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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 the Metropolitan Police and to those government departments, regional health authorities, 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 Lambeth's boundary with Southwark, with the exception of that part of the boundary in the vicinity of Crystal Palace. The boundaries of Lambeth, Croydon, Bromley and Southwark all meet in the Crystal Palace area. Given this unusual pattern, we have given separate consideration to the area and will be reporting our conclusions at a later date.

6. Lambeth's boundaries with Westminster and Croydon will be considered as part of the review of those London Boroughs. Lambeth's boundaries with Wandsworth and Merton will be considered as part of our review of the London Borough of Wandsworth.

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

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

8. 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).

9. 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 as part of its Review.

Wider London Issues

10. When we commenced our review in 1987, we received a number of suggestions advocating radical change to certain London boroughs and to the City of London, including, in some cases, their abolition. Some of these suggestions have engendered considerable publicity and support from residents of the areas concerned, many of whom wrote to us, or signed or submitted petitions.

11. The reasons given for proposing radical change have been varied. Some respondents felt that the authorities in question were either too large to represent the essentially local communities within their areas, or that they encompassed communities of unlike socio-economic complexion which had little or no community of interest, or both. Others felt that their particular communities had little or no affinity with their local authority, and a number suggested that they had been disadvantaged in terms of service provision by the focusing of local authority resources towards the more stressed areas of their boroughs.

12. With only a few exceptions, a common feature of the suggestions for radical change was, perhaps inevitably, that the respondents sought either a return to the pre-1965 pattern of boundaries in their areas, or different amalgamations of the former authorities from those brought about by the London Government Act 1963.
13. We do not doubt the strength and sincerity of the feelings expressed by those who have written to us seeking radical change, and we consider each case on its merits, having regard to the guidelines within which we work. The campaigns for major change, such as have been suggested by the Dulwich Conservative Association in the context of this review of Lambeth's boundary with Southwark, make us aware of the strength of feeling towards the local authorities in certain parts of London. However, we need to consider the extent to which the underlying reasons for proposals for radical change are a consequence of the size, shape or boundaries of a borough, rather than the result of the particular policies and priorities of its present council. We hold the view that it is not our function to make changes to local authority boundaries for the purposes of influencing levels of services in any area. That is the responsibility of the council to its electorate.

14. Our guidelines request us to consider the community of interest in an area. We are aware of the feelings of separation and alienation which sometimes exist between parts of the same borough. Together with the wishes of the people, as expressed to us, such feelings may illuminate the extent to which people view their local authority as a single unit to which they can identify. However, in the context of a local government pattern consisting of authorities of substantial size, it is impossible (even if it were desirable) for any authority to conform to a particular homogenous grouping of residents. In practice, all local authorities, irrespective of size, contain a degree of social diversity, and contain minority groups. Since the former authorities were therefore often the product of the amalgamation of areas with different characteristics, the pattern of authorities created in 1965 inevitably shows considerable socio-economic diversity within most of them.

15. We regard it as impossible within the remit of the current review to consider in detail the socio-economic characteristics of areas within the present boroughs. We are aware of the claims
that revenue raised in one part of a borough is spent in other parts, or that councillors favour a particular area of a borough at the expense of others. We consider that it would be very difficult to prove or disprove these assertions, especially as the exercise would need to extend over several years to be meaningful. In any event, the determination of spending priorities is entirely a policy matter for each local authority within the overall statutory framework and financial constraints set by Parliament. It is not for us to seek to influence such questions through the alteration of boundaries.

16. We are also aware that the splitting of an authority into its component parts (assuming that they can be shown to exist), and the accompanying boundary changes, would often have considerable implications for what might remain of the authority, and for its neighbouring boroughs. We therefore consider that it is right for us to rely on our guidelines from the Secretary of State, which indicate that "...the abolition or creation of a principal area would be appropriate only where the Commission consider that present arrangements clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government....". This is clearly a very stringent test and, no doubt, is intended to be. It is also applicable to the indirect effects of radical change, which may result in an authority becoming unviable, with consequential effects on the structure and pattern of neighbouring authorities.

17. 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. However, 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 SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

18. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 we received representations from the London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark, and from various interested organisations and residents.

