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INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the City of London’s boundaries with the City of Westminster and the London Boroughs of Camden, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Southwark and Tower Hamlets. In the main, we have proposed limited changes to improve already defaced boundaries which split existing developments so as to reflect more closely the pattern of development in the City. The only major proposal we are making is to transfer the whole of the Golden Lane Estate from Islington to the City. Our report explains how we arrived at our proposals.

2. 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.

3. Copies of our letter were sent to the adjoining London boroughs; 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 the Metropolitan Police and to those government departments, regional health authorities; and electricity, gas and water 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.

4. The London boroughs and the City Corporation 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.

5. 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 criteria laid down in the 1972 Act.

6. This report concerns the City of London's boundaries with the City of Westminster and the London Boroughs of Camden, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Southwark and Tower Hamlets.

7. One of our members, Professor K Young, declared an interest in the City of London's boundary with Tower Hamlets and, in accordance with our normal procedures, took no part in our consideration of that particular boundary.

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

8. As with our previous London borough reports, we have thought it appropriate to commence with some relevant general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of this and other London borough areas.

9. 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 given to us by the
Secretary of State (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

10. 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 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 in its Review.

WIDER LONDON ISSUES

11. Our review of the London boroughs and the City of London is the first such review to have been undertaken since the creation of the present London boroughs 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 considered in any more fundamental review of London in the future.

OUR REVIEW OF THE CITY OF LONDON: INTRODUCTION

12. When the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London (the Herbert Commission) came to look at the structure of local government in London it concluded that logic has its limits, and that the position of the City lies outside them. We too have felt it necessary during the course of this review to recognise the special importance of the City of London to London government. The historic and financial importance of the City, together with its international and ceremonial role accounts for its survival intact as a unit of local government even though it
is, at approximately 5,000 resident population, very considerably smaller than any London borough (the next smallest has a population of 135,296). The size of the City's resident population and its unique electoral arrangements suggest a different relationship between its electorate and its governing body - the City Corporation - than exists in the other London authorities. This is likely to give rise to practical differences because most of the services provided by the City Corporation are for a very large non-resident population and for the business community. As well as performing important functions in London's commercial core, the City Corporation is also responsible for several functions well beyond its area. One example is the ownership and management of open space; Hampstead Heath has recently been added to a land holding which includes Epping Forest and Wanstead Flats. Another is housing owned by the City Corporation. It also has some unexpected functions, such as the responsibility for the health and welfare of imported animals at Heathrow Airport.

13. In our review of the City of London, we have considered whether radical change would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. Two such possibilities have been presented to us. Firstly a suggestion from a member of the public for greatly enlarging the City and secondly a suggestion from the Association of London Authorities, and the London Boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets for the abolition of the City and its absorption into a neighbouring borough or boroughs. In addition we have considered the position of the City and other boroughs in the context of London's central area. The present pattern of boroughs bears little relation to the central area of London as defined, for example, for census purposes or in planning studies.

14. We have decided that we should not pursue any of these suggestions. We have no powers to propose the abolition of the City, which cannot therefore be considered in this review. Moreover, we doubt whether any radical solution affecting the City should be entertained without considering the benefits of a closer alignment of local government with the commercial heart of London. This would call for a fundamental review of all the inner London boroughs.
15. In this review particularly contentious issues have arisen where new or proposed developments straddle the existing boundary. Such developments are clearly associated with the commercial life of the City; but they also bring benefits to the adjoining boroughs. Accordingly, where major developments have taken place, or are in the process of construction, we have sought to take a view on where the interests of effective and convenient local government lie.

16. We received representations, principally from the City Corporation, that the entire boundary of the City should be left unchanged for reasons of history and tradition. We appreciate the historic importance of the City's boundaries. However, the present boundary is unsatisfactory in several places: it divides properties and cuts across the present building pattern. We have therefore proposed limited changes in the course of this review where we believe these to be in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

17. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the Corporation of London, the City of Westminster and from the London Boroughs of Camden, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Southwark and Tower Hamlets. Comments were also received from two interested organisations and from two members of the public, one of whom proposed the major change referred to in paragraph 13 above.

