

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No. 49

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 49

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
CHELMSFORD DISTRICT IN THE COUNTY OF ESSEX

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the Chelmsford district, in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that District.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 3 June 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Chelmsford District Council, copies of which were circulated to the Essex County Council, Parish Councils and a Parish Meeting in the district, the members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. Chelmsford District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Council had passed a resolution under section (7)(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 requesting the Secretary of State to provide for a system of whole council elections.

5. On 29 October 1974 Chelmsford District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. They proposed that the district should be divided into 29 wards, each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 60 members, <sup>THE SAME NUMBER AS</sup> ~~3 more~~ than at present.

6. We carefully considered the draft scheme, together with the comments which had been made on certain areas. We concluded that we should make some modifications to the council's draft scheme before adopting it as our draft proposals. We decided to divide one 3-member ward to form 2 single member wards and to regroup certain other parishes giving additional representation. On the advice of Ordnance Survey we proposed some minor adjustments to the alignment of some of the ward boundaries. We then formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

7. On 3 January 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying maps which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 28 February 1975.

#### RESPONSE TO DRAFT PROPOSALS

8. Some parish councils ~~wrote~~ to support our proposals for their regrouping. We also received comments objecting to the Commission's proposals for the Springfield, Boreham, South Hanningfield, Runwell and Rettendon wards asking that they should be rejected in favour of the proposals put forward by the

District Council in their draft scheme. We again received proposals for an alternative boundary between the proposed Cathedral and The Lawns wards. We also received representations from South Hanningfield Parish Council objecting to the arrangements for the proposed Rettendon ward, from Boreham Parish Council objecting to the proposal to reduce the number of councillors, and other objections to the proposal to separate the proposed Boreham and Springfield wards.

9. In view of these differences of views we considered we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act, and at our request, you appointed Mr H J Backhouse as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

10. The Assistant Commissioner visited the areas which were the subject of dispute and held a meeting at the Civic Centre, Chelmsford on 17 June. A copy of his report to us of the inspection and of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

11. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that the boundary between the Cathedral ward and the The Lawns ward should be realigned and that the parishes of Boreham and Springfield should be combined to form a 2-member ward. He also recommended that two ward names should be changed.

12. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that we should accept all the Assistant Commissioner's recommendations and, subject to these modifications, we confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

13. Details of these proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached maps. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are shown on the maps.

PUBLICATION

14. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report together with copies of the maps are being sent to Chelmsford District Council and will be available for inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without maps) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the maps is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH (Secretary)

31 July 1975

REPORT OF MEETING TO INQUIRE INTO THE  
FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF CHELMSFORD.

I attended at the Civic Centre, Chelmsford on 17th June, 1975 to hear representation relating to the following wards proposed by the Commission: Cathedral, The Lawns, Boreham, Springfield, Rettendon, South Hanningfield, Runwell.

The persons set out in the attached list attended.

Cathedral and The Lawns Wards.

The boundary between the above-named wards was changed by the District Council in their draft scheme, thereby transferring 755 electors from The Lawns ward to Cathedral ward. This proposal was adopted by the Commission.

The Springfield Residents Association objected to the new southern boundary of The Lawns and suggested that it should be restored to the railway as the obvious line.

It appears that one object of the proposal to depart from the original railway boundary was to secure some equality in electoral representation. The figure given in the Commission's Draft Proposals for 1979 were, for Cathedral ward, 4303 electors and for The Lawns ward, 4953 electors. Since these Draft Proposals were issued, however, a mistake has been found, making the 1979 figure now, for Cathedral ward, 5058 electors and for The Lawns ward, 4198 electors. Mr. Hartley, for the District Council, conceded that these new figures meant that the proposed boundary now gave no advantage in equality of representation, since by reverting back to the railway boundary, the figure would be for Cathedral ward, 4303 electors and for The Lawns ward, 4953 electors.

