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INTRODUCTION

1. On 1 April 1987 we announced the start of a review of Greater London, the London boroughs and the City of London as part of the programme of reviews we are required to undertake by virtue of section 48(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. We wrote to each of the local authorities concerned.

2. Copies of our letter were sent to the appropriate County, District and Parish Councils bordering Greater London; the local authority associations; Members of Parliament with constituency interests; and the headquarters of the main political parties. In addition, copies were sent to those government departments, regional health authorities, the Metropolitan Police, water authorities, electricity and gas undertakings which might have an interest, as well as to local television and radio stations serving the Greater London area and to a number of other interested persons and organisations.

3. The London boroughs and the City of London were requested to assist us in publicising the start of the review by inserting a notice for two successive weeks in local newspapers so as to give a wide coverage in the areas concerned.
4. A period of seven months from the date of our letter was allowed for all local authorities and any person or body interested in the review to send us their views on whether changes to the boundaries of Greater London authorities were desirable and, if so, what those changes should be and how they would serve the interests of effective and convenient local government, the criterion laid down in the 1972 Act.

5. This report concerns Harrow’s boundaries with Ealing, Hillingdon, Hertsmere and Three Rivers, with the exception of that part of the Harrow/Hertsmere boundary in the vicinity of Elstree; this was considered in the context of our review of Barnet’s boundary with Hertsmere and Harrow, and our final report and proposals in respect of that review were submitted to you on 25 October 1990 (Report No 594). Harrow’s boundary with Brent is being considered separately, as part of our review of the London Borough of Brent.

APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

6. We have thought it appropriate to commence this report with some relevant general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of Harrow and other London borough areas.

7. We took the opportunity in our Report No 550, "People and Places", to explain in some detail the approach we take to our work and the factors which we take into consideration when conducting reviews, including the guidelines we have been given (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

8. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London borough
boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which the Commission had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as part of its Review.

Wider London Issues

9. Our review of the London boroughs and the City of London is the first such review to have been undertaken since their formation in 1965, under the provisions of the London Government Act 1963. Although our view remains that this Review is not the right occasion for a fundamental reappraisal of the extent of London or the pattern of London boroughs, which would inevitably raise questions about the nature and structure of London government, we do see it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which arise and which may need to be brought to the attention of any body charged with undertaking a more fundamental review of London in the future.

The Outer Boundary Of London

10. Our guidelines advise us that special care needs to be taken in considering changes to the outer boundary of Greater London, because the distribution of functions is different within and without that boundary. The Commission’s press notice also referred to the particular problems presented by the outer London boundary, which does not always follow the edge of the built-up area, and where the relevance of the M25 and the Green Belt would need to be considered. We have borne in mind the need to find, if possible, a clear boundary for outer London which will not be rapidly overlaid by development. On the other hand, where continuous development already spills over the outer London
boundary, we may not necessarily seek to extend the boundary up to the limit of that development. Indeed, the conurbation of London has in some places already stretched far into the countryside along salients of development. We have to reach a balanced view as to where the boundary should lie, taking account of shape, community ties and the impact of major and new infrastructure, as well as the extent of development. Thus, in the context of this review, we discussed whether the salient of development that encompasses Watford should be considered to be part of the Greater London area.

The M25

11. Early in our deliberations we acknowledged that, with a few exceptions, the M25 encompasses the continuous built-up area of London. We took the view that the capital’s boundary should not normally extend beyond it. On the other hand, it could not be regarded as a satisfactory boundary for Greater London as a whole, particularly in the south, where it encloses substantial areas of open countryside, including parts of the North Downs. Nevertheless, there are parts of the M25 which are close to the present outer boundary of London. As we indicated in "People and Places", we recognise the need to consider each one of these stretches to see whether it offers a better boundary for the future, taking into account the effect of the motorway itself on local ties in the vicinity.

