

MINISTRY OF
HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

LONDON GOVERNMENT
THE LONDON BOROUGHs

Report presented to the
Minister of Housing and Local Government by

S. LLOYD JONES, Esq.,
Town Clerk, Plymouth

F. D. LITTLEWOOD, Esq., O.B.E.,
Town Clerk, Cheltenham

HARRY FLOWMAN, Esq., C.B.E.
Town Clerk, Oxford

R. S. YOUNG, Esq.,
Town Clerk, South Shields



LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
1962

PLYMOUTH CHELTENHAM OXFORD SOUTH SHIELDS

18th July, 1962

Madam,

London Government

At the direction of the Minister of Housing and Local Government you invited us to conduct on his behalf discussions with local authorities in the London area about the future pattern of the London boroughs. This we have now done and our report is enclosed.

We should like to express our thanks to the officers of the Department for the very ready help they gave us.

We are, Madam,

Your obedient Servants,

S. LLOYD JONES.

F. D. LITTLEWOOD.

HARRY FLOWMAN.

R. S. YOUNG.

The Secretary,

Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

LONDON GOVERNMENT

THE LONDON BOROUGHS

1. We were invited by the Minister of Housing and Local Government to make recommendations for the creation of a pattern of boroughs in connection with the reorganisation of London government. Our full terms of reference were:

- (1) To take into consideration the map showing the possible grouping of boroughs sent to local authorities in the London area on 16th December, 1961 (subject to any amendments to the outer boundary which the Minister may indicate), and the views expressed and any alternative suggestions made by local authorities in respect of this map.
 - (2) To make recommendations (after such consultations with each other and with the Department as we may think necessary) for the creation of a pattern of London boroughs over the whole of this Greater London area (other than the City of London) mainly by the amalgamation of existing local government areas.
 - (3) In making recommendations to have regard to the Government's declared aim of creating boroughs with a minimum population of around 200,000 wherever possible (some boroughs might be substantially larger than this); and also to the present and past associations of existing local government areas, to the lines of communication, the patterns of development, and the location and areas of influence of service centres.
2. Before proceeding to our recommendations and the reasons for them, it is necessary to recall the immediate antecedents of our task.
3. The Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London whose report was published in October 1960 (Cmd. 1164) recommended that the existing pattern of counties and county boroughs in Greater London should be replaced by a new structure in which the primary unit should be the boroughs which would be responsible for all local government functions except those which needed to be planned and administered over the whole of the metropolitan area.
4. The Commission proposed that a directly elected Council for Greater London should be established for these wider functions and that its principal responsibilities should be the preparation of the development plan, the overall planning of the education service, overspill housing (with some concurrent housing powers inside Greater London), main roads, traffic control, the fire and ambulance services, refuse disposal and main sewerage. All other local government functions, notably housing, the health, welfare and children's services and local responsibility for education, planning control and highways should be in the hands of the borough councils.
5. The Commission's view was that the large number of existing boroughs and urban districts in Greater London should be reduced in order to produce a

pattern of fewer but stronger boroughs which should, as a rule, be within the population range of 100-250,000. The Commission indicated how these new boroughs might be formed, but they took no evidence on this subject and made it clear that their suggested groups were only provisional.

6. The White Paper entitled *London Government: Government Proposals for Reorganisation* (November 1961, Cmnd. 1562) showed that the Government accepted the main lines of reorganisation recommended by the Royal Commission but with two qualifications.

7. The Government proposed that, except in a central area for which special arrangements would need to be made, education should be wholly a borough service instead of responsibility being shared (as the Royal Commission suggested) between the Greater London Council and the London boroughs.

8. The Government also proposed that for this and other reasons the boroughs should be larger and therefore fewer than the Commission had recommended; they thought it would be desirable to aim at a minimum population of around 200,000 wherever possible.

9. On 16th December, 1961 the Ministry sent to all local authorities in the Greater London area a circular (No. 56/61) enclosing a map referred to as Map A which was an illustration of how the existing local government areas in Greater London might be regrouped to form boroughs of the size the Government had in mind. This was the map referred to in our terms of reference. Authorities were invited by the Minister to let him have their views and any alternative suggestions in preparation for discussions in the Spring of 1962; the observations of the local authorities concerned and the views of a number of other persons and bodies who had written to the Minister were made available to us.

10. The Department's Map A illustrated a possible pattern of London boroughs within the Greater London area proposed by the Royal Commission. The Government had indicated in the White Paper, however, that they would be prepared to consider representations about the possible exclusion of peripheral districts and our conferences to discuss the borough groups in the outer parts of the metropolitan area were timed so as to take account of the decisions reached on the outer boundary of Greater London.

11. These decisions were taken by the Minister; the definition of the outer boundary was not included in our terms of reference. The course of events was that the Minister announced on 17th May, 1962 that in his view seven districts should be completely excluded from the Greater London area proposed by the Royal Commission—Banstead, Caterham & Warlingham, Cheshunt, Esher, Staines, Sunbury-on-Thames and Walton & Weybridge. In addition the Minister concluded that Chigwell urban district should be left out subject to a boundary adjustment to bring the whole of the Hainault housing estate into Greater London and that the southern wards of the borough of Epsom & Ewell, embracing the town of Epsom and the village of Old Ewell, should also be excluded.

12. Our recommendations regarding the borough groups thus relate to the area settled by the Minister. In framing them we also took note of the Government's announcement regarding the central area for education. The White Paper

explained that in the Government's view there should be an education authority for an area in the centre of London much larger than was envisaged for a single borough. On 3rd May, 1962 the Minister of Housing and Local Government announced that, subject to later review after the new authorities had been established, it was the Government's intention to adopt the present area of the administrative county of London as the central education area foreshadowed in the White Paper; the organisation of education within the present county boundaries would continue undisturbed, its administration being entrusted to a statutory committee of the Greater London Council. This decision virtually ruled out any amalgamation of a metropolitan borough with any authority outside the administrative county of London, though we have not regarded it as precluding consideration of the adjustment of that boundary at North Woolwich.

13. With these various considerations in mind we examined the proposals and counter-proposals which were put to us. In the course of this examination certain principles or factors came to assume particular importance.

14. *First* we noted that the groups illustrated in Map A were put forward as a basis for discussion rather than as settling firm proposals, and we did not feel unduly tied to the groups so suggested. We have considered fully the alternative proposals and have done so from the point of view of the general pattern of boroughs and not simply in the context of individual local authorities. Where the local authorities expressed agreement with a grouping we did not feel it necessary to examine the proposal so meticulously as we would otherwise have done save where counter-proposals by other authorities affected the grouping. Even then it seemed to us that an extraordinarily good case needed to be made for such counter-proposals if they were to prevail over an agreed grouping, for such agreement clearly provides a good augury for the future. In saying this we by no means discount the possibility of an enforced amalgamation proving to be equally satisfactory in the long run.

15. *Secondly* we noted that while we were not precluded from recommending boroughs with populations below 200,000, it was clearly not the Government's intention that the new authorities should be smaller than this where it could be avoided, and they were willing to contemplate much larger boroughs where this seemed desirable. We have in some instances recommended groups whose populations are less than 200,000, but we have done so only where this course seemed unavoidable if we were to produce the best pattern of boroughs attainable, looking at Greater London as a whole.

16. *Thirdly* we were faced with suggestions, some in Map A and others put forward by local authorities, which would involve the partition of existing districts within Greater London. There are obvious reasons based on sentiment and on administrative convenience for keeping existing local government areas intact if possible. Our terms of reference also enjoined us to recommend the creation of a pattern of London boroughs mainly by the amalgamation of existing areas. We were given to understand that the proposed legislation on London government would provide machinery through which boundary adjustments could later be made by Order, and in these circumstances we have departed from existing boundaries only where it appeared necessary to do so in order to produce, from the outset, a satisfactory pattern of London boroughs.

17. *Fourthly* we found, as the Ministry circular 56/61 also implies, that the considerations referred to in our terms of reference—past and present associations, lines of communication, patterns of development, and the location and influence of service centres—did not always give clear and unequivocal guidance on the drawing up of the borough pattern and the application of these considerations in some places would not accord with other factors, e.g. the injunction to achieve the new pattern mainly by the grouping of existing areas.

18. In regard to the financial implications, the Government's view as expressed in paragraphs 51–53 of the White Paper is that the financial arrangements should follow consequently on changes which are necessary for other reasons. As a result we have not made enquiries on this aspect of the subject and have not taken it into account in making our recommendations other than bearing in mind, in a broad way and against the context of our terms of reference, the resources likely to be available to each group.

19. Our examination of the borough pattern was facilitated by there being very few suggestions involving amalgamations across county boundaries or the River Thames; the decision of the Minister that the Greater London Council should be responsible for education within the present administrative county of London also limited the choice of amalgamations which could be considered. In consequence, we were able to confer with the authorities in groups which were largely self-contained. Our conferences embraced:

- (a) the county of London north of the Thames;
- (b) the county of London south of the Thames;
- (c) West Ham, East Ham and the authorities in metropolitan Essex;
- (d) the authorities in metropolitan Kent;
- (e) Croydon and the authorities in metropolitan Surrey;
- (f) the authorities in metropolitan Middlesex and Hertfordshire.

20. For the most part we sat separately to hold these conferences though occasionally another sat in during some part of the discussions. In addition we visited a number of the areas to gain further information by personal inspection. In the later sections of this report, from paragraph 23 onwards, we individually examine the pattern of London boroughs discussed at the conferences over which we each presided but we have consulted together at all stages and our recommendations are presented as part of a complete whole.

21. Before reviewing the proposals for amalgamations and setting out our recommendations, we would like to express our thanks to the authorities who made accommodation available for the conferences, to their officers who helped in the arrangements, and to all members and officers who put their views before us and gave us information in support of them and in answer to our questions.

22. At the same time we think we should record that some of the authorities represented at the conferences made it clear that their assistance was given without prejudice to their opposition in principle to the Government's proposals or to the inclusion of their districts in the Greater London area.

The County of London North of the Thames

(Mr. Littlewood, Town Clerk, Cheltenham)

23. Conferences were held in the City Hall, Westminster, on 10th April, 1962 and in the Town Hall, Islington, on 12th April. The starting point of the discussions was the possible pattern illustrated in the Ministry's circular 56/61:

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
2	City of Westminster	85,223	
	Paddington Met. B.	115,322	
	St. Marylebone Met. B.	68,834	269,379
3	Hampstead Met. B.	98,902	
	Holborn Met. B.	21,596	
	St. Pancras Met. B.	125,278	245,776
4	Finsbury Met. B.	32,989	
	Islington Met. B.	228,833	261,822
5	Hackney Met. B.	164,556	
	Stoke Newington Met. B.	52,280	216,836
6	Bethnal Green Met. B.	47,018	
	Poplar Met. B.	66,417	
	Shoreditch Met. B.	40,465	
	Stepney Met. B.	91,940	245,840
13	Fulham Met. B.	111,912	
	Hammersmith Met. B.	110,147	222,059
14	Chelsea Met. B.	47,085	
	Kensington Met. B.	170,891	217,976

24. The suggested *London borough No. 2*, comprising the City of Westminster and the metropolitan boroughs of Paddington and St. Marylebone, would embrace an area of great national importance, a vital communication centre, with many Government buildings and the headquarters of numerous businesses of world-wide significance, and the nation's administrative, social and cultural centre. It has, however, extensive residential areas, whose characteristics vary considerably. The population, now about 270,000, is tending to decline.

25. The City of Westminster and the metropolitan boroughs of Paddington and St. Marylebone expressed their full and ready agreement to the suggested amalgamation. These authorities have already a number of joint interests, have co-operated successfully in the past and were taking further steps to that end.

26. The borough of Willesden submitted an alternative proposal, namely, that certain parts of the area should be incorporated into Willesden or, if this was not acceptable, that Willesden should be joined to Paddington with which, out of all the surrounding boroughs, there were the best communications. In this case Willesden suggested that Westminster might be grouped with Kensington and Chelsea, and St. Marylebone with Hampstead, St. Pancras and Holborn. This proposal was not in any way acceptable to Westminster, Paddington, or St. Marylebone, and in addition would involve crossing the existing county boundary.

27. The suggestion put forward by the metropolitan borough of Chelsea (see paragraphs 40-43 dealing with London borough No. 14) for the creation of a new South of the Park borough to include the hamlet of Knightsbridge would, if adopted, affect the boundary of the suggested borough No. 2 as Knightsbridge now forms part of Westminster. The other councils concerned were entirely opposed to such a boundary alteration, however, and it does not appear that there is a sufficient case for departing at this time from existing local government boundaries.

28. In the light of the complete agreement arrived at between Westminster, Paddington, and St. Marylebone, and on the general tests that require to be satisfied, I recommend their amalgamation to form a new London borough.

29. The suggested *London borough No. 3*, comprising the metropolitan boroughs of Hampstead, Holborn and St. Pancras would have many of the characteristics of London borough No. 2. It borders on the City of London, and its lines of communication run mainly from south to north into primarily residential areas. The three authorities expressed their complete willingness to amalgamate into a new London borough which should make a satisfactory unit with a population of some 245,000. The borough would be affected by Willesden's proposal outlined above, but this alternative suggestion was emphatically rejected by Hampstead and (as already mentioned in paragraph 26) it would involve crossing the present county boundary. The amalgamation illustrated in Map A is recommended.