He claimed, however, that the area proposed to be transferred from The Lawns ward to Cathedral ward comprised older development which had a community affiliation and good road links with the remainder of Cathedral ward south of the railway. This view was supported by the representatives of the Conservative Association, who also pointed out that the polling station at the Church School would be more convenient for the residents of the old persons' dwellings by Springfield Green than the Tyrell School polling station in The Lawns ward.

Mr. Roberts, for the Springfield Residents Association, pointed out that most of the property in the area under dispute was post-war, a substantial part around Chichester Drive (235 electors) being of very recent construction, and was totally different in type from most of Cathedral ward which stretched into the centre of the town. He agreed that the old persons at Springfield Green would have a longer journey to vote if the boundary was moved back to the railway but only by a few hundred yards. On the other hand, the electors in the Chichester Drive and Seven Ash Green area would have a difficult and dangerous journey to vote at the Trinity School polling station in Cathedral ward under the draft proposals. He also pointed out that the proposed boundary was tortuous and complicated, sometimes following roads and sometimes the back fences of dwellings, whereas the railway was a clearly defined boundary.

On inspecting the area, I noted that there was no substantial difference in the type of property in the area under dispute from that in the rest of The Lawns ward, but that much of the remainder of Cathedral ward was significantly different in type. Although there is good communication between the area under dispute and the remainder of Cathedral ward, the route from Chichester Drive and Seven Ash Green area to the polling station in Cathedral ward was much less convenient than to the appropriate

Continued .....

polling station in The Lawns ward and Arbour Lane bridge appeared to be a danger spot.

Since an improvement in equality of representation is not now achieved by the Commission's Draft Proposals then these proposals should clearly demonstrate some other advantage to be acceptable. I could find no such advantage but I did find that the proposed southern boundary of The Lawns ward was less easily identifiable than the original railway boundary. For these reasons, therefore

I Recommend that the southern boundary of The Lawns ward be returned to the original line of the railway.

Springfield and Boreham Wards.

This area is bedevilled by the problem as to whether residential development in the Parish of Springfield will, in the present economic climate, take place on the scale forecast by the District Council. As the District Council have adopted the maximum recommended size for a non-metropolitan district council of sixty members, it will be possible only to produce electoral arrangements for the above parish to take full account of such development at the expense of some under-representation and/or undesirable combination of wards or parishes in the South Hanningfield, Rettendon and Runwell parishes. Alternatively, if such account is taken in the electoral arrangements and the development does not take place as forecast, there would be considerable over-representation in the parish of Springfield. The best that can be done in the circumstances, therefore, is a compromise solution which will mitigate the worst possibilities of under or over-representation and undesirable combinations of wards or parishes.

The Commission proposed separate single member wards for these parishes. The effect of this, as the District Council point out, would be that the Springfield electors would be over-represented at the 1976 Elections and if the development takes place as they forecast, under-represented by June 1979. If the two parishes were combined in one ward, it would be possible to mitigate, to some extent, these two extremes, since it is agreed that the Boreham electorate is unlikely to increase significantly. This is what the District Council's Scheme proposed.

Mr. C. R. Kemp objected to this proposed combination on the grounds that Boreham was a self-contained rural area and had no ties with Springfield North, where the electorate was urban in character and centred on Chelmsford, and that Springfield North had little association with Springfield South (a rural area) being divided from it by the A 12 road and the railway. This, however, is really an argument for dividing the Springfield parish into North and South wards and Mr. Kemp does at least concede that Boreham and Springfield South could be combined. Neither Parish Council appear to have objected to the District Council's Proposals, although Boreham Parish Council object to the Commission's proposals on the grounds that it reduces their representation from two to one member. Mr. Burgess, a District Councillor living in Boreham, supports the District Council's proposals. It appears, therefore, that there is not substantial local opposition to the combination of the two parishes to form one ward.