London’s Green Belt

12. There is a presumption against development in the green belt. Again, as we indicated in "People and Places", fears are often expressed to us that an urban authority will more readily seek to extend its built-up areas into green belt than will a rural authority. We do not accept this as a general premise: once an area of green belt has been defined, its status should not be affected by a change in the authority in which it lies. Nor is there any reason to suppose that London boroughs are any
less able to preserve and maintain green belt than shire districts and counties. There are already significant tracts of green belt within the existing boundaries of Greater London and we have seen no evidence to suggest that they are under any greater threat than green belt land lying immediately beyond the boundaries of the capital. Indeed, policies for the protection and improvement of green belt are advocated in the Department of the Environment's Strategic Planning Guidance for London, and will form part of boroughs' Unitary Development Plans. We have therefore taken the approach that, while the relevance of the green belt needs to be taken into account as we look at each section of the outer London boundary, it would be inappropriate to consider excluding green belt land from London solely on the misplaced grounds that London boroughs are unsuitable custodians of it.

THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

13. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 to the London Borough of Harrow, we received submissions from that Council, and from the London Boroughs of Ealing and Hillingdon, Hertsmere Borough Council, Three Rivers District Council and Hertfordshire County Council. Comments were also received from ten interested organisations, 54 members of the public, one local councillor and one Member of Parliament. We also received two petitions in respect of the Harrow/Ealing boundary.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MAJOR CHANGE TO HARROW'S BOUNDARIES WITH HERTFORDSHIRE AND HILLINGDON, AND OUR INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

14. We noted that Harrow's boundaries with Hertfordshire and Hillingdon raised wider issues. In considering these issues, we were mindful of our guidelines that special care would be required in considering changes to the outer boundary of Greater London, because the distribution of functions is different within and without that boundary.
15. First, we considered whether the Borough of Watford should be brought within the Greater London area. We had received one submission from a member of the public who advocated such a change, by the creation of a new London borough to encompass this part of South West Hertfordshire. Second, we considered Harrow’s boundary with Hillingdon, which seemed somewhat arbitrary, particularly in its division of Pinner and Ruislip. We had received one suggestion proposing a radical redrawing of Hillingdon’s boundaries, by placing parts of Rayners Lane and South Harrow in Hillingdon and transferring parts of Ruislip, Eastcote and Northwood to either Three Rivers or Harrow.

16. We took the view that, while the pattern of local authority boundaries in this area left something to be desired, very little could be done without a major restructuring exercise which, as indicated above, we do not regard as being the purpose of the current review. Accordingly, as we had received no evidence to suggest that the present Hillingdon boundary causes any severe practical problems in terms of effective and convenient local government, we decided not to pursue the suggestions for major change submitted to us, and to consider only those suggestions intended to resolve specific boundary anomalies.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HARROW AND HERTSMERE (HERTFORDSHIRE)

INTERIM DECISION TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS

(a) Open land west of Elstree at Caldecote Hill

17. Harrow had suggested realigning its boundary to the A409, the A411 and the A41(T), thereby bringing green belt land to the west of Elstree into its area. The suggestion was submitted on the grounds that the realignment would provide a clearer and more logical boundary, and would assist in the management of the green belt, which straddles the current Harrow/Hertsmere boundary.
18. Harrow's suggestion was supported by the Labour Group on Harrow Council, the Harrow East Conservative Association and a member of the public. The Liberal Group on Harrow Council raised no objection to the suggestion, commenting that it appeared to be merely a tidying up exercise, affecting few properties. However, it was opposed by Hertsmere, on the grounds that the area in question is largely open space with a number of large residential properties situated along its western edge; accordingly, it saw no advantage in the suggestion.

19. We agreed with Hertsmere that there appeared to be little justification for the suggested realignment. We also noted that, if adopted, the suggestion would result in similar properties on either side of the A409 being in different local authority areas. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals for the boundary in this area.

