm their opposition. if the boot was on the other foot and the conservative party were losing safe seats do you think that they would allow this to go forward as it is.

My area in Anerley is better represented in terms of the local community by the current boundary because Crystal Palace and Penge are far more naturally conjoined areas than Crystal Palace and Croydon for which the public transport options are less available. The public transport routes and accessibility between the two areas should be taken into account as much as where peoples homes are and how many people are in them. Similarly the amount of homes in an area is all well an good but what about the areas through which people have to travel to get to work. The main transport route for me to work is Penge East which would no longer be under the control of the same council.

RUBBISH RUBBISH RUBBISH!

27. Robert Lewis

Since I live in Beckenham, not Lewisham West or Penge, I welcome the commonsense boundary change proposed.

28. Donal Mullane

Absolutely delighted that Penge and Cator Wards are proposed to move to the Beckenham Constituency from Lewisham West. I live in Cator Ward, which is in Beckenham, in the London Borough of Bromley. I have no affinity whatsoever with Lewisham, so to be in a Lewisham constituency simply made no sense. Thank you.

29. Dominique Dyer

I live in Penge east, which is currently part of Lewisham West and Penge. It is a mostly deprived/poor area, and under the current plans will become a part of the wealthy Beckenham ward. Penge will become the ONLY part of the constituency that is not well off - also the most "inner London" part .. This means we will have no voice in parliament. None of the issues affecting places like Shortlands,

Hayes, Bromley, Beckenham or West Wickham will effect us. Also Penge is a multicultural area with a high non white population - the rest of the proposed ward is mostly white.. Will our ethnic minority voices be listened to? I don't think so. Penge East should stay part of Lewisham or become part of Croydon North or our voices will never be heard.

### **Submissions for Lewisham Deptford constituency**

30. Ross Archer, Conservative Party

Counter-proposals for proposed Lewisham & Catford and Greenwich & Deptford seats

I write on behalf of Lewisham Deptford Conservative Association in reference to the proposals for the revision of Parliamentary boundaries relating to the proposed Lewisham & Catford and Greenwich & Deptford seats published on September 13th 2016.

I believe the current proposals for the Lewisham & Catford and Greenwich & Deptford seats would damage established community links and historic boundaries and I therefore support an alternative plan.

I believe that if the Blackheath and Lee Green wards, currently in Lewisham East, were switched from the proposed new Greenwich & Deptford seat and incorporated in the new Lewisham & Catford seat. And if the Ladywell and Lewisham Central wards (in the current Deptford seat) be moved from the proposed new Lewisham & Catford seat into the proposed new Greenwich and Deptford seat. I believe that these changes would help keep local ties in both seats and mean both are still within quota.

This would mean a change in the electorates of both seats of:

Greenwich & Deptford: 77,005 (under Commision proposals) changes to 78,401

Lewisham & Catford: 72,781 (under Commision proposals) changes to 71,385

The effect of these changes would be to keep 2 historically Lewisham wards together in the same Parliamentary Constituency. The Lee Green and Blackheath wards would then continue to form part of a wholly Lewisham constituency.

The Ladywell and Lewisham Central wards are both currently in the existing Deptford constituency and it would make sense to incorporate them in the new Greenwich and Deptford seat as they are both a better fit with the other Deptford Wards and, in particular, Ladywell ward has been a Deptford ward since the boundary changes in the early 1970's.

Similarly, both Lee Green and Blackheath have been in the existing East Lewisham seat over the same time period.

These changes do not involve any disturbance in the proposals for any other seat, fall within the electoral quota, make much more sense on the ground and help maintain the long-established affiliation of wards and activists.

These proposals have been incorporated into the Conservative Party's formal counter-proposals for London and we would therefore like to formally add our support to that submission.

### 31. Gordon Cowie

I am very unhappy with the proposed constituencies as they affect my local area, and the proposal seems totally unacceptable. Brockley (the area rather than the ward), which is my neighbourhood & immediate local area, is currently in Lewisham Deptford. Under the proposal it will be split between 3 constituencies (Ladywell ward to Lewisham & Catford; Brockley ward to Greenwich & Deptford; Crofton Park & Telegraph Hill wards to Peckham & Lewisham West). Brockley is a cohesive area with many local links within it. This proposal totally goes against the principle of taking account of local ties. It will make it more difficult to lobby local MPs on issues in a coordinated way and will make it more difficult to organise hustings etc.

In addition the London boroughs, in this case Lewisham borough, play an important part in creating a local community identity. This would be reduced by the proposal with only one constituency being totally in Lewisham & 2 other being only partly in Lewisham.

