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

CROYDON AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH BROMLEY, AND WITH REIGATE AND BANSTEAD AND TANDRIDGE IN SURREY

COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT AND PROPOSALS

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, and 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 Croydon's boundary with Bromley, with the exception of that part of it in the vicinity of Crystal Palace, and its boundaries with Reigate and Banstead, and Tandridge, in Surrey. The boundaries of Croydon, Bromley, Lambeth 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. Similarly, our recommendations for Croydon's boundary with Lambeth will be published separately.

6. Croydon's boundary with Merton will be considered as part of the review of the London Borough of Merton, and Croydon's boundary with Sutton will be considered as part of the review of the London Borough of Sutton.

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 relevant general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of Croydon and other London 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 we have been given (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 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

10. Our review of the London boroughs and the City of London is the first 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 brought to the attention of any body charged with undertaking a more fundamental review of London in the future.

The Outer Boundary of London

11. In his guidelines, the then Secretary of State said 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. 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.

12. We gave consideration to the changes advocated by the Herbert Commission in 1964, namely that Caterham, Warlingham and Banstead should be incorporated into Greater London. We noted that development in these areas takes the form of "fingers" stretching out along the valleys south of Croydon, in some cases with no break in the development, and that there is considerable influence exerted in journey to work terms by both Croydon and London as a whole. The Herbert Commission had considered that the most appropriate natural boundary was the North Downs watershed but, in the event, Caterham and Warlingham Urban Districts and Banstead Urban District (though not Orpington Urban District) had been excluded from Greater London. We noted that it would be a major step to bring these areas of continuous development into a London borough, and one which would have considerable repercussions for the existing districts. No suggestions for such major change had been made to us.

13. More specifically, in relation to our review of Croydon's boundary with Tandridge, we noted that continuous development has overlain the boundary at Hamsey Green. While the local authorities concerned had proposed only minor changes to the boundary in this area, in the light of our guidelines to give special care to the outer boundary of Greater London, we considered whether effective and convenient local government might be better served by more extensive adjustments to the
boundary south of Hamsey Green. However, we concluded that there is unlikely to be any alternative boundary that would offer clear benefits, and felt that we should confine our draft and final proposals to minor change in this area, while providing a clear outer London boundary. Our draft proposals for this area are given in paragraphs 29 - 32 below.

14. Without prejudice to any representations which might be made to us during the course of our review of Croydon's boundaries, we therefore decided to confine our consideration to relatively minor change, to correct anomalies along the general line of the existing boundary.

THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

15. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Croydon and Bromley, the Borough of Reigate and Banstead, Tandridge District Council and Surrey County Council and from various interested organisations and individuals.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

DRAFT PROPOSALS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND REIGATE AND BANSTEAD, SURREY

(a) Chipstead Valley Primary and Secondary Schools, and adjoining area

16. Croydon suggested a minor realignment along the rear of properties in Gidd Hill, the south side of Chipstead Valley Road, the west of Sandown Lane and the rear of properties in Lyndhurst Road and Winifred Road, thereby uniting Chipstead Valley Primary and Secondary Schools in Reigate and Banstead and adjoining residential properties in Croydon. Both Reigate and Banstead and Surrey County Council supported this suggestion, but proposed a
centre of road alignment along Chipstead Valley Road and the use of the top of a cutting on the side of Sandown Road. We considered that Croydon's suggestion was technically superior, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal subject to using a side of road alignment to facilitate highway maintenance.

(b) Coulsdon Lane, Hollymeoak Road and Rickman Hill Road

17. Croydon suggested realigning the boundary where it splits properties in Rickham Hill Road, Coulsdon Lane and Hollymeoak Road. It suggested uniting the split properties on Hollymeoak Road and Coulsdon Lane in Reigate and Banstead, and uniting all the properties on Rickham Hill Road in Croydon.

18. Reigate and Banstead and Surrey County Council suggested an alternative alignment of the boundary, which would result in all the properties in Rickham Hill Road, Coulsdon Lane and Hollymeoak Road being united in Reigate and Banstead, on the grounds that Rickham Hill Road and Highwold are one settlement, with Portnalls Road forming a natural boundary. We agreed that Rickham Hill Road and Highwold did appear to be a single community, and decided to adopt Reigate and Banstead's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to minor amendments to make better use of ground detail.