If the parishes were combined the question then arises as to whether the ward should be represented by two or three members. The District Council point out that detailed planning permission has now been granted for 1435 new dwellings in North Springfield and for 217 dwellings at East Springfield (i.e. south of the A 12 road) which would, when implemented, give rise to 3304 electors above the October 1973 figures. They forecast that by June 1979 there will be another 2206 electors in Springfield from the building of about 1100 houses, giving a total electorate by that date of 3210 for Springfield and, taking account of some development in Boreham, 5214 for the proposed combined ward. They argue that three members for the combined ward would give a representation in 1979 of 1738 electors per member, close to the average of 1660. By the same token, however, a three member ward would give even more over-representation for the 1976 Elections than the proposals of the Commission.

I inspected the areas which are the subject of the detailed permissions. One of them is an existing estate of which approximately two-thirds has already been developed. Two others were on either side of Pump Lane where drainage works and some roadworks had already started. It seems likely, therefore, that the existing estate will continue to be developed and a start to housebuilding made in the near future on the areas where site clearance and setting out has been made. At what rate and to what extent this development takes place can depend only on how well the houses sell.

Continued .....

The detailed permission for East Springfield was granted only on 18th June, 1975 and the timing and extent of any development here is even more problematical.

The proposals of the District Council, in my view, fail to strike a reasonable balance between an almost certain over-representation in 1976 and possible under-representation by June 1979. If, however, the combined parishes were made a two member ward, this would produce figures of approximately 1500 electors per member in 1976, very close to the average for that date and a considerable improvement on the proposals of both the District Council and the Commission. By June 1979, if the District Council's forecast is accepted, the figure will be approximately 2600 electors per member. This again is an improvement on the Commission's proposal and, although inferior to that of the District Council, it should be remembered that there is one ward in the District with a proposed ratio of 2344 electors per member and two others of over 2000 electors per member.

I therefore Recommend that Boreham and Springfield Parishes should be combined to form a two member ward.

Rettendon, South Hanningfield, Runwell Wards.

The Commission's draft proposals for this area, following a suggestion from Rettendon Parish Council, are to make the Parish of Runwell a two member ward, to combine Rettendon Parish with the South Hanningfield ward of South Hanningfield Parish to form a single member ward, leaving the Downham and Ramsden Heath wards of South Hanningfield Parish to form a single member ward known as South Hanningfield. They were able to add an extra member for this area over the number proposed by the District Council, by reducing the District Council's proposed membership for the Boreham and Springfield Parishes from three to two.

The District Council and South Hanningfield Parish Council both object to the Commission's proposals on the following grounds:-

- (i) Downham, Ramsden Heath and South Hanningfield have long-standing local ties and a unified parish administration and should not be split unnecessarily.
- (ii) The western boundary of South Hanningfield village coincides along its length with that of Downham village.
- (iii) The natural boundary between South Hanningfield and Rettendon could be considered to be the A 130 road, since the bulk of Rettendon lies to the east of it.
- (iv) The South Hanningfield and Rettendon/Runwell wards suggested by the District Council would form compact areas, whilst the proposed Rettendon/South Hanningfield ward would be a sprawling area of unusual shape.
- (v) The Commission's proposals result in two wards being over-represented, whilst in the District Council's proposals, only one ward is under represented.
- (vi) The South Hanningfield Parish ward is a good mixture of urban and rural communities (Ramsden Heath is semi-urban), whilst South Hanningfield ward with Rettendon would constitute a wholly rural ward.

Mr. Patmore, a District Councillor, who had lived in South Hanningfield village for fifty years, says he cannot understand why South Hanningfield was linked with Downham and Ramsden Heath some forty years ago, because there were no ties between the villages then and precious few now. He pointed out that the Womens Institute at South Hanningfield had disbanded, but that only two women now go from the village to Downham Womens Institute, that the old people from the village go to Rettendon rather than to the clubs at Downham and Ramsden Heath, that, although the Children at Ramsden Heath go to school at Downham, those from South Hanningfield go to West Hanningfield to school. He said that there were only two members from the village of South Hanningfield on the Parish Council, of which ~~we~~ was one, and he had voted against the objection from the Parish Council. He denied that the natural boundary between South Hanningfield and Rettendon was the A 130 and pointed out that 190 Rettendon electors lived to the west of that road which matched roughly the 212 electors from South Hanningfield village.

