

Clock House & Elmers End

45 Our draft recommendations for Clock House & Elmers End ward are based on a combination of the proposals from the Labour Group, the Conservative Group and the 61-councillor local resident scheme. These proposals all kept the communities of Clock House and Birkbeck within one ward.

46 However, we decided that our Clock House & Elmers End ward should follow Upper Elmers End Road up the railway line, as per the Conservative Group proposal, to include the Elmers End Green area in this ward. This area contains the Elmers End Free Church and the Elmers End Café. We agree with the Conservative Group argument that these form part of the Elmers End community and should thus be included in a Clock House & Elmers End ward. This proposal will be supported by the West Beckenham Residents' Association, who opposed the existing boundary along Croydon Road, which currently splits the Elmers End Green area from the larger Elmers End community, and Bob Stewart MP, who suggested that Elmers End be united into one ward.

47 We have adopted the Labour Group proposal to include the area around the Kent House railway station and Beckenham Road tram stop, which includes electors on Barnmead Road, Plawfield Road, Thayers Farm Road and Chaffinch Road. We were persuaded by the evidence received, and from our visit to Bromley, that this area has better community links with Clock House than with Penge, where the railway line, adult education centre and school provide a barrier between the communities. This proposal was supported by Ellie Reeves MP, several local councillors, Penge Forum and a local resident.

48 Given our decision to include the area of Anerley in our Crystal Palace & Anerley ward, we cannot adopt the Conservative Group proposal of including Anerley in our proposed Clock House & Elmers End ward. Furthermore, we also cannot adopt the Labour Group proposal to include the area bounded by the railway line and Rectory Road in this ward as we are including this area in our Beckenham & Copers Cope ward. The justification for this decision is described in paragraph 55.

49 We were not persuaded that the community evidence provided by the ERO was strong enough to adopt their proposed Birkbeck ward, which we believed divided the Clock House and Elmers End communities.

50 We have named this ward Clock House & Elmers End, as we consider that this ward name best represents the communities that reside within this ward. We, however, welcome comments on the name of this ward, in addition to the boundaries. Our proposed Clock House & Elmers End ward will have an electoral variance of -5% by 2025.

Penge & Cator

51 Our draft recommendations for this ward are based entirely on the Labour Group proposal, given our inclusion of the Lawrie Park triangle in this ward and the transfer of the area around the Kent House railway station and Beckenham Road tram stop into Clock House. However, apart from these amendments, the Labour Group, Conservative Group and 61-councillor local resident scheme proposed broadly similar Penge & Cator wards which utilise Penge High Street as the focal point of the ward, while also keeping both Penge East and Penge West railway stations within the ward.

52 As previously discussed in paragraph 44, we did not consider the community evidence from the ERO strong enough to transfer the area between the railway line and Croydon Road from the existing Penge & Cator ward into a Crystal Palace & Anerley ward. Our draft recommendations result in a Penge & Cator ward with an electoral variance of 3% by 2025.

Beckenham Town & Copers Cope and Kelsey & Eden Park

53 We received significantly different proposals regarding the area of Beckenham. The Conservative Group and 61-councillor local resident scheme generally followed the existing warding pattern here, where the most significant amendment involved transferring electors bounded by Rectory Road and the railway line into this ward from the existing Clock House ward, as part of a proposed three-councillor Beckenham Town & Copers Cope ward.

54 Conversely, the Labour Group proposed a three-councillor Beckenham Town ward which included a substantial number of electors around the Kelsey Park area, while the ERO proposed a three-councillor Beckenham Central ward bounded by two smaller two-councillor wards for Copers Cope and Eden Park & Elmers End to the north and south respectively.

55 Based on the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the warding arrangement proposed by the Conservative Group and 61-councillor local resident scheme for this area of Bromley. We consider that placing electors bounded by Rectory Road and the railway line within a Beckenham ward will reflect community identity effectively. We agree with the Conservative Group and 61-councillor local resident scheme that this area is an extension of the Beckenham town centre and would fit more appropriately within a Beckenham-centric ward. Our proposed Beckenham Town & Copers Cope ward will have variance of -3% by 2025.

56 The Conservative Group and 61-councillor local resident schemes proposed broadly similar Kelsey & Eden Park wards, the only significant difference between the two being that the Conservative Group included the Elmers End Green area in an Elmers End ward. Alternatively, the Labour Group proposed an Eden Park & Elmers End ward, which was similar to the existing ward, but which excluded Langley Waterside but included a substantial number of electors around the Kelsey Park area.

57 We are of the view that the Conservative Group proposal for this area better reflects our statutory criteria. We consider that the Labour Group proposal splits the Elmers End community and the exclusion of Langley Waterside from this ward would not reflect communities as we consider electors in this area are more likely to identify with communities in Kelsey and Eden Park, rather than Shortlands. We also consider the ERO proposal splits the Clock House, Elmers End and Eden Park communities and we have not adopted their Beckenham Central and Eden Park & Elmers End wards for this reason.

58 Apart from the borough-wide schemes, we did not receive much localised evidence for this area during consultation and we welcome any comments regarding our draft recommendations for this area.