OUR DRAFT AND FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM

18. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published two further consultation letters in connection with this review of the City's boundaries with the adjoining London boroughs. The first, announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, was published on 5 March 1990. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. The City Corporation and the London Boroughs of Camden, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Southwark
and Tower Hamlets were asked to publish a notice advertising our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, they were requested to post copies of the 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 1 May 1990.

19. We received 22 representations in response to our draft proposals letter. They included six from the local authorities concerned, seven from members of the public making suggestions for boundary changes, two petitions (including a signed letter from the Aldermen of Cripplegate), and a letter from the Rt Hon Peter Brooke MP, enclosing a letter from a constituent. The remainder were from local residents and bodies, and from the City of London Police.

20. The City Corporation reiterated its view that it wished to see no change to the City's existing boundaries. However, if we were to confirm our draft proposals, the City Corporation stated that it would be prepared to accept them.

21. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposals, was issued on 17 May 1991, and received similar publicity. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Comments were invited by 12 July 1991.

22. In response to our further draft proposals letter, we received 30 representations. These included four from the local authorities concerned; the others were from business organisations, public bodies, residents' associations and members of the public.

23. The City Corporation reaffirmed its view that it had no desire for changes to its boundaries, but that it would be prepared to accept such changes as we might finally propose within the limits of our draft and further draft proposals. However, it suggested modifications to our further draft proposals for its boundaries with Islington, Hackney and Tower
Hamlets.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITIES OF LONDON AND WESTMINSTER

(a) Fleet Street and Chancery Lane (Map 1)

Draft Proposal

24. A member of the public suggested realigning the northern end of this boundary to reflect more closely the street pattern in the area. The City Corporation and the City of Westminster did not submit any proposals for change.

25. We considered that, as the present boundary divided buildings, it should be realigned along Fleet Street and Chancery Lane, and we decided to adopt a draft proposal to this effect.

Final Proposal

26. Our draft proposal was opposed by Westminster, on the grounds that a minimal number of residents were affected, and that the area was primarily used for business and commercial purposes. The Council expressed the view that, in the light of this, our draft proposal would not lead to more effective and convenient local government.

27. We considered that, given the scale of the anomalies along the City’s existing boundary with Westminster, the boundary was in clear need of realignment. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND CAMDEN

(b) Chancery Lane, Holborn and Charterhouse Street (Maps 1 & 2)

Draft Proposal

28. Camden suggested realigning the boundary along Cursitor Street, Furnival Street, Holborn and Charterhouse Street, on the grounds that such a change would lead to more effective service provision. This would transfer part of the City to Camden.

29. As mentioned in paragraph 16 above, the City Corporation had expressed the view that the present boundaries of the City should be retained. However, in response to Camden’s suggestion, it suggested that, if change were to be pursued, the boundary should be realigned along Chancery Lane, Holborn and Charterhouse Street. The City Corporation commented that this would provide a clearer boundary than that suggested by Camden. An identical suggestion was submitted by a local organisation.

30. We considered that, of the two suggested alignments for this boundary, the City Corporation’s was to be preferred, as it would unite the buildings divided by the present boundary, follow a larger break in the development, and would be consistent with our draft proposal for the City’s boundary with Westminster. We therefore decided to adopt the City Corporation’s suggestion as our draft proposal for this boundary.

Final Proposal

31. Camden supported that part of our draft proposal relating to Charterhouse Street and the north side of Holborn, but opposed the remainder, asking for further consideration of its original suggestion for a realignment along Furnival Street.

32. The Council commented that it saw no good reason for a realignment along Chancery Lane and High Holborn, particularly as only 14 electors would be affected and, with the introduction of the uniform business rate, there would be no financial
advantage to the City. It also drew our attention to the historic ties between the Borough and Holborn Bar.