30. The metropolitan boroughs of Finsbury and Islington—the suggested constituents of *London borough No. 4*—both took the same view as the constituent authorities of boroughs Nos. 5 and 6, and argued that it was not possible to discuss groupings until the functions of the new London boroughs had been settled, and that questions relating to the education service and the financial position needed to be clarified before views could be expressed upon the Map A groupings. (The conference concerning these authorities was held before the Minister's statement on education in central London referred to earlier in paragraph 12 of this report.) These councils also emphasised their general view that the existing authorities were quite able to undertake all the services needed by the new London boroughs, and that the larger units would mean the break-up of an existing healthy rivalry between authorities.

31. The southern part of the suggested borough No. 4 is mainly a commercial and business area and, as it spreads out into Islington, residential characteristics steadily increase along the main lines of development which flow northwards. The communications of the area are dominated by central London and influenced by the nearby railway termini and their associated installations.

32. The population has been declining and though this trend has been steep in the past, it is suggested that the curve is now flattening out. Finsbury and Islington have associations which would appear to make them suitable partners for amalgamation. Their common boundary is a feature of the area, and its central point is a focus both for traffic, shopping and other amenities. The commercial and factory element in Finsbury and its employment potential and rateable resources should balance well with the residential characteristics of Islington and its relatively small amount of industry and commerce.

33. The possibility of including Stoke Newington in the suggested borough No. 4 was considered. This would be practicable on a number of grounds but on balance it is thought that Stoke Newington is better placed in combination with Hackney. I therefore recommend the amalgamation of Finsbury and Islington to form a separate London borough.

34. *London borough No. 5*, as suggested in Map A, would consist of the amalgamation of Hackney and Stoke Newington with a population of about 216,000. These existing boroughs are primarily residential in character with their lines of communication running mainly north and south, and on the east is the natural boundary of the Lea Valley. Boroughs Nos. 5 and 6 are perhaps best considered together, although this task must be attempted without the help of any expressed views or alternative suggestions by the councils concerned. The suggested borough No. 6 would include the metropolitan boroughs of Bethnal Green, Poplar, Shoreditch and Stepney. In this area, with its awkward geographical boundary of the River Thames, its dock and dock-side interests, the heavy damage sustained during the war and the need for continued redevelopment, there are grounds for suggesting that the responsibilities are so heavy that, within the terms of reference, the objective should be to concentrate upon making the new boroughs in this part of London as strong as possible in the sense of providing for the maximum resources at their disposal.

35. If this view obtained, the suggested London boroughs Nos. 4, 5 and 6 might be reduced to two. Bearing in mind, however, the points made at the conference held at Islington relating to the maintenance of local civic pride and sense of achievement, the alterations to local government life should be no more than is absolutely necessary. Civic tradition and consciousness are matters vital to healthy local government, and should be fostered, whilst resources, especially those of finance, are capable of adjustment. Bearing these thoughts in mind it seems worthwhile making sure that the consequences of amalgamation are shared as fairly as possible and in a way which affects local interests to the smallest practicable extent.

36. The lines of communication of the suggested borough No. 5 run essentially north and south, many of them passing through the metropolitan borough of Shoreditch. Whilst Shoreditch with its business and commercial interests might be a helpful addition to the resources of proposed borough No. 6, administratively it would seem better placed in London borough No. 5 with which it would form a unity. Shoreditch appears to have more in common with Hackney and Stoke Newington than it has with the metropolitan boroughs in group No. 6, some of which are difficult to reach from Shoreditch. To associate Shoreditch with Hackney and Stoke Newington would result in borough No. 5 having a population of 257,000 in an area lying along one of the spokes of the

wheel radiating outwards from the business neighbourhood adjoining the City. Bearing in mind the manner of past and present metropolitan growth this is a sound and not unusual pattern; it is basically similar to that in the suggested boroughs Nos. 3 and 4.

37. As to *London borough No. 6*, reference has already been made to the distinctive features of this area through which the lines of communication, emanating from the City, run primarily east and west with the southern portion of Poplar having its own special characteristics. In this area much redevelopment has already taken place and further extensive redevelopment is required.

38. Portions of Shoreditch, Stepney and to a limited extent Bethnal Green, that lie nearest to the City have business and commercial aspects which add to their financial resources, but which otherwise do not appear to be reflected in the social or cultural life of the existing metropolitan boroughs. The service centres, influenced by the characteristics of the area, follow in the main an essentially local pattern. The population trend has been in the past sharply to decline, but in places especially where redevelopment has taken place, may now have been reversed. Though it is accepted that a local authority is better off having interests of differing natures, these boroughs with their special problems have in many ways unique features, and it is thought that a London borough confined to Bethnal Green, Stepney and Poplar would, in the circumstances and in view of their present and past associations, be of the best shape and fit well into the pattern for the development needed for its social life as well as giving to the inhabitants the kind of services they require. If Shoreditch were to be added, the financial resources and population would certainly be strengthened but, as mentioned earlier, resources are capable of adjustment. The population of the new borough would admittedly be reduced from 246,000 to 206,000, but would still be above the figure mentioned as acceptable in our terms of reference. Further redevelopment may not only halt any further decline but may lead to some increase. On balance therefore I recommend that London borough No. 5 should consist of Hackney, Shoreditch and Stoke Newington, and borough No. 6 of Bethnal Green, Poplar and Stepney.

39. The suggested *London borough No. 13* would be formed by the amalgamation of the metropolitan boroughs of Fulham and Hammersmith. Whilst Fulham expressed their willingness to join with Hammersmith, with whom they had many common interests and some lines of common communication, the Hammersmith Council took the view that they could not profitably discuss regrouping until further information was available as to education and finance. It would, however, be very difficult to recommend any other amalgamation as alternative proposals, other than that discussed in connection with group No. 14, would involve crossing the river or the existing county boundary.

40. Map A suggests the formation of the new and near-central *London borough No. 14* by merging Chelsea with Kensington thus combining areas having a high residential and business content with a population of about 218,000 and including the museums and colleges of South Kensington, major shopping centres, and both fashionable and poorer residential districts.

41. This proposal was welcomed by the Royal Borough of Kensington but the Chelsea Council put forward an alternative proposal for the creation of a new South of the Park Borough by the fusion of the Parliamentary constituencies of

Chelsea, South Kensington and Fulham; this new borough also to include the hamlet of Knightsbridge which is at present within the boundaries of the City of Westminster. Such a borough would produce an estimated population of 219,500, and the Chelsea Council felt convinced that their proposal would give a better and more compact area for local government purposes than, they argued, a long and narrow borough running north and south across lines of communication. In their view the proposal was more in keeping with the natural development trends in this part of London. Chelsea further suggested it would then be logical to group the Parliamentary constituencies of North Kensington, Baron's Court and Hammersmith to form another London borough with an estimated population of 222,000.

42. The Chelsea proposal was not at all acceptable to Kensington, nor, in so far as the boundaries at Knightsbridge were affected, to the City of Westminster. The metropolitan borough of Fulham also did not agree in any way, and emphasised that there was no sufficient community of interest to justify such a grouping.

43. Bearing in mind that the new London boroughs should be composed of existing local government areas unless there are very strong grounds for departing from present boundaries, and taking account of the complete rejection of Chelsea's suggestion by the other local authorities concerned, it is difficult to think that this proposal for a South of the Park borough should be adopted. In these circumstances I recommend the amalgamation of Chelsea with Kensington, and of Fulham with Hammersmith.

44. To summarise my conclusions regarding the county of London north of the Thames, therefore, I recommend that two new London boroughs should be formed by merging the metropolitan boroughs of Hackney, Shoreditch and Stoke Newington on the one hand and Bethnal Green, Poplar and Stepney on the other, but that elsewhere the pattern suggested in circular 56/61 and Map A should be followed.

The County of London South of the Thames

(Mr. Young, Town Clerk, South Shields)

45. The London boroughs suggested in the Ministry's circular and illustrated in Map A are set out below. These groupings were discussed at a conference at the Lambeth Town Hall on 9th April, 1962.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population *(1961 Census Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
7	Greenwich Met. B. Woolwich Met. B. (except that part north of the River Thames)	85,585 144,497	230,082
8	Lewisham Met. B.	221,590	221,590
9	Bermondsey Met. B. Camberwell Met. B. Deptford Met. B.	51,815 174,697 68,267	294,779
10	Lambeth Met. B. Southwark Met. B.	223,162 86,175	309,337
11	Wandsworth Met. B. (except the wards of Earlsfield, Fairfield, Putney, Southfield, Thamesfield and West Hill)	240,300	240,300
12	Battersea Met. B. Wandsworth Met. B. (the wards of Earlsfield, Fairfield, Putney, Southfield, Thamesfield and West Hill)	105,758 106,909	212,667

46. This area comprises ten metropolitan boroughs. Their total population is over 1½ millions. The greatest density of population and the greatest density of industry is to be found in the northern parts towards the River Thames. Parts of Lambeth, Southwark and Bermondsey adjoining the river can now be accounted parts of central London and are rapidly being rebuilt to meet the special purposes that inhere. Towards the southern and eastern margins of the area, the buildings tend to be of more recent construction. The concentrations of population are still very dense but the density is relieved by open spaces, some of which are very large.

47. Here and there local developments are resulting in increased opportunities for employment and bringing about local increases in population, but for the greater part population is falling throughout the area and is likely to go on

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

doing so. Because of the way in which the area developed, communications tend to radiate from the Thames bridges. Lateral communications are much less frequent and much less convenient.

48. The ten metropolitan boroughs vary greatly in every dimension. Wandsworth, the largest, has approximately seven times the population and area of Bermondsey, the smallest. The suggestions illustrated in Map A would reduce their number to six and make them of more even size. Only Lewisham would be left as it is. The number of possible groupings is strictly limited by the circumstances of the case and particularly by the need to watch the effect of any combination on the pattern as a whole.

49. The major problem in devising a satisfactory grouping for this area is presented by the metropolitan borough of Wandsworth. This is not because of its population: at 347,000 this would be acceptable. The difficulty arises out of its shape. It lies folded round the western, southern and eastern boundaries of Battersea with the result that it is somewhat kidney shaped with Battersea as an inclusion. From east to west is a distance of approximately seven miles and unfortunately in this direction communications are not as good as would be desirable. The council have maintained an efficient administration within their borough in spite of these disadvantages. When they have to perform the larger duties of a London borough, however, the burden will be heavier. Battersea, with a population of 106,000 must be reinforced in some manner to take its place in the pattern of London boroughs and this can only be done with due regard to the effect on Wandsworth.

50. The proposal illustrated in Map A was to link Battersea with the western parts of Wandsworth to form a borough with a population of 213,000 and to create out of the balance of Wandsworth a new unit of 240,000. The drawback in this proposal is that the new unit would be without municipal buildings or any other of the basic equipment of public administration. No doubt this could be rectified with time and, no doubt, in the meantime the work of administration could be kept going by one expedient or another—some were suggested by Battersea—but the situation would give rise to prolonged anxiety. It would be wrong that a new authority should have such a poor start in life.

51. At the conference (which was held before the municipal elections in May, 1962) the Wandsworth Council strongly opposed any suggestion of partition and looked with disfavour on any linkage of Battersea with the western part of their Borough. They accepted that the only two possibilities in dealing with the situation of Battersea were to amalgamate it with Wandsworth or with Lambeth, and they advocated the latter course. To meet the objection that the physical connection of Battersea with Lambeth was too exiguous, they indicated that they would accept an amendment of the boundaries so that the Larkhall and Clapham North Wards of Wandsworth (other than the common land) would be joined to the Lambeth/Battersea group and in return the Nightingale, Broomwood, Thornton and Bolingbroke Wards of Battersea would become part of Wandsworth. This adjustment would put two main roads running east and west into the Lambeth/Battersea group and would provide a better connection between the two parts.

52. This proposition was rejected by Lambeth on the ground that they were capable of carrying out the duties of a London borough as they were and did not need to be linked to any other area. It was also rejected by the majority and minority of Battersea Borough Council who both submitted written observations to the Minister.

53. The majority of the Battersea Council said that, without prejudice to their opposition to the pattern of future London boroughs, they were willing, if the proposals are to be implemented, to consider the possibility of agreeing to a plan along the lines suggested in Map A. In the meantime, they put forward an alternative suggestion that six wards from the eastern parts of Wandsworth and the greater part of a ward from the west should be added to Battersea to make an enlarged borough of 220,000 population. The proposal would no doubt have had all the virtues that Battersea suggested but it would make worse all the disadvantages affecting Wandsworth.

54. The minority of the Battersea Council strongly supported the linkage with the western parts of Wandsworth as proposed by Map A, but in the event of this not being accepted by the Minister, they proposed the addition to Battersea of nine wards from the eastern parts of Wandsworth to give an enlarged borough of 247,000. This proposition, like that put forward by the majority, paid insufficient attention to the needs of Wandsworth and the pattern of boroughs as a whole.

55. Having regard to the matters we were directed to consider, the most satisfactory linkage for Battersea would appear to be with Wandsworth rather than with Lambeth. The amalgamation of Battersea with the whole of Wandsworth, however, would create a borough which would be disproportionate to the rest in population and area, and it is necessary to consider how this could be adjusted.

56. In any new borough formed from Battersea and Wandsworth the centre of administration would almost certainly be the larger Town Hall of Wandsworth. But it is not easy to reach this Town Hall from Clapham or from Streatham. Most people living in these parts of Wandsworth must be much more familiar with Brixton, the most important centre of inner South London, either because they go there to shop or because they pass through Brixton on their way to central London.