DRAFT PROPOSAL

(b) Magpie Hall Road, Bushey Heath

20. Hertsmere Borough Council considered that the existing boundary severed a small triangular area of land north of the A409, which, in terms of community, forms part of Bushey Heath. It therefore suggested a realignment passing south-east along a fenceline from a point west of Hive Road, then north-east along the centre of Common Road and Magpie Hall Road (A409), and the rear curtilage of Belswood Cottage, to rejoin the existing boundary. This suggestion would have the effect of transferring a number of dwellings, including Belswood Cottage, from Harrow to Hertsmere.

21. Hertfordshire County Council submitted a similar suggestion, but preferred an alignment along the eastern edge of Hive Road and the northern edge of the A409, thereby excluding the houses to the west of Hive Road, and Belswood Cottage, from the proposed area of transfer.
22. Hertsmere's suggestion was opposed by the Harrow East Conservative Association, but was supported by the Liberal Group on Harrow Council, subject to the views of residents. One member of the public submitted an alternative suggestion, to transfer Bushey Heath to Harrow, by realigning the boundary along the A41.

23. We noted that the existing boundary is unsatisfactory, passing arbitrarily through gardens and properties north of the A409. We agreed that Harrow Weald and Stanmore Commons constitute the division between Stanmore and Bushey, and that the A409 would provide the best dividing line between the two areas. We felt that Belswood Cottage should remain in Harrow, and that the properties on either side of Hive Road appeared to have an affinity of interest, and should therefore be united in one local authority.

24. We felt that these objectives could largely be achieved by a combination of the suggestions submitted by Hertfordshire and Harrow. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment passing south-east along a fenceline from a point west of Hive Road, then north-east along the northern edge of Common Road and Magpie Hall Road (A409), to rejoin the existing boundary north of Belswood Cottage. We also decided to rectify two stretches of defaced and undefined boundary, to the west of Common Road, and within the curtilage of Belswood Cottage. These realignments formed part of our draft proposals.

**THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HARROW AND THREE RIVERS (HERTFORDSHIRE)**

**INTERIM DECISION TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS**

25. Three Rivers District Council commented that it saw little need for change to the present boundary. We agreed, and in the absence of suggestions for any realignment, took an interim decision to make no proposals for this boundary.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HARROW AND HILLINGDON

DRAFT PROPOSALS

26. Harrow suggested several changes to its boundary with Hillingdon, to rectify minor anomalies which had arisen as a result of recent development. Hillingdon submitted similar suggestions. A number of organisations in both authorities supported the suggestions of their respective councils.

(a) Potter Street Hill, Pinner

27. Harrow and Hillingdon submitted similar suggestions to rectify a short section of defaced boundary to the east side of Potter Street Hill. Harrow suggested a side of road alignment whilst Hillingdon suggested that the boundary should follow a fence to the east of the road. We agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for both the highway and the adjoining verge to be administered by one authority. We therefore decided to adopt Hillingdon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(b) Abbey Close, Pinner

28. The existing boundary passes arbitrarily through gardens and properties in Abbey Close, isolating within Hillingdon four dwellings which have no access from that authority. Harrow and Hillingdon submitted an identical suggestion to unite the whole of Abbey Close in Harrow, by means of a realignment along the southern and western curtilages of the properties and lock-up garages in Abbey Close, re-joining the existing boundary at No 22 Wynlie Gardens. The Ruislip-Northwood Conservative Association supported this suggestion.

29. We considered it to be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite Abbey Close within Harrow,
the authority from which it has access. We therefore decided to adopt the local authorities' suggestion as our draft proposal.

(c) **Cuckoo Hill, Pinner West**

30. The existing boundary passes arbitrarily through gardens and properties to the east of Cuckoo Hill. Harrow suggested realigning the boundary to the eastern side of Cuckoo Hill. This would have the effect of transferring six properties on the eastern side of Cuckoo Hill, and nine properties at the western end of Birchmead Avenue, to Harrow. Hillingdon submitted a similar suggestion, differing only in that it extended the realignment northwards, along the eastern edge of Cuckoo Hill to the railway line, to rectify a length of ill-defined boundary.