33. We considered Camden's suggestion for a realignment along Furnival Street, but concluded that Chancery Lane still appeared to provide the clearest and most significant break in development in this area and that our draft proposal would provide a clearer boundary. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND ISLINGTON

34. We received no suggestions from either authority for changes to this boundary. However, a member of the public suggested a realignment which would reflect the existing street pattern, and bring a united Barbican complex and the Golden Lane Estate into the City. We noted that there were a number of anomalies along this boundary, and that some realignment would be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

(c) Charterhouse Street, Charterhouse Square and Carthusian Street (Map 2)

Draft Proposal

35. We noted that the present boundary runs arbitrarily across streets, bisects buildings, and is difficult to identify at ground level. We considered that these anomalies could be rectified at the western end of the boundary by a realignment along Charterhouse Street, Charterhouse Square and Carthusian Street. We therefore decided to adopt such a realignment as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

36. Islington agreed to accept our draft proposal and the Charterhouse Square Residents' Association supported it. However, the Association suggested a modification, to realign the boundary along the north side of Charterhouse Square and eastwards through Glasshouse Yard to Aldersgate Street, thereby transferring the Square to the City.
37. In support of its suggestion, the Association commented that Charterhouse Street suffers from severe traffic congestion, which is not helped by the split in traffic management responsibilities between the City Corporation and Islington. The Association also felt that there could be economies in service provision if the whole of Charterhouse Square were served by one authority. It commented that many residents of the Square have links with, or work in, or are retired from, the City.

38. We noted that Charterhouse Street is a busy thoroughfare, but considered that its traffic problems appeared to be no worse than those experienced in many other parts of the City. Nor did we feel that transferring Charterhouse Square to the City would be likely to result in economies in service provision. Accordingly, we decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

39. However, in response to our further draft proposals letter proposing changes for a different stretch of the same boundary, the Charterhouse Square Residents’ Association reiterated its suggestion that Charterhouse Square should be transferred to the City, on the grounds that the current division of Carthusian Street between two authorities exacerbated the mounting traffic problems in the area. The Association commented that, with increasing office development in Aldersgate Street and the proposed "CrossRail" Station planned for the south-west corner of the Square, the need for Carthusian Street to be united in one authority was imperative.

40. Furthermore, the Association considered that our further draft proposal to unite the Golden Lane Estate in the City (discussed in paragraphs 43-49 below) reinforced its case, and suggested that the boundary should be moved even further north of Charterhouse Square. The Association therefore suggested a realignment along the Clerkenwell Road, to transfer not only Charterhouse Square to the City but also an area which includes St Bartholomew’s Medical College and Nurses’ Home, and the Charterhouse. It expressed the view that the residents of this area have strong ties, and social and cultural links, with the City, and none with Islington.
41. We had previously considered the Charterhouse Square Association's suggestion, and had concluded that there was insufficient justification to warrant its adoption. In considering its further representation we acknowledged that the "CrossRail" station may be sited in the area, but noted that this had yet to be confirmed. We also considered that, in the event of the station being built, ground features in the area might be altered and any realignment could soon become defaced. Accordingly, as neither of the local authorities had suggested that unifying Charterhouse Square would be desirable for traffic or planning reasons, we decided that it would be premature to take the proposed development into account.

42. The Association had suggested that the residents of a wide area round Charterhouse Square have strong affinities with the City. However, we had received no representations in support of this. Accordingly, we still hold to the view that the defaced and arbitrary boundary in this area should be clarified by a realignment along Charterhouse Street, the south side of Charterhouse Square and Carthusian Street. We have therefore reaffirmed our decision to confirm our draft proposal as final

(d) Barbican and Golden Lane Estate (Maps 3 & 4)

Draft Proposal

43. We considered the area to the east of Charterhouse Square and took the view that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the entire Barbican complex to be united in the City. However, we were not convinced of the merits of transferring the Golden Lane Estate from Islington, notwithstanding that it is owned by the City Corporation and occupied by its tenants. We therefore decided to adopt as a draft proposal a realignment which followed clearly identifiable features and which would unite the Barbican complex in the City and the Golden Lane Estate in Islington.
Further Draft Proposal

44. Our draft proposal to unite the Barbican complex in the City was supported by a number of Barbican residents. However, our draft proposal to unite the whole of the Golden Lane Estate in Islington was opposed by the Golden Lane Tenants' Association and a number of other respondents, including residents of Cuthbert Harrowing House and the Aldermen of Cripplegate.

