

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Bexley

Electoral review

November 2016

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926

Table of Contents

Summary	1
Who we are and what we do	1
Electoral review	1
Why Bexley?	1
Our proposals for Bexley	1
What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?	2
1 Introduction	3
What is an electoral review?	3
Consultation	3
How will the recommendations affect you?	4
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Number of councillors	6
Ward boundaries consultation	6
Draft recommendations and further limited consultation	7
Final recommendations	7
Erith and the north of the borough	8
Bexleyheath and central borough	12
Sidcup and the south of the borough	14
Conclusions	16
Summary of electoral arrangements	16
3 What happens next?	17
Equalities	17
Appendix A	18
Final recommendations for the London Borough of Bexley	18
Appendix B	20
Outline map	20
Appendix C	21
Submissions received	21
Appendix D	23
Glossary and abbreviations	23

Summary

Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

2 Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Bexley?

4 We have conducted an electoral review of Bexley Council at the request of the Council. The Council sought a review with the aim to reduce its council size.

Our proposals for Bexley

- Bexley should be represented by 45 councillors, 18 fewer than there are now.
- Bexley should have 17 wards, four fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of all wards should change; none will stay the same.

5 **We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Bexley.**

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

7 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)
- Dr Peter Knight CBE, DL
- Alison Lowton
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Sir Tony Redmond
- Professor Paul Wiles CB
-
- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

¹ Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

1 Introduction

- 8 This electoral review was carried out to ensure that:
- The wards in the London Borough of Bexley are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
 - The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

What is an electoral review?

- 9 Our three main considerations are to:
- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
 - Reflect community identity
 - Provide for effective and convenient local government

10 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

Consultation

11 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Bexley. We then held two periods of consultation addressing the electoral arrangements for the whole of the borough: first on warding patterns for the Council and secondly on our draft recommendations. We also undertook a period of further limited consultation for specific areas of the borough. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

12 This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
18 August 2015	Number of councillors decided
8 September 2015	Start of consultation seeking views on new wards.
16 November 2015	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
9 February 2016	Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation
4 April 2016	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
2 August 2016	Publication of further draft recommendations, start of limited consultation
12 September 2016	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
8 November 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

13 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.

2 Analysis and final recommendations

14 Legislation² states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors³ there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

15 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

16 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

	2015	2021
Electorate of Bexley	179,439	189,189
Number of councillors	45	45
Average number of electors per councillor	3,988	4,204

17 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having 'electoral equality'. All of our new wards for Bexley will have electoral equality by 2021.

18 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Bexley or result in changes to postcodes or local taxes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. We have seen no evidence to suggest that our recommendations will have an effect on house prices or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

19 See Appendix C for details of submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

20 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 5.4% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by increases in electorate resulting from developments in the north of the borough.

21 During our consultation on warding patterns, we were informed that the Labour

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Group on the Council had queried the accuracy of the Council's forecasts. The Group's comments regarded the distribution and scale of future development and the way that numbers of existing electors had been taken into account in areas likely to be subject to new development.

22 We considered the information provided by both the Council and the Labour Group and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We used these figures to produce our draft and final recommendations.

Number of councillors

23 Bexley Council currently has 63 councillors. Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal that the number of members be reduced to 45. We were satisfied that the Council had sufficiently demonstrated that the authority could operate efficiently and effectively under a council size of 45 and ensure effective representation of local residents.

24 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 45 councillors – for example, 45 one-councillor wards, 15 three-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards

25 We received five submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. Three proposed a reduction in council size, with reductions to 42 or to 21 suggested. Two respondents said that an acceptable approach would be to retain the existing number of councillors but substantially reduce the allowances which are paid to them. However, we considered that the evidence contained in these responses to be insufficient to persuade us to alter our initial view. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a 45-member council.

26 We received nine submissions about the number of councillors in response to consultation on our draft recommendations. Eight supported our view that the number of councillors should be reduced to 45. One respondent commented that the existing ward boundaries be retained and that each ward should be represented by one councillor. This respondent did not set out a view of how a total of 21 councillors would carry out the activities required of councillors, collectively and individually. We have therefore maintained 45 councillors for our final recommendations.

Ward boundaries consultation

27 We received 30 submissions to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included two detailed borough-wide proposals from the Borough Council and the Labour Group on the Council. Both were based on a pattern of wards to be represented by 45 elected members. The schemes each provided for a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for ward arrangements, particularly in Blackfen and North Cray.

28 We visited the area in order to look at the various different proposals on the ground. The tour of Bexley helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

29 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we did not think that any single proposal made to us would provide the best balance of our statutory criteria.