LAMBETH'S BOUNDARY WITH SOUTHWARK

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES AND OUR INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

Interim decisions to propose no radical changes

(a) New borough

19. The Dulwich Conservative Association suggested the creation of a new borough, comprising the southern halves of Southwark and Lambeth, and two wards of Lewisham. It also suggested the creation of an urban development corporation, comprising the northern halves of Lambeth and Southwark.

20. The Association expressed the view that effective and convenient local government had broken down in Southwark and Lambeth because existing boundaries had proved to be inappropriate. It commented that the southern parts of Lambeth and Southwark have more in common with each other in terms of community of interest than with the northern parts of both boroughs. The Association believed that local services would be improved if a new borough were to be created from the southern parts of Lambeth and Southwark, and part of Lewisham.

21. We gave careful consideration to the Dulwich Conservative Association's suggestion. While acknowledging that there may be scope for improvements to the delivery of local government services within Lambeth and Southwark (or, indeed, within many other local authorities), we found no evidence to suggest that the shortcomings in service provision perceived by the Association were a consequence of the size, shape or boundaries of the two
22. Accordingly, in the absence of evidence to suggest that the socio-economic structure and geography of Lambeth and Southwark hindered effective and convenient local government in South London, or that the present arrangements in those boroughs clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government, we took an interim decision to make no proposals.

23. We have no powers to propose the creation of an urban development corporation and were therefore unable to consider that part of the Association's suggestion.

(b) Westminster Bridge Road

24. The Vauxhall Conservative Association and the Lambeth Co-ordinating Committee suggested realigning the boundary along Westminster Bridge Road, thereby transferring Waterloo and County Hall to Southwark. It claimed that the present boundary follows a tortuous course, which now has only historical justification. It believed that the boundary divides the community which focuses on Waterloo, and that there would be obvious administrative and planning advantages in having a single authority (Southwark) responsible for the whole of the South Bank from County Hall downstream, including the environs of two main railway termini, Waterloo and London Bridge and the (then) proposed Channel Tunnel terminus.

25. We noted that the area was subject to major redevelopment proposals and that both Lambeth and Southwark contained part of the Central Area of London, as defined for statistical purposes, south of the Thames. At an early stage in our Review, we had considered whether radical proposals should be made to boundaries in inner London. However, we decided that the present review was not the appropriate occasion to pursue radical change. Nevertheless, in considering the suggestion for the Waterloo area on its merits, we were of the view that it had not been shown how
this area's transfer would be likely to improve effective and convenient local government in the area. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals.

Draft proposals

(a) London Nautical School and Hatfield Gardens

26. Lambeth suggested realigning the boundary from the centre of the River Thames to Old Bargehouse Stairs, and along Old Bargehouse Alley to meet the existing boundary at Upper Ground. It then suggested following the existing boundary to Stamford Street, a realignment east along Stamford Street, south along Hatfields, west along the southern side of the Nautical School and then south along the edge of Hatfield Gardens to meet the existing boundary. Southwark suggested realigning the boundary from the centre of the river to the east side of Gabriels Wharf, south along Duchy Street, then east along the south side of the London Nautical School and south along the west side of Hatfield Gardens.

27. We noted that the present boundary cuts through playgrounds in Hatfields and through the London Nautical School and takes no account of recent development in the area. We considered that a riverside park and the playgrounds west of Hatfields looked more to the residential areas in Lambeth than to Southwark. We therefore decided to adopt Lambeth's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a centre of road alignment down Broadwall, and extending Lambeth's suggestion for Hatfields southwards, to meet the existing boundary.

(b) Chaplin Close

28. Neither Lambeth nor Southwark submitted suggestions for this area. However, Ms Kate Hoey MP, a local councillor, Bishops Ward Labour Party and a member of the public, all suggested uniting the Chaplin Close Sheltered Housing Scheme in a single authority.
29. We noted that the present boundary cuts through the Sheltered Housing Scheme, which is owned and serviced by Lambeth, and agreed with the desirability of uniting it in that authority.

30. We considered that a satisfactory boundary could be provided by following the eastern curtilage of the scheme, to rejoin the existing boundary north of Quentin House. We therefore decided to adopt this realignment as our draft proposal.

(c) Dante Road

31. Lambeth suggested realigning the boundary along the southern curtilages of Holyoak Road, then to the west of properties in Holyoak Road, to meet the existing boundary at Brook Drive. Southwark submitted an identical suggestion for this area.