45. Residents of the Golden Lane Estate emphasised their close links with the City, commenting that they looked to the City, rather than to Islington, for their social and leisure activities, as well as for churches, hospitals and libraries. The Golden Lane Tenants' Association suggested that these close affinities could be reflected by realigning the boundary in this area along Goswell Road, Baltic Street and Golden Lane, thereby transferring the Golden Lane Estate to the City.

46. We decided to confirm our draft proposal to unite the Barbican complex in the City as final. However, we acknowledged the strong affinities with the City expressed by the residents of the Golden Lane Estate, and that the estate is owned and managed by the City Corporation. We were persuaded by the representations received and therefore decided to adopt as a further draft proposal the suggestion submitted by the Golden Lane Tenants' Association, subject to leaving within Islington the College of Fashion and Clothing Technology and the Richard Cloudesley School.

Final Proposal

47. Our further draft proposal to unite the Golden Lane Estate in the City was supported by the Golden Lane Tenants' Association. However, it was opposed by Islington, on the grounds that the transfer of the estate to the City would provide no real benefit to residents and would cause considerable disruption. The City Corporation accepted our further draft proposal, subject to the inclusion in the area to be transferred of garages and workshops in the north east corner of the estate.
48. We considered Islington’s opposition to the transfer of the Golden Lane Estate to the City but, for the reasons given above, reaffirmed our view that a transfer would be the right course to take.

49. We considered the City Corporation’s request that garages and workshops in the northern part of the estate should also be transferred. However, while these ancillary buildings are owned and maintained by the City Corporation, it seems unlikely that the workshops in particular are used solely by the residents of the estate. We therefore felt that only minimal benefit would be gained, in terms of effective and convenient local government, by their transfer to the City. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

(e) Chiswell Street, Ropemaker Street, South Place, including the Whitbread Brewery Site (Maps 4 & 5)

Draft Proposal

50. Further to the east, the present boundary is unsatisfactory in that it divides buildings and sites, and is difficult to identify on the ground. We therefore decided to adopt as a draft proposal a realignment along Chiswell Street, south along Moor Lane, following the curtilages of properties as far as Ropemaker Street, and then along the north side of Ropemaker Street and South Place as far as Wilson Street. Our draft proposal would also have the effect of uniting the Whitbread Brewery site, which is currently split between the City and Islington, in the City.

Final Proposal

51. Our draft proposal was supported by agents acting on behalf of Whitbread & Co. However, it was opposed by Islington, on the grounds of the brewery site’s historic links with the former borough of Finsbury, now part of its authority. As an alternative, Islington suggested realigning the boundary along Whitecross Street South, Silk Street and Milton Street.
52. We considered Islington's suggested realignment but concluded that our draft proposal would provide the better boundary in this area. We therefore decided to confirm it as final.

(f) Area north of Chiswell Street

53. In response to our further draft proposals letter, we received a suggestion from a member of the public to transfer an additional, substantial area to the City, north of Chiswell Street and adjacent to the Golden Lane Estate, by a realignment along Central Street, Lever Street and Bath Street. It was submitted on the grounds that the residents of this area look to the City as much as do the residents of the Golden Lane Estate.