Continued .....

All the representatives from Runwell and Rettendon were, however, unanimous in their view that there was no association whatever between the parishes. Practically everybody in Runwell parish lived in the urban area, the distance by road from the nearest point of this area to Rettendon village was four miles and there was no direct bus route on this road. Runwell was a completely self-contained community with its own Village Hall, Womens Institute, Horticultural Society, Old Age Pensioners Association and Residents Association. Mrs. Brymont pointed out that in about 1950 Rettendon Parish Council had asked that a few people in the North of Runwell parish should be included in Rettendon parish because the village of Runwell was completely inaccessible to them. After a Local Inquiry, this had been agreed. Mr. Pengelly expressed the concern of the Conservative Association at the proposed amalgamation of the two parishes and said that Rettendon had more in common with South Hanningfield than with Runwell.

The Runwell and Rettendon representatives, in opposing the District Council's proposals, claimed that the District Council had underestimated the 1979 electorate for these parishes. They claimed that the parishes contained an above-average number of children who would be coming up to 18 years of age and Runwell claimed that no account had been taken of the considerable amount of infilling likely to take place in the village. Mr. Ray produced figures to show that there was no such special age structure in these villages and Mr. Hartley pointed out that no account had been taken of infilling anywhere in the District and that this was not, therefore, a particular feature of Runwell which should be taken into account. He did, however, concede that in the calculations for the 1979 electorate in Rettendon, no account had been taken of two detailed permissions for some 29 houses, which he agreed were about to be built and would raise the 1979 electorate for the parish to 1157.

Finally, a suggestion was made that Rettendon should be made a single member ward, leaving South Hanningfield Parish as a single member ward and Runwell Parish as a two member ward. Although this was acceptable to all the representatives, it was, in my view, too drastic a solution as it would result in Rettendon being, and likely to remain, very over-represented.

It is clear, therefore, that some combination is required in this area. In my view the one proposed by the Commission is much more desirable than the one proposed by the District Council, both on the grounds of community association and equitable representation.

One further point which was raised by the District Council, the South Hanningfield Parish Council and Mr. Pengelly was that the naming by the Commission of the ward formed from the Downham and Ramsden Heath wards as South Hanningfield was likely to lead to confusion. This is a problem which can easily be cured and I therefore Recommend that the Commission's proposals be adhered to and that the wards be named Runwell, Rettendon and South Hanningfield and Ramsden Heath and Downham.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
R. M. HARTLEY	Chief Executive, Chelmsford District Council	Chelmsford District Council
A. D. J. PENGELLY	88 Rectory Lane, Chelmsford, CM1 1RF.	Chelmsford Constituency Conservative Association
MRS. A. HILTON-TAPP	59 Torquay Road, Chelmsford.	Springfield Place Branch Conservative Association
W. P. PATMORE	"Ashdown" Brock Hill, Runwell, Wickford.	District Councillor and S. Hanningfield Resident
A. W. FYSH	23 Church Road, Ramsden Heath, Billericay.	S. Hanningfield Parish Council (Clerk)
MRS. J. WHITE	Hill House, Rettendon, Chelmsford.	Rettendon Parish Council
MRS. M. BRYMONT	50 Church End Lane, Runwell, Wickford.	Runwell Parish Council
MRS. D. KEMPSON	5 Locarno Avenue, Runwell, Wickford.	Runwell Parish Council
R. DOCKERILL	1 Canewdon Close, Runwell, Wickford.	Runwell Parish Council
E. DALES	10 Brock Hill, Runwell, Wickford.	Runwell Parish Council
W. C. FAIRMANER	8 Dartmouth Road, Chelmsford.	Springfield Residents Association
I. D. ROBERTS	120 Falmouth Road, Springfield, Chelmsford.	Springfield Residents Association
C. R. KEMP	9 Bridge Close, Springfield, Chelmsford.	Springfield (Rural), Braintree tree Conservative Association
M. BREWER	Avenue Lodge, The Avenues, Witham, CM8 2DL.	Braintree Conservative Association
C. RAY	Planning Officer, Chelmsford District Council.	Chelmsford District Council