My proposal for a local constituency that meets the numbers criteria & keeps local ties, would be to add Blackheath ward to the current Lewisham Deptford constituency, or alternatively part of Blackheath & part of Rushey Green wards as I think local ties are more important than ward boundaries.

I also think that this is very poor time to be doing such a large reorganisation. Firstly it uses the electoral role created immediately after individual registration came, which is likely to under represent numbers of potential voters in a relatively mobile area like Lewisham. Secondly, in the current political climate, it seems particularly important to strengthen links between MPs & local communities. This proposal would seem to weaken them.

### 32. Susan Shanks

I am concerned that, under these new changes, Deptford, London, will lose its MP and will not benefit from the political representation it deserves, or to which it has a right. Not only that, but citizens in Greenwich will suffer from an overstretched parliamentary representative.

This public consultation has not been well publicised enough, in my opinion. This website provides nothing to accompany the map to help residents of each area understand the potential impact of the changes in each area, and this is a major failing.

### 33. Sev Flowers

The proposed changes are undemocratic! They put too much power into the hands of the conservatives which is unrepresentative of the voting British public. The majority of voting people in this country do NOT vote for the conservatives. Take that into consideration and make the boundary changes more democratic!

### 34. Michael Coulston

I think that parliamentary constituencies are being separated from the boroughs to an unnecessary extent. I think that this is part of a deliberate move to remove a kind of right of appeal or higher authority, because MPs will have an excuse not to intervene in Council matters on the grounds that they answer to two or three different councils. More effort should have been made to make as many constituencies as possible within the boundaries of only one borough.

35. Trina Lynskey

I think my new constituency of Greenwich & Deptford is good. There may be an issue with 2 of the wards Evelyn (Lewisham) and Penninsula (Greenwich) which will see significant population increase in the next 10 years. The bit of the new constituency south of the B220 is a bit of an odd add-on. Overall, I think it's fine. I think this is a better fit for the area I live in.

36. Ben Holden

I believe proposed boundary changes in the Brockley/ Lewisham Deptford area are inappropriate.

In particular I don't understand why the boundary of the lady well and lewisham constituency doesn't follow Brockley Road. (or in fact i do, i understand this is an a council electoral ward boundary, which itself doesn't make sense and shouldn't be used for something as important as an MP constituency boundary.

The MP for this area will naturally focus on Lewisham, Catford and Lady well. These are areas which have limited public transport from SE4 2BA and the adjoining streets and limited physical proximity because of the large parks separating SE4 2BA from Lewisham and Catford and Ladywell (namely Hilly fields and Lewisham and Deptford Cemetery.

Brockley road forms a natural boundary and should be used in full. the Roads around SE4 2BA would naturally fall within either the Brockley/Deptford, or Nunhead and crouton Park constituencies, directly north and south of these SE4 2BA and adjoining streets along brockley road. Where there is regular public transport and natural walking routes.

37. David Littlefair

The boundary for my local area is completely changing and seems to only keep 20% or so of the original mapping. I feel like this is a mistake, My MP will no longer be familiar with her constituents, for one, and I have no idea - given how radically this is changing the geographic layout of my constituency- what processes have gone into redrawing the boundaries to prevent politicized gerrymandering

I also believe that the method of creating boundaries based on a specific number of people is crude. Some areas might have differing needs at a local level and there seems to be oversimplification here.

38. Jacob Stringer

It is clearly unjust that boundaries are set according to how many voters are registered rather than how many are eligible. We know that older, whiter, more established, (and so richer) people are more likely to be registered. This aspect of the law/regulations needs to change before any constituency boundary changes can be considered worthwhile. The proposed boundaries compound inequality by increasing disenfranchisement.

39. Kay Smith

The proposed constituency for my area would cover 2 local authorities. Soutwark and Lewisham. Wouldn't it be difficult for the MP and local councillors to represent constituents in 2 different local authorities?

At the moment it's difficult to get an appointment with an MP working in one Local authority area.

40. Caspar Below

The boundary review is counter productive to electorate engagement and ultimately undermines MPs standing in the community, because MPs would represent 3 halves of communities around town centres, rather than one or two complete ones.

People want to address the MP for Peckham, or Camberwell, or Camberwell and Peckham, but not half of Camberwell, a bit around Vauxhall bridge and some of Peckham. The split from East to West is counter intuitive for people who live here. It fragments local communities further, it makes parliamentary politics seem aloof and unconnected and ultimately less useful.