54. We noted that the respondent had provided no evidence for his assertion that residents of the area look primarily to the City for their social and leisure facilities, and that no other representations had been received in support of this view. We have therefore decided to make no proposals along the lines suggested to us.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CAMDEN AND ISLINGTON

Farringdon Road (Map 2)

Draft Proposal

55. Our draft proposals for Charterhouse Street would resolve a number of anomalies along the City's boundaries with Camden and Islington. However, we observed that they did not address a problem on the Camden/Islington boundary, where the boundary divides properties on the corner of Farringdon Road and Charterhouse Street. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a centre of road alignment from Charterhouse Street north along Farringdon Road, to meet the existing Camden/Islington boundary.
Final Proposal

56. We received no comments on our draft proposal and have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND HACKNEY

Broadgate (Maps 5 & 6)

Draft Proposal

57. As mentioned in paragraph 13 above, Hackney, amongst others, had proposed that the City be abolished. Otherwise, it had submitted no specific suggestions for this boundary. However, a member of the public suggested realigning the boundary to reflect the pattern of development in the Broadgate area, on the grounds that this would be in the interests of administrative efficiency.

58. The present boundary is defaced and does not follow well-defined features at ground level. In particular, it splits the Broadgate development, which we felt should be united in one authority in order to simplify planning procedures and facilitate service provision. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment following Wilson Street, Sun Street, Appold Street and Worship Street, to unite the Broadgate development in the City.

Further Draft Proposal

59. Our draft proposal to unite the Broadgate development within the City was opposed by Hackney, on the grounds that the extent of the area to be transferred was excessive and was more than the minimum necessary to resolve existing boundary anomalies.

60. Hackney also expressed the view that uniting the Broadgate development in the City would jeopardise training initiatives and planning agreements, intended to benefit Hackney residents, which its Council was in the process of negotiating with the site’s
developers. As an alternative to our draft proposal, Hackney suggested realigning the boundary along Eldon Street and Liverpool Street, turning northwards to follow the building curtilages of the Broadgate development to Primrose Street, thereby leaving Phases 12 and 13 of the development in its area.

61. We accepted Hackney's argument in support of its proposed alignment, namely that uniting the site in the City could prejudice planning agreements currently being negotiated in respect of Phases 12 and 13 of the Broadgate development. We therefore decided to adopt as a further draft proposal Hackney's suggestion to unite in its Borough the area covered by Phases 12 and 13 of the development.

Final Proposal

62. Our further draft proposal to unite the Broadgate development in Hackney was opposed by the City Corporation, the site's developers and by a number of business occupiers, on the grounds that the proposed realignment would divide Exchange House, the basement concourse, and compromise the integrity of the development. In addition, it was asserted that Broadgate's community of interest lay with Liverpool Street Station and the City, rather than with Hackney.

63. From the information received in response to our further draft proposal, it was apparent to us that the realignment we had adopted was defaced in that it divided the basement concourse area which forms an integral part of the Broadgate development. We considered that this was unsatisfactory and decided to withdraw our further draft proposal for this area, and to consider alternative realignments.

64. We recognised that Hackney was concerned that Phases 12 and 13 of the development should be retained in its area, partly in view of the benefits to be derived from the package of training initiatives and planning agreements it was in the process of negotiating with the developer. However, we felt it was undesirable to perpetuate the split of the development, bearing in mind that Broadgate is being developed in conjunction with the
Liverpool Street Station redevelopment. We considered that it was not possible to identify any alternative alignment that would retain Phases 12 and 13 in Hackney, unless a larger area, including the station, was also transferred to the Borough. We concluded that such major change could not be justified in terms of effective and convenient local government.

65. Accordingly, having regard to the assurances we have received from the Broadgate's developers that they are content to be bound by the terms of any agreements negotiated with Hackney, we have decided to revert to our original draft proposal, to realign the boundary along Wilson Street, Sun Street, Appold Street and Worship Street, thereby uniting the Broadgate development in the City, and to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND TOWER HAMLETS

66. The City Corporation proposed, at the outset, that the present boundary should remain unchanged. However, in responding to Tower Hamlets' suggestions for this section of boundary, it submitted several alternative realignments.

(a) Bishopsgate (Map 6)

Draft Proposal

67. Tower Hamlets suggested uniting the Bishopsgate area in its authority by realigning the boundary along Bishopsgate and Middlesex Street. However, the City Corporation suggested uniting Bishopsgate in the City, by realigning the boundary along Spital Square, Steward Street and Parliament Court, on the grounds of the area's historic links with the City.