## CHELMSFORD DISTRICT : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ALL SAINTS	3
BADDOW ROAD	2
BOREHAM AND SPRINGFIELD	2
BROOMFIELD AND CHIGNALL	2
CATHEDRAL	3
DANBURY AND SANDON	3
EAST AND WEST HANNINGFIELD	1
GALLEYWOOD	3
GOAT HALL	2
GOOD EASTER, MASHBURY AND ROXWELL	1
GREAT BADDOW VILLAGE	2
GREAT AND LITTLE LEIGHS AND LITTLE WALTHAM	1
GREAT WALTHAM AND PLESHEY	1
HIGHWOOD AND MARGARETTING	1
LITTLE BADDOW	1
MILDMAYS	2
MOULSHAM LODGE	2
OAKLANDS	3
PATCHING HALL	3
RAMSDEN HEATH AND DOWNHAM	1
RETTENDON AND SOUTH HANNINGFIELD	1
ROTHMANS	2
RUNWELL	2
ST ANDREWS	3
STOCK	1
THE LAWNS	3
WATERHOUSE FARM	3
WOODHAM FERRERS NORTH	1
WOODHAM FERRERS SOUTH	2
WRITTLE	3

## CHELMSFORD DISTRICT: DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

## GOAT HALL WARD

Commencing at a point where the Chelmsford to Brentwood railway meets the eastern boundary of Margaretting CP, thence northeastwards along said railway to a point opposite the southern boundary of Chelmsford Golf Club, thence eastward to and along said boundary and the northern and eastern boundaries of the Golf Course to the northern boundary of parcel No 1149 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TL70/7104 edition of 1968, thence eastwards and following said boundary and northeastwards along the southeastern boundaries of the properties known as Green Hills and Chattis Hill to the northeastern boundary of No 18 Galleywood Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 12 to 8 Galleywood Road, thence northeastwards along said boundaries and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of the last mentioned property to Galleywood Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 1 Galleywood Road, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and northeastwards and following the northern and eastern boundaries of No 7 Galleywood Road to the rear boundaries of Nos 18 and 20 Hornbeam Close, thence southwestwards and following said boundaries, the southwestern boundaries of Nos 38 and 40 Fir Tree Rise, the rear boundaries of Nos 39 to 29 Fir Tree Rise and the rear boundaries of Nos 119 to 213 Linnet Drive to the path to the south of the properties in Laburnum Drive, Hawthorn Close and Palm Close; thence generally eastwards along said path to the western boundary of Great Baddow CP, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the northwestern boundary of Stock CP to the eastern boundary of Margaretting CP, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

## OAKLANDS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Goat Hall Ward meets the eastern boundary of Margaretting CP, thence generally northwards

