

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	8
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
North Kensington	9
Central and South Kensington	11
Chelsea	14
Conclusions	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	21
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea	21
B Glossary and abbreviations	23



## Summary

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

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

This review is being conducted as follows:

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

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 50 members, comprising a pattern of four two-member wards and 14 three-member wards. The recommendations were broadly based on a combination of the borough-wide schemes received during our consultation, subject to a number of modifications to reflect our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 98 submissions including comments from the Council. All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of

approximately 3.5% over this period. This represents relatively even growth throughout the borough with increased growth due to occur in Golborne, World's End and particularly Abingdon where significant residential building work is currently taking place. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

## General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we have proposed amendments to our draft recommendations for ward boundaries in Colville, Courtfield, Hans Town, Queen's Gate and Pembridge. We have also adopted new ward names for our proposed St Charles and Hans Town wards.

Our final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea are that the Council should have 50 members, as under our draft recommendations, with four two-member wards and 14 three-member wards. No ward would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2018.

## What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Kensington & Chelsea, in 2014.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea on our interactive maps at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

# 1 Introduction

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

2 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on ward arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 10 June 2013.

## What is an electoral review?

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

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Kensington & Chelsea?

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

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

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

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

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

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

### Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 98 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations. All submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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

## Electorate figures

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

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

17 Prior to preparing our draft recommendations, the Council advised us that further growth in the borough was anticipated in our proposed Dalgarno ward. This was due to planned redevelopment of the former Kensington Gas Works site in Kensal Town. However, the Council confirmed this development would not be completed until after 2018, more than five years subsequent to the scheduled end of the electoral review to which we must have regard for electorate forecasts. Consequently, the Council did not have regard for the planned development in this specific area while producing its electorate forecasts for the borough.

18 We are therefore of the view that the electorate figures provided are the best available at this time and they form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

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

20 During the consultation on council size, we received seven submissions, from local residents and local organisations. Broadly speaking, respondents supported a council size of 51. Two local residents proposed a larger reduction. One of the local residents did not specify what this reduction should be while the other proposed a significant reduction resulting in a council size of between 35 and 45 members. A further local resident proposed the existing council size of 54 be retained.

21 The local resident who proposed a significant reduction in council size commented on the 'tri-borough' shared services agreement with the neighbouring London boroughs of Westminster and Hammersmith & Fulham. The local resident suggested that the impact of the shared services agreement was not reflected in the modest reduction in council size proposed by the Council. The local resident also felt a council size of 51 would leave a large number of backbenchers, regardless of the size of its cabinet. He instead suggested that the Council could effectively function with significantly fewer members.

22 We considered the local resident's comments regarding the tri-borough arrangement. We met with the Council's cross-party working group for the electoral review, which elaborated on the impact of the tri-borough arrangement with regard to

workload. Members of the working group clarified that the tri-borough arrangement has no bearing on the sovereignty of the respective councils and has, it was argued, generated further workload for the Council's scrutiny function.

23 While the local resident proposed a significant reduction in council size, he did not provide evidence to support a specific number and did not have sufficient regard for the Council's political management structure and member workload. Conversely, the Council's submission clearly outlined how a council size of 51 would operate effectively. On balance, we were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 51 and invited proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

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

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

26 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Council again referred to the planned development discussed in paragraph 17 but in the context of council size. The Council acknowledged this development was not scheduled to come on stream within a five-year period from the scheduled end of the electoral review to which we must have regard for electorate forecasts. Nonetheless, the Council suggested that in anticipation of this growth, an additional councillor be added to the proposed two-member Dalgarno ward.

27 The Council's proposal would result in a three-member Dalgarno ward with 33% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018. We would not normally consider adopting a ward with such poor electoral equality except in rare and exceptional circumstances.

28 The increase of one councillor would also have a knock-on effect to the electoral equality of our proposed wards elsewhere throughout the borough. As this planned development will not be completed by 2018, we were not minded to modify our proposed council size of 50.

29 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, a local resident also expressed concern at the reduced council size. However, she did not elaborate on her concerns or propose a specific alternative council size.