68. We considered that the City Corporation's suggestion was preferable: it would unite the Bishopsgate area in the City, with which it has an historic and geographic affinity. We therefore decided to adopt the City Corporation's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a side of road alignment.
Further Draft Proposal

69. Our draft proposal was opposed by Tower Hamlets, on the grounds that it would divide the Spitalfield Market development area. Tower Hamlets commented that, as a result of the planned redevelopment of the area, Steward Street would cease to be a public highway and might disappear altogether. As an alternative, the Council suggested a realignment to follow Bishopsgate and Middlesex Street, uniting the development site in its area.

70. We noted that, under the development proposals for the Spitalfields site, there was a possibility that our draft proposal would very soon become defaced, and agreed that this would be undesirable. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal and, as the major part of the site is located in Tower Hamlets, to consider that Council's suggested realignment. However, this would involve the transfer of a large area of the City, including the Bishopsgate Institute and Library, for which no justification had been made. We therefore decided to adopt as a further draft proposal Tower Hamlets' suggestion for a realignment along Bishopsgate, but then to follow Brushfield Street and Fort Street, to rejoin the existing boundary at Artillery Lane. This would unite Spitalfields Market site in Tower Hamlets.

Final Proposal

71. Our further draft proposal was opposed by the City Corporation and by four companies, one of which was acting as agent for the Market site's developers, the Spitalfields Development Group. While generally supportive of our further draft proposal, Tower Hamlets resubmitted its suggestion that Artillery Lane and Middlesex Street should also be united within its area, in order to rationalise the cleansing and maintenance arrangements for these roads.

72. The City Corporation objected to our further draft proposal on the grounds that it ignored the City Corporation's ownership of Spitalfields Market; it suggested that we should revert to our
original draft proposal for the area. The City Corporation also expressed the view that a satisfactory boundary might best be identified when the layout of the new development became known; it therefore suggested deferring any boundary changes until then.

73. We considered the objections to our further draft proposal submitted on behalf of the Spitalfields Development Group, and from three other Bishopsgate companies, all of which had suggested uniting the site in the City; it was asserted that, for financial and prestige reasons, this was 'essential'. However, we noted that the City Corporation itself had not suggested such an expansion of its area.

74. We had formulated our further draft proposal in response to evidence that the realignment we had originally proposed would be defaced by forthcoming development; our view remained that it would not be desirable for any new boundary to split the development site. We therefore did not accept the City Corporation's suggestion that we should revert to our original draft proposal. We also took the view that the boundary anomalies in this area were such that their correction should not be deferred.

75. We considered that there was insufficient evidence to suggest that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the Spitalfields Market site in the City, and reaffirmed our view that land ownership was, in itself, insufficient reason to justify such a transfer. The existing boundary is ill-defined and requires realignment and the major part of the site lies within Tower Hamlets. On the other hand, the existing boundary to the south is clearly defined. We took the view therefore that Tower Hamlets' additional suggestion, to unite Artillery Lane and Middlesex Street in its area, was unnecessary. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our further draft proposal to realign the boundary along Bishopsgate, Brushfield Street and Fort Street to rejoin the existing boundary at Artillery Lane, thereby uniting Spitalfields Market site in Tower Hamlets.
Draft Proposal

76. Tower Hamlets submitted a series of minor suggestions for this stretch of boundary, intended to tie it to firm ground detail and to unite split properties. However, these were opposed by the City Corporation, which suggested that the boundary should be realigned along Mansell Street.

77. We considered that while Tower Hamlets' suggestions would resolve the problem of divided properties, they would not remove an unnecessarily complicated boundary in this area. By contrast, Mansell Street would provide the basis of a clearer and more enduring boundary. We therefore decided to adopt the City Corporation's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

78. Our draft proposal was opposed by Tower Hamlets which resubmitted its original suggestions. As we had already concluded that these suggestions would result in a complicated boundary, and as no further arguments had been made in support of them, we decided to confirm as final our draft proposal to realign the boundary along Mansell Street.