This boundary review is an opportunity to bring communities together, not to promote further division.

41. Steven Cuthill

Hello,

I must object to the arbitrary change that slips hither green in half. It makes is no logic in doing this and has no support in our community.

Ether merge all of hither green into lewisham or Greenwich but please do not devid up our communit.

42. Martin Quinlan

I understand that the Boundary Commission is constrained by having been required to use 2015 electoral roll data, but it brings the whole process into disrepute when it is clear to everyone that the electoral roll data used to revise boundaries is flawed from the outset.

In terms of my own constituency, it is clear that the boundaries of the new constituency of Greenwich and Deptford have been drawn based on a "needs must" basis rather than any obvious sense of the wards across the Lewisham and Greenwich boundary having any actual connection to each other (Deptford wards have much more in common with those across the Southwark border than the Greenwich border).

The proposed constituency is also at the upper end of the constituency size range, ignoring the known fact that the electoral roll being used for the exercise is particularly flawed in such areas of London and thus the constituency in reality will be over the prescribed voter number limit from the outset (which will be proven in due course if and when 2016 numbers are considered) and that development of the areas on both the Greenwich and Deptford sides means that the disparity between the average constituency size and that of this new constituency will grow significantly over the next 5-10 years. Such factors are of course difficult to include in the exercise, but where they are as obvious as they are here I'm at a loss as to why they are not taken into consideration if the proposed constituency is so close to the upper boundary.

I hope Parliament rejects these proposals as they stand so that the redrawing of boundaries for a new 600 seat House of Commons can be based on more honest data.

43. James Walsh

Would it not be better to square these two halves of a constituency off rather than have to long protesting interlocking fingers of a borough?

## General Comments

### 44. David Boardman, KOV

Representation by Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum to the Boundary Commission for England about proposed new Parliamentary Constituencies for London

#### Who we are

1 KOVF is a neighbourhood forum, with some 700 members, recognised and funded by the London Borough of Lambeth as a non-political umbrella group bringing together local community organisations, businesses and residents, in the North Lambeth area between Lambeth Road, Kennington Park Road, Camberwell New Road, Harleyford Road and the river Thames [essentially the two Lambeth Wards of Oval and Prince's, with a small element of Bishop's Ward south of Lambeth Road]. At present this area lies exclusively within the Vauxhall Parliamentary constituency, with a local MP heavily engaged in issues arising in our area, with boundaries unchanged for over a decade.

2 In practice, Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall are overlapping descriptions, and there is no generally recognised set of internal boundaries between them. But the external boundaries of the combined grouping are reasonably settled, and there was no public dissent when the whole of the Forum's area and the Forum itself were recognised as being sufficiently coherent to be designated by Lambeth Council for the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area in July 2015. Prince's and Oval Wards were also put together in July 2014 as a natural grouping, as the Council's Co-operative Local Investment Plan (CLIP) area for North Lambeth, which organises the spending of locally earmarked S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies.

#### Impact of the proposals – The 3 Way Split of our KOV area

3 Given this well-recognised unity of our community, we were amazed to find it distributed between no less than three constituencies in the draft (4, 8 and 13), within the space of a 400m walk north to south along one of our principal main roads, Kennington Road. Only Oval Ward would remain within a predominantly Lambeth constituency, while Bishop's Ward would be a singleton Lambeth Ward within a predominantly Southwark constituency, and Prince's one of only two Lambeth wards brigaded with Southwark wards to the east. We must expect such minority status within a constituency, bolstered by no natural links, to be detrimental to adequate parliamentary representation or attention. Such a partition does not respect local links, nor principal public transport routes, which run predominantly north and south. Indeed, it was the lack of direct public transport links east west which led the Post Office, in July 2014, to abandon its proposals to close Kennington Post Office and merge its business with the Walworth Road office in Southwark to the east.

4 We therefore urge that our local links be respected and Prince's and Oval Wards in particular be grouped with other wards to form a predominantly Lambeth based constituency.

#### Wider impact of the methodology for Lambeth and South London

5 In circumstances like these, the Commission Consultation document (para 69) urges respondents "to bear in mind any knock on effects that might result from their suggestions." Given the disconcerting prospect that our three adjacent constitutive wards or ward elements might find themselves in three different constituencies, we have looked at the extent of this over-fragmentation of boroughs first in Lambeth itself, then more widely, particularly for the South London sub-region.