We based our draft recommendations on parts of the proposals made to us by the Council, the Labour Group, the North Cray Residents' Association, and having regard to the more localised comments made by residents of the borough.

Draft recommendations and further limited consultation

30 We received 119 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included detailed borough-wide comments from the Council's Conservative and Labour groups and from Bexley Local Agenda 21 UK. The majority of the other submissions received were in relation to our proposals for Belvedere Village, Lower Belvedere, Erith, Slade Green and Sidcup. Following consideration of representations, we decided to conduct a period of further limited consultation on an alternative warding proposal in the north of the borough.

31 In response to our further limited consultation we received 26 submissions. Of these, 24 were either fully or broadly supporting the alternative proposals.

32 Our final recommendations are similar to our draft recommendations. After considering the local evidence received in response to our consultation, we have made modifications to several wards, mainly in the north and central part of Bexley. We have also made changes to the names of two wards.

33 In preparing final recommendations, a check of the assignment of addresses to wards revealed an error in the electorate calculation for Erith and Northumberland Heath wards as published in the further draft recommendations. The boundaries proposed would result in a variance of +15% in Erith by 2021. We propose that this be addressed by modifying the boundary between Erith and Northumberland Heath, notwithstanding the broad support given to the further draft recommendations as a whole. This will provide for improved electoral equality in this part of Bexley.

Final recommendations

34 Pages 8–18 detail our final recommendations for each area of Bexley. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:


- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

35 Our final recommendations are for 11 three-councillor wards and six two-councillor wards. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

36 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out on page 19 and on the large map accompanying this report.

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Erith and the north of the borough



Ward name	Number of cllrs	Variance 2021
Belvedere	3	1%
Erith	2	10%
Northumberland Heath	2	-2%
Slade Green & Northend	2	4%
Thamesmead East	3	-9%
West Heath	3	0%

Belvedere

37 In our draft recommendations, we proposed a single-member Belvedere Village ward and two-member Lower Belvedere ward. We received 34 submissions relating to this proposal. Most argued that these two proposed wards should be combined to form a Belvedere ward served by three councillors. Representations provided us with evidence of community identity and the way in which the community interacts.

38 We are persuaded by this evidence now to recommend a single three-member ward as suggested to us.

Erith

39 In our draft recommendations, we proposed to combine Erith and Slade Green to form a two-member ward. This proposal met with little support but attracted 26 objections. Evidence was presented which argued not only that Erith and Slade Green constitute separate communities, but that our draft recommendations would also split part of the Erith community off into a Northumberland Heath ward and also split part of the Slade Green Community off into a Barnehurst & North End ward. Representations about Erith and Slade Green were consistent with evidence we received about the identity of communities both in Northumberland Heath and in Barnehurst.

40 We were persuaded by the evidence that our draft proposals would not best reflect the communities of this part of Bexley and made further draft recommendations for a different pattern of wards. We decided to further consult on the new proposals for this area before finalising our recommendations. In response to our consultation we received 18 submissions about Erith. Whilst all were broadly supportive of our further draft recommendations, we received a suggestion that we include an industrial area at Church Manorway in a Belvedere ward. This suggestion did not provide us with evidence to persuade us to alter the boundaries of our further draft recommendations in the light of the support we received for our proposal.

41 We received a suggestion that we change the name of the ward either to Erith Town or Erith Riverside, although most respondents were happy with the name Erith. We are not persuaded to name the ward anything but Erith.

42 We propose a two-member Erith ward which is broadly similar to the current Erith ward. Our proposed ward reflects, however, the change in the overall number of councillors for Bexley and the location of anticipated housing development. We must also provide for good levels of electoral equality having regard to a substantial amount of development expected to take place over the next five years, increasing the electorate by around 2,000. We therefore propose that the Frinsted Road area, currently in the Erith ward, be included in our new Northumberland Heath ward described below.

43 In order to provide good electoral equality, we propose to move away from our further draft recommendations by excluding properties at Carlton Road and Silver Spring Close and including them in Northumberland Heath ward.

Northumberland Heath

44 We received evidence which indicated that the Northumberland Heath community occupies a much smaller area than the ward we proposed in our draft recommendations. Our decision to reflect local evidence regarding Erith means that

we can reflect this evidence. However, the need to provide for good electoral equality means that we must modify the existing Northumberland Heath ward by including the Frinsted Road area as described in paragraph 42 above, and by excluding the Little Heath Road area which we recommend be included in a West Heath ward. As stated above, we decided to further consult on our proposals for this ward before finalising our recommendations. In response to our consultation we received 15 submissions about Northumberland Heath. Whilst responses broadly supported our further draft recommendations, we received suggestions that we add the area between Colyers Lane and Stelling Road to the Northumberland Heath ward, and the Brook Street area to the Barnehurst ward. If we were to make either or both of the changes suggested, then we would detract from our overall warding proposals which provide good levels of electoral equality throughout Bexley. The changes suggested would result in levels of inequality which we would not normally recommend and are not persuaded by the evidence presented to recommend changes in these specific instances.