31. We agreed with Hillingdon's suggestion, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal, subject to extending the realignment even further north, to link with our draft proposal for Abbey Close.

(d) **West Towers and Rushdene Road, Pinner West**

32. The existing boundary is defaced, running through St Andrew's Presbyterian Church and the rear gardens of properties in Rushdene Road. Harrow and Hillingdon submitted identical suggestions for a realignment to the rear garden fence line between these properties and those in West Towers. We agreed with the Councils that their suggestion would resolve the boundary anomalies in this area, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

(e) **Cannonbury Avenue, Pinner West**

33. The existing boundary splits No 8 Cannonbury Avenue and the gardens of Nos 2-6. In order to unite all the properties in Cannonbury Avenue in its area, Harrow suggested realigning the boundary to the back edge of the pavement on the south side of
Cannonbury Avenue, and the fenceline of Nos 76-82 Lowlands Road. Hillingdon submitted a similar suggestion, differing only in that it proposed the use of the north side of Cannonbury Avenue, thereby uniting both the dwellings and the highway in Harrow.

34. We agreed that the dwellings should be united in Harrow, and felt that it would facilitate highway maintenance for one authority to be responsible for Cannonbury Avenue. We therefore decided to adopt Hillingdon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(f) Castleton Road and Seymour Gardens

35. The existing boundary in this area arbitrarily divides properties, gardens and the roadway. It also isolates a number of properties in Harrow, from which they have no access. Harrow and Hillingdon submitted identical suggestions to unite the whole area in Hillingdon, by realigning the boundary to the rear curtilage of properties in Castleton Road.

36. The Ruislip-Northwood Conservative Association supported the suggestion, commenting that the area is isolated from Harrow. However, it was opposed by the Liberal Group on Harrow Council, on the grounds of the special history of development in Castleton Road. It pointed out that the properties that both Harrow and Hillingdon had suggested be transferred, were the result of a Harrow council house development. Consequently, it considered that in spite of the road's geographical location, tenants and owners of these properties had traditional links with Harrow. The Liberal Group therefore suggested an alternative, minor suggestion, to clarify the boundary whilst retaining all the Harrow council house development within that Borough.

37. We noted that the area affected by Harrow and Hillingdon's suggestion had clear geographical links with Hillingdon, and that it was very much isolated from the rest of Harrow. We considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient
local government for Castleton Road and Seymour Gardens to be united in one authority, and that that authority should be Hillingdon. We therefore decided to adopt the local authorities' suggestion for a realignment of the boundary to the rear curtilage of properties in Castleton Road as our draft proposal for this area.

(g) Malvern Avenue

38. Harrow suggested realigning the boundary to the curtilages of Nos 241 and 256 Malvern Avenue, in order to remedy the division of properties and to unite this road in its area. Hillingdon submitted a similar, but more extensive, suggestion which also realigned the boundary where it divided gardens and properties at Nos 673-693 Field End Road. The effect of Hillingdon's suggestion was to unite Nos 241 and 256 Malvern Avenue in Harrow, and Nos 673-693 Field End Road in its area. It was supported by one member of the public.

39. We agreed that both sections of defaced boundary required realignment, as they divide properties. We therefore adopted Hillingdon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(h) Field End Road

40. The existing boundary is ill-defined along the length of Field End Road. We considered that a minor, side of road realignment to follow the back edge of the eastern pavement would facilitate highway maintenance by uniting the road in one authority. We therefore decided to issue a draft proposal to that effect.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HARROW AND EALING

DRAFT PROPOSALS

(a) The Heights, Gaylor Road and Dabbs Hill Lane

41. Ealing suggested realigning the boundary in this area along the railway line, thereby transferring the Heights, Doncaster Drive, Doncaster Gardens, Dabbs Hill Lane, Gaylor Road, Martin Drive and Mallet Drive to its area. Ealing submitted this suggestion on the grounds that it considered the railway to be the natural boundary with Harrow, that access to this area is from Ealing, and that adoption of the railway line would be conducive to the more effective operation of local services and result in improvements to the pattern of community life. Harrow supported the suggestion, commenting that the existing boundary is irregular and unclear.