32. We noted that the existing boundary cuts through a semi-derelict area, partly occupied by prefabricated houses and wholly owned by Southwark. We agreed that the area should be united in Southwark, and decided to adopt Lambeth's and Southwark's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a modification to realign the boundary to the western and northern curtilage of No 128 Newington Butts.

(d) Aspen House School and Brandon Estate

33. We received a number of suggestions for boundary realignments in this area. Both Lambeth and Southwark agreed that Aspen House School should be united in Lambeth and that the Brandon Estate be united in Southwark. The Metropolitan Police suggested that the Estate be united in a single authority.

34. Lambeth suggested realigning the boundary along Kennington Park Gardens and Otto Street to unite Aspen House School in its area. It also suggested realigning the boundary along the eastern side of Kennington Park, Hillingdon Street, Bolton Crescent and Camberwell New Road to meet the existing boundary. Southwark
agreed with Lambeth's suggestion in the vicinity of Aspen House School. However, it suggested that the Brandon Estate be united in its area by a realignment following the northern side of John Ruskin Street, the curtilage of Hanworth House and then Camberwell New Road to the existing boundary.

35. The Vauxhall Conservative Association suggested that Kennington Park be transferred to Southwark, and that Aspen House School and the Brandon Estate be united in that Authority, by realigning the boundary along Camberwell New Road and Kennington Park Road. The Lambeth Co-ordinating Committee submitted a similar suggestion, but proposed the transfer of a smaller area of the park to Southwark, by realigning the boundary along Camberwell New Road, Bolton Crescent and St Agnes Place.

36. We noted that the present boundary splits Aspen House School and the Brandon Estate, and that Southwark administers the estate. In the interests of effective and convenient local government, we agreed that Aspen House School should be united in Lambeth and the Brandon Estate in Southwark. However, we considered that Southwark's suggestion for the Brandon Estate would result in the boundary being drawn tightly round the curtilage of Hanworth House, cutting off adjoining open space and play areas from the residents of the building. We accordingly decided to adopt Lambeth's suggestion for Aspen House School and the Brandon Estate as our draft proposal.

Interim decision to make no proposals

(e) Flodden Road/Denmark Road/Coldharbour Lane

37. Lambeth suggested realigning the boundary along Camberwell New Road and Denmark Hill on the grounds of creating a more natural neighbourhood boundary.

38. We noted that the present boundary is not defaced at any point and felt that Lambeth's suggestion would not result in any
improvement in effective and convenient local government. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals.

(f) Denmark Hill  
(g) Herne Hill  
(h) Croxted Hill

39. Lambeth suggested minor highway boundary realignments in these areas. However, we considered that they would not result in any benefits in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals in these areas.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

40. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 30 April 1991. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. We arranged for a notice to be published announcing our proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark 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 25 June 1991.

RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

41. We received a total of five responses to our draft proposals letter. They included comments from the London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark, and from three interested organisations. The Metropolitan Police stated that it had no comments to make on our draft proposals. No comments were received from individual members of the public.
OUR FINAL PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

Decisions to propose no radical changes

(a) New borough

42. Our interim decision to propose no radical changes to Lambeth's boundary with Southwark was opposed by the Dulwich Conservative Association. The Association considered that a thorough and fundamental review of the boundary insofar as it related to the area covered by the Dulwich constituency was appropriate. It reiterated its previous view that the social needs and interests of the residents of Dulwich were more consistent with those of the residents of Streatham and West Norwood than with the residents of Peckham and Bermondsey. The Association accepted that it was outside our remit to propose the creation of an Urban Development Corporation, but suggested that we should still relay this request to the Secretary of State.

43. For the reasons given in paragraphs 15, 21 and 22 above, we considered that it would be inappropriate to propose major change to the structure of local government in London in the context of this review, and that the Dulwich Conservative Association's suggestion could only reasonably be considered as part of a wider review of the pattern of London Boroughs. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

(b) Westminster Bridge Road

44. No comments were received concerning our interim decision to make no proposals in respect of the Waterloo area. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.
Final Proposals

(a) London Nautical School and Hatfield Gardens

45. Both Lambeth and Southwark supported our draft proposal to unite the London Nautical School and a riverside park in Lambeth.