30 In light of the comments received on council size, and in the absence of persuasive evidence to move away from our draft recommendations, we confirm a council size of 50 as part of our final recommendations.

## Electoral fairness

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

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

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

## General analysis

34 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations, we received 16 submissions, including four borough-wide proposals from the Conservative Group, the Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group and a local resident, in relation to warding arrangements for Kensington & Chelsea.

35 The borough-wide proposals were supported by limited evidence of community identity and instead largely referred to socio-economic and historical factors which, in isolation, the Commission cannot consider when seeking to reflect its statutory criteria. However, they would all provide good electoral equality and would use relatively clear boundaries.

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

37 Where we proposed modifications, these were to provide clearer boundaries. Our proposed changes to ward names also reflected evidence of community identity received from other local respondents and apparent community identities observed while touring the borough.

38 Our draft recommendations proposed four two-member wards and 14 three-member wards.

39 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 98 submissions. Our draft recommendations were broadly supported by respondents with the exception of the Brompton area. Respondents commenting on this area largely opposed the draft recommendations, instead proposing the existing Brompton

ward be retained. However, under a council size of 50, the existing Brompton ward would have 17% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018. Furthermore, retaining Brompton ward would have a significant knock-on effect to the proposed warding pattern for adjoining areas which have been consulted on and broadly endorsed by other respondents.

40 While we are unable to retain the existing Brompton ward as part of our final recommendations, we acknowledge the evidence of community identity that some respondents raised in opposition to our proposed warding pattern for this area.

41 A number of respondents commenting on this area argued that the museums and streets north of Cromwell Road shared a strong link with the area to their south. Indeed, many respondents argued this area did not share any commonality with the proposed Queen's Gate ward with which it would be included under our draft recommendations. Conversely, the inclusion of this area was welcomed by the current ward councillors for Queen's Gate ward. However, they provided largely historical reasons in support of this.

42 Similarly, respondents commenting on the warding pattern in this area argued that Onslow Square should not be divided between the proposed Hans Town and Courtfield wards.

43 In light of the evidence submitted in relation to this area, we propose modifying our draft recommendations to reflect the proposals received. Under our final recommendations, the museums and streets north of Cromwell Road will be included within the proposed Hans Town ward. Onslow Square will also be wholly included within the proposed Courtfield ward. To reflect these changes, and proposals received from a number of respondents, we also propose renaming Hans Town ward Brompton & Hans Town.

44 Elsewhere in the borough, our final recommendations are broadly unchanged from draft. We propose minor modifications in North Kensington and confirm our draft recommendations in Chelsea as final.

## Electoral arrangements

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

- North Kensington (pages 9–11)
- Central and South Kensington (pages 11–14)
- Chelsea (pages 14–15)

### North Kensington

46 North Kensington is the most northerly part of the borough and broadly comprises the areas of Ladbrooke Grove and Notting Hill. North Kensington currently has six three-member wards and has a distinct character, particularly in the Ladbrooke Grove area, which differentiates it from South Kensington and Chelsea to the south of the borough. The area has a clear north-to-south boundary in Ladbrooke Grove and

the east-to-west boundaries of the Westway and the railway lines running parallel to it, and Notting Hill Gate/Holland Park Avenue.

47 As discussed in paragraph 36, our draft recommendations in North Kensington were broadly based on the Labour Group's proposals, subject to some modifications, and would provide good electoral equality. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, and in addition to the Council's proposals, we received 14 submissions in relation to this area. Our proposed warding pattern in North Kensington was broadly supported with only minor modifications being suggested by respondents.

### **Notting Hill**

48 The Council proposed two minor modifications in this area, between the proposed Colville and Pembridge wards. The Council stated that the boundary between these proposed wards would separate residents of Kensington Park Gardens from Ladbrooke Square, a garden square for which the residents of Kensington Park Gardens pay a levy for its upkeep. The Council proposed the boundary instead follow the backs of properties north of Kensington Park Gardens, rather than the backs of properties to its south as proposed in our draft recommendations. The Council added that, further east, this boundary should follow the centre of Chepstow Villas, rather than the backs of properties as proposed in our draft recommendations.

