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1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Greenwich's boundary with the London Borough of Bromley. We have proposed only limited change to this boundary with the intention of removing anomalies, for example, where properties are divided by the boundary.

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, 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 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.

5. A period of seven months from the date of our letter was allowed for all local authorities and any body or person 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.

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

6. 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).

7. 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 it makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.
8. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since London government reorganisation in 1965 and to offer our thoughts on the issues which have been raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We have therefore published a general report, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London boroughs" (Report No 627), which discusses a number of the wider London issues which have arisen during the course of our review of London.

THE BOUNDARY COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Greenwich's boundary with Bromley. Our final proposals for Greenwich's boundary with Barking and Dagenham, Bexley, Newham and Tower Hamlets have already been submitted to you (Report No 622). We have considered Greenwich's boundary with Lewisham as part of our review of that authority, which will be the subject of a separate report.

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

10. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Greenwich and Bromley. Responses were also received from the Metropolitan Police, Mr Roger Sims JP MP, a local councillor, a local organisation, and over 300 members of the public, together with eight petitions.

11. The original submissions from both Greenwich and Bromley suggested only minor realignments of the boundary. However, Greenwich subsequently submitted a radical suggestion to unite Mottingham in its area. This was followed by a counter-proposal from Bromley, suggesting that Mottingham be united in its authority.
OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS LETTER AND THE RESPONSES RECEIVED

12. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published a further consultation letter, announcing our draft proposals and interim decision. This was published on 21 August 1991, and 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 draft proposals and interim decision. In addition, Greenwich and Bromley 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 16 October 1991.

13. We received a total of 23 individual responses to our draft proposals letter and two petitions. They included comments from Greenwich, Bromley, Mr Peter Bottomley MP and 18 members of the public. The Metropolitan Police and Bromley Magistrates' Court both stated that they had no comments on our draft proposals.

14. Bromley's response related solely to our interim decision not to propose major change in the Nottingham area; the Council did not comment on our draft proposals.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

(a) Suggestions for major change in the Nottingham area

15. Greenwich suggested uniting the whole of Nottingham Village in its area, on the grounds that Nottingham is a single community divided by an artificial boundary. Bromley opposed Greenwich's suggestion, and submitted a counter-proposal to realign the boundary along the A20 Sidcup Road, thereby uniting Nottingham in its area. Bromley's counter-proposal was supported by Mr Roger Sims JP MP and by a considerable number of local residents, who objected to the area being united in Greenwich. A local
Bromley councillor supported suggestions for minor change in the area, but suggested that the A20 would form a more natural neighbourhood boundary.

16. A further suggestion was submitted by a local resident, who suggested realigning the boundary along William Barefoot Drive, and north along Nottingham Road, thereby transferring a large part of the Nottingham area to Bromley.

17. We received over 300 individual letters opposing Greenwich's suggestion. We also received four petitions: 723 residents signed a petition organised by the Nottingham Estate Tenants' and Residents' Association; the residents of Cranmore Road submitted a petition bearing 121 signatures; 361 residents signed a petition organised by the Edgebury Tenants' and Residents' Association; and a further petition was signed by 533 residents. All opposed Nottingham being united in Greenwich.

18. A local general practitioner opposed Greenwich's suggestion on the grounds that the transfer of the Edgebury Estate and part of Chislehurst would present working difficulties for medical practitioners in Chislehurst, and result in less efficient services for patients. It was also opposed by the Bromley Residents' Federation, which supported Bromley's suggestion.

19. Greenwich had expressed the view that the residential property to the south of Nottingham Village centre had characteristics in common with Greenwich's Coldharbour Estate. However, the Nottingham and Chislehurst residents who wrote to us disclaimed any affinity or community of interest with Greenwich; rather, they stressed their community of interest with Bromley. A view expressed by some Chislehurst residents was that Greenwich's suggestion would further split their area, and that their affinities lay with the community of Chislehurst, in Bromley.
20. We took the view that Bromley's suggestion, to realign the boundary to the A20 Sidcup Road, would unite Nottingham and would provide a good, clear boundary. However, notwithstanding the support from many residents for this suggestion, we considered that the council had failed to demonstrate how such a major change would be justified in terms of improvements in effective and convenient local government in the Nottingham area. We felt that similar considerations applied to the suggestion from a local resident for a realignment of the boundary along William Barefoot Drive and Nottingham Road.