45 Our final recommendations therefore include a two-member Northumberland Heath ward. We have modified the boundaries shown in our further draft recommendations by including properties in Carlton Road and Silver Spring Close in this ward, as described in paragraph 43 above.

Slade Green & Northend

46 As described in paragraphs 30–1 above, we are recommending a pattern of wards in the Slade Green area which is different from that of our draft recommendations. As stated, we decided to further consult on our new proposals for this ward before finalising our recommendations. In response to our consultation we received 21 submissions about Slade Green & Northend. We received a suggestion that we add the Wessex Drive and Ranworth Close area to the Barnehurst ward. If we were to make this change, then we would detract from our scheme which provides good levels of electoral equality. The change suggested would result in levels of inequality which we would not normally recommend and are not persuaded by the evidence presented to recommend in these specific instances.

47 We did receive several suggestions, however, that the Slade Green Train Care and Maintenance Depot be included in the Slade Green ward. Respondents to the consultation cited its access from the junction of Forest Road and Moat Lane in Slade Green and its importance to the employment of Slade Green residents. Making this change would have no impact on electoral equality. We accept this suggestion in making our final recommendations, having regard to the evidence submitted.

48 We also received evidence regarding the name of the ward. In our draft recommendations, we proposed the name Northend & Slade Green. Whilst we received support for this name, we also received suggestions that the ward be more simply named Slade Green. The Slade Green Community Forum advised us that the proposed ward would reflect both the Slade Green area and Northend but that whilst the latter name should be retained, the ward name should reflect that Slade Green forms the larger community. We are happy to accept that advice and therefore propose as part of our final recommendations, a two-member Slade Green & Northend ward.


Thamesmead East

49 We received six submissions about Thamesmead East, all supporting our draft recommendations. We have not changed any of the boundaries we proposed.

West Heath

50 In our draft recommendations, we proposed a ward which we called Bostall. We received some support for the boundaries of the ward. We also received suggestions that we should either split up our proposed ward or combine the western and eastern parts of our proposed wards with adjoining wards. The evidence we received did not, however, persuade us that our initial conclusions were incorrect. We have not made any changes to our proposed ward boundaries. We did receive suggestions that the name Bostall would not reflect the locality or the communities that live there. The name St Michael's was suggested, but we considered that the current ward of that name does not reflect the extent of our proposed ward. Instead, we confirm the ward name West Heath as part of our final recommendations.

Bexleyheath and central borough



Ward name	Number of cllrs	Variance 2021
Barnehurst	2	5%
Bexleyheath	3	1%
Crayford	3	-2%
Crook Log	3	-1%
East Wickham	3	0%
Falconwood & Welling	3	1%

Barnehurst

51 In our draft recommendations, we combined the Barnehurst area with Northend in a proposed three-member ward. Representations made to us indicated that Barnehurst and Northend are distinct communities and it was suggested that we recommend a two-member Barnehurst ward and a single-member Northend ward. It was also suggested that we include the Barnehurst Golf Club in this ward. As described in paragraphs 30–1 above, we moved away from our draft recommendations to make further draft recommendations. In response to our further consultation on our proposals for this ward before finalising our recommendations, we received 18 submissions about Barnehurst. As described in paragraphs 44 and 46 above, we received submissions which suggested different configurations of the Barnehurst ward at Brook Street, Colyers Lane and Wessex Drive. We are not able to discount the high levels of electoral inequality which the suggested changes would imply and consequentially we now make our final recommendation for a two-member Barnehurst ward which reflects the evidence relating to the nature of the Barnehurst and Northend communities.

Bexleyheath

52 We proposed a three-member Christchurch ward as part of our draft recommendations. The boundaries of the ward were broadly supported but we did receive some detailed suggestions for changes at Barnehurst Road, Church Road, Lion Road and Randolph Close. We are persuaded by the evidence relating to each of these suggestions and therefore have adjusted the boundaries of our proposed ward. We received a suggestion that properties at Risedale Road be included in our Barnehurst ward. However, we also received support for the draft recommendation to include Risedale Road in Bexleyheath and were not persuaded by the evidence

received to move from that draft recommendation.