57. I am of the opinion that local government services for the eastern parts of Wandsworth could be conveniently rendered from Brixton, where the Lambeth Town Hall is sited. I therefore recommend (a) that the metropolitan borough of Battersea and the metropolitan borough of Wandsworth less the wards mentioned below should be grouped to form a London borough with an estimated population of 335,000; (b) that the following wards of the metropolitan borough of Wandsworth be grouped with the metropolitan borough of Lambeth to form a London borough of an estimated population of 341,000, viz.:

Streatham South

Streatham Common

St. Leonards (excluding that part of Tooting Bec Common to the west of the Croydon and Balham Railway line)

Streatham Hill

Thornton Ward (excluding that part to the west of Cavendish Road)
Clapham Park
Clapham North
Larkhall.

58. The link for Lambeth proposed by Map A was with Southwark. At the conference both authorities expressed objections to this proposal and, in view of the recommendations made above for Lambeth, Wandsworth and Battersea, it is no longer possible to persevere in it. Fortunately there is an equally strong and perhaps stronger case for grouping Southwark with Bermondsey and Camberwell. In so far as the Southwark Council were prepared to express any opinion on grouping at the conference, they preferred to be linked with Bermondsey and the City of London. This would not give a population figure at all approaching the minimum contemplated by the White Paper and would not commend itself on other grounds but it recognises that there are already strong links between Southwark and Bermondsey. In fact central London may now be regarded as extending into these areas and when the reconstruction of the Elephant and Castle is completed, it will provide a service centre which will strengthen the connection.

59. Camberwell and the remaining authorities within the area were strongly opposed to the whole of the Government's proposals and, whilst prepared to detail their opposition to the whole basis of the White Paper, they were not prepared either in their written observations on Map A or at the conference to express any views one way or the other on possible groupings.

60. There is little ground for doubt, however, that the proper grouping is with Bermondsey and Southwark and the only question is whether Deptford should form part of this group. To find an answer it is necessary to consider its neighbour Lewisham.

61. It was proposed in Map A that Lewisham should remain as it is and taken by itself this proposal would be satisfactory. There is, however, in Lewisham, a service centre just as convenient to many parts of Deptford as is the service centre at Peckham (in Camberwell)—indeed Lewisham is a major centre of the south-east of this area and one of the most accessible. The boundary between the two boroughs passes through a densely built-up area and it is in the parts of Lewisham adjoining this boundary that the largest part of the Borough's population is to be found. Deptford could therefore equally well be linked with Lewisham. This would give a London borough with a population of about 290,000 and a geographical size comparable to the other groupings suggested. The only other practicable grouping would be with Greenwich and Woolwich but as the administrative centre would most likely be at Woolwich, this arrangement would hardly be convenient to the residents of Deptford.

62. I therefore recommend the grouping of Southwark and Bermondsey with Camberwell and the grouping of Deptford with Lewisham.

63. This leaves a final possible grouping of Greenwich and Woolwich. This would give a London borough with a population of 230,000 and on all counts is acceptable.

64. Only two other matters call for comment. They are the line of the boundary between Greenwich and Deptford. Not only is it tortuous but it annexes to Greenwich in the neighbourhood of St. Nicholas Deptford, a long strip of the river bank with little hinterland to support it. It appears to call for review and possibly for alteration and the opportunity should be taken of doing this under the machinery which it is intended to provide in the proposed legislation. The other matter concerns the detachment of North Woolwich which lies on the other side of the River Thames from the parent borough. Recommendations on this are made in paragraphs 90-95 below in connection with East Ham and Barking.

65. My recommendations would result in the metropolitan boroughs south of the Thames being grouped into five London boroughs in place of the six illustrated in Map A, namely:

- (a) Greenwich and Woolwich
- (b) Deptford and Lewisham
- (c) Bermondsey, Camberwell and Southwark
- (d) Lambeth and part of Wandsworth
- (e) Battersea and part of Wandsworth.

Metropolitan Essex and the County Boroughs of West Ham and East Ham
(Mr. Lloyd Jones, Town Clerk, Plymouth)

66. The following extract from the table appended to circular 56/61 lists the authorities represented at the conference held at the Town Hall, Barking, on 28th May, 1962 and sets out the suggested amalgamations shown on Map A.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population *(1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
15	Chigwell U.D. (that part north of the River Roding)	45,501	
	Chingford M.B.	45,777	
	Leyton M.B.	93,857	
	Walthamstow M.B.	108,788	
	Wanstead & Woodford M.B.	61,259	355,182
16	Chigwell U.D. (that part south of the River Roding)	15,500	
	Dagenham M.B. (the northern part of the ward of Chadwell Heath)	1,900	
	Ilford M.B.	178,210	195,610
17	Hornchurch U.D. (except the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch)	99,927	
	Romford M.B.	114,579	214,506
18	Barking M.B. (except that part west of Barking Creek)	72,182	
	Dagenham M.B. (except the northern part of the ward of Chadwell Heath)	106,463	
	Hornchurch U.D. (the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch)	28,200	206,845
19	Barking M.B. (that part west of Barking Creek)	100	
	East Ham C.B.	105,359	
	West Ham C.B.	157,186	
	Woolwich Met. B. (that part north of the River Thames)	1,900	264,545

67. Physically, this part of Greater London is bounded on the west by the River Lea and on the south by the River Thames. The remaining boundary is the boundary of the Greater London area as defined for the purposes of the report

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

of the Royal Commission, less the urban district of Chigwell, which the Minister decided to exclude except for the London County Council's Hainault housing estate (see paragraph 11).

68. Alternative proposals put forward by the local authorities fell into two main patterns and these, in their essentials and leaving on one side for the moment relatively minor boundary adjustments, were as follows:

The first, which followed Map A except in respect of the borough of Wanstead & Woodford, would result in London boroughs comprising:

- (a) the boroughs of Ilford and Wanstead & Woodford;
- (b) the boroughs of Chingford, Leyton and Walthamstow;
- (c) the county boroughs of East Ham and West Ham;
- (d) the boroughs of Barking and Dagenham, and the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch in the urban district of Hornchurch;
- (e) the borough of Romford and the urban district of Hornchurch (except the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch).

69. The second alternative pattern would result in London boroughs comprising:

- (i) the borough of Ilford;
- (ii) the boroughs of Chingford, Walthamstow and Wanstead & Woodford;
- (iii) the county borough of West Ham and the borough of Leyton;
- (iv) the county borough of East Ham and the boroughs of Barking and Dagenham;
- (v) the borough of Romford and the urban district of Hornchurch.

70. Several authorities made it clear that they considered amalgamation in any form was unnecessary in order that the boroughs could carry out the functions proposed for them and their expression of support for a particular form of amalgamation must be accepted subject to this qualification.

71. There were two proposals by local authorities in relation to the borough of Wanstead & Woodford; the first was that it should amalgamate with Ilford, its neighbour to the east; and the second that it should amalgamate with Chingford and Walthamstow, two of its neighbours to the west. Leyton, the third and most southerly neighbour on the west side, did not object to an amalgamation of the four boroughs of Chingford, Leyton, Walthamstow and Wanstead & Woodford. It was not in dispute that Chingford and Walthamstow must amalgamate and that if Wanstead & Woodford merged with Ilford then Leyton must amalgamate with Chingford and Walthamstow.

72. The borough of Wanstead & Woodford is separate to some extent from all its neighbours; the boundary on the west coincides with a finger of Epping Forest which runs along the Epping ridge and the boundary on the east is for the most part the Roding Valley which at this point is fairly free of buildings. The affinities of the northern part around Woodford are not the same as those of the southern part around Wanstead. The main lines of communication run south-westwards to the City and there are some main road links with the centres of both Ilford and Walthamstow.

73. Wanstead & Woodford and Ilford both favoured the merger of their two boroughs and considered that communications between the two are good

enough to support an amalgamation, though there seemed to be some doubt as to the location of the Civic Centre to serve the new borough. Wanstead & Woodford also argued that such an amalgamation would result in a better pattern of new boroughs throughout the area under consideration.

74. The borough of Chingford must be joined with Walthamstow under any pattern of amalgamation but Chingford would prefer Wanstead & Woodford as the third partner rather than Leyton, on the grounds of existing ties and community of interest and also because the resulting borough would be capable of achieving a balanced representation of political parties. A minority of the members of the Chingford Borough Council made representations for the inclusion of Leyton in this group in preference to the inclusion of Wanstead & Woodford.

75. The borough of Walthamstow supported an amalgamation of Chingford, Leyton and Walthamstow. It was claimed that there are good communications to the present Town Hall of Walthamstow, which is the obvious Civic Centre of the new borough; that there is a good relationship between the three councils; and that Walthamstow are already joint partners with Leyton in a number of spheres. Walthamstow considered another reason for including Wanstead & Woodford in an amalgamation with Ilford is that the population of the new London boroughs in metropolitan Essex would then be much more evenly balanced.

76. The borough of Leyton is bounded on the north by Walthamstow and on the south by West Ham and the local government boundaries on these two sides do not coincide with any natural features; the eastern boundary with Wanstead & Woodford roughly coincides with the open spaces which form part of Epping Forest. Communications between most of Leyton and all the neighbouring centres appear to be good. But Leyton has no local government links with West Ham and the amalgamation of Leyton and West Ham has never been suggested in any previous discussion about reorganisation. Leyton agreed with Walthamstow's arguments. The amalgamation of Leyton with Chingford and Walthamstow was opposed by West Ham.

77. West Ham has been a county borough since the establishment of that type of authority in 1889 and considered that it would be of value in settling the new pattern of London boroughs that a county borough such as West Ham should be linked with another authority which had not had experience of county borough services rather than be linked with another county borough such as East Ham. This argument was supported by East Ham (which has been a county borough since 1915).

78. It was said on behalf of both authorities that the only thing they have in common is their name (though it is to be observed that building development runs over the common boundary between East and West Ham for most of its length). Each attached importance to the situation of the Civic Centre for the new borough of which either of them became part. The Town Hall of West Ham at present is at Stratford where it is proposed to provide land for a new building in the course of redevelopment and this, it was said, would make a good site for a borough which embraced the present county borough and Leyton but would not be a good site if the new London borough comprised the two present county boroughs. There is no other site available in the two county boroughs

for an entirely new Town Hall instead of the two existing ones. The Town Hall of East Ham, which it is not suggested is in any way inadequate, would not be well placed to serve a new borough formed out of the two county boroughs. If the two county boroughs were not amalgamated, leaving East Ham free to amalgamate with Barking, a good centre could be provided at the recently completed Barking Town Hall.

79. The borough of Barking wished to form part of a new borough with Dagenham and East Ham and if a borough were formed of these authorities Barking would not wish the Rainham and South Hornchurch wards of Hornchurch to be included; but if East Ham were not included in this new borough then Barking would wish to see these wards included; Barking did not wish to amalgamate with East Ham alone. Barking has recently completed a new Town Hall and is anxious to see the building used as the Civic Centre of any new borough. Barking is not able to point to any particular community of interest with East Ham except that Barking people use the shopping centre at East Ham. Barking people work for the greater part either in Barking, in the City, or in Dagenham. The River Roding and Barking Creek prevent building development in Barking running into building development in East Ham. At the eastern end of the Borough of Barking lies the London County Council Becontree housing estate on which about 80,000 people live, one half in Dagenham, a third in Barking and the remainder in Ilford.

80. The borough of Dagenham supported the proposals contained in Map A for a new borough formed from Barking, Dagenham and the Rainham and South Hornchurch wards of Hornchurch. Dagenham did not support the suggestion for a new London borough comprising Barking, Dagenham and East Ham. Thus each of the proposals put forward envisaged the amalgamation of Barking and Dagenham.

81. The borough of Romford and the urban district of Hornchurch were prepared to amalgamate provided that the whole of the present Hornchurch urban district was included in the amalgamation. Both authorities were opposed to the proposal to separate the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch and add them to a new borough formed of Barking and Dagenham.

82. The Rainham and South Hornchurch wards of the Hornchurch urban district have together an area of 6,394 acres (about one-third of the whole district) and a population of just over 28,000, which is expected to increase by 5,000 in the next ten years; about three-quarters of the built-up area of two wards drain to the Riverside sewage disposal works of the borough of Dagenham which is situate in Hornchurch on the banks of the Rainham Creek. The Breton Farm works jointly owned by Hornchurch and Romford and situate on the banks of the River Bream (which forms the boundary between Hornchurch and Dagenham) takes the drainage from the remainder of the built-up area of these two wards. Hornchurch has about 3,000 council houses, 1,250 of which are in the two wards; moreover the Council has 30 acres of land available for local authority housing, five-sixths of which is in the two wards. The boundary suggested in Map A was said not to be satisfactory as a division between two authorities, though it is the ward boundary which was reviewed in 1958. It is straddled by a housing estate owned by the Hornchurch Council; of the 1,141 houses on this estate, 690 lie to the north of the boundary and the remainder to the south of it.

83. Both Hornchurch and Romford submitted that these two wards are in the sphere of influence of the important shopping centre of Romford and that the communications are good between the two wards and the northern parts of the new borough to be formed out of Hornchurch and Romford. Romford suggested that the proposal was made primarily in order to bring the population of the new borough up to the 200,000 mark and proposed as an alternative that north Dagenham should remain in the new borough which the main part of Dagenham would join.