49 We acknowledge that Ladbrooke Square reflects a shared community identity for the residents of Kensington Park Gardens and have decided to adopt the Council's proposed modification in this area.

50 However, we do not consider the Council's proposed ward boundary which would follow the centre of Chepstow Villas would improve upon our draft recommendations. Following the backs of properties on Chepstow Villas provides a clear boundary which unites the properties on this street within the proposed Colville ward. We have therefore decided not to depart from our draft recommendations in this area.

51 A local resident also opposed the proposed Colville and Pembridge wards. However, her opposition was based on socio-economic characteristics which we do not consider as part of this review.

52 Consequently, our proposed Colville and Pembridge wards will have 5% more and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

53 To the west of this area, we received two comments regarding our proposed Norland ward. A local resident opposed this ward on the basis that she felt it would 'eliminate some of the diversity that exists with the current wards'. However, she neither elaborated on this nor proposed an alternative warding pattern. Conversely, the Latymer Christian Centre supported the warding pattern in this area, adding that it 'more accurately reflects the communities of which we are a part'. We have therefore confirmed our draft recommendations for this area as final.

## **Golborne**

54 The Golborne Forum and a local resident both supported the draft recommendations for Golborne ward. However, the local resident advised that following the Westway dual carriageway would result in the boundary running through Westbourne Studios at ground level. We have therefore made a minor modification to reflect this and departed from following the Westway where it meets Westbourne Studios. This modification does not affect any electors and ensures Westbourne Studios is fully included within Golborne ward.

## **St Charles**

55 The Council, St Helen's Church, St Helen's Residents Association and a local resident all proposed St Charles ward be renamed St Helen's. The Council argued that the area covered by this ward would be more appropriately named St Helen's because St Helen's Residents' Association already covers most of this area and St Helen's Church would lie at its centre. The Residents' Association added that St Helen's Gardens would also lie at the centre of the ward. Furthermore, the Residents' Association noted that St Charles Hospital would not lie within the proposed ward and in recent years, the name St Helen's had been associated with the area, as reflected by the annual St Helen's Festival.

56 While this area includes St Charles Square and St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College, we acknowledge the evidence of community identity that supports this area being identified as St Helen's. We have therefore decided to adopt the ward name St Helen's as part of our final recommendations.

57 To the north of this area, a local resident proposed that Dalgarno ward be renamed St Quintin, and cited largely historical factors in support. The ward name of Dalgarno has been consulted on and we are confident that it adequately reflects the community identity of this area. We are therefore not minded to modify this ward name and so confirm our draft recommendations for Dalgarno ward as final.

58 Elsewhere in North Kensington, our draft recommendations were endorsed and we confirm them as final. Our final recommendations in this area are for the two-member Dalgarno, Norland, Pembridge and St Helen's wards, and the three-member Colville, Golborne and Notting Dale wards. These wards are forecast to have equal to, 2% fewer, 4% fewer, 3% more, 5% more, equal to and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## **Central and South Kensington**

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

60 As discussed in paragraph 36, our draft recommendations in Central and South Kensington were based on the Conservative Group's proposals and would provide good electoral equality. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, and in addition to the Council's proposals, we received 78 submissions in relation to this area. Comments were received broadly in relation to the Brompton area where the

majority of respondents opposed our proposed warding pattern. Elsewhere, in Central and South Kensington, our draft recommendations were broadly supported.

## **Brompton**

61 Under our draft recommendations, the Brompton area would be broadly covered by the proposed Courtfield, Hans Town and Queen's Gate wards. The area covered by the existing Brompton ward would effectively be divided between these three wards.

62 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, respondents commenting on this area largely opposed the proposed warding pattern. However, the existing councillors for Courtfield ward – councillors Tony Holt, Professor Sir Anthony Coates and Elizabeth Rutherford – all supported the draft recommendations for Courtfield ward, with particular focus on the ward name of Courtfield being adopted. The Kensington Square Residents' Association and the existing ward councillors for Queen's Gate ward also endorsed the proposed Queen's Gate ward.