42. Ealing's suggestion was also supported by the Harrow East Conservative Association, the Ealing Conservative Association, the Ealing Social Democratic Party, and one member of the public. However, it was opposed by Mr Robert Hughes MP, a local councillor, and the Roxeth Local History Society, on the grounds that the area suggested for transfer forms part of the Roxeth area of Harrow, that Roxeth itself has existed since 845 AD, and that it has no connections with Ealing. The Labour Group of Harrow Councillors also opposed the suggestion, considering it to be unnecessary and unsupported by local residents. The South Harrow and Roxeth Ratepayers' Association commented in similar terms.

43. We also received letters from 30 members of the public, and a petition containing 433 signatures, all opposing Ealing's suggestion. These representations contended that the area's current and historical links are with Roxeth and Harrow, rather than with Ealing.
44. The local councillor suggested that Dabbs Hill Lane might be transferred to Ealing on the grounds that the tenants of council properties in the Lane already pay their rents to that authority. An identical suggestion was submitted by the South Harrow and Roxeth Ratepayers' Association. A member of the public submitted two further alternative realignments, which reflected his opinion that only The Heights, and those houses to the north of Gaylor Road, have a close affinity with Harrow.

45. In considering the suggestions and representations made to us, we recognised the strong attachment to Harrow and Roxeth felt by residents of The Heights. While agreeing that the boundary in this area warranted some alteration, we did not consider that it need be realigned to the extent suggested by Ealing.

46. We noted that the council properties in Dabbs Hill Lane are owned by Ealing and considered the Lane to have an affinity with Northolt, in Ealing. We felt that a clearly defined boundary, which reflected that affinity, could be created by a realignment along the rear curtilages of properties on the south side of The Heights, thereby transferring Dabbs Hill Lane to Ealing. We therefore decided to issue a draft proposal to that effect, and also to rectify a stretch of ill-defined boundary in Eastcote Lane.

(b) Halsbury Road East and Sudbury Hill

47. Harrow suggested extending the current boundary east along the British Rail line, from the point where it currently departs from it north of Halsbury Road East, to Greenford Road, thereby transferring Cavendish Avenue and part of Wood End Road to Ealing. Harrow submitted its suggestion on the grounds that this realignment would produce a clear and recognisable boundary, and reflect the Council's view that the residents of these roads have a closer affinity with the remainder of Sudbury Hill, in Ealing.
48. Harrow’s suggestion was supported by the Harrow East Conservative Association, and two members of the public. Ealing did not comment on the suggestion, but proposed a minor realignment of the boundary to the southern side of the LT Piccadilly Line, adjacent to Halsbury Road East. This would transfer to Ealing an area of vacant land which was claimed to be inaccessible from Harrow.

49. We received sixteen letters from individuals opposing Harrow’s suggestion, together with a petition containing 278 signatures. The representations expressed the view that residents’ affinities lay with Harrow, and that they were satisfied with the current provision of services.

50. We did not consider the present boundary to be defective and, in view of the strongly expressed views of the local residents, saw little need for major change in the area. However, we felt that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the vacant land north of Halsbury Road East to be transferred to the authority from which it has access. We therefore decided to adopt Ealing’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

51. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 23 October 1989. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. The London Boroughs of Harrow, Hillingdon and Ealing, and the Districts of Hertsmere and Three Rivers, were asked to publish a notice announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the Councils were asked to post copies of this notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 18 December 1989.
RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

52. We received a total of 33 representations in response to our draft proposals letter. They included comments from the London Boroughs of Harrow, Hillingdon and Ealing, the District of Hertsmere, two interested organisations, one local councillor and one from a local Member of Parliament. The remainder were from members of the public.