6 It is impractical for a group such as ours to rework the whole of London at a ward level in consequence of our proposal, but we note that the wider Lambeth borough is proposed to be partitioned between no less than 6 constituencies, when the electorate of 188,189 amounts to about 2.51 constituencies with a nominal size of 75,000, with a benchmark of 3 constituencies, rounding up. We regard the excess of  $6 - 3 = 3$  constituencies as a measure of the over-fragmentation of Lambeth under the current proposals, correlated with the splitting of natural communities.

7 Turning to the wider London picture, the BC London proposals, eg at Annex A, concentrate on which wards go into which constituencies, rather than how many constituencies individual boroughs are split into. So we have inverted the process in the attached spreadsheet, identified how many constituencies of nominal size (75,000 electors) each borough would amount to, rounded up to the nearest whole number above, then computed the difference between this benchmark figure and the actual number of constituencies between which the borough is shared. This difference is a measure of the excess fragmentation of that borough, likely involving the division of natural communities. In a few asterisked cases we have rounded down where the 5% size tolerance would permit this.

8 When you graph this excess (see map attached), you see that Lambeth, with Merton, have the highest excesses, at 3 each (Lambeth 3 nominal, 6 actual, Merton 2 nominal, 5 actual). Indeed, there is a South London cluster of over-fragmented boroughs (Lambeth, Merton and Croydon), surrounded by boroughs with 0s and 1s. Essentially, we find that this cluster, for whatever reason, becomes the dumping ground for the problems thrown up by the methodology of tight numerical limits, varied ward sizes between London boroughs, and a policy of no breaking ward boundaries.

9 Over-fragmentation of natural communities to different MPs reduces the territorial link and tilts the franchise arrangements towards an “any 75,000 electors will do” approach, reminiscent of the European Parliament franchise, which is correlated with reduced democratic engagement, low representative recognition among constituents and lower esteem for the whole process.

10 We consider that the South London model should be run again, this time from the centre outwards, to spread what appears to be the inevitable fragmentation more evenly over the South London area.

#### 45. Mark Chapman, Pirate Party

South London:

Whilst there are a number of possible ‘groupings’ in South London, we originally treated it as a single sub-region. However,

it naturally divides into the following groups of Boroughs:

Richmond and Kingston (3 seats in total, 2 seats south of the Thames):

Wandsworth, Merton, Sutton, Croydon, Lambeth (12 seats)

Bromley (3 seats)

Southwark, Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley (9 seats)

Bermondsey and Old Southwark (77,623): Unlike the BCE, we don’t cross the border with Lambeth, and so this seat is simply the existing seat with the exchange of Faraday ward for Newington ward.

Camberwell and Peckham (73,463): Instead of a somewhat odd and unnatural linking with the Lambeth wards of Vassall and Prince's in the BCE's 'Camberwell and Vauxhall Bridge' we keep this as a Southwark only seat more closely based on the existing Camberwell and Peckham. We lose Faraday ward to Bermondsey and Old Southwark in exchange for Newington ward, and also lose Peckham Rye ward.

Dulwich and Forest Hill (73,744): Instead of the current link with the West Norwood area of Lambeth, we link Dulwich with the Forest Hill area of Lewisham. There are good communication links between the 2 areas along the South Circular, and the railway lines.

Lewisham and Catford (72,781): As the BCE – this takes the southern-most wards of the Lewisham borough

Greenwich and Deptford (76,793): A cross borough Lewisham-Greenwich seat focused on the "Maritime Greenwich" area this is the same as the BCE except that Telegraph Hill ward is included (thus maintaining the Southwark-Lewisham boundary) and Peninsular ward is excluded.

Woolwich (78,107): Relative to the existing Greenwich and Woolwich this seat has less change than the BCE's proposal, losing just Greenwich West and Blackheath Westcombe, and gaining the remaining 3 Greenwich wards along the river (Thamesmead Moorings, Abbey Wood and Plumstead). This respects the boundary with Bexley in this area and is a logical 'Thames-side' seat which follows the strong east-west lines of communication.

Eltham (77,628): Relative to the BCE's proposal which adds Woolwich Common to the existing seat, we instead propose adding the 2 Bexley wards of Falconwood and Welling and East Wickham.

Bexley and Sidcup (73,127): Relative to the current constituency, we propose losing the 'Welling' wards to Eltham as above, and replacing them with the 3 Bexleyheath wards (Christchurch, Barnehurst and Crayford)

Erith (76,277): The remaining wards of Bexley – that is relative to the BCE's proposed 'Erith and Crayford' this takes Lesnes Abbey, St Michaels and Danson Park instead of the 3 Bexleyheath wards listed above which we believe are a better fit with the Bexley seat.