84. The Barking and Dagenham Councils put forward the following arguments in favour of the inclusion of the two wards in the new Barking/Dagenham borough, in addition to the need to bring the population to the 200,000 minimum. Three-quarters of the built-up area of the two wards drain into the Dagenham Riverside sewage disposal works; South Hornchurch was once in the same Parliamentary constituency as Barking and Dagenham; Dagenham and South Hornchurch have the same employment exchange; until Dagenham became an excepted district under the Education Act, 1944, they were in the same education district; communications between South Hornchurch and Dagenham and Barking are as good as, if not better than, those between South Hornchurch and Hornchurch and Romford and the residents in the two wards shop extensively in Barking; the general pattern of residential development in the whole of the area of the proposed amalgamation is very similar; and the Thames-side industrial belt should be placed under one authority.

85. Looking at this part of Greater London as a whole there were thus presented three proposals for amalgamations: first, that contained in the Ministry's circular and illustrated by Map A; secondly, a variation of Map A by including Wanstead & Woodford with Ilford; and thirdly a different pattern which is described in paragraph 69. The possibility of other patterns was also considered.

86. In the older part of metropolitan Essex communications are such that each of the main patterns of amalgamations would seem to be workable. But from the point of view of this area as a whole, the pattern outlined in paragraph 68 would be the most satisfactory and would attain more nearly to the several criteria laid down by the Minister.

87. In regard to the wards of Rainham and South Hornchurch it is considered that there are factors which would support the addition of at least part of the two wards to the new borough formed by the amalgamation of Barking and Dagenham. But the boundary suggested in Map A is not satisfactory and the question was considered whether it was essential to attempt to define a better line as part of the process of defining the pattern of London boroughs. The amalgamation of Barking and Dagenham would result in a new London borough with a population of about 180,000. This figure appeared sufficiently to meet the requirements of our terms of reference to suggest that any boundary adjustment affecting the southern wards in Hornchurch should be left to a later stage. There was also a proposal for the adjustment of the Ilford and Barking/Dagenham boundary in connection with the Becontree housing estate. This, too, should be considered later and as these two boundary proposals are to some extent related it would appear more appropriate to consider the whole boundary question in this vicinity at the same time. Having regard to all these circumstances it is considered that, on balance, the boundary between Barking/Dagenham on

the one hand and Hornchurch on the other should not be altered at the present stage.

88. There remain to be considered boundary adjustments which arise either from the Minister's decision about the outer boundary or from the proposals in circular 56/61 and illustrated in Map A.

89. The Minister decided to exclude the Chigwell urban district from the Greater London area subject to a boundary adjustment to bring the whole of the London County Council Hainault estate into Greater London. It was not within our terms of reference to suggest where the new outer boundary line should be drawn but only to recommend into which borough this part of the Hainault estate should be included. It is not easy to suggest the allocation of an area of which not all the boundaries are known. It was, however, agreed by Ilford and Dagenham that the estate as a whole should be brought within one borough. Ilford do not press for the inclusion in Ilford of the whole estate or of any other part of Dagenham. Dagenham were agreeable to the Chigwell section of the Hainault estate being added to Ilford and also that part of the estate which lies in Dagenham with the addition of the northern limb of Dagenham as far south as Billet Road (as proposed in Map A). I therefore recommend: that there should be added to the new borough of which Ilford will form part (1) the part of the Chigwell urban district which is to be brought into the Greater London area, on the assumption that the boundary of the Greater London area will not be drawn on a line further north than Manor Road; and (2) the part of the borough of Dagenham lying north of Billet Road.

90. Circular 56/61 and Map A also proposed:

- (a) the transfer of the two parts of the metropolitan borough of Woolwich which lie north of the River Thames to the new borough proposed to be formed by the amalgamation of East Ham and West Ham; and
- (b) the transfer of the part of the borough of Barking which lies west of Barking Creek to the new borough proposed to be formed by the amalgamation of the two county boroughs.

91. The local government boundaries on the north bank of the Thames between the mouth of the River Lea and Barking Creek contain a number of anomalies. At two points in this area, namely North Woolwich and at the Beckton Gas Works, the Thames ceases to be the local government boundary and is crossed by the metropolitan borough of Woolwich which otherwise lies wholly on the south bank. Further, the boundary between East Ham and Barking does not exactly follow the River Roding (which is Barking Creek as it enters the River Thames) but lies on the west bank of this tributary of the Thames to varying depths until it joins one of the bridgeheads of Woolwich.

92. To these anomalies of the boundary is added the awkward physical situation which results from the large docks lying parallel with the Thames for about two-and-a-half miles, leaving between them and the Thames the long and narrow strip of Silvertown and North Woolwich. Here there is mixed industrial and residential development in which about 4,000 people live (about 2,000 in North Woolwich). If one walks from west to east between the two entrances to the docks one starts in the county borough of West Ham, crosses a very narrow strip of the county borough of East Ham, enters North Woolwich, which is

administered by the metropolitan borough of Woolwich and the London County Council then returns to East Ham and comes finally to another area administered by Woolwich and the London County Council. The provision of local government services has had to depend to an unusual degree on interchange arrangements; West Ham provide the bulk of the emergency services, East Ham provide a primary school and the London County Council provide a secondary school. In North Woolwich the Woolwich Borough Council own houses, built at the turn of the century, public baths and a public library; the London County Council has also prepared plans for a substantial housing development scheme here.

93. Woolwich were opposed to losing the areas north of the river. North Woolwich has been linked with Woolwich for many centuries and there is now a foot tunnel and a free vehicle ferry; a number of people living in Woolwich itself work in North Woolwich and the people living in North Woolwich use the shops and other services in Woolwich itself; the area north of the river represents about one-ninth of the rateable value of the metropolitan borough whose finances would be severely affected by its loss.

94. The Barking Council were also opposed to the loss of the area west of the River Roding; the rateable value is more than one-tenth of their total rateable value and only about a hundred people live in the area, so that the area makes a substantial contribution to Barking's financial resources.

95. The present boundaries are plainly anomalous however and should at some stage be altered to conform with the natural boundaries formed by the rivers. The only question is whether this should be done at the time of the general amalgamation or at the time of the other adjustments of boundaries referred to in paragraph 87. It is recognised that minor adjustments of boundaries should not normally be added to the other problems of amalgamation but having regard to the present position in the provision of local government services in these areas and the ease with which the new boundaries can be defined I recommend that the boundaries should be altered at the time of the borough amalgamations to those shown in Map A, i.e. to follow the line of the River Thames and River Roding throughout.

96. To conclude the consideration of this part of the Greater London area, I therefore recommend the following amalgamations:

- (a) the boroughs of Chingford, Leyton and Walthamstow;
- (b) the boroughs of Ilford and Wanstead & Woodford, together with that part of the borough of Dagenham lying north of Billet Road and that part of the urban district of Chigwell brought into the Greater London area;
- (c) the borough of Romford and the urban district of Hornchurch;
- (d) the boroughs of Barking (except that part west of Barking Creek) and Dagenham (except that part north of Billet Road);
- (e) the county boroughs of East Ham and West Ham, together with that part of the borough of Barking west of Barking Creek and that part of the metropolitan borough of Woolwich north of the Thames.

Metropolitan Kent

(*Mr. Young, Town Clerk, South Shields*)

97. The groupings suggested in circular 56/61 and illustrated in Map A are set out below. These suggested new boroughs were discussed at a conference at the Bromley Town Hall on 4th June, 1962.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
20	Bexley M.B.	89,629	
	Chislehurst & Sidcup U.D.	86,907	
	Crayford U.D.	31,265	
	Erith M.B.	45,043	252,844
21	Beckenham M.B.	77,265	
	Bromley M.B.	68,169	
	Orpington U.D.	80,277	
	Penge U.D.	25,726	251,437

98. This area comprises four municipal boroughs and four urban districts lying to the south east of the administrative county of London in a flat arc some 15 miles long. The greatest density of building and population is to be found towards the L.C.C. boundary where it represents out-thrusts of metropolitan development into rural Kent. Wedges of Green Belt break up this development while much of Chislehurst & Sidcup and Orpington still remains open country.

99. Fortunately Bexleyheath in the northern part of the area and Bromley in the southern part are two established centres which by virtue of their location and the services they provide form natural cores round which the remainder of the area can readily and conveniently be assembled.

100. That it would be reasonable and satisfactory to make use of these two centres in this way was recognised by those responsible for Map A and was accepted by the local authorities themselves both in their written comments to the Minister under circular 56/61 and in the subsequent conference at Bromley.

101. It was common ground also that any grouping around the centre of Bexleyheath should certainly comprise the boroughs of Erith and Bexley and the urban district of Crayford with a combined population of 166,000, and any grouping around Bromley should contemplate the linking of the boroughs of Beckenham and Bromley with the urban district of Penge making a combined population of 171,000.

102. It was at this point that doubt set in. Save in population, these two groupings would pass an examination of the matters we were directed to take into account and must be considered basic to any recommendations that might be made for the area as a whole, but they say nothing of the urban district of Chislehurst & Sidcup or the urban district of Orpington.

103. Orpington was created as a local authority on a review of county districts by the Kent Review Order, 1934. It was constituted out of the greater part of the former rural district of Bromley together with part of the former urban district of Chislehurst. It runs to 20,842 acres and the population amounts to 80,000, the greater part living in the northern part of the urban district adjoining the Bromley and Chislehurst boundaries. At the south western extremity is Biggin Hill where a small concentration of population is to be found, but the rest is open country not presenting the picture of an area for which the concept of a London borough was designed.

104. The Orpington Council joined with the Councils of Beckenham, Bromley and Penge in making joint comments on Map A. Subject to certain reservations on the functions to be exercised by the proposed London boroughs, the joint document said "The four authorities are agreed that if the standard of 200,000 population is to be applied as a minimum, the grouping of Beckenham, Bromley, Orpington and Penge as one London borough must be accepted as the best arrangement possible in the circumstances. They are agreed also that if this grouping is to be applied, they will work together in harmony to ensure that the new system produces the best possible results in the interests of the public".

105. These sentiments give a very good augury for the success of such a joint authority and must be given full weight in any recommendations. They were reiterated at the conference in Bromley save that the new Chairman of the Orpington Council felt it necessary to enter a caveat that recent elections had effected changes in his council and that the new council had not met to consider the situation. There was no suggestion, however, that when they did meet they would not subscribe to the views and intentions expressed above. Such reservation as there was appeared to be based on the fear, particularly entertained in the villages in the southern wards of the district, that inclusion within a London borough might make it more difficult to resist the tide of development and population flowing into the rural areas from the north west. Suggestions had indeed been made to the Minister that the southern wards should be excluded from the area of Greater London and included in the Sevenoaks Rural District. Without coming to any conclusion on their merits the Minister had declined to pursue these suggestions as part of the reorganisation of London government and had pointed out that machinery for boundary alterations would be included in the proposed legislation. Under this any of the authorities concerned could bring forward such proposals again at a later date. The views of the inhabitants of the southern wards can therefore still be considered and it is unnecessary to say more at this point than that their inclusion or exclusion would not influence the effectiveness in any fundamental respect of the grouping of the four authorities around Bromley.

106. The urban district of Chislehurst & Sidcup came into existence in stages. Originally this area was part of the Bromley Rural District. Chislehurst was made a small urban district in 1900 and Foots Cray (later renamed Sidcup) in

1902. These two were united in 1934 when further parts of Bromley Rural District were added to form the present local government unit. It has therefore had only a comparatively short time to achieve a sense of unity and to some extent it still bears the marks of its origins. Development is more broken up than in almost any other local authority area in Greater London. It is concentrated in three main parts which are more or less physically separate. In the north the Sidcup and Blackfen area is a continuation of the housing estates extending southwards from Welling and Bexleyheath. A block of development in the south, including part of the St. Paul's Cray Estate of the London County Council and a growing amount of industrial construction, is a continuation northwards across the boundary of developments in Orpington. The housing in the curious salient of Mottingham and Chislehurst West is continuous with that in Lewisham and Woolwich.

107. This salient takes the shape of a finger thrust into the administrative county of London between the boundaries of Lewisham and Woolwich to a depth of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles. It is generally little more than half-a-mile wide and at its point of attachment to the main body of Chislehurst & Sidcup it has less width than that. Undoubtedly a case exists for reviewing the boundary at this point but the area involved seems insufficiently large to deal with it as part of our recommendations for grouping and it would be more appropriate that it should be dealt with as a boundary rectification under the proposed legislation.

108. Map A suggests that Orpington should be linked with the Bromley group and Chislehurst & Sidcup with the Bexley group. The latter part of this proposition was strongly opposed however by two suggested members of the Bexley group, namely, Erith and Crayford, both in their written observations and at the conference at Bromley. They strongly supported the grouping of Bexley, Erith and Crayford—indeed 15 years ago a Parliamentary Bill was unsuccessfully promoted for this very purpose—but they opposed the addition of Chislehurst & Sidcup on the ground that it was not needed in order to make up the minimum population contemplated by the White Paper and on the ground that there was no compatibility with any area lying south of the A2 road. They were of opinion that the population of the group would within 10 years reach the 200,000 mark by normal development. Within their own areas they referred to the possibility of building in the Belvedere Marshes by the London County Council to house upwards of 25,000 people and to the scope for residential and industrial building in the vicinity of Slade Green and northwards towards the River Thames. It may be that these expectations will be fulfilled but looking at the interests of the area as a whole, that in itself would not conclude the matter.