63 In opposition to the warding pattern for this area, some respondents proposed the existing Brompton ward be retained. However, under a council size of 50, the existing Brompton ward would have 17% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018. Furthermore, retaining this ward would have significant knock-on effects on the proposed warding pattern for adjoining areas which has been consulted on and broadly endorsed by respondents.

64 Similarly, some respondents argued that Onslow Square should not be divided between the proposed Hans Town and Courtfield wards, as it is under our draft recommendations. Given the opposition to our draft recommendations in this area, we therefore considered an alternative warding pattern.

65 Under a council size of 50, we are unable to retain the existing Brompton ward as part of our final recommendations. Nonetheless, we acknowledge the evidence of community identity that some respondents provided in opposing our warding pattern in this area.

66 Some respondents commenting on this area argued that the museums and streets north of Cromwell Road shared a strong link with the area to their south. Indeed, many respondents argued this area did not share any commonality with the proposed Queen's Gate ward with which it would be included under our draft recommendations.

67 The Princes Gate Mews Residents' Association, which represents a section of the area north of Cromwell Road, argued that 'there is active use by [Princes] Mews and Exhibition Road residents of South Kensington for shopping, eating and transport links'. The Residents' Association added that South Kensington tube station (south of Cromwell Road) is also the location of their local bus stop and that a pedestrian tunnel connects residents in this area directly to South Kensington tube station. This was echoed by a local resident who stated 'we shop, go to [the] gym, eat out... predominately in Knightsbridge/South Kensington – not Queensgate/High Street Kensington'.

68 The Brompton Association, whose comments were supported by a number of respondents, also referred to the focus of the museums area north of Cromwell Road. The Brompton Association stated that 'the new traffic layout around the [South

Kensington underground] station and the considered focus on the needs of the pedestrian is all about linking the tube station and the immediate surrounding shops and restaurants to the museums and then linking the museums to each other’.

69 While this area north of Cromwell Road largely comprises museums and the London Oratory, we acknowledge there are residential properties in this area that share community identity and transport links with the area to their south. Furthermore, there are clear transport routes that support this area being associated with the area to its south.

70 In light of the evidence submitted in relation to this area, we propose modifying our draft recommendations to reflect the evidence of community linkages received. We therefore propose transferring the museums area north of Cromwell Road from the proposed Queen’s Gate to Hans Town ward. Based on the evidence received, we consider this modification to our draft recommendations will provide a better reflection of the community identities in this area.

71 To the south of this area, we received a number of comments in opposition to Onslow Square being divided between the proposed Courtfield and Hans Town wards. Respondents provided limited evidence of community identity in support of their objection. However, having considered an alternative warding pattern that would unite Onslow Square within the same ward, we feel this would provide a clearer warding pattern for residents in Onslow Square. We therefore propose transferring the eastern half of Onslow Square from the proposed Hans Town ward to Courtfield ward. This was also proposed by a local resident and we note the Onslow Neighbourhood Association also stated that ‘there are no synergies with this area’ and Hans Town.

72 The Onslow Neighbourhood Association added that the area to east of Onslow Square should ‘not be considered a part of Hans Town’. However, in light of our proposed modification to this ward discussed in paragraph 70, and given the lack of evidence to support the Neighbourhood Association’s assertion, we are not minded to adopt this modification as part of our final recommendations.

73 Our proposed modifications in this area would result in three-member Courtfield, Hans Town and Queen’s Gate wards with 9% more, equal to and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

74 The Council proposed that Courtfield ward be renamed Brompton & Courtfield. However, this was largely based on historical reasons. As discussed in paragraph 62, the existing Courtfield ward councillors all supported the ward name of Courtfield and so we are not minded to adopt the Council’s proposal. To the east, as our modification to the proposed Hans Town ward will comprise a larger area of Brompton, we feel a more appropriate ward name to be Brompton & Hans Town and we have therefore adopted this as part of our final recommendations.