(c) Starrock Wood

19. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to rectify a stretch of undefined boundary just east of Starrock Wood. We agreed with Croydon over the desirability of providing a clear boundary in this area and decided to adopt its suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a minor amendment to make better use of ground detail.
(d) Woodplace Farm

20. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to the boundary, which would have the effect of uniting Woodplace Farm in Reigate and Banstead. Both Reigate and Banstead and Surrey County Council made similar suggestions. As the boundary in this area is clearly anomalous, we decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND TANDRIDGE, SURREY

(a) Broad Wood

21. Croydon suggested a realignment to transfer Broad Wood from Croydon to Tandridge, including a property which only has access from Tandridge. Both Tandridge and Surrey made almost identical suggestions. We therefore decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a minor realignment at its northern end in order to remove a stretch of defaced boundary.

(b) Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close, Kenley

22. Croydon suggested the transfer to Tandridge of Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close, an area of Ministry of Defence housing located at the southern end of Kenley Airfield. Both Tandridge and Surrey County Council submitted similar suggestions, the only difference being that they also suggested transferring a triangular shaped area of land to the west of Gauntlet Crescent to Tandridge. Croydon and Surrey County Council both indicated that residents of this area look to Tandridge rather than Croydon for local services and facilities. In view of the claimed affinities of the local residents, we agreed that Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close should be transferred to Tandridge. We therefore decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to two minor amendments to make better use of ground detail.
(c) Kenley Common, Hornchurch Hill and Hilltop Road

23. As an extension of its suggestion for Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close, Croydon suggested realigning the existing undefined boundary in the vicinity of Kenley Common to follow the backs of properties on Whyteleafe Hill. The Council also suggested three minor realignments to rectify split property curtilages on Hornchurch Hill and Mosslea Road.

24. Neither Tandridge nor Surrey commented on Croydon's suggestion for Kenley Common. However, both authorities agreed with Croydon's suggestion for Hornchurch Hill and Mosslea Road. We therefore decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(d) Kenley/Whyteleafe Railway Line and the Gasholder Station Site

25. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all submitted suggestions for this area. Croydon suggested realigning the boundary along the centre of the Kenley/Whyteleafe railway line, the southern side of industrial buildings on Godstone Road, the southern side of the gasholder station land, the centre of the Riddlesdown/Upper Warlingham railway line and along the line of a path to meet the existing boundary.

26. Tandridge suggested realigning the boundary along the centre of the Kenley/Whyteleafe railway line only as far as the point at which it is crossed by the existing boundary. It also suggested realigning the boundary along the northern side of the industrial buildings on Godstone Road and the southern side of the gasholder station land. Surrey County Council suggested a minor realignment to the boundary where it crosses the Kenley/Whyteleafe railway line. It also submitted a similar suggestion to Tandridge's for the industrial buildings on Godstone Road and the gasholder station.
27. We considered each of these suggestions but felt that none of them would produce a well-defined boundary. We concluded that a clearer and more durable boundary could be found by uniting Welcome Terrace, the engineering and printing works and the gasholder station in Tandridge, by realigning the boundary along the Kenley/Whyteleafe railway line, Old Barn Lane and a path along the curtilage of the gasholder station. We accordingly adopted this line as our draft proposal.

(e) Dipsley's Shaw

28. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to the boundary to remove a portion of defaced boundary at Dipsley's Shaw. We agreed that the suggestion would rectify the anomalies in the existing boundary and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

(f) Hamsey Green

29. Croydon suggested uniting Princes Avenue, Princes Close, Wentworth Way, Tudor Close and Clyde Avenue in Croydon. The Council also suggested transferring No 350 Limpsfield Road, a garage and Nos 8 - 11 Audley Drive from Tandridge to its area, by realigning the boundary along the rear of properties in Wentworth Way, Tithepit Shaw Lane and Kingswood Lane to meet the existing boundary. It also suggested a northern side of road alignment along Kingswood Lane.

30. Croydon claimed that, for two reasons, this part of Hamsey Green had a stronger community of interest with Croydon than with Tandridge. First, public transport links are primarily with Croydon and local authority services could be more easily provided by its Council. Second, Croydon claimed that the area in question is similar in character to the adjoining residential community which is already in Croydon, and that it is bounded to the west by open country, which separates it from urban development in Tandridge. Croydon's suggestion was supported by two Croydon Councillors and by the Wentworth Area Residents' Association.
31. Tandridge suggested that the boundary, which at present splits properties on Princes Avenue, should be realigned to the rear curtilages of properties on that road. It also suggested uniting Nos 2-8 (even) Clyde Avenue in Tandridge and realigning the boundary along the rear of Nos 7-17 Kingswood Lane. Surrey County Council submitted a suggestion for a realignment similar to that proposed by Tandridge. However, it also suggested transferring Nos 1-8 Clyde Avenue to Tandridge.