79. Tower Hamlets also suggested further realignments, on the grounds that our draft proposal for Mansell Street was defaced by new development; that the resulting enlargement of the City in this area was not justified; and that local residents had expressed a wish to stay within Tower Hamlets.

80. We established that our proposed boundary had not been defaced by redevelopment, and noted that we had received no representations from residents or businesses in the area to the effect that they wished to remain in Tower Hamlets. We also noted that the alternative realignments suggested by the Council would not provide as clearly defined a boundary as that offered by our draft proposal. We have therefore reaffirmed our decision to confirm it as final.
Draft Proposal

81. Tower Hamlets made a series of minor suggestions for realignments to the boundary in the vicinity of the Tower of London and Tower Bridge. These were opposed by the City Corporation, which proposed a realignment to follow Tower Bridge Approach Road, and the bridge itself, to its boundary with Southwark, which follows the mid course of the River Thames. The effect of the City Corporation’s suggestions would be to transfer the Tower, its immediate environs, and the northern half of Tower Bridge, from Tower Hamlets to the City. The City Corporation expressed the view that such a realignment would reflect its historic links with the City; it would also lead to more efficient car parking provision.

82. The present boundary is unsatisfactory, divides properties and in stretches is defaced. We took the view that Tower Hamlets’ suggestions would resolve most of these anomalies, but considered that they would still result in a complicated boundary. Similarly, while we felt that there was some merit in the City Corporation’s case for bringing the Tower and part of Tower Bridge within the City, we considered the case was insufficient to warrant breaking the current and historic links between Tower Hamlets and the Tower. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment, consistent with our draft proposal for Mansell Street, which would rectify the current boundary anomalies, whilst retaining the Tower and Tower Hill within Tower Hamlets.

Further Draft Proposal

83. Our draft proposal was opposed by Tower Hamlets, which resubmitted its original suggestions for this area.

84. We had previously accepted that the Tower of London’s historic associations were with Tower Hamlets, rather than with the City. However, we noted that a consequence of our draft proposal would be to separate the Tower and Trinity Gardens from
surrounding approach roads and from Tower Hill Station. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal and to adopt, as a further draft proposal, Tower Hamlets' original suggestions for this area, subject to a modification to realign the boundary from the eastern end of Shorter Street to the boundary with Southwark in the Tower Pier area, leaving Tower Hill Station within Tower Hamlets, and uniting the Tower Pier area in that Borough.

Final Proposal

85. Our further draft proposal was supported by Tower Hamlets and by one member of the public. However, it was opposed by the City Corporation, on the grounds that the open space south of Byward Street is one of the few in this area available to City workers, and that the vaults beneath it were being developed by the City Corporation as a tourist attraction.

86. We noted the City Corporation's objections. However, we considered that the area of open land was not used exclusively by City employees, and noted that the tourist attraction referred to is primarily a private commercial enterprise, albeit in association with the Museum of London. We remain of the view that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the Tower and its approach roads to be united within one authority. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND SOUTHWARK

87. The existing boundary follows the centre of the River Thames, except where it diverts round the south of Blackfriars Bridge. We noted that the City Corporation manages the Blackfriars, Southwark and London Bridges, and that the existing arrangements were said not to cause any problems. Neither the City Corporation nor the London Borough of Southwark made proposals for changes to this boundary. We therefore took an interim decision to propose no change to this boundary.
88. We received one representation in respect of our interim decision, from the Commissioner of Police for the City of London.

89. The Commissioner expressed the view that, as London Bridge and Southwark Bridge are owned and maintained by the City Corporation, the boundary should be extended to their southern ends, as was the case at Blackfriars Bridge. However, in the absence of any operational justification for the change, we decided not to pursue the suggestion. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision to make no proposals as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE CITY OF LONDON AND LAMBETH

90. The City and Lambeth have a short length of common boundary which is aligned along the centre of the River Thames. No submissions were received concerning this boundary; we therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals to change it.