OUR FINAL PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

HARROW’S BOUNDARY WITH HERTSMERE

(a) Open Land West Of Elstree And Caldecote Hill

53. Hertsmere Borough Council supported our interim decision to make no proposals for the transfer of an area of green belt land to Harrow. However, Harrow opposed our interim decision, and restated its original suggestion, arguing that the transfer of the area in question would result in a more contiguous stretch of green belt and would assist in the Council’s management of it.

54. We considered that Harrow had provided insufficient reason to warrant the transfer of this area. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

(b) Magpie Hall Road, Bushey Heath

55. Hertsmere supported our draft proposal to unite a small triangular shaped area of land north-west of the A409, with Bushey Heath, in Hertsmere. Harrow, having consulted the residents affected, informed us that 27 had objected to our draft proposal, whilst 18 had supported it. Harrow consequently opposed the draft proposal, and further stressed its view that the green belt land to the west of Hive Road should remain in its area, in order to ensure effective Green Belt management and provide a logical boundary. It commented that the area in
question, known as Kestrel Grove, is an Area of Special Character and Special Advertisement Control. We also received eight letters from members of the public, all objecting to our draft proposal.

56. The representations received claimed strong ties with Harrow, and satisfaction with the administration and services provided by that Council. Nevertheless, we noted that while the Harrow survey of residents' views had shown some opposition to our draft proposal, there had also been some significant support for it.

57. We reaffirmed our view that Harrow Weald and Stanmore Commons constitute the division between Stanmore and Bushey, and that Magpie Hall Road (A409) would provide the best dividing line between the two areas. However, we took the view that a realignment south-east along Magpie Hall Road and Common Road (A409), then north-west along Hive Road to meet the existing boundary would, in general, provide a clearer boundary than the field boundary we had previously proposed. Such a modification would also satisfy Harrow's concern to retain this area of green belt in Harrow. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to a modification to realign the boundary along the centre of Hive Road.

HARROW'S BOUNDARY WITH THREE RIVERS

58. Harrow supported our interim decision to make no proposals for Harrow's boundary with Three Rivers. Three Rivers did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have confirmed our interim decision as final.
HARROW'S BOUNDARY WITH HILLINGDON

(a) Potter Street Hill, Pinner

59. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioners Committee supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary along a fence on the east side of Potter Street Hill. Hillingdon did not comment. Accordingly, in the absence of objections we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(b) Abbey Close, Pinner

60. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal to unite Abbey Close in Harrow. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) Cuckoo Hill, Pinner West

61. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal for a realignment of the boundary to the eastern side of Cuckoo Hill, transferring six properties on the eastern side of Cuckoo Hill, and nine properties at the western end of Birchmead Avenue, to Harrow. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) West Towers And Rushdene Road, Pinner West

62. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the rear garden fence line between Rushdene Road and West Towers. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
(e) Cannonbury Avenue, Pinner West

63. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal to unite Cannonbury Avenue in Harrow. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(f) Castleton Road And Seymour Gardens

64. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal to unite Castleton Road and Seymour Gardens in Hillingdon. Hillingdon did not comment.

65. A local councillor wrote to inform the Commission of the results of a survey of residents he and a colleague had conducted in the area affected by our draft proposal. This had shown that, whilst many residents expressed no opinion as to whether they should be transferred, of those who did give a preference, the greater number wished to remain in Harrow. In the event that we decided to withdraw our draft proposal, the councillor suggested an alternative minor realignment.

66. Nevertheless, we considered that the area in question had clear geographical links with Hillingdon, and was relatively isolated from Harrow. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(g) Malvern Avenue

67. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the curtilages of Nos 241 and 256 Malvern Avenue and Nos 673-693 Field End Road. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of
any objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(h) Field End Road

68. Both Harrow and the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee supported our draft proposal for a side of road alignment in Field End Road. Hillingdon did not comment. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

HARROW’S BOUNDARY WITH EALING

(a) The Heights, Gaylor Road, Dabbs Hill Lane and Eastcote Lane

69. Harrow informed us that, following consultations with local residents, it wished both to oppose our draft proposal to transfer Dabbs Hill Lane to Ealing, and withdraw its previous support for Ealing’s original suggestion. Ealing, supported by Harrow, had originally suggested a realignment to the railway line, which would have the effect of transferring The Heights and other residential roads, including Dabbs Hill Lane, to its area.