32. We acknowledged that Hamsey Green presented a particularly difficult boundary problem, as it forms part of a "finger" of development running south from Croydon and there is no recognisable break between the built-up areas of Hamsey Green and Warlingham. Notwithstanding our wish to provide a readily identifiable outer boundary for Greater London, we concluded that we could only provide a clear and more recognisable boundary by a realignment along Tithepit Shaw Lane and Kingswood Lane. We therefore adopted this line as our draft proposal.

(g) Threecorner Grove and Gushybank Shaw

33. Croydon submitted a minor suggestion to remove a section of defaced boundary just south of Threecorner Grove. We agreed with Croydon that its suggestion would resolve the anomalies in the existing boundary and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal, subject to a minor modification to make better use of ground detail.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON, BROMLEY AND TANDRIDGE, SURREY

(h) Fairchildes Junior and High Schools, New Addington

34. Croydon suggested realignments to its boundary with Tandridge and Bromley, the effect of which would be to unite Fairchildes Junior and High Schools, and their playing fields, in Croydon. Tandridge and Surrey County Council supported Croydon's suggestion. Bromley did not comment.
35. We noted that the existing boundaries split the school site and buildings between three local authority areas. We considered that Croydon's suggestion would remove an obvious boundary anomaly and, in the interests of effective and convenient local government, decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND BROMLEY

(a) The stretch of boundary between Fairchildes High School and Foxhill Shaw

36. Croydon, supported by Bromley, suggested minor realignments in order to rectify a stretch of defaced boundary. We decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(b) Birch Wood Pumping Station, Inchwood and Briar Lane, Spring Park

37. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to remove a stretch of defaced boundary to the west of the pumping station and the electricity sub station, off Addington Road. The Council also suggested realigning the boundary so that properties in Briar Lane and Inchwood, at present in Croydon, would be transferred to Bromley. Bromley supported this suggestion. Croydon stated that access to these roads can only be obtained from Bromley and that some local authority services, such as refuse collection, are already provided by Bromley by agreement with Croydon. Croydon claimed that residents of this area tend to look to West Wickham in Bromley for their services.

38. We agreed that the existing boundary is clearly anomalous, and decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to minor amendments to make better use of ground detail.
(c) Copse Avenue and Oak Avenue

39. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to rectify a stretch of defaced boundary. It suggested realigning the boundary to the backs of properties on Copse Avenue and Oak Avenue. Bromley supported this suggestion.

40. We agreed that the existing boundary is clearly anomalous, and decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to minor amendments to make better use of ground detail.

(d) Pond Lane Caravan Park and Bethlem Royal Hospital

41. Croydon suggested realigning the boundary where it splits Pond Cottage Lane Caravan Park and Bethlem Hospital. It suggested that the caravan park be united in Bromley, and that Bethlem Hospital and an area of open space to the north of the hospital be united in Croydon.

42. Bromley suggested a similar realignment at the caravan park. However, with regard to Bethlem Hospital, it suggested realigning the boundary along the western and northern side of the hospital building and then following a path in the vicinity of Cold Shaw. This would unite the hospital buildings in Bromley but it would still leave the hospital complex split. We received no comments from Bethlem Hospital.

43. We preferred Croydon's suggestion as it would unite the hospital complex and its grounds within one borough. We therefore decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

(e) Hillcrest View and Aylesford Avenue

44. Croydon suggested a realignment of the boundary along Chaffinch Brook, to unite properties on Ash Tree Close, Fairway Close and Fairford Close, all cul-de-sacs with no access from Bromley, in its area. Bromley supported this suggestion.
45. We noted that the existing boundary splits properties and allotment gardens. We agreed that Ash Tree Close, Fairway Close and Fairwood Close all look to Croydon and should be united in that Borough. We therefore decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal.

(f) Longheath Gardens and Beckenham Crematorium

46. Croydon suggested a minor realignment to the boundary in the vicinity of Longheath Gardens and Beckenham Crematorium, to remove stretches of defaced boundary and to unite in its area split properties in Longheath Gardens and Love Lane. Bromley supported the suggestion.