109. The representatives of Bexley, which is the immediate neighbour of Chislehurst & Sidcup, did not support these views. They pointed to similarities in nature between the two—both are dormitory areas with little industry—to the continuity of development across the boundaries and to the communication which existed by coach, bus and rail.

110. Whilst the addition of the whole of Chislehurst & Sidcup to the Bexley group would divide metropolitan Kent into two London boroughs of even size it would not give adequate recognition to the natural relationship of the southern parts to the Bromley group.

111. It would, of course, be possible to link Orpington with Chislehurst & Sidcup. This would result in the creation of three London boroughs instead of two and the population of all three would be substantially under the minimum proposed in the White Paper. The proposition would therefore have to have special advantages to offset this disadvantage. Examination shows, however, that the conjoint districts would be 11 to 12 miles from the northern to the southern extremities without any focal point of communications and without any obvious administrative centre. Orpington might be the best candidate but would not be reasonably convenient for residents in Mottingham or Blackfen to the north or Biggin Hill to the south. The joining of these two urban districts would produce a large, diffuse, and sparsely populated local government unit for which the form of a London borough is hardly the most suitable. The compensating advantages required to justify this proposition do not seem to exist.

112. There is the final possibility that a better grouping might be achieved by partitioning Chislehurst & Sidcup on the line of the A20 road and linking the northern parts to the Bexley group and the southern parts to the Bromley group. Notwithstanding the injunction in our terms of reference to base our recommendations as far as possible on the amalgamation of existing local government areas, there is much that is attractive about this proposition. Because of the lack of physical connections between the various areas of development, it would be practicable to find a suitable line for partition and indeed the A20 road has merit for this purpose. The connection of the Blackfen and northern areas to Bexley has already been described as well as the continuity of the St. Paul's Cray district with the development in Orpington. If the Mottingham salient were nipped off at Chislehurst West an apparently satisfactory picture begins to emerge. There is strong feeling, as expressed by the Chislehurst Residents' Association in a letter to the Minister, that the proper linkage for the southern parts is with Bromley and there is no doubt that this would be more convenient to residents in that area than the Bexley connection. The Chislehurst & Sidcup Council did not themselves support any proposal which would involve the partition of their area and said that if they had to be grouped with some other authorities for the benefit of the area as a whole they preferred the link should be with Bexley.

113. The population in Chislehurst & Sidcup to the north of the A20 road is estimated to number 44,000 and to the south 43,000. Partition along this line would produce a northern borough of 210,000 people and a southern borough of 294,000. The possibility of boundary adjustments in Mottingham and the southern parts of Orpington might in due course equate the figures more nearly but in any event the northern borough would be adequate for its responsibilities and the southern borough would not be disproportionately large looking at the pattern as a whole.

114. On the weighing of the merits and demerits of the possible groupings within this area of metropolitan Kent, the balance of advantage lies with this proposition and I therefore recommend the formation of the following London boroughs:

- (a) the boroughs of Bexley and Erith, the urban district of Crayford, that part of the urban district of Chislehurst & Sidcup lying north of the A20 road;

- (b) the boroughs of Beckenham and Bromley, the urban districts of Orpington and Penge, that part of the urban district of Chislehurst & Sidcup lying south of the A20 road.

Metropolitan Surrey and the County Borough of Croydon

(*Mr. Littlewood, Town Clerk, Cheltenham*)

115. This part of Greater London was considered at a conference held at the Guildhall of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames on 5th June, 1962.

116. Within the area originally proposed by the Royal Commission the following groups were suggested in circular 56/61:

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
22	Caterham & Warlingham U.D. Coulston & Purley U.D. Croydon C.B.	34,808 74,738 252,387	361,933
23	Banstead U.D. Beddington & Wallington M.B. Carshalton U.D. Epsom & Ewell M.B. Sutton & Cheam M.B.	41,573 32,588 57,462 71,177 78,969	281,769
24	Merton & Morden U.D. Mitcham M.B. Wimbledon M.B.	67,974 63,653 56,994	188,621
25	Esher U.D. Kingston-upon-Thames M.B. Malden & Coombe M.B. Surbiton M.B. Walton & Weybridge U.D.	60,586 36,450 46,587 62,940 45,497	252,060
26	Barnes M.B. Richmond M.B. Twickenham M.B.	39,757 41,002 100,822	181,581

117. After considering the views put to him on the extent of the Greater London area, however, the Minister made several amendments to the outer boundary which, in Surrey, resulted in the exclusion of the whole of the urban districts of Caterham & Warlingham, Banstead, Esher and Walton & Weybridge, together with the southern wards of the borough of Epsom & Ewell. Even so, however, the groupings suggested in the Ministry's circular appeared to offer a reasonable starting point for the discussions covering metropolitan Surrey.

118. The suggested *borough No. 22* (as amended by the exclusion of Caterham & Warlingham) would be formed by the amalgamation of the county borough of Croydon with the urban district of Coulsdon & Purley, with a total population of 327,000. Croydon is an outstanding service centre and is in many ways self-contained; besides extensive business and residential development it includes a good deal of open Green Belt land. Coulsdon & Purley, with development springing from the main north-south line of communication, contains much that is of a high class but predominantly dormitory character; much of the district lies in the Green Belt and, in places, is rural in aspect.

119. The Coulsdon & Purley Council expressed the view that they should be entirely excluded from the Greater London area but that if the district was included and if boroughs of the size envisaged in the Government's proposals had to be created there would be no alternative but for Coulsdon & Purley to be amalgamated with Croydon. The Croydon County Borough Council agreed that, if these two authorities were included in the Greater London system envisaged in the White Paper, their amalgamation was inevitable; they made it known however that, whilst they have cordial relations with Coulsdon & Purley, amalgamation in their view was neither desirable nor necessary.

120. Some thought was given to the possibility of dividing Coulsdon & Purley in a way that would avoid making this proposed borough so extensive in comparison with its neighbours to the west at the same time producing what might be a more favourable and better balanced pattern. Such an alternative would add a part of the urban district to Croydon and the remainder to the proposed new London borough No. 23. But it quickly became apparent that such a suggestion would be unwelcome and indeed unworkable, as no sufficient means of communication exist between Coulsdon & Purley and the adjacent districts of Beddington & Wallington and Carshalton to the north.

121. In these circumstances, though the combination of Croydon and Coulsdon & Purley would produce, by comparison, a rather large local government unit, this amalgamation is clearly indicated by such factors as communications, development, and present and past associations. There is little reason to doubt that the resultant borough would be a strong and effective authority, and I recommend accordingly.

122. The suggested *London borough No. 23*, after excluding the areas which will not now come within the Greater London system, would consist of the present boroughs of Beddington & Wallington, Sutton & Cheam, the urban district of Carshalton and the northern wards of the borough of Epsom & Ewell. The total population of this group would be about 189,000.

123. Development in these areas is mainly of the residential type which took place during the inter-war period; a high proportion of those employed travel to work in London's more central areas. Beddington & Wallington expressed the view that the grouping was now most satisfactory in relation to the area and the community of interests involved, and was acceptable to them. As the Carshalton Council still wished to press for the exclusion of their district from the Greater London area, they had not formulated any considered views on possible groupings, but their representatives were prepared to concede that the amalgamation of Beddington & Wallington, Carshalton, and Sutton & Cheam was "less undesirable" than the larger group originally proposed.

124. Sutton & Cheam, in whose area the largest service centre in the group is situated, were agreeable to the proposed new borough in its reduced form. They asked that a minor boundary revision should be considered in conjunction with the severance of the northern part of Epsom & Ewell, but this proposal did not appear to be essential to the creation of the pattern of London boroughs and was not pursued in this context.

125. Epsom & Ewell expressed their strong objection to the inclusion of the borough in the Greater London area, and particularly emphasised their unhappiness at the proposed severance of the northern wards. Without prejudice to these general views and any action they might take in regard to them, a preference was put forward for these wards to be merged with the new *London borough No. 25* rather than borough No. 23 on the grounds that lines of communication with the Kingston service centre were considerably better than in the Sutton direction.

126. The authorities in the suggested *London borough No. 24*—the boroughs of Mitcham and Wimbledon and the urban district of Merton & Morden—all expressed much the same point of view: they were opposed to the Greater London plan, but if it took place then the grouping shown on Map A was the most suitable. The amalgamation of these authorities would produce a population of about 189,000. The three existing areas have much in common and good internal communications.

127. The exclusion of the urban districts of Esher and Walton & Weybridge from the original grouping in Map A left the suggested *London borough No. 25*, consisting of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, together with the boroughs of Malden & Coombe and Surbiton. The population of 146,000 would be well below the figure of 200,000 mentioned in our terms of reference. It was suggested, however, that those wards of the borough of Epsom & Ewell which are to be within the London area should also become part of this new borough. From the point of view of ease of communications and close associations there is little doubt that these wards would be more appropriately included in a borough based on Kingston than on one based on Sutton, and if this course were taken the population of the group would be about 166,000.

128. The area, which is well linked with means of communication, has a significant service and transport centre in the Kingston area, and with its combined commercial and residential characteristics, has specially sound resources. The Kingston Council supported the proposed new group, which they felt would be capable of coping with the responsibilities of a London borough—a view to which Malden & Coombe did not subscribe; in their view the group would be totally inadequate in size and resources. The Surbiton Council were quite willing to join Kingston and Malden & Coombe (and, should the opportunity present itself, with part of Epsom & Ewell) in the new borough.

129. The three suggested London boroughs Nos. 23, 24 and 25 would all fall short of the minimum population figure and consideration was given to the possibility of grouping the present authorities, with or without the boroughs of Barnes and Richmond (referred to in paragraphs 131–136 below), in order to create a small number of larger London boroughs. Theoretically this could be done but it is clear that the groups so formed would be far less satisfactory. The main service centres in this part of Surrey are Sutton, Wimbledon and

Kingston and it would be natural for the new boroughs to be formed round them. Such groups, derived from Map A, would each be cohesive areas, closely linked by common interests and good internal communications; these amalgamations would also meet the wishes of most of the present authorities.

130. In this part of metropolitan Surrey, therefore, a pattern of three London boroughs would be so much more suitable than any alternative combination into two groups that this solution is to be preferred, notwithstanding that the populations in each case would be somewhat below 200,000. The groupings recommended are:

- (a) the boroughs of Sutton & Cheam and Beddington & Wallington, and the urban district of Carshalton;
- (b) the boroughs of Mitcham and Wimbledon and the urban district of Merton & Morden;
- (c) the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, the boroughs of Malden & Coombe and Surbiton, with the northern wards of the borough of Epsom & Ewell.

131. The suggested new *London borough No. 26*, to be formed by the amalgamation of the two Surrey boroughs of Barnes and Richmond with the Middlesex borough of Twickenham, was considered in its relationship to the other London boroughs in Surrey and Middlesex. As this borough and three other groups in Surrey would have populations of under 200,000 the possibility of alternative combinations was carefully examined. The need to retain the county of London boundary made it impracticable to amalgamate Barnes and Richmond with any part of Wandsworth (even if this was desirable) but the possibility was considered of including the two Surrey boroughs in group No. 25 and Twickenham in a different group north of the Thames.

132. To break up the suggested borough No. 26 would mean abandoning a group with good internal communications and with a service centre at Richmond which is easily accessible from most of the area. It would, moreover, run counter to the wishes of all three of the authorities concerned; all of them supported the group proposed in Map A subject to certain boundary modifications with Feltham urban district and with the suggested borough No. 25, which were left to be dealt with at a later stage.

133. The Barnes Council stressed their close ties with Richmond and thought the inclusion of Twickenham was sensible. Communications from Barnes to Richmond and Twickenham were good and any other grouping would not, they thought, have proper regard to the convenience of the people. A new administrative centre would need to be provided, probably on the borders of Twickenham and Richmond. The main service centre for Barnes was Richmond.

134. The Richmond Council also stressed the closeness of their links with Barnes and said that although their ties with Twickenham were not quite so close, because the Thames was to some extent a barrier, they were close enough to justify the amalgamation of the three areas. The Thames had given Richmond and Twickenham many duties and functions in common because of the need to preserve the character and amenities of the river. Communications between the three areas were good and there was no reason why the new borough should not prove to be an effective and convenient unit. If the administrative centre

was to be in Richmond there was a site adjacent to the Town Hall which would provide for extensions.

135. The Twickenham Council were generally in agreement with the views expressed by the Richmond and Barnes Councils; they thought that the Thames was a unifying influence rather than a barrier at this point.

136. Notwithstanding, therefore, that this suggested grouping would involve combining areas on both sides of the Thames and would result in a borough with a population of less than 200,000, it should produce a cohesive new authority capable of tackling the tasks of the proposed London boroughs. It has the support of all the authorities concerned and as it would fit well into the overall pattern, I recommend the establishment of a new borough consisting of Barnes, Richmond and Twickenham.