91. We received no representations in respect of our interim decision, and have decided to confirm it as final.

CENTRE OF ROAD ALIGNMENTS ALONG THE CITY OF LONDON’S BOUNDARIES

92. In response to requests from the City Corporation and Islington, we have considered whether our final proposals for the former’s boundaries should follow centre of road, rather than side of road, alignments. In our draft and further draft proposals, we adopted side of road alignments. However, after consideration, we have taken the view that, in the City, where many buildings overhang pavements and roads, the interests of effective and convenient local government would be better served by adopting centre of road alignments. We have therefore adopted centre of road alignments throughout our proposals for the City’s boundaries.
ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

93. Our final proposals have some limited electoral consequences for the local authorities affected by this review. The details of our proposals for changes in electoral arrangements are described in Annex B to this report.

CONCLUSIONS

94. We believe that our final proposals, which are summarised in Annex A to this report, are in the interests of effective and convenient local government and we commend them to you accordingly.

PUBLICATION

95. A separate letter is being sent to the City Corporation, and the London Boroughs of Camden, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Southwark and Tower Hamlets, 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 six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, together with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposals letter and further draft proposals letter of 5 March 1990 and 17 May 1991 respectively, and to those who made representations to us.
Signed:  

K F J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
2 April 1992
LIST OF THE COMMISSION’S FINAL PROPOSALS

Boundary between the Cities of London and Westminster - realignment along Fleet Street and Chancery Lane

Boundary between the City and Camden - realignment along Chancery Lane, Holborn and Charterhouse Street.

Boundary between the City and Islington - realignment of the western end of the boundary along Charterhouse Street, Charterhouse Square and Carthusian Street

- unification of the whole of the Barbican complex and the Golden Lane estate in the City by realigning the boundary along Goswell Street, Baltic Street and Golden Lane

- realignment along Chiswell Street, Ropemaker Street and South Place to unite the Whitbread Brewery site in the City

Boundary between Camden and Islington - realignment of a short stretch of the boundary along Farringdon Road and Charterhouse Street

Boundary between the City and Hackney - realignment to unite the Broadgate development in the City by aligning the boundary along Wilson Street, Sun Street, Appold Street and Worship Street.

Boundary between the City and Tower Hamlets - realignment southwards along Bishopsgate subject to a modification to follow Brushfield Street and Fort Street to rejoin the existing boundary at Artillery Lane.

- realignment southwards along Mansell Street to its junction with Shorter Street

- realignment from the eastern end of Shorter Street to the boundary with Southwark in the Tower Pier area, leaving Tower Hill station within Tower Hamlets and unifying the Tower Pier within that borough
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

THE CITY OF LONDON

AFFECTING THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER, CAMDEN LB, ISLINGTON LB, HACKNEY LB AND TOWER HAMLETS LB

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing Boundary
Proposed Boundary
Other boundary divisions

Produced by Ordnance Survey for the Local Government Boundary Commission for England
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
<td>St James's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St James's Ward</td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Camden LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn Ward</td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Camden LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
<td>Holborn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Camden LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn Ward</td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Camden LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
<td>Holborn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Camden LB</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn Ward</td>
<td>Clerkenwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
<td>Clerkenwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerkenwell Ward</td>
<td>Farrington West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerkenwell Ward</td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerkenwell Ward</td>
<td>Farrington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunhill Ward</td>
<td>Cripplegate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunhill Ward</td>
<td>Cripplegate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman Street Ward</td>
<td>Bunhill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hackney LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moorfields Ward</td>
<td>Bishopsgate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hackney LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moorfields Ward</td>
<td>Bishopsgate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bishopsgate Ward</td>
<td>Spitalfields Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spitalfields Ward</td>
<td>Bishopsgate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Area Ref.</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portsoken Ward</td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
<td>Portsoken Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
<td>Portsoken Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portsoken Ward</td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
<td>Aldgate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
<td>Tower Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
<td>Tower Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tower Ward</td>
<td>St Katherine’s Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>