47. We agreed with both authorities that this stretch of defaced boundary was not conducive to effective and convenient local government, and should be realigned. We therefore decided to adopt Croydon's suggestion as our draft proposal subject to a minor amendment to remove a further section of defaced boundary.

(g) Cambridge Road, Penge Road, Orchard Road, and Orchard School Sports Centre

48. Croydon suggested uniting Cambridge Road, Penge Road and Selby Road in Bromley, by realigning the boundary along the centre of the Crystal Palace/Birkbeck railway line. Bromley also suggested uniting these roads in Bromley, but by realigning the boundary along the eastern side of the railway.

49. We considered that a side of railway alignment would be more convenient operationally for British Rail. We therefore decided to adopt Bromley's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to minor amendments to make better use of ground detail.
ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

50. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 23 January 1989. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Croydon, Bromley, Reigate and Banstead, and Tandridge were asked to publish a notice announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the Borough Councils and Surrey County Council were asked 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 20 March 1989.

RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS

51. We received a total of 203 responses to our draft proposals' letter. They included comments from all the local authorities involved; from interested bodies including the Bethlem Hospital, the South East Thames Regional Health Authority and the Metropolitan Police; from a residents' association; and 182 letters from members of the public.

OUR PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

(a) Chipstead Valley Primary and Secondary Schools, and adjoining area

52. Croydon, Surrey County Council and a member of the public supported our draft proposal to unite Chipstead Valley Primary and Secondary Schools in Reigate and Banstead. Reigate and Banstead did not oppose it. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
(b) Coulsdon Lane, Hollymeoak Road and Rickman Hill Road

53. Both Croydon and Surrey County Council supported our draft proposal to unite split properties in Reigate and Banstead. Reigate and Banstead did not oppose it. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) Starrock Wood

54. Both Croydon and Surrey County Council supported our draft proposal to rectify a stretch of defaced boundary. Reigate and Banstead did not oppose it. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) Woodplace Farm

55. Both Croydon and Surrey County Council supported our draft proposal to unite Woodplace Farm in Reigate and Banstead. Reigate and Banstead did not oppose it. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND TANDRIDGE, SURREY

(a) Broad Wood

56. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all supported our draft proposal to unite Broad Wood in Tandridge. However, a resident of Broad Wood objected to the proposed realignment of the boundary to the centre of a bridleway. He claimed that our draft proposal would divide his property and result in "dual jurisdiction" of the bridleway. He suggested a realignment to the western side of Broad Wood.

57. We acknowledged the reasoning behind the objection to the bridleway's division between the two authorities. However, we
noted that the western perimeter of Broad Wood does not follow ground features and concluded that it would not make a suitable boundary. We therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to realigning it to the east side of the bridleway.

(b) Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close, Kenley

58. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all supported our draft proposal to transfer Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close from Croydon to Tandridge. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm it as final.

(c) Kenley Common and Hornchurch Hill and Hilltop Road

59. Our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the rear of properties in Whyteleafe Hill, Regents Close and Hornchurch Hill was supported by Croydon. It was opposed by Tandridge, Surrey County Council, the Whyteleafe Residents' Association and forty-five members of the public.

60. Tandridge and Surrey County Council both suggested retaining the existing boundary. Tandridge claimed that main access to the area is from its authority and is of particular value to local residents. Surrey County Council claimed that existing boundary is a reflection of the local topography and that the hillside is important to the setting of the properties to the south and east, in Tandridge. It believed that a realignment in this area was unnecessary, as the existing boundary crosses open land where no development is expected.

61. The Residents' Association argued that the existing boundary runs along the top of an escarpment and so provides a natural geographical divide. It claimed that our draft proposal would run half way down the escarpment and would not provide a natural boundary. It also claimed that the area which, under our draft proposal, would be transferred to Croydon could only be seen by
Tandridge residents because of the slope of the land, and that access to the land is mainly through Tandridge. The Residents' Association also considered that the area, which was also used as a recreational facility, would enjoy better environmental protection under Tandridge.

62. We noted the large number of objections to our draft proposal, many of which had expressed the view that the existing boundary, although undefined, did not cause any problems. We also noted the importance of these wooded slopes to the residents of Tandridge as a recreational facility. We considered the alternative suggestions submitted by the Residents' Association but concluded that none would provide a boundary which would be both well defined and which would avoid the severance of the airfield. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal for this area.