Metropolitan Middlesex and Hertfordshire

(Mr. Plowman, Town Clerk, Oxford)

137. The groupings suggested in the Ministry's circular and illustrated in Map A are set out below. They were discussed at conferences held at the Town Hall, Ealing, on 4th June, 1962, and at the Town Hall, Hornsey, on 23rd May, 1962.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population* (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority's Area	New Borough
26	Barnes M.B. Richmond M.B. Twickenham M.B.	39,757 41,002 100,822	181,581
27	Brentford & Chiswick M.B. Feltham U.D. Heston & Isleworth M.B. Staines U.D. Sunbury-on-Thames U.D.	54,832 51,041 102,897 49,259 33,403	291,432
28	Hayes & Harlington U.D. Ruislip-Northwood U.D. Uxbridge U.D. Yiewsley & West Drayton U.D.	67,912 72,541 63,762 23,698	227,913
29	Acton M.B. Ealing M.B. Southall M.B.	65,274 183,151 51,337	299,762
30	Wembley M.B. Willesden M.B.	124,843 170,835	295,678
31	Harrow M.B.	208,963	208,963
32	Barnet U.D. Finchley M.B. Hendon M.B.	27,834 69,311 151,500	248,645
33	East Barnet U.D. Enfield M.B. (the wards of Chase, Town, West and Willow) Friern Barnet U.D. Hornsey M.B. Southgate M.B. Wood Green M.B.	40,599 42,000 28,807 97,885 72,051 47,897	329,239
34	Chesham U.D. Edmonton M.B. Enfield M.B. (except the wards of Chase, Town, West and Willow) Tottenham M.B.	35,297 92,062 67,524 113,126	308,009

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

138. The suggested *London borough No. 26* comprising Barnes, Richmond and Twickenham has been dealt with in the context of the pattern of boroughs in metropolitan Surrey (see paragraphs 131-136 of this Report) and its formation is recommended.

139. *London borough No. 27*, as originally suggested, would have stretched from the county of London boundary at Hammersmith to the outer perimeter of Middlesex. The Minister has since decided to exclude the urban districts of Staines and Sunbury-on-Thames from the Greater London area, however, thus reducing the population of the proposed new borough from 291,000 to about 209,000.

140. The Brentford & Chiswick Borough Council disagreed with this suggested grouping and preferred the proposal put forward by Ealing for an amalgamation of Ealing, Brentford & Chiswick and Acton. The Brentford Council said that their borough had no associations at all with Feltham and few with Heston & Isleworth; it looked towards Ealing and Acton. In their view there would be little cohesion in the borough proposed which would be of an unusual shape, at one point being only two-thirds of a mile across whereas its length was about ten miles. They thought that their own idea, with which Ealing agreed, would provide a much better borough. This would involve joining Southall with Heston & Isleworth and Feltham.

141. They did not accept Acton's view that communications between the two were poor or that Acton's associations were elsewhere. The fact that the Royal Commission recommended the amalgamation of the two boroughs was, they felt, sufficient to dispose of these assertions. They did not think that the Ministry had paid enough regard to present and past associations in arriving at its provisional grouping.

142. The approach of the minority group on the Brentford & Chiswick Council had been modified by the decision to exclude Staines and Sunbury. They were in agreement with the majority that the grouping proposed by the Ministry should be rejected but now thought that Brentford & Chiswick should be linked with Hammersmith and Fulham. Hammersmith had a large, modern Town Hall, communications between the three areas were good and there should in their view be no difficulty in linking authorities within and without the county of London. They would accept the fact that in these circumstances Brentford & Chiswick could not become an education authority. They could see no merit in a suggestion that their borough should link with Barnes, Richmond and Twickenham—the Thames was a natural boundary—but they thought it would be a satisfactory move to bring Southall into group No. 27 to counterbalance the transfer of Brentford & Chiswick to group No. 29.

143. The Feltham Council said that, while they welcomed the Minister's decision to exclude Staines and Sunbury, it left them in a difficulty. The council still felt that their district should be excluded from the Greater London area but, even if this could not be they would still not wish to be included in group No. 27. In its reduced form this group would be more manageable, but they were in favour of a "London Airport Authority" linking Yiewsley & West Drayton, Hayes & Harlington, Feltham and possibly the Cranford area of Heston & Isleworth. This would provide a population of about 170,000 but they submitted that boroughs on the periphery need not be as large as those in and

nearer to the centre. 31,000 people worked at the Airport and Feltham housed most of them. There was already a London Airport Standing Consultative Committee which, in addition to the London and Middlesex County Councils, comprised representatives of Heston & Isleworth, Staines, Feltham, Hayes & Harlington and Yiewsley & West Drayton. The administrative centre would be in Feltham and they only asked for the Cranford part of Heston & Isleworth because of the exclusion of Staines and Sunbury. They thought borough No. 27 "quite ridiculous" as proposed and one which "could only be run on bureaucratic lines". Communications, they said, were bad and there was no real community of interest between Feltham and the areas to the east.

144. The borough council of Heston & Isleworth agreed with the proposed grouping illustrated in Map A, particularly now that its size had been reduced by the exclusion of Staines and Sunbury. They felt that the borough of Brentford & Chiswick with its links with Heston & Isleworth must come in, although it was admitted that there were also links between Brentford & Chiswick and Acton. Although the populations of Southall and Brentford & Chiswick were about the same, to transfer Southall to borough No. 27 in place of Brentford & Chiswick would not provide such a satisfactory area. The shape would, perhaps, be more attractive but the communications would be bad as the traffic flows were from east to west and Southall lay to the north of them; communications between Heston & Isleworth and Brentford & Chiswick were good. Adding parts of other areas could in their view only lead to widening repercussions. There was a site of about 20 acres close to Hounslow Central Railway Station which would, they suggested, be a satisfactory location for an administrative centre.

145. The suggested *London borough No. 28* would include the borough of Uxbridge and the urban districts of Hayes & Harlington, Ruislip-Northwood, and Yiewsley & West Drayton.

146. The Hayes & Harlington Council said that they were opposed to Feltham's suggestion for a London Airport Authority. They thought that the existence of a large "frozen" space in the middle of the new borough would preclude any question of community of interest and would disrupt communications.

147. They also disagreed with the proposal for group No. 28 and suggested instead that their district should be amalgamated with Uxbridge, Yiewsley & West Drayton and Southall. Group No. 28 was not in their view really well-based because the communications in this area ran east and west rather than north and south. There was, they said, a close relationship between Hayes & Harlington and Southall but very poor communications with Ruislip-Northwood. Between Hayes and Ruislip moreover there was part of the London Green Belt and also Northolt Airport. North of this open space development was continuous between Ruislip-Northwood and Harrow; these two areas should, they thought, be amalgamated and Ruislip-Northwood excluded from group No. 28. The minority group on the Hayes & Harlington Council were in favour of the arrangement suggested by the Ministry.

148. The Ruislip-Northwood Council favoured joining with Harrow in borough No. 31. They agreed with the points already made by Hayes & Harlington concerning the difficulty of including Ruislip-Northwood in borough No. 28. They pointed out that communications ran radially from London on

two distinct lines, one running to Southall and Hayes, and the other having several prongs coming out through Harrow and Ruislip to Uxbridge. Of the authorities in group No. 28, Ruislip-Northwood had a common boundary only with Uxbridge; a tongue of Ealing interposed between Ruislip and Hayes, between whose areas there was but a single road route. Borough No. 28 would, they thought, be extremely difficult to administer.

149. On the other hand, they said, there was a continuous pattern of development over the boundary between Ruislip-Northwood and Harrow. The combined area was served by two branches of the Metropolitan Railway and road communications were good. The larger population of proposed borough No. 31, would, they considered, be all to the good and the depletion of borough No. 28 could be made up by the addition of Southall. They admitted that Ruislip-Northwood had an administrative connection with other authorities in borough No. 28 but this had not really worked well because of the difficulty of communications and the intervening Green Belt. It was significant, they felt, that more than one authority disagreed with the grouping and even Uxbridge was not wholly in favour of it.

150. The view of the Ruislip-Northwood minority group was that the onus rested on the council to show that proposed borough No. 28 failed to measure up to the Minister's four criteria, and this the council had not done. Uxbridge, they contended, was the natural centre of the proposed new borough and a population of just over 200,000 was sufficient for a peripheral borough. In their view the district had no real affinity with Harrow.

151. The Uxbridge Council contended that borough No. 28 should comprise Uxbridge, Ruislip-Northwood, and Yiewsley & West Drayton, i.e. excluding Hayes & Harlington. While this would produce a population below the minimum of 200,000, they said there had been a 10 per cent increase in population over the last 10 years and this was likely to continue over the next 10. The addition of Hayes & Harlington would, they thought, provide too large an area and there was not the same community of interest between Uxbridge and Hayes as there was between Uxbridge and the other two areas concerned. The factors set out in circular 56/61 did not, in their view, apply with the same force to Hayes & Harlington as they did to Ruislip and Yiewsley & West Drayton. If, notwithstanding, the Minister decided to include Hayes & Harlington in the amalgamation, Uxbridge would accept the situation. They were completely opposed to any suggestion that Southall should be brought into the combination, however, and were also opposed to Feltham's suggestion for a London Airport Authority. They stressed the tenuous connection between Ruislip-Northwood and Harrow and said that this had been brought out strongly by the minority view on the Ruislip Council. The areas of open space in Ruislip did not, they contended, provide any case for joining it with Harrow. There was Green Belt also in other areas and it was available to the public whatever the boundaries were.

152. The Yiewsley & West Drayton Council wanted their district to be excluded from Greater London and had not considered what should happen if the district was left in. They thought that the London Airport borough suggestion would be unworkable.

153. *London borough No. 29*, as suggested in the Ministry's circular, would comprise the boroughs of Acton, Ealing and Southall.

154. Acton Borough Council agreed with this grouping and stressed the good communications which existed within it; on the other hand there were only two through roads between Acton and Brentford (one of them liable to flood) which was a serious impediment to bringing the borough of Brentford & Chiswick into this grouping. They emphasised this because in their view local authority services depended upon the road pattern. The administrative centre would be in Ealing and there were good service centres. While they understood the objection of Brentford & Chiswick to being linked with some of the areas originally proposed for borough No. 27, they did not consider that these should outweigh the obvious claims of Southall to be included in borough No. 29. They thought that a paramount consideration was the prospect of achieving unity in the future and in their view the residents of Acton, Ealing and Southall would come naturally to regard themselves as one community.

155. Ealing Borough Council said that their preference would be for their borough to remain on its own as recommended by the Royal Commission. It had a population of 183,000 and was the oldest borough in Middlesex. In the alternative Ealing and Acton should be amalgamated with Brentford & Chiswick rather than with Southall. In the council's view present and past associations, the locations and areas of influence of the service centres and the lines of communication all justified this grouping rather than that proposed in borough No. 29. The populations of Brentford & Chiswick and Southall were almost equal; if Southall were linked with borough No. 27 in place of Brentford & Chiswick the population of the new borough would therefore be substantially unchanged and the shape would be improved. The River Brent would provide a better eastern boundary to borough No. 27 than the artificial boundaries proposed.

156. The minority group on the Ealing Council favoured the Ministry's proposal for borough No. 29. They felt that Ealing had no real case to remain unaltered and that as Acton should clearly be joined, the only question was whether the other partner should be Southall or Brentford. They stressed the importance of the main road linking Southall, Ealing and Acton and thought that this amalgamation would provide the minimum of disturbance. Southall was already part of the community with Ealing and in their opinion the proposed grouping had everything to commend it.

157. The Southall Borough Council (who described their borough as "the cockpit of today's discussions") approved the grouping proposed for borough No. 29 and opposed all alternatives. The Minister's decision to exclude Staines and Sunbury had, they thought, materially affected the general position and had made a number of the observations of Ealing and Brentford no longer relevant or significant. The lines of communication between Ealing, Acton and Southall were good. The three Town Halls with Ealing in the centre were on the main Uxbridge road. They pointed out that the large Greenford residential area of Ealing protruded west beyond the northern boundary of Southall which at its northern extremity comprised residential property and open space. In connection with the suggestion that Southall might take the place of Brentford & Chiswick in borough No. 27 they contended that the lines of communication

between Southall and Heston & Isleworth were by no means so convenient as those existing between Southall and Ealing. The large open spaces of Osterley Park, Warren Farm, White Green Golf Course, and Heston Airport formed a Green Belt between Southall and Heston & Isleworth which would, they thought, make any real integration between those areas almost impracticable. Further, the proposed South Wales motorway would provide a clear physical division between the two areas. For similar reasons, the Southall Council were strongly opposed to any suggestion that their borough should take the place of Ruislip-Northwood in borough No. 28. The shape of borough No. 29 was, they thought, as good as if not better than most others and they were satisfied that the three areas could be welded into a workmanlike and convenient local government unit within a reasonable time.

158. The Ministry's suggestion for *London borough No. 30* would amalgamate the boroughs of Wembley and Willesden.

159. The Wembley Council contended that this amalgamation would have disastrous consequences. Wembley, they submitted, was capable of being a London borough as it stood. If its population had to be increased to 200,000 or thereabouts this could be done by the addition to it of territory from neighbouring areas other than Willesden. There had been, they said, no past associations between the two boroughs and the few present associations have only served to show their incompatibility due to their quite different needs. The absence of any real association was the result, they thought, of geographical and boundary conditions. Travelling from north to south along the line of the River Brent (which forms the boundary) Wembley was, they contended, effectively divided from Willesden by the Welsh Harp and its open space, industry, power stations, railway yards, former sewage works, transport depots, more railway yards, refuse disposal tips and more industry—these conditions could be likened, they said, to an "iron curtain". They pointed out that there was an absence of any satisfactory rail or road communications to any central point of the proposed borough and that although the area is joined by main railways only two provided for local passengers. The new borough would, they said, therefore depend on road communications, and crossing the $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles of common boundary there were only two—Harrow Road and Neasden Lane. At peak traffic hours normal movement between the two boroughs was, they contended, non-existent.