53 We also received evidence to indicate that the name Christchurch would be inappropriate, but that Bexleyheath would be a more suitable name for the ward. We have accepted this evidence and name the ward accordingly.

Crayford

54 We received a suggestion that we make a minor change to our Crayford ward in order to include within it Willow Walk, off Thames Road. This is a sensible, practical suggestion which we accept in making our final recommendations. We have, however, also included some industrial land in order to reflect the local road network in the light of this change.

Crook Log

55 In our draft recommendations we proposed a two-member Brampton ward and a single-member Crook Log ward. We received one expression of support for this proposal. We also received a suggestion that the Farnham Road area, which we included in our Brampton ward, should be included in our East Wickham ward. Accepting this suggestion would mean that electoral inequality would rise to a level we would not normally be prepared to accept. We see no strong reason which would persuade us to do so and we have therefore not altered the boundary of our proposed East Wickham ward.

56 We received suggestions from 15 respondents to our consultation that the two wards of our draft recommendations – Brampton and Crook Log – be combined to form a three-member ward. Several included detailed descriptions of how the community in this part of Bexley interacts and we are persuaded by the evidence which we have received. We therefore recommend that there be a three-member Crook Log ward, the name being suggested by respondents.


East Wickham

57 We did not receive many comments specifically about East Wickham although general expressions of support were given. We received a suggestion that the Farnham Road area, which we included in our Brampton ward, should be included in East Wickham. For the reasons given in paragraph 55 above, we have not altered the boundary of our proposed East Wickham ward.

Falconwood & Welling

58 We received a suggestion that the boundary of Falconwood & Welling ward be adjusted to include properties on Danson Road. We were not persuaded of the merits of such a change as our proposed ward essentially covers the areas to the north and west of Danson Park, but not to the east of it. However, we also received a suggestion regarding access at South Gipsy Road which we have accepted. The boundary of our ward is adjusted northwards to the junction of South Gipsy Road with Westbrooke Road. This will reflect the road and access layout of the locality.

Sidcup and the south of the borough



Ward name	Number of cllrs	Variance 2021
Blackfen & Lamorbey	3	3%
Blendon & Penhill	3	-1%
Longlands	2	-2%
Sidcup	3	-3%
St Mary's & St James	2	2%

Blackfen & Lamorbey

59 We received four comments about this ward. Two of those suggested a small change to the boundary with Blendon & Penhill ward; it was suggested that the shops at Wellington Parade and Blackfen Parade be included in this ward in order to bring the whole of the shopping area into the Blackfen & Lamorbey ward. We have accepted this suggestion in making our final recommendations.

Blendon & Penhill

60 We received several submissions supporting our proposal for a three-member Blendon & Penhill ward as well as our proposals for the area to the south of the A2 generally. We did, however, also receive seven representations which argued that the area to the south of Hurst Road should be regarded as part of the Sidcup community. Omitting that area from Blendon & Penhill ward would result in a degree of electoral inequality we are not prepared to recommend. A further submission argued that the whole of our proposed ward which lies to the south of the River Shuttle should be excluded from Blendon & Penhill ward. Whilst we recognise that a good level of electoral equality could be achieved by making this area a single-member ward, with Blendon & Penhill becoming a two-member ward, we do not

consider that we have received sufficiently strong and clear evidence of community distinctiveness to persuade us to make this change. We have described in paragraph 59 above, a change to our draft recommendation in relation to the shopping area at Wellington Parade and Blackfen Parade. That is the only alteration we therefore make to our proposal for this ward as part of our final recommendations.

Longlands

61 We received three submissions about Longlands, all supporting in principle our draft recommendations. However, we received a suggestion that we make a minor amendment to the boundary between this ward and Sidcup ward in order to include the Main Road car park in the latter ward. The car park serves the Sidcup town centre and we therefore include it in Sidcup ward.

Sidcup

62 We received a number of suggestions relating to the three-member Sidcup ward we proposed in our draft recommendations. Principally amongst them was the suggestion of a single-member ward covering the Foots Cray area to the south-east of the town centre and the Ellenborough Road area which forms the southern part of our St Mary's & St James ward. The creation of a Foots Cray ward would require further changes to our Blendon & Penhill ward if electoral equality is to be maintained.

63 We received support for our St Mary's & St James ward and our boundaries in the Old Bexley area. We are not persuaded either that a Foots Cray ward as proposed or consequential alteration of proposed boundaries would be consistent with the evidence of community identity we have received. Subject to minor alterations explained in paragraph 61, above, and paragraph 65 below, involving no electors, our final recommendation is a three-member Sidcup ward which includes Foots Cray.