(d) Kenley/Whyteleafe Railway Line and the Gasholder Station Site

63. Both Tandridge and Surrey County Council supported our draft proposal to transfer a gasholder station and a terrace of houses from Croydon to Tandridge. However, Croydon opposed it and submitted an alternative suggestion for the gasholder station to remain in Croydon. Croydon claimed that our draft proposal would not produce a clearer boundary than its own original suggestion, but acknowledged that Welcome Terrace had more affinity with Whyteleafe in Tandridge than with Kenley in Croydon. Two residents of Welcome Terrace opposed our draft proposal on financial grounds.

64. We considered that the opposition to our draft proposal was unrelated to the provision of effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
65. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all supported our draft proposal to realign a defaced stretch of boundary in the vicinity of Dipsley's Shaw. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

66. Croydon supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary along Tithepit Shaw Lane and Kingswood Lane. However, Tandridge and Surrey County Council opposed it and submitted alternative suggestions. Tandridge claimed that there is a strong sense of community in the area which would be destroyed by our draft proposal. It also believed that the residents of Hamsey Green associate themselves with Surrey life and use the facilities available in Tandridge. It also pointed out that the distance and journey time to its offices in the Caterham Valley is shorter than to Croydon's offices, and reiterated its previous suggestion to unite properties in Clyde Avenue and Princes Avenue, and the whole of Audley Drive and Kingswood Lane, in Tandridge. Croydon strongly opposed this counter-suggestion.

67. Surrey County Council supported minimum change in the area, on the grounds that it is difficult to find a break in the general north-south line of development which would provide a boundary having clear advantages over any other which might be suggested. However, in the event that the Commission were not minded to accept minimum change, the County Council submitted an alternative suggestion, to realign the boundary along rear property curtilages in Wentworth Way, Tithepit Shaw Road and Kingswood Lane. This, it claimed, acknowledged the Commission's view that the general line of Tithepit Shaw Lane and Kingswood Lane represented a more recognisable boundary, but would retain or transfer to Surrey properties to which access could only be gained from that county.
68. Surrey County Council claimed that local services to Kingswood Lane and Tithepit Shaw Lane could be more efficiently and effectively provided if these roads were united in Surrey. It expressed the view that our draft proposal would not assist effective local government, especially in respect of highway maintenance and the emergency services, as residents on opposite sides of the same road would be in different administrative areas. In addition, the County Council believed that residents of the eastern end of Kingswood Lane, who overlooked open land to the south in Surrey, had a greater community of interest with Surrey than with Croydon.

69. The residents of Hamsey Green who submitted representations to us were almost unanimous in their opposition to any change in the boundary. Of the Tandridge residents, seventy-three opposed our draft proposal to transfer their properties to Croydon, while eight supported it. Of Croydon residents, thirty-five opposed Tandridge's counter-suggestion to unite their properties in that district, while one resident supported it. The Croydon residents stressed their extensive use of Croydon's services and expressed satisfaction with them. Tandridge residents claimed to be content with the services provided by Tandridge, and felt better served by a rural based council.

70. We noted that the majority of residents had expressed equally strong loyalty to, and satisfaction with, the services provided by their respective local authorities. We felt that either of the alternatives to our draft proposal, suggested by Surrey or Tandridge, would provoke similar opposition.

71. We noted that although Hamsey Green was centred on a small shopping parade and three schools, none of the representations from residents had cited a community of interest in the area as being a factor in opposing their transfer to either Croydon or Tandridge, nor had they asked for Hamsey Green to be united within one authority.
72. As indicated in paragraph 13 above, we recognised that nothing short of major boundary change could succeed in uniting Hamsey Green in one authority, as development between Hamsey Green and Warlingham is continuous. We nevertheless felt that a clearer and more robust Greater London boundary should be sought in this area, and concluded that our draft proposal would achieve this objective. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

(g) Threecorner Grove and Gushyban Shaw

73. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to ground features. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON, BROMLEY AND TANDRIDGE, SURREY

(h) Fairchildes Junior and High Schools, New Addington

74. Croydon, Tandridge and Surrey County Council all supported our draft proposal to unite Fairchildes Junior and High Schools in Croydon. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND BROMLEY