160. The patterns of development of the two boroughs were, moreover, quite different in their view. Much of Willesden required redevelopment whereas Wembley was more modern, and Willesden had largely "turned its back" on Wembley by the sort of development which had taken place on the boundary between the two. They felt that amalgamation would hinder the redevelopment work on which Willesden was engaged, jeopardise the character of Wembley and introduce disharmony into the management of the services required. The existing service centres, they said, played no part in the development of any community of interest between the two. Wembley had a modern Town Hall conveniently situated for Wembley but not for both. The Willesden Town Hall was inadequate and unsuitably located. A successful amalgamation would, in their submission, be impossible.

161. As alternatives the Wembley Council proposed the enlargement of their borough by taking in either a part of Harrow (producing a population of 178,000), parts of Harrow and Ealing (giving a population of 193,000), or parts of Harrow, Ealing and Hendon (bringing the population up to 207,000). They described the effect of these changes in some detail and submitted that they would not be seriously detrimental to group No. 32. They admitted that Harrow would require compensating and suggested that they could take in Ruislip-Northwood from group No. 28. Southall, they said, could be transferred from group No. 29 to group No. 28, leaving Ealing and Acton to comprise group No. 29. They would not favour being joined to Harrow as the resulting borough would, they said, be too large.

162. Willesden Borough Council also opposed the proposed merger with Wembley on similar grounds and contended that Willesden should be constituted a new borough as it stands or that it should acquire territory from its southern and eastern neighbours. The present population of 171,000 was likely, in their view, to increase following the county council's recent decision to permit an increase of ten persons per acre over the maximum net density proposals of the Greater London Plan. Willesden also had 43 acres of non-conforming industry which in due course would be redeveloped mainly for residential purposes. Communications within the borough were good and a new Civic Centre for which some land had already been acquired was planned to be built at Willesden Green. If Willesden could not stand alone and had demonstrated the impracticability of merging with Wembley, then as joining with Hendon was equally out of the question and linking with Hampstead would not really produce a first-rate unit, an extension of boundaries was, they said, forced upon them. This would involve taking parts of Hampstead, Paddington and Acton, details of which they gave. They also proposed to absorb small parts of Hendon and Hammersmith but these they said were minor adjustments which could be left to a later stage. They realised that extension into the county of London would mean that the education authority for part of the area of the new borough might, at least for the time being, be a committee of the Greater London Council, but saw no difficulty arising from this.

163. The minority group on the Willesden Council were in accord with the majority in submitting that Willesden should become a new borough as it stood. If, however, the Minister was not prepared to agree to this, then the minority said they would accept the proposal to merge with Wembley because they felt that the proposal to take in territory from other authorities was not warranted and that Willesden would benefit more from a merger with Wembley than by taking in bits of other areas. They could not agree with the majority view that a merger between Wembley and Willesden was impossible though they conceded that it would create difficulties.

164. The Paddington Council said that Willesden's proposal was quite unacceptable and had been rendered virtually impossible by the Minister's decision about the central area for education. The Hendon Council referred to the predatory raids of Wembley and Willesden and emphasised that, in their view, the Edgware Road was a firm boundary which should not be departed from. These proposals, they said, had only been put forward to secure the necessary minimum population. Hendon could have made similar claims to enlarge their area by claiming to take in parts of Wembley and Willesden. The

Finchley Council thought there was a good deal of community of interest between Hendon and the inhabitants west of the Edgware Road and that the inclusion of this territory in Hendon might assist regrouping. The Hampstead Council adopted the arguments put forward on behalf of Paddington and Hendon and stressed the education point. They thought that the Edgware Road was a logical boundary. The Ealing Council strongly resisted Wembley's proposals and the Acton Council said that what Willesden referred to as a minor adjustment affected some 22 per cent of Acton's rateable value.

165. The suggested *London borough No. 31* would consist of the present borough of Harrow. The Harrow Council were entirely satisfied with this proposal and maintained that Harrow was a complete entity and an ideal unit and that the consequences of any alteration to it could well be serious. They objected most strongly to the proposals made by Wembley for annexing the southern part of Harrow and had not given any consideration to a suggestion that Wembley should be joined to it. They would have no real objection to Ruislip-Northwood being added to the new borough but emphasised that this must be by way of an addition and not as compensation for loss of any territory to Wembley.

166. The proposals put forward by Wembley and Willesden constituted the only major suggestions for modifying the boundary which now runs (for the most part) along the Edgware Road, dividing these two boroughs on the south-west from Hendon and Hampstead on the north-east. A convenient point has thus been reached for a review of the groups in this part of Middlesex.

167. This is an area with certain major and well-defined service centres—Hounslow, Ealing, Uxbridge and Harrow, for instance. In any combination of authorities these must be the focal points of new boroughs. Certain amalgamations follow fairly clearly from this starting point and from the boundaries of the area now under consideration—Feltham with Heston & Isleworth, Acton with Ealing, Yiewsley & West Drayton and Hayes & Harlington with Uxbridge. Alternative suggestions were made in respect of Brentford & Chiswick, Southall and Ruislip-Northwood, but these cannot, of course, be considered in isolation.

168. Brentford & Chiswick could be grouped either with Heston & Isleworth as proposed, or with Ealing as they wish, or possibly with Richmond. To take the borough out of group No. 27 would, however, make it difficult to build up this area satisfactorily because the substitution of Southall, besides bringing other repercussions, would not provide a really satisfactory combination; on grounds of communications, community of interest and the expressed wish of the council, Southall should be joined with Ealing. To link Brentford & Chiswick with Richmond would mean upsetting an arrangement which has the approval of the authorities in borough No. 26. The Feltham proposal for a group round London Airport does not seem to be really tenable. I accordingly recommend that *London borough No. 27* should be constituted as proposed less, of course, Staines and Sunbury.

169. It would be feasible to amalgamate Ruislip-Northwood with Harrow but there does not seem to be a very strong case for doing so and such a move would leave borough No. 28 with a population of only about 155,000. The only practicable way to increase this figure would be by including Southall in

borough No. 28, but for reasons indicated in the previous paragraph Southall appears to be best amalgamated with Ealing.

170. On balance, therefore, and having regard to the pattern of London boroughs as a whole, Brentford & Chiswick, Southall and Ruislip-Northwood appear to be most suitably included in the boroughs illustrated in Map A.

171. The place of Wembley and Willesden in this pattern was most carefully considered. Each of these boroughs would prefer to remain on its own and if this were possible it would dispose of a difficult problem. But although it might conceivably be permissible in the case of Willesden, the population of Wembley is clearly too low. The two boroughs contended strenuously that it was impossible for them to be merged, realising that it was essential for them to demonstrate this beyond any doubt if they were to achieve their objective of becoming separate London boroughs enlarged, if necessary, for this purpose. They submitted that the merger would be wrong on all counts and, indeed, that it would be impossible because of the nature of the boundary between them. This was putting the matter very high but, if they had stated the position correctly they were bound to succeed. The boundary, which is along the valley of the Brent, does consist of the sort of development which has been described, but whether it is such an impossible barrier as the two authorities claimed is vital because there are only two alternatives to the grouping suggested in Map A—either to enlarge Wembley and Willesden at the expense of the neighbouring authorities or to join Wembley with Harrow and leave Willesden a London borough on its own.

172. In this connection the view expressed by the minority group on the Willesden Council is of extreme importance; while at one with the majority group about the undesirability of merging with Wembley, they said that the boundary, although it would make it difficult, would not render this physically impossible. This seems to be a pretty fair view of the situation. The boundary in fact is not the complete and absolute barrier it was made out to be. It is true that, not counting the railway routes, the tube and the Edgware Road itself, there are only two roads running directly across the common boundary; and it is true that in places the development is of an appreciable width, but it is no more a barrier than a river would be and, like a river, might well be treated as a boundary unless there were exceptional circumstances. Such circumstances exist here, and I recommend the amalgamation of Wembley and Willesden in the expectation that the new borough will in due course become a very effective unit.

173. Notwithstanding the fact that the groupings proposed in Map A were questioned by some authorities and strongly resisted by others, they command a considerable measure of support and represent, on balance, the most satisfactory pattern that can be devised for this area as a whole. I therefore recommend the adoption of these groups, modified by the exclusion of Sunbury and Staines.

174. Turning now to the suggested groups between the Edgware Road and the River Lea, Map A proposed, for *London borough No. 32*, the amalgamation of the boroughs of Finchley and Hendon and the urban district of Barnet.

175. The Barnet Council persisted in the view, which the Minister has rejected, that their district should remain in Hertfordshire together with parts of the urban district of East Barnet and of the borough of Enfield. They said, however, that they would be agreeable to inclusion in borough No. 32 if they had to be grouped with anybody. They had considered the rest of the various alternatives put forward and were opposed to all of them. Barnet was said to be very similar to its neighbours in general character and the nearest major service centre was Tally Ho Corner in North Finchley which was central not only for Finchley and Barnet, but also for Friern Barnet and East Barnet and some parts of Hendon. Barnet claimed to have fairly close ties with East Barnet and Finchley.

176. Finchley Borough Council disagreed with the suggested group No. 32, expressing a desire to join with Barnet, East Barnet and Friern Barnet to form a new borough with a population of 167,000. They contended that the amalgamation of Finchley and the three Barnets as proposed by the Royal Commission would be ideal, although it would provide a population somewhat less than the White Paper minimum. Finchley, they said, had very close links with Friern Barnet and whatever else happened both of these areas should go together. Although the exclusion of Finchley and Barnet from borough No. 32 would leave Hendon on its own, this borough had a population of 152,000, which was not so far below the required minimum; but it was the view of the Finchley Council that the populations of all these areas would tend to increase. There were, it was pointed out, physical features separating Finchley and Barnet from Hendon in the shape of a green wedge all the way from Barnet in the north to the southern boundary of borough No. 32, the Barnet bypass and the proposed new motorway. There was none between Finchley and the three Barnets. In borough No. 32 there was no single service centre, but Finchley and the three Barnets would, it was claimed, be well-served in this respect by Tally Ho Corner which would be at the heart of the combination. The lines of communication in and out of London from Hendon and from Finchley and Barnet were quite distinct. There was no administrative centre suitable for Hendon as well as for Finchley and Barnet, but a good one could be established for Finchley and the Barnets within a short distance of Tally Ho Corner. If Hendon was regarded as being too small to be a borough on its own, it was suggested that it could take in areas to the west of the Edgware Road without depleting proposed new boroughs Nos. 30 and 31 too much.

177. The Hendon Council said that as it could not remain a borough on its own the grouping in Map A was the best that could be achieved. They were glad that Barnet would be a willing partner and despite Finchley's views they felt that there were decided links between the two. If it was thought that Finchley and Friern Barnet should go together, Hendon would be prepared to see the latter brought within borough No. 32. Hendon regarded the Edgware Road as a traditional and historical boundary which should not be tampered with in spite of the contrary view of some other authorities. A new centre would have to be found for borough No. 32 but this would be necessary whatever regrouping was decided upon. Hendon could not approve Finchley's counter-proposal since Hendon would not be large enough to stand alone as a London borough and it doubted Finchley's view that the population would increase.

178. For *London borough No. 33*, the Ministry suggested the amalgamation of the boroughs of Hornsey, Southgate and Wood Green, the urban districts of

East Barnet and Friern Barnet and three wards forming the west part of the borough of Enfield.

179. The East Barnet Council disagreed with this grouping and suggested the amalgamation of Barnet, East Barnet, Finchley, Friern Barnet and Southgate. They were opposed to Barnet's suggestion that a part of East Barnet should be excluded from Greater London and were pleased that the Minister had decided against this. But they contended that borough No. 33, with a population of 329,000, would be too large and without community of interest. It was also wrong, they submitted, to divide Barnet and East Barnet which had many associations; the service centres in Barnet and Finchley in group No. 32 were both used by people living in East Barnet. The main north/south road was on the eastern edge of group No. 33 and there was no main road link between East Barnet in the north-west of borough No. 33 and Hornsey in the south of it. There was no real association they thought between East Barnet and Wood Green or Hornsey and the only physical link East Barnet had with Enfield was around Hadley Wood Station which was isolated from the remainder of Enfield by the Green Belt. East Barnet thought an excellent borough would be created by the combination they suggested, producing a population of 238,000 with good road and rail communications and three main service centres at Barnet, North Finchley and Palmers Green (Southgate).

180. The Enfield Council also disagreed with the inclusion of the western part of their borough in group No. 33, contending that the whole of Enfield should be in group No. 34. Here, there was a minority view to the effect that Enfield, Edmonton and Southgate, or alternatively Enfield, Southgate, Friern Barnet and East Barnet should be linked together (see also paragraphs 187-189).