70. Harrow informed us that their survey revealed that the majority of residents were in favour of retaining the existing boundary, including 30 of the 32 respondents living on the Harrow side of Dabbs Hill Lane. In the light of clearly expressed local views, Harrow wished the existing boundary to be retained, with the exception of a minor realignment in the vicinity of No 1-3 The Heights.

71. Ealing did not object to our draft proposal to transfer properties on the northern side of Dabbs Hill Lane to its area. However, it did object to the transfer of Nos 1-3 The Heights, an Ealing Social Services Home for Children, to Harrow. Ealing contended that considerable disruption would result for both
residents and staff if the Home were to become an 'out-of-
borough' facility.

72. Our draft proposal was supported by a local councillor, the South Harrow and Roxeth Ratepayers’ Association, and 13 residents of The Heights and other, adjacent roads. One resident also suggested a minor alteration at the eastern end of The Heights, to bring that part of Northolt Road which gives access to The Heights into Harrow. Two residents of Dabbs Hill Lane opposed our draft proposal, one of whom pointed out that the number of out-of-borough Ealing council tenants in Dabbs Hill Lane was diminishing, as approximately 75% of the council housing in that road was now in private ownership. We noted that we had taken account of the potential impact of Right to Buy sales when formulating our draft proposals. A further member of the public expressed regret that we did not adopt an alignment along the railway line as our draft proposal.

73. Our draft proposal was also opposed by Mr Harry Greenway MP, who considered it unfeasible to transfer the residents of Dabbs Hill Lane to Ealing whilst leaving The Heights and other adjoining roads in Harrow. He advocated either retaining the existing boundary, or realigning the boundary along the railway line.

74. No objections were received to our draft proposal for a minor amendment in Eastcote Lane to rectify a section of defaced boundary.

75. In the light of the representations received, we gave further consideration to the perceived affinities of this area, and whether it looked more to Ealing or to Harrow. We noted that the response to our draft proposal suggested that Dabbs Hill Lane might have fewer links to Roxeth than did The Heights, and that it overlooks Northolt Park, which is located in Ealing. However, we observed that Northolt Park could be considered as a divide between Harrow and Ealing, and that we had received no
confirmation that the area had an affinity with Northolt. We also noted that, from the results of Harrow's survey and the individual responses we had received, the residents of Dabbs Hill Lane wished to remain in Harrow.

76. We have decided that it would both reflect the wishes of the people and be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to modify the western part of our draft proposal, by realigning the boundary along the northern edge of Dabbs Hill Lane. Such a realignment would create a well-defined boundary and leave Dabbs Hill Lane in Harrow.

77. With regard to Nos 1-3 The Heights, we agreed with Ealing that the Children's Home should remain in that Borough. We therefore decided to further modify our draft proposal by aligning the boundary to the western and northern curtilages of Nos 1-3 The Heights, and also to the western side of Northolt Road in the vicinity of Nos 2-4 The Heights in order to avoid isolating a grass verge.

78. We considered the suggestion from a member of the public to modify our draft proposal at the eastern end of The Heights, by transferring part of Northolt Road to Harrow. However, we concluded that such a modification would be unlikely to improve effective and convenient local government and we did not therefore adopt it.

79. Accordingly, subject to the modifications referred to above, we have decided to confirm our draft proposals for The Heights, Gaylor Road, Dabbs Hill Lane and Eastcote Lane as final.

(b) Halsbury Road East And Sudbury Hill

80. Harrow supported our draft proposal to transfer an area of vacant land north of Halsbury Road East to Ealing. In the absence of objections, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
CONCLUSION

81. We believe that our final proposals and decisions, as set out in paragraphs 53 to 80 above, are in the interests of effective and convenient local government and we commend them to you accordingly.