(a) The stretch of boundary between Fairchildes High School and Foxhill Shaw

75. Croydon and Bromley both supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary in this area to firm ground details. However, a resident of the area opposed our draft proposal, as he believed that the boundary of his farm was coterminous with the Croydon/Bromley boundary and that our draft proposal would result in his property being divided. However, we concluded that the boundary of Layhams Farm is not coterminous with the borough
boundary, but that it follows the perimeter fencing, to which we proposed aligning the boundary. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(b) Birch Wood Pumping Station, Inchwood and Briar Lane, Spring Park

76. Croydon and Bromley both supported our draft proposal to transfer properties in Briar Lane and Inchwood to Bromley and to realign the boundary to firm ground detail. In the absence of any opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) Copse Avenue and Oak Avenue

77. Croydon and Bromley both supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the backs of properties in Copse Avenue and Oak Avenue. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) Pond Lane Caravan Park and Bethlem Royal Hospital

78. Croydon supported our draft proposal to unite the caravan park in Bromley and the hospital in Croydon. However, Bromley opposed that part of our draft proposal relating to the Bethlem Royal Hospital, and suggested uniting it in Bromley, as did the chief executive of the hospital, who pointed out that the local authority boundary in this area is co-terminous with the boundary between the South West and South East Thames Regional Health Authorities. The chief executive claimed that the hospital has contractual service links with the South East Thames Regional Health Authority, and community service links with the population of Bromley; it had no such links with the South West Thames Regional Health Authority or Croydon. The chief executive supported uniting the whole of the hospital site in Bromley, to reinforce the existing links with that borough. The Department of Health and the South East Thames Regional Health Authority
both supported the views expressed by the chief executive of the hospital. A member of the public opposed the draft proposal on financial grounds.

79. We considered the response to our draft proposal and the alternative realignments submitted by Bromley. We considered that the present boundary, which cuts through the hospital buildings, is clearly unsatisfactory but felt that we had insufficient information to justify uniting the hospital. We therefore wrote to Bromley, Croydon and the Bethlem Royal Hospital requesting further information about the nature of the relationships between the hospital and the two local authorities.

80. In response to this request, Croydon supported the Commission’s original draft proposal to unite the hospital in Croydon, and stated that it was responsible for refuse collection and the provision of social services support to all but two wards of the hospital. Bromley reiterated its health service links with the hospital and the need for it to remain within the area of the South East Thames Regional Health Authority.

81. The Department of Health explained that, as a Special Health Authority, the Bethlem and Maudsley Hospitals are not accountable to a regional health authority. However, it pointed out that the hospital also provides local psychiatric service to some residents of South East Thames Regional Health Authority, which includes Bromley residents. Bromley Health Authority supported the hospital being united in Bromley, and the South East Thames Regional Health Authority outlined the services it provided on the hospital site. The chief executive of the hospital reiterated the necessity for the hospital, as part of the Special Health Authority (comprising itself and the Maudsley Hospital), to retain its present links with the South East Thames Regional Health Authority as part of its service provision to the people of Bromley.

82. We noted the hospital’s role as a local service provider to
the people of Bromley, and the view of the hospital management and relevant health bodies that it would be counter-productive to the provision of existing and future health and community care arrangements for the site to be united in Croydon. In the light of this, we took the view that health and social service provision considerations should take priority and that the site should be united in Bromley. We therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal to unite the caravan park in Bromley, but to adopt as a further draft proposal Bromley's suggestion to unite the hospital in its area.

(e) Hillcrest View and Aylesford Avenue

83. Croydon and Bromley both supported our draft proposal to unite properties in Ash Tree Close, Fairway Close and Fairford Close in Croydon. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(f) Longheath Gardens, Beckenham Crematorium and South Norwood Country Park

84. Bromley supported our draft proposal to unite Longheath Gardens in Croydon, remove stretches of defaced boundary in the vicinity of South Norwood Sewage Farm, and to unite properties in Love Lane in Croydon. However, Croydon submitted a late suggestion to unite South Norwood Sewage Farm in its area. Croydon advised us that the sewage farm had been redeveloped and was now the South Norwood Country Park. The park was wholly owned and managed by Croydon.