181. The Friern Barnet Council also objected to the suggested borough No. 33, which it thought too big, expressing a preference for the combination of Friern Barnet, Barnet, East Barnet, Finchley and Hornsey, producing a population of 265,000. Friern Barnet's closest link was said to be with Finchley, although it also had associations with Barnet, East Barnet and Hornsey. They did not, however, wish to be included in group No. 32. The Great North Road had for centuries linked the areas of Friern Barnet, Finchley, Barnet and East Barnet, and the principal service centres at High Road, Tally Ho, North Finchley and Barnet served all the four districts. Finchley, Friern Barnet and East Barnet all agreed on their suitability for inclusion in one group. As, however, Finchley with the three Barnets was not in Friern Barnet's view a large enough grouping, it appeared desirable and appropriate that Hornsey should be included in the group. It also was served by the Great North Road as its main traffic route and many of the residents of Finchley and the Barnets travelled by road or rail through Hornsey to reach their business or place of employment. Communications between all five districts were good since they were situated generally on the same main routes into and out of London.

182. The Hornsey Council were in full agreement with the proposed borough No. 33. The only alternatives they would be prepared to consider were groupings of the authorities in boroughs Nos. 32 and 33 and there should in their opinion be no accretions to these groups from borough No. 34. There should be no difficulty they thought in providing a convenient administrative centre for the

new borough in a position best situated to serve the ratepayers. To leave out the western part of Enfield from this grouping would not in their view be fatal but would take away some of its attractions.

183. The Southgate Council were in complete disagreement with the proposed borough No. 33 which they said would be too large both in area and population. There were no direct contacts between Southgate and Hornsey. They suggested a number of alternatives, all of which would, however, produce populations of less than 200,000. Their main preference was for borough No. 33, less Hornsey and Wood Green, which would produce a population of 183,000. Southgate was a suburban area with hardly any industry and looked to the west of Enfield for its open space. They thought that the proposed division of Enfield was a natural one. A new administrative centre could be provided at Southgate Circus.

184. The Wood Green Council also opposed the proposed grouping in Map A on the same grounds as Southgate. They thought that it would produce an unnatural association. Their own preference was for the amalgamation of Wood Green, Hornsey and Tottenham (i.e. dividing groups Nos. 33 and 34 horizontally) with Wood Green providing an excellent service and administrative centre. The main lines of communication were also good. Borough No. 33 was largely residential and borough No. 34 industrial. To split them horizontally would, it was maintained, provide two well-balanced areas. West Enfield should in their view certainly not be included in borough No. 33 if the group was left as proposed.

185. Since the exclusion of the urban district of Cheshunt from the Greater London area, the suggested *London borough No. 34* would consist of the boroughs of Edmonton and Tottenham together with the four eastern wards of the borough of Enfield—a total population of some 273,000.

186. The Edmonton Council agreed with this grouping subject to the whole of Enfield being included in the new borough. This was all the more necessary they said now that Cheshunt had been excluded. Since the Green Belt area of West Enfield would be available to everybody there was no point in including it in borough No. 33 rather than in No. 34 but there were obvious advantages in not splitting Enfield. A new Civic Centre would be required for borough No. 34 and this could be provided in a satisfactory position for the whole of the new borough at the site of the present Edmonton Town Hall.

187. The Enfield Council (already briefly referred to in paragraph 180), said that both the majority and minority groups on the council were opposed to the proposal for dividing the borough. Enfield's boundaries had hardly changed since 1900 and its population of 110,000 had been built up gradually. There was a good deal of industry and it was self-sufficient from the employment point of view. Its Charter of Incorporation had been granted only seven years ago, demonstrating within recent years the community of interest which obtained.

188. The majority group thought that the whole borough should be included in new borough No. 34. The borough derived from the Lea Valley industrial area and about half of it was open space, the urban and industrial development being mainly in the east. It was not easy to get from west to east of the borough. The suggested borough No. 33 would be predominantly of a dormitory character and basically different from No. 34.

189. The minority view on the Enfield Council was that now Cheshunt had been excluded, new boroughs Nos. 33 and 34 should be split horizontally to group together Enfield, Southgate and Edmonton, and Tottenham, Wood Green and Hornsey. The group containing Enfield would be a well-balanced borough with a Civic Centre planned at Enfield Town almost at the heart of such a new borough. The communications were good. The open spaces were available to the public whatever was done about borough boundaries. The L-shaped borough which would be formed by including the whole of Enfield in new borough No. 34 would be unsatisfactory. On the other hand, if Enfield was to be split, it would not be possible to find a better dividing line than that shown on Map A. 85 per cent of Enfield's population lived to the east of a line drawn $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles west of the suggested boundary.

190. The Tottenham Council said that since the Minister had decided that Cheshunt was to be excluded from the Greater London area, borough No. 34 should comprise Edmonton, Tottenham and the whole of Enfield. Alternatively, if the whole of Enfield was not to be included, then the boundary dividing the two parts of Enfield should be moved further west. In Tottenham's view, the new borough council would be well able to control development along the 11 miles of the Lea Valley. There was a growing concentration of industry in the Valley but there was still opportunity for planning and preservation of open space. Communications were particularly good. The exclusion of Cheshunt, however, meant that the new borough would be deficient in open space and amenities unless it took in the whole of Enfield. With regard to proposals made by other authorities, Tottenham said that communications between Tottenham and Hornsey were not good and between Tottenham and Wood Green only slightly better. The proposal by Friern Barnet to amalgamate Tottenham, Southgate and Wood Green would have far-reaching repercussions and Tottenham had no real community of interest with Southgate.

191. It will be apparent that the area covered by the Ministry's suggested groups Nos. 32, 33 and 34 produced a particularly rich crop of alternative and conflicting suggestions which must be considered together.

192. The proposal to divide Enfield required close examination, not only because it was strongly opposed by the Enfield Council but also because it offended one of the principles laid down in my terms of reference. The exclusion of Cheshunt made this examination all the more necessary. The division of Enfield, if it was to be supported, required to be justified on the grounds that it was essential to the creation of the overall pattern of boroughs.

193. The inclusion of the whole of Enfield in borough No. 34 did not seem to give the right solution. Apart from producing an odd-shaped area, the west of Enfield is rather remote from Tottenham. An alternative course to put the whole of Enfield into group No. 33 did not seem right either, for apart from adding to an already large population, it did not appear that the east of Enfield had a great deal in common with Hornsey. The fact that communications east to west are almost, if not quite, as good as those north to south supported the alternative possibility suggested by Wood Green and the Enfield minority group, namely, to regroup most of the authorities in boroughs Nos. 33 and 34 on an east-west instead of north-south principle. Enfield, Southgate and Edmonton might, as a result, be included in one group and Wood Green, Hornsey and Tottenham in

another. These groupings appear to produce effective and convenient units in accordance with the factors and principles laid down and have the merit of avoiding the subdivision of Enfield.

194. Wood Green has the outstanding service centre in north London and a likely future centre of administration. It could serve several possible combinations of the local authority areas, but Wood Green Council emphasised in particular the importance of its position in relation to Hornsey and Tottenham. There is also much in the claim that Enfield as a growing major service centre could establish itself as the administrative focus of a combination of the three areas to the north. Around these two foci each borough would have a share of suburban residential development and Lea Valley industry.

195. Returning to the suggested borough No. 32, it seems that the Edgware Road (despite the "Welsh Harp" deviation) provides a good boundary. The service centre mentioned most frequently in the discussions on this part of Greater London is North Finchley (Tally Ho). It is easy to get to from all the Barnets and also from much of Hendon. The combination of Finchley and the Barnets as proposed by the Royal Commission would command wide acceptance among these authorities. The addition of Hendon supplements an otherwise inadequate population and is certainly to be preferred to any extension west of the Edgware Road. An administrative centre at North Finchley would be centrally placed and at the point most accessible for the majority of people in the combined area. No difficulties would be caused by detaching East Barnet and Friern Barnet from suggested groupings with authorities further east and combining Finchley and the three Barnets with Hendon. Although this would result in the creation of a borough with a population of 318,000, it would have the advantage of keeping the present Hertfordshire authorities and Finchley together.

196. I therefore recommend that the groupings in this part of Greater London should be as follows:

- (a) the boroughs of Finchley and Hendon, the urban districts of Barnet, East Barnet and Friern Barnet;
- (b) the boroughs of Enfield, Edmonton and Southgate;
- (c) the boroughs of Hornsey, Tottenham and Wood Green.

Conclusions

197. In the preceding sections of this Report we have each dealt with that part of the Greater London area considered at the conferences over which we presided. But, as we have already recorded, all the groupings have been discussed between us and are presented as our joint proposals for a pattern of London boroughs covering the whole of the metropolis.

198. Throughout this Report we have adopted, for convenience, the numbering of the groups set out in the Ministry's circular 56/61. We are now proposing a

total of 32 new London boroughs—one fewer than was originally suggested in that circular. We have accordingly renumbered the groups in the accompanying schedule which we recommend as the pattern of new London boroughs.

- (Signed) S. LLOYD JONES,
Town Clerk, Plymouth.
- F. D. LITTLEWOOD,
Town Clerk, Cheltenham.
- HARRY PLOWMAN,
Town Clerk, Oxford.
- R. S. YOUNG,
Town Clerk, South Shields.

Proposed London Boroughs

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population* (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority Area	New Borough
1	City of Westminster Paddington Met. B. St. Marylebone Met. B.	85,223 115,322 68,834	269,379
2	Hampstead Met. B. Holborn Met. B. St. Pancras Met. B.	98,902 21,596 125,278	245,776
3	Finsbury Met. B. Islington Met. B.	32,989 228,833	261,822
4	Hackney Met. B. Shoreditch Met. B. Stoke Newington Met. B.	164,556 40,465 52,280	257,301
5	Bethnal Green Met. B. Poplar Met. B. Stepney Met. B.	47,018 66,417 91,940	205,375
6	Greenwich Met. B. Woolwich Met. B. (except that part north of the River Thames)	85,585 144,497	230,082
7	Deptford Met. B. Lewisham Met. B.	68,267 221,590	289,857
8	Bermondsey Met. B. Camberwell Met. B. Southwark Met. B.	51,815 174,697 86,175	312,687
9	Lambeth Met. B. Wandsworth Met. B. (the wards of Larkhall, Clapham North, Clapham Park, Thornton (east of Cavendish Road), Streatham Hill, St. Leonards (east of the railway), Streatham Common and Streatham South)	223,162 117,600	340,762
10	Battersea Met. B. Wandsworth Met. B. (except that part included in London borough No. 9)	105,758 229,609	335,367
11	Fulham Met. B. Hammersmith Met. B.	111,912 110,147	222,059

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population* (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority Area	New Borough
12	Chelsea Met. B. Kensington Met. B.	47,085 170,891	217,976
13	Chingford M.B. Leyton M.B. Walthamstow M.B.	45,777 93,857 108,788	248,422
14	Chigwell U.D. (Hainault Estate area) Dagenham M.B. (that part of the ward of Chadwell Heath north of Billet Road) Ilford M.B. Wanstead & Woodford M.B.	7,200 1,900 178,210 61,259	248,569
15	Hornchurch U.D. Romford M.B.	128,127 114,579	242,705
16	Barking M.B. (except that part west of Barking Creek) Dagenham M.B. (except the northern part of the ward of Chadwell Heath)	72,182 106,463	178,645
17	Barking M.B. (that part west of Barking Creek) East Ham C.B. West Ham C.B. Woolwich Met. B. (that part north of the River Thames)	100 105,359 157,186 1,900	264,545
18	Bexley M.B. Chislehurst & Sidcup U.D. (north of the A20) Crayford U.D. Erith M.B.	89,629 44,000 31,265 45,043	209,937
19	Beckenham M.B. Bromley M.B. Chislehurst & Sidcup U.D. (south of the A20) Orpington U.D. Penge U.D.	77,265 68,169 42,907 80,277 25,726	294,344
20	Coulsdon & Purley U.D. Croydon C.B.	74,738 252,387	327,125
21	Beddington & Wallington M.B. Carshalton U.D. Sutton & Cheam M.B.	32,588 57,462 78,969	169,019
22	Merton & Morden U.D. Mitcham M.B. Wimbledon M.B.	67,974 63,653 56,994	188,621
23	Epsom & Ewell M.B. (the wards of Cuddington, Ewell Court and Stoneleigh) Kingston-upon-Thames M.B. Malden & Coombe M.B. Surbiton M.B.	19,800 36,450 46,587 62,940	165,777

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

London Borough	Present Local Authority Area	Population* (1961 Census, Preliminary Report)	
		Present Local Authority Area	New Borough
24	Barnes M.B. Richmond M.B. Twickenham M.B.	39,757 41,002 100,822	181,581
25	Brentford & Chiswick M.B. Feltham U.D. Heston & Isleworth M.B.	54,832 51,041 102,897	208,770
26	Hayes & Harlington U.D. Ruislip-Northwood U.D. Uxbridge M.B. Yiewsley & West Drayton U.D.	67,912 72,541 63,762 23,698	227,913
27	Acton M.B. Ealing M.B. Southall M.B.	65,274 183,151 51,337	299,762
28	Wembley M.B. Willesden M.B.	124,843 170,835	295,678
29	Harrow M.B.	208,963	208,963
30	Barnet U.D. East Barnet U.D. Finchley M.B. Friern Barnet U.D. Hendon M.B.	27,834 40,599 69,311 28,807 151,500	318,051
31	Hornsey M.B. Tottenham M.B. Wood Green M.B.	97,885 113,126 47,897	258,908
32	Edmonton M.B. Enfield M.B. Southgate M.B.	92,062 109,524 72,051	273,637

* Where populations are shown for part only of districts, these figures are estimated.

Total for the whole of Greater London (including the City of London)—
8,004,187.