PUBLICATION

82. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Harrow, Hillingdon, and Ealing, the District Councils of Hertsmere and Three Rivers and the County Council of Hertfordshire, asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that we have fulfilled our statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than a period of six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposal letter of 23 October 1989, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed: G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

K J F ENNALS

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

PROFESSOR K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary

12 September 1991
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REVIEWS OF GREATER LONDON, THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON

HARROW LB

AFFECTING HERTSMERE DISTRICT IN THE COUNTY OF HERTFORDSHIRE AND THE LONDON BOROUGHS OF EALING AND HILLINGDON.

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing Boundary
Proposed Boundary
Other boundary divisions

Produced by Ordnance Survey for the
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
## CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NO.</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Harrow LB • • •</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County Harrow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hertsme District Bushey Heath ED</td>
<td>Harrow LB Hertsmere District Bushey Heath ED Heath South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Heath South Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County Harrow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrow LB Heath South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Northwood Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Northwood Hills Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Northwood Hills Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner West Ward</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Northwood Hills Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner West Ward</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Eastcote Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Eastcote Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Pinner West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Harrow LB Roxeth Ward</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Roxeth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Harrow LB Roxeth Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Roxeth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Harrow LB Roxeth Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Roxeth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Harrow LB Roxeth Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Roxeth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB Roxeth Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Roxeth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB Wood End Ward</td>
<td>Harrow LB Wood End Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map Numbers

- **Map No. 5**
  - A Harrow LB Rayners Lane Ward
  - Hillingdon LB Cavendish Ward

- **Map No. 6**
  - A Harrow LB Roxbourne Ward
  - Hillingdon LB Deansfield Ward

- **Map No. 7**
  - A Harrow LB Roxeth Ward
  - Ealing LB Roxeth Ward

- **Map No. 8**
  - A Harrow LB Harrow on the Hill Ward
  - Ealing LB Wood End Ward
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

Boundary between Harrow and Hertsmere

Magpie Hall Road, Bushey Heath  
Realignment to unite an area of land north-west of the A409, with Bushey Heath, in Hertsmere  
Paragraphs 55-57  
Map 1

Boundary between Harrow and Hillingdon

Potter Street Hill, Pinner  
Minor realignment to a fence on the east side of Potter Street Hill to remove a section of ill-defined boundary  
Paragraph 59  
Map 2

Abbey Close, Pinner  
Minor realignment to unite Abbey Close in Harrow  
Paragraph 60  
Map 3

Cuckoo Hill, Pinner West  
Realignment of the boundary to the eastern side of Cuckoo Hill  
Paragraph 61  
Map 3

West Towers and Rushdene Road, Pinner West  
Minor realignment to the rear garden fence line between Rushdene Road and West Towers  
Paragraph 62  
Map 4

Cannonbury Avenue, Pinner West  
Realignment to unite Cannonbury Avenue in Harrow  
Paragraph 63  
Map 4

Castleton Road and Seymour Gardens  
Realignment to unite Castleton Road and Seymour Gardens in Hillingdon  
Paragraphs 64-66  
Map 5

Malvern Avenue  
Minor realignment to the curtilages of properties in Malvern Avenue and Field End Road  
Paragraph 67  
Map 6

Field End Road  
Minor realignment of the boundary to the side of Field End Road  
Paragraph 68  
Map 6
**Boundary between Harrow and Ealing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Heights, Gaylor Road, Dabbs Hill Lane and Eastcote Lane</td>
<td>Realignment to rectify a stretch of defaced and ill-defined boundary in the vicinity of Dabbs Hill Lane, Wincanton Crescent Petts Hill and Eastcote Lane</td>
<td>69-79, Map 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsbury Road East and Sudbury Hill</td>
<td>Realignment to transfer an area of vacant land north of Halsbury Road East to Ealing</td>
<td>80, Map 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>