85. We agreed that uniting the country park in Croydon would facilitate the maintenance and further development of the park and would be conducive to effective and convenient local government. We therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal to unite Longheath Gardens and properties in Love Lane in Croydon, but to adopt as a further draft proposal Croydon's suggestion to unite the country park in its area.
Cambridge Road, Penge Road, Orchard Road, and Orchard School Sports Centre

86. Croydon and Bromley both supported our draft proposal to unite split properties in Cambridge Road, Selby Road and Penge Road, by realigning the boundary along the eastern side of the railway. In the absence of any opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

RESPONSE TO OUR FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS: OUR FINAL PROPOSALS

87. Our further draft proposals' letter was issued on 20 March 1991. The local authorities concerned were asked to ensure that it received the same publicity as our original draft proposals. Copies of our letter were also sent to all those who had made representations to us on the issues covered by our further draft proposals. Comments were invited by 15 May 1991.

88. In response to our letter of 20 March 1991, we received comments from Croydon and Bromley, the Bethlem Hospital and one member of the public. The Metropolitan Police, London Waste Regulation Authority, Thames Water Utilities stated they had no comments to make.

89. As required by section 60(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, we have carefully considered all the representations made to us and set out below our final proposals.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CROYDON AND BROMLEY

(a) Bethlem Royal Hospital

90. Our further draft proposal to unite the Bethlem Royal Hospital in Bromley was supported by Bromley and by the hospital's chief executive. It was opposed by Croydon, which suggested uniting the hospital site in its borough, in accordance with our original draft proposal.
91. In support of its objection, Croydon enclosed a letter from a local councillor for the area. The councillor commented that the long term future of the hospital was unclear. He pointed out that, under current policy, long term patients are leaving mental health institutions and are being returned to the community. In his view, it was possible that the hospital could become surplus to requirements within the next few years and the site redeveloped. The councillor also questioned the view expressed by the chief executive of the hospital that the hospital primarily serves Bromley residents.

92. In support of the further draft proposal, the chief executive of the hospital claimed that unification in Bromley would reinforce the hospital's close links with that borough and aid the long term development of the hospital's considerable land assets, to the benefit of the local community.

93. We took the view that the issues raised by the hospital's long-term future and its redevelopment potential were purely speculative. We noted that the hospital's role as a service provider to the people of Bromley had been reaffirmed by the chief executive of the hospital. This, we felt, was the major consideration in this case. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

(b) South Norwood Country Park

94. Croydon supported our further draft proposal to unite South Norwood Country Park in its area. The Council stressed that it had spent considerable resources on developing the Country Park as an amenity area for the enjoyment of residents of both Croydon and neighbouring authorities.

95. Bromley opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that, in its Draft Unitary Development Plan, it had earmarked part of the site, owned by Croydon, for a new refuse transfer station to replace an existing one. While a planning application for the
site, submitted in 1987, had not been determined, Bromley claimed that the opportunity to use the site as a refuse transfer station would be lost if we confirmed our further draft proposal. This would, it claimed, cause the Council particular difficulties because, in anticipation of the proposed relocation, a new primary school has been built next to the transfer site which was to be replaced. Bromley suggested that we revert to our original draft proposal or, alternatively, to leave the area of the proposed refuse site in Bromley, while transferring the remainder of the park to Croydon.

96. Croydon opposed the development of a refuse transfer station on the site, which it believed would be wholly inappropriate within South Norwood Country Park. A resident of the area also opposed the development, and attached a letter from the Kent Trust for Nature Conservation emphasising the importance of this land as a valuable wildlife refuge and amenity site.

97. We considered that, as planning permission had not yet been granted, the proposals for a refuse transfer station could at this stage only be regarded as speculative. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

CONCLUSIONS

98. 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

99. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Croydon and Bromley, Tandridge District Council, the Borough of Reigate and Banstead, and Surrey County Council 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, with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft and further draft proposal letters of 23 January 1989 and 20 March 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

PROFESSOR K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary
10 October 1991
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FINAL PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing LB/County Boundary</th>
<th>Proposed LB/County Boundary</th>
<th>Existing Ward Boundary</th>
<th>Proposed Ward Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The alignment X-Y is defaced boundary. It is intended that the proposed boundary be treated as fixed detail throughout and cannot be depicted at this scale.
CROYDON LB

SURREY COUNTY

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT

NON PARISHED AREA

Area A

Area B
# Consequential Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NO.</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Reigate and Banstead Borough Non-parished area Chipstead-Hooley and Woodmansterne Ward Banstead East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Woodcote and Coulsdon West Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex B