along said parish boundary and the eastern boundary of Writtle CP to a point opposite the northern boundary of parcel No 0868 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TL 68/6905 edition of 1965, thence northwards to and following said boundary, the rear boundaries of the properties on the south side of Longacre and Nos 121 to 115 Writtle Road and the rear boundaries of Nos 12 to 20 Robjohns Road to Hanbury Road, thence eastwards along said road to Robjohns Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Bakery, thence generally eastwards to and along said boundary and the northern boundary of the Depot to Westway, thence southwestwards along said Westway to a point opposite the Southern boundary of the Depot to the east of Westway, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the western boundary of Borough Cemetery, thence southwards and following the western and southern boundaries of the said cemetery to the railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 195 Upper Bridge Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to Upper Bridge Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Lower Anchor Street, thence southeastwards along said street and Anchor Street to Moulsham Street, thence southwestwards along said street to St John's Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Moulsham Drive, thence northeastwards along said drive to a point opposite the path between Nos 57 and 61 Moulsham Drive thence southeastwards along said path and generally northeastwards along the path to Princes Road (Chelmsford By Pass) to Princes Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of the Sports Ground, thence generally southwestwards to and along said boundary to the northern boundary No 16 Tylers Close, thence northwestwards along said boundary to Tylers Close, thence southwards along said close to Gloucester Avenue, thence northwestwards along said avenue to Heath Drive, thence southwards and following said drive to a point opposite

the western boundary of No 83 Laburnum Drive, thence southwards to and along and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 81 to 77 Laburnum Drive to the western boundaries of Nos 71 to 75 Laburnum Drive, thence southwestwards along said boundaries to the northern boundary of Goat Hall Ward, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### WATERHOUSE FARM WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Oaklands Ward meets the eastern boundary of Writtle CP, thence generally northwards along said boundary to Roxwell Road, thence eastwards along said road, Rainford Road and Duke Street to the railway, thence southwestwards along said railway and southwestwards and following the northern boundary of Oaklands Ward, to the point of commencement.

#### ST ANDREWS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward meets the eastern boundary of Writtle CP, thence northwestwards and following said boundary and the southeastern boundary of Chignall CP to the western boundary of parcel No 3312 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TL 6909 edition of 1952, thence southwards along said boundary and generally southeastwards and southwards along the northeastern and eastern boundaries of the Athletic Stadium to the rear boundaries of Nos 62 to 50 St Nazaire Road, thence generally southeastwards along said boundaries and continuing southeastwards to the path forming the western boundary of the Sports Ground thence southwards along said path, Melbourne Avenue, the rear boundaries of the properties on the western side of West Avenue, the eastern boundary of No 2 Langton Avenue, crossing Langton Avenue, the eastern boundary of No 7 Langton Avenue, the rear boundaries of the properties on the eastern side of Fox Crescent and crossing Fox Crescent to the southern boundary of

Rainsford County Secondary School, thence generally westwards along the said boundary and the southern boundary of the Playing Field southwest of Langton Avenue and Northwards along the western boundary of the said Playing Field to the northern boundary of the Council Depot, thence westwards along said boundary, crossing the access road and the northern boundary of the Allotment Gardens and southwards along the western boundary of said gardens to the rear boundaries of Nos 86 to 94 Highfield Road, thence westwards along said boundaries to Pines Road, thence southwards along said road to Highfield Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 73 to 51 Highfield Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundaries and southwestwards and following the rear boundaries of Nos 42 to 2 Sunningdale Road, to Screens Court, thence westwards along said Court to Chignall Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward, thence westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### ALL SAINTS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward meets the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, thence northwards and following said boundary to Partridge Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 58 to 52 Tennyson Road, thence eastwards to and along said boundaries, the northern boundary of the Allotment Gardens and the southern boundary of St Pius X RC Primary School to the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 11 Tennyson Road, thence southwestwards along said boundaries to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 112 to 42 Brownings Avenue, thence southeastwards to and along said boundaries and the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 39 Eves Crescent, crossing Sunrise Avenue to the path from said avenue to the northwestern boundary of No 45 Eves Crescent, thence southeastwards along said path and northeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 45 to 51 Eves Crescent, thence southeastwards along said boundaries and continuing

southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 44 to 2 Kings Road to the eastern boundary of No 2 Kings Road, thence southwards along said boundary to Kings Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 1 Kings Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and southwards and eastwards along the western and southern boundaries of the Engineering Works to the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 10 Jubilee Terrace, thence southwards along said boundaries to the northern boundary of Okeley, thence eastwards, southwards and westwards along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of said Okeley to the access road to said property, thence southwards along said road to Corporation Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Broomfield Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the unnamed road to the south of Nos 28 to 13 John Henry Keene Memorial Homes, thence eastwards and northwards to and along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Cemetery, thence eastwards to and along said boundary and the northern boundary of No 31a Henry Road to the track from Henry Road to Bishop Hall Lane, thence northwards along said track to a point opposite northern boundary of the Factory, thence eastwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the River Chelmer, thence southwards and following said river to the railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward, thence generally westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### PATCHING HALL WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of All Saints Ward meets the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, thence northwards and following said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Broomfield CP, thence eastwards and following said boundary to the River Chelmer, thence generally southwards along said river to the northern boundary of All Saints Ward, thence westwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

## THE LAWNS WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of All Saints Ward meets the railway thence northwards and following said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Patching Hall Ward to the southern boundary of Broomfield CP thence eastwards and following said boundary and the western boundary of Springfield CP to the railway thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

## CATHEDRAL WARD

Commencing at the point where Duke Street meets the southeastern boundary of All Saints Ward thence northeastwards and following said boundary and the southern boundary of The Lawns Ward to the western boundary of Springfield CP thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the northern boundary of Great Baddow CP thence westwards and following said boundary and continuing northwestwards along the River Chelmer to the River Can thence continuing northwestwards along said river to High Street thence generally northwestwards along said street and Duke Street to the point of commencement.

## MILDMAYS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Oaklands Ward meets the eastern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary of the southern boundary of Cathedral Ward, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Great Baddow CP, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the path from Baddow Road Hospital to Princes Road, thence northwestwards along said path, to the northern boundary of Oaklands Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

## MOULSHAM LODGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Great Hall Ward meets the eastern boundary of Oaklands Ward, thence northwestwards and following said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Mildmays Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Great Baddow CP, thence southwards and following said boundary to the northern boundary of Goat Hall Ward, thence westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

## GREAT WALTHAM AND PLESHEY WARD

The parishes of Great Waltham and Pleshey.

## GREAT AND LITTLE LEIGHS AND LITTLE WALTHAM WARD

The parishes of Great and Little Leighs and Little Waltham.

## GOOD EASTER, MASHBURY AND ROXWELL WARD

The parishes of Good Easter, Mashbury and Roxwell.

## BROOMFIELD AND CHIGNALL WARD

The parishes of Broomfield and Chignall.

## BOREHAM AND SPRINGFIELD WARD

The parishes of Boreham and Springfield.

## WRITTLE WARD

The parish of Writtle.

## LITTLE BADDOW WARD

The parish of Little Baddow.

## HIGHWOOD AND MARGARETTING WARD

The parishes of Highwood and Margaretting.

## BADDOW ROAD WARD

The Baddow Road Ward of the parish of Great Baddow

## ROTHMANS WARD

The Rothmans ward of the parish of Great Baddow

## GREAT BADDOW VILLAGE WARD

The Village Ward of the parish of Great Baddow

## GALLEYWOOD WARD

The Galleywood Ward of the parish of Great Baddow

## DANBURY AND SANDON WARD

The parishes of Danbury and Sandon

## STOCK WARD

The parish of Stock

## EAST AND WEST HANNINGFIELD WARD

The parishes of East Hanningfield and West Hanningfield.

## WOODHAM FERRERS NORTH WARD

The Village ward and the Bicknacre ward of the parish of Woodham Ferrers

## WOODHAM FERRERS SOUTH WARD

The South Ward of the parish of Woodham Ferrers

## RUNWELL WARD

The parish of Runwell

## RETTENDON AND SOUTH HANNINGFIELD WARD

The parish of Rettendon and the South Hanningfield ward of the Parish of South Hanningfield.

## RAMSDEN HEATH AND DOWNHAM WARD

The Downham ward and the Ramsden Heath ward of the parish of South Hanningfield