

Boundary Commission Review Part 2 (Warding Patterns) – Amendment on behalf of Independent Residents’ Group

This Council agrees with Option 4A but rejects the proposal to divide the existing Rainham and Wennington ward into two, to create a one member ward north of New Road (A1306) and a two member ward south of New Road (**replaced with a 3 Member ward known as ‘Rainham & Wennington’**) because it appears the proposal is made for partisan political advantage contrary to Boundary Commission criteria, and because:-

- There is no special reason for a one member ward in this area, as its clearly part of Rainham and the ward has existed since the LB Havering was formed in 1964 and all residents consider themselves as living in Rainham, with the River Ingrebourne acting as a natural border.
- The social and cultural connections between both sides of New Road are strong. For example, all residents consider Rainham Village Conservation Area and buildings a part of their heritage and attend Christmas and May Fayre’s organised by council supported Rainham Association for Village Events.
- The dissecting New Road is easily crossed, meaning it’s a porous soft border rather than a hard border.
- The main connecting road is Upminster Road North and South which is a busy bus and pedestrian route through a traffic light crossing.
- Residents north of New Road use Tesco Extra in Rainham Village and the High Street in the south side for most of their local convenience shopping as there is only a few small shops on the north side.
- There are three primary schools and a secondary school attended by children throughout the ward.
- The north side contains about 45% of the population, so well above the 33% for an equal division of the ward. Therefore to equalise numbers Option 4A proposes dividing the north side between residents East and West of Upminster Road North, but this undermines the logic behind creating a separate ward north of New Road. How can the northern side be deemed a distinct area and then divided in an arbitrary way, with part of it remaining part of the south side?
- One member wards should be the exception to ensure representation in case a member falls ill etc.

This Council agrees with Option 4A but calls on the Boundary Commission to implement the proposed changes for the 2026 rather than 2022 local elections, because:-

- The projected big increase in population is based on planning consents for developments that may not be built and occupied by 2026, let alone 2022.
- The creation of new wards in Romford and Beam Park based on projected increase in population will result in ghost wards with unequal representation if implemented for the 2022 local elections.
- The big changes proposed to ward boundaries will result in many residents leaving and joining, old and new wards. This severe disruption is too close to the 2022 local elections. To ensure effective continuing representation a more

evolutionary transition is needed by implementing the changes for the 2026 local elections.

- Boundary Commission reviews work on projected figures to ensure longevity to the changes made. This aim is not compromised by implementing the Option 4A changes in 2026 as the last review was 20 years ago, so there is unlikely to be another review anytime soon.
- Boundary Commission can exercise a sliding scale of discretion as everywhere is different. Big increases in projected population growth due to high density localised high rise building is untypical and requires a distinct response.