Four tables are shown, each detailing consequential changes from one area to another.
## Consequential Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NO</th>
<th>AREA REF</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>MAP NO</th>
<th>AREA REF</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey County Tandridge District Chelsham and Forleigh CP Chelsham and Forleigh, Tatsfield and Tiltyard Warlingham ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB Heathfield Ward</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Tandridge District Chelsham and Forleigh CP Chelsham and Forleigh, Tatsfield and Tiltyard Warlingham ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB New Addington Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Surrey County Tandridge District Chelsham and Forleigh CP Chelsham and Forleigh, Tatsfield and Tiltyard Warlingham ED</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB New Addington Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bromley LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB New Addington Ward</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB Clock House Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bromley LB Fieldway Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB Clock House Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bromley LB Fieldway Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB Rylands Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bromley LB Fieldway Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB South Norwood Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Bromley LB Fieldway Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB Annerley Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Bromley LB Heathfield Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB South Norwood Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bromley LB Heathfield Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB South Norwood Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bromley LB Heathfield Ward</td>
<td>Croydon LB West Wickham South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Croydon LB</td>
<td>Bromley LB Annerley Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The table lists areas and changes relating to district boundaries in England and Wales.
- Areas are referenced with letters (A, B, C, D, E) and numbers (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15).
- The from and to columns indicate before and after changes.
- Areas such as Greater London, Bromley LB, and Croydon LB are referenced.
- The changes include shifts from one area to another within the same or different boroughs.
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

Boundary between Croydon and Reigate and Banstead

Chipstead Valley
Primary and Secondary and adjoining area

Realignment to unite Schools in Reigate and Banstead
Paragraph 52
Map 1

Coulson Lane, Hollymeak Road and Rickman Hill Road

Realignment to unite split properties in Reigate and Banstead
Paragraph 53
Map 2

Starrock Wood

Minor realignment to remove stretch of ill-defined boundary
Paragraph 54
Map 3

Woodplace Farm

Realignment to unite Woodplace Farm in Reigate and Banstead
Paragraph 55
Map 4

Boundary between Croydon and Tandridge

Broad Wood

Realignment along the eastern side of a bridleway
Paragraphs 56 - 57
Map 5

Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close, Kenley

Realignment to transfer Gauntlet Crescent and Anson Close to Tandridge
Paragraph 58
Map 6

Kenley/Whyteleafe Railway Line and Gasholder Station

Realignment to transfer Gasholder Station and Welcome Terrace to Tandridge
Paragraphs 63 - 64
Map 7

Dipsley’s Shaw

Minor realignment to remove stretch of ill-defined boundary
Paragraph 65
Map 8

Hamsey Green

Realignment along Tithepit Shaw Lane and Kingswood Lane
Paragraphs 66 - 72
Map 9

Threecorner Grove and Gushybank Shaw

Minor realignment to tie the boundary to ground detail
Paragraph 73
Map 10

Boundary between Croydon, Bromley and Tandridge

Fairchildes Junior and High Schools, New Addington

Realignment to unite Schools in Croydon
Paragraph 74
Maps 10 & 11
Boundary between Croydon and Bromley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stretch of boundary between Fairchilde High School and Foxhill Shaw</td>
<td>Minor realignments to tie the boundary to firm ground detail</td>
<td>Paragraph 75 Maps 12, 13, 14 &amp; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Wood Pumping Station, Inchwood and Briar Lane, Spring Park</td>
<td>Minor realignment to tie the boundary to firm ground detail and transfer properties in Briar Lane and Inchwood to Bromley</td>
<td>Paragraph 76 Maps 15 &amp; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copse Avenue and Oak Avenue</td>
<td>Minor realignment to backs of properties</td>
<td>Paragraph 77 Maps 16 &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Lane Caravan Park and Bethlem Royal Hospital</td>
<td>Realignment to unite the caravan park and hospital in Bromley</td>
<td>Paragraphs 90 - 93 Maps 17, 18 &amp; 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest View and Aylesford Avenue</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Ashtree Close, Fairway Close and Fairwood Close in Croydon</td>
<td>Paragraph 83 Map 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longheath Gardens, Beckenham Crematorium and South Norwood Country Park</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Longheath Gardens, South Norwood Country Park and Love Lane in Croydon</td>
<td>Paragraphs 94 - 97 Maps 20, 21 &amp; 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Road, Penge Road, Orchard Road and Orchard Road School Sports Centre</td>
<td>Realignment along the eastern side of the railway line to unite properties in Cambridge Road, Penge Road and Selby Road in Bromley</td>
<td>Paragraph 86 Maps 22 &amp; 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>