## **Abingdon**

75 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received three submissions in relation to the proposed Abingdon ward. The Chatsworth Court Residents’ Association and Edwardes Square Scarsdale & Abingdon Association both supported the proposed Abingdon ward. However, the Earl’s Court Society opposed the inclusion of the area bounded by Kensington High Street, Warwick Road and Beckford Close within the proposed Holland ward. Instead, the Earl’s Court

Society considered this area would lie more appropriately within the proposed Abingdon ward and argued that Kensington High Street would provide a 'natural dividing line and psychological barrier' in this area.

76 Having toured this area in preparing our draft recommendations, we acknowledge Kensington High Street would indeed provide a clear boundary. We considered this in formulating our draft recommendations but noted that this area will be subject to significant growth in its electorate due to the building of residential properties.

77 Including this area within Abingdon ward would result in Holland and Abingdon wards with 18% fewer and 14% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2018. As a consequence of these levels of electoral inequality, we are not minded to adopt this warding pattern. In light of the support for our warding pattern in this area, we confirm our draft recommendations for Abingdon ward as final.

78 Elsewhere in Central and South Kensington, our draft recommendations were endorsed and we confirm them as final. Our final recommendations in this area are for the three-member Abingdon, Brompton & Hans Town, Campden, Courtfield, Earl's Court, Holland, Queen's Gate and Redcliffe wards. These wards are forecast to have 3% fewer, equal to, 7% fewer, 9% more, 4% more, 2% fewer, 6% fewer and 1% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

## Chelsea

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

80 As discussed in paragraph 36, our draft recommendations in Chelsea were based on the Conservative Group's proposals and would provide good electoral equality. During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received four submissions in relation to this area. Respondents commenting on this area supported the draft recommendations.

81 The Ten Acres Residents' Association proposed that Stanley ward, of which the former Leader of the Council is one of the three members, return four members instead of three. The Residents' Association suggested that an additional member would help to mitigate demands upon the Leader. However, we take the view that wards returning more than three councillors result in a dilution of accountability to the electorate and we would not normally recommend a number above that figure. We have therefore decided against adopting the Residents' Association's proposal.

82 Our final recommendations in this area are for the three-member Chelsea Riverside, Royal Hospital and Stanley wards. These wards are forecast to have 1% more, 5% more and equal to the number of electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

# Conclusions

83 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	50	50
Number of electoral wards	18	18
Average number of electors per councillor	2,193	2,270
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	2	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**  
 Kensington & Chelsea should comprise 50 councillors serving 18 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.



### 3 What happens next?

84 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Kensington & Chelsea in 2014.

#### Equalities

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



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea

86 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Kensington & Chelsea:

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

You can also view our final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>



## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Abingdon	3	6,237	2,079	-5%	6,637	2,212	-3%
2	Brompton & Hans Town	3	6,766	2,255	3%	6,838	2,279	0%
3	Campden	3	6,296	2,099	-4%	6,361	2,120	-7%
4	Chelsea Riverside	3	6,336	2,112	-4%	6,906	2,302	1%
5	Colville	3	7,059	2,353	7%	7,129	2,376	5%
6	Courtfield	3	7,365	2,455	12%	7,436	2,479	9%
7	Dalgarno	2	4,515	2,258	3%	4,562	2,281	0%
8	Earl's Court	3	6,934	2,311	5%	7,066	2,355	4%
9	Golborne	3	6,167	2,056	-6%	6,844	2,281	0%
10	Holland	3	5,646	1,882	-14%	6,681	2,227	-2%
11	Norland	2	4,400	2,200	0%	4,447	2,224	-2%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Kensington & Chelsea**

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2018)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12 Notting Dale	3	6,150	2,050	-7%	6,333	2,111	-7%
13 Pembridge	2	4303	2,152	-2%	4,351	2,176	-4%
14 Queen's Gate	3	6,197	2,066	-6%	6,381	2,127	-6%
15 Redcliffe	3	6,824	2,275	4%	6,895	2,298	1%
16 Royal Hospital	3	7,045	2,348	7%	7,118	2,373	5%
17 St. Helen's	2	4,650	2,325	6%	4,698	2,349	3%
18 Stanley	3	6,747	2,249	3%	6,817	2,272	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>109,637</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>113,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,193</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,270</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision-making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