46. The Department of Education and Science informed us that, under the Education (Inner London Education Authority) Schools Designation Order 1989, Southwark had been designated as the successor authority to the Inner London Education Authority in respect of the London Nautical School, which is grant maintained, and that there were no powers to transfer this function from one borough to another. However, the Department did not foresee any funding problems arising from a boundary change; the school draws its pupils and recoups its costs from other boroughs across a wide area of London.

47. In the absence of opposition, and given the fact that the funding of the London Nautical School would not be affected by our draft proposal, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(b) Chaplin Close

48. Lambeth supported our draft proposal to unite the Chaplin Close Sheltered Housing Scheme in its area. The Council pointed out that it had built and owns the scheme, and that all the tenants pay their rent to Lambeth. However, Southwark opposed our draft proposal, and suggested realigning the boundary along Ufford Street and Gray Street, to unite the housing scheme in Southwark.

49. In responding to our draft proposal Southwark claimed that it had nomination rights to the housing scheme. However, we have established from the two authorities that this is not in fact the case, and that Lambeth has sole rights to place the residents. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as
final.

(c) Dante Road

50. Southwark did not object to our draft proposal to transfer an area west of Dante Road to its area. However, it was opposed by Lambeth, on the grounds that there were a number of proposals for future housing development in the area. The Council expressed its concern that it would lose nomination rights to any development on the site by a housing association. It also commented that, if implemented, the redevelopment proposals would result in the disappearance of Dante Road as an effective boundary.

51. However, we were subsequently informed by Lambeth that planning applications for the site's redevelopment for housing had been withdrawn, and that the Council would be withdrawing its objection to our draft proposal. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) Aspen House School and Brandon Estate

52. Both Lambeth and Southwark supported our draft proposal to unite Aspen House School in Lambeth and the Brandon Estate in Southwark. However, Southwark suggested a modification to our proposed alignment, to transfer a larger area of Kennington Park from Lambeth to its area. In support of its suggestion, Southwark reported that the Brandon Tenants' and Residents' Committee had expressed concern that our draft proposal would split Kennington Park along Hillingdon Street and, as this area of the park would be overlooked by Southwark tenants, they felt that it should be wholly in Southwark.

53. We noted that Southwark's suggested amendment would result in houses on either side of St Agnes Place being in different authorities. We also felt that it would be undesirable to transfer a larger part of Kennington Park to Southwark. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as
Decision to make no proposals

(e) Flodden Road/Denmark Road/Coldharbour Lane

54. No comments were received in respect of our interim decision to make no proposals for this area. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

(f) Denmark Hill
(g) Herne Hill
(h) Croxted Hill

55. We noted that, while Lambeth had expressed disappointment that we had not adopted its minor suggestions, it had offered no objection to our interim decision to make no proposals. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision to make no proposals as final.

CONCLUSIONS

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

PUBLICATION

57. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark 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 the Commission has fulfilled its 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, together with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposal letter of 30 April 1991, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed  

G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

K F J ENNALS

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary
19 December 1991
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METROPOLITAN BOUNDARY REVIEW

LAMBETH LB
AFFECTING SOUTHWARK LB

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing Boundary
Proposed Boundary
Other boundary divisions
Other proposed 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 B</td>
<td>Southwark LB Cathedral Ward</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Bishop's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Southwark LB Cathedral Ward</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Bishop's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Southwark LB Cathedral Ward</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Bishop's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Prince's Ward</td>
<td>Southwark LB Browning Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Southwark LB Newington Ward</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Vassall Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Vassall Ward</td>
<td>Southwark LB Newington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Vassall Ward</td>
<td>Southwark LB Newington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Lambeth LB Vassall Ward</td>
<td>Southwark LB St Giles Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

### Boundary between Lambeth and Southwark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pages/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Nautical School and Hatfield Gardens</td>
<td>Realignment to unite a riverside park, London Nautical School and Hatfield Gardens in Lambeth</td>
<td>Paragraphs 45-47, Maps 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplin Close</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Chaplin Close in Lambeth</td>
<td>Paragraphs 48-49, Map 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante Road</td>
<td>Realignment to transfer an area west of Dante Road from Lambeth to Southwark</td>
<td>Paragraphs 50-51, Map 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen House School and Brandon Estate</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Aspen House School in Lambeth and Brandon Estate in Southwark</td>
<td>Paragraphs 52-53, Maps 5-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>