St Mary's & St James

64 In our draft recommendations we proposed a two-member ward with the River Cray forming its western boundary. Whilst we received general support for this proposal we received evidence based on the nature of the Foots Cray Meadows through which the river runs. Local community organisations proposed that we include the whole of the Meadows in this ward because of the community's involvement in the use and management of the Meadows. Based on the evidence presented, we concur with that proposal.

65 It was also suggested that we exclude the area lying to the south of Maidstone Road from this ward. In line with our conclusion that the River Cray does not form a key marker for ward boundaries in this area, we have amended our proposals in order to include all of the industrial area at Maidstone Road in our Sidcup ward.

Conclusions

66 The table below shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	45	45
Number of electoral wards	17	17
Average number of electors per councillor	3,988	4,204
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	1	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

Bexley London Borough Council should be made up of 45 councillors serving 17 wards representing six two-councillor wards and 11 three-councillor wards. The details and ward names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for the London Borough of Bexley. You can also view our final recommendations for Bexley on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

3 What happens next?

67 We have now completed our review of the London Borough of Bexley. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2018.

Equalities

68 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.

Appendix A

Final recommendations for the London Borough of Bexley

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barnehurst	2	8,606	4,303	8%	8,857	4,429	5%
2	Belvedere	3	11,983	3,994	0%	12,678	4,226	1%
3	Bexleyheath	3	11,993	3,998	0%	12,724	4,241	1%
4	Blackfen & Lamorbey	3	12,572	4,191	5%	12,941	4,314	3%
5	Blendon & Penhill	3	12,134	4,045	1%	12,486	4,162	-1%
6	Crayford	3	11,595	3,865	-3%	12,339	4,113	-2%
7	Crook Log	3	12,076	4,025	1%	12,496	4,165	-1%
8	East Wickham	3	12,081	4,027	1%	12,590	4,197	0%
9	Erith	2	7,102	3,551	-11%	9,281	4,641	10%
10	Falconwood & Welling	3	12,241	4,080	2%	12,721	4,240	1%
11	Longlands	2	7,947	3,974	0%	8,277	4,139	-2%

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12 Northumberland Heath	2	8,021	4,011	1%	8,273	4,137	-2%
13 Sidcup	3	11,669	3,890	-2%	12,181	4,060	-3%
14 Slade Green & Northend	2	8,080	4,040	1%	8,727	4,364	4%
15 St Mary's & St James	2	8,299	4,150	4%	8,556	4,278	2%
16 Thamesmead East	3	10,848	3,616	-9%	11,500	3,833	-9%
17 West Heath	3	12,192	4,076	2%	12,562	4,187	0%
Totals	45	179,439	-	-	189,189	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,988	-	-	4,204	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by London Borough of Bexley Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral 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

Outline map



A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the A1 sheet accompanying this report, or on our website <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/greater-london/bexley>

Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at:
<https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/greater-london/bexley>

Draft recommendations

Political Groups

- Bexley Heath & Crayford Constituency Labour Party
- London Borough of Bexley Council Conservative Group
- London Borough of Bexley Council Labour Group
- Erith & Thamesmead Constituency Labour Party
- Old Bexley & Sidcup Conservative Association
- Old Bexley & Sidcup Constituency Labour Party

Councillors

- Councillor L. Bailey (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor D. Francis (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor J. Hunt (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor J. Husband (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor D. Leaf (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor G. MacDonald (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor H. Marriner (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor D. Massey (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor P. Read (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor J. Waters (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor J. Wilkinson (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor E. Boateng, Councillor J. Ferreira and Councillor A. Oppong-Asare (London Borough of Bexley Council)

Members of Parliament

- D. Evennett MP
- T. Pearce MP

Local Organisations

- Belvedere Community Forum
- Bexley Local Agenda 21 UK
- Erith Town Council
- North Cray Residents' Association
- Slade Green Community Forum
- St John's Church

Local Residents

- 93 local residents

Further draft recommendations

Political Groups

- Bexleyheath & Crayford Conservative Association
- London Borough of Bexley Council Conservative Group
- London Borough of Bexley Council Labour Group
- Erith & Thamesmead Conservative Association
- St Michaels Ward of Bexleyheath & Crayford Labour Party

Councillors

- Councillor S. Borella (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor D. Leaf (London Borough of Bexley Council)
- Councillor H. Marriner (London Borough of Bexley Council)

Members of Parliament

- D. Evennett MP
- T. Pearce MP

Local Organisations

- Bexley Local Agenda 21 UK
- Slade Green Community Forum

Local Residents

- 14 local residents

Appendix D

Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
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
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
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