21. After carefully considering the representations from local residents and the petitions submitted to us opposing Greenwich's suggestion, we decided against proposing major change in the Nottingham area. It appeared to us that the existing boundary causes little difficulty in the provision of local government services to the area, and that there was little evidence that large scale change would lead to a significant improvement in effective and convenient local government. We considered that anomalies in the existing boundary could be resolved by minor realignments, and took an interim decision to make no proposal for radical change.

22. Our interim decision to propose no radical change in the Nottingham area was supported by Greenwich and by three members of the public. The Council commented that, while it still believed Nottingham should be united in Greenwich, it recognised that this would be strongly opposed by local residents.

23. Bromley opposed our interim decision and resubmitted its previous suggestion to unite Nottingham in Bromley, by realigning the boundary along the A20 Sidcup Road. The Council took the view that the existing boundary divides what is essentially a single community, whereas the A20 is a natural barrier between communities. It commented that those residents living south of the A20 look to Nottingham Road, in Bromley, for their community facilities.
24. Bromley said that if Mottingham was united in its area, it would be able to handle the extra demands on its services, and that planning issues would be simplified. It commented that the fact that the current boundary was not perceived as causing significant problems did not justify the continued division of what it considered to be a single community. The Council said that it believed that the majority of Mottingham residents, including those currently in Greenwich, would prefer to be in Bromley.

25. Greenwich strongly opposed Bromley's suggestion, commenting that it would severely disrupt service provision, as various Greenwich facilities such as libraries, adult education, community centres and playing fields are located in the area that would be transferred. The Council emphasised that there are different levels of service provision in the two boroughs. Nor did Greenwich consider there to be any justification for Bromley's claim that the overwhelming majority of Greenwich residents in Mottingham would support being united in Bromley, as no survey of local opinion had been carried out.

26. We received no other representations opposing our interim decision, and thus had little evidence to support Bromley's contention that the majority of Mottingham residents wanted major change in the area. While Bromley's suggestion had originally received quite strong support locally, we felt this had been primarily a reaction against Greenwich's suggestion, and concluded that residents are content with the general alignment of the existing boundary. Nor did we feel that Bromley had demonstrated that the present arrangements seriously hinder the effective provision of services to the area, or that major change would lead to a significant improvement in effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.
Draft Proposal

27. Greenwich suggested realigning the boundary along Mottingham Lane and Winn Road. Bromley submitted an identical suggestion. The existing boundary splits properties and is ill-defined, and we agreed that the suggested realignment would provide a clear, well-defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt the Councils' suggestions as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

28. Greenwich supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) West Hallowes/Highcombe Close

Draft Proposal

29. Greenwich suggested realigning the boundary along the rear of properties in West Hallowes and Highcombe Close. Bromley submitted an identical suggestion. The existing boundary is ill-defined and divides properties, and we agreed that the Councils' suggestions would provide a more satisfactory boundary. We therefore decided to adopt them as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

30. Greenwich supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
(d) Mottingham Road

Maps 3 and 4

Draft Proposal

31. The existing boundary divides properties in Mottingham Village. Greenwich suggested a realignment of the boundary along the centre of Mottingham Road and White Horse Hill. The Metropolitan Police made an identical suggestion. Bromley suggested realigning the boundary along the rear of Nos 29 - 75 Mottingham Road, and then along the centre of Mottingham Road and White Horse Hill. The residents of two properties split by the existing boundary asked for them to be united in Bromley.

32. We accepted that, with the exception of the centre of the village, where Greenwich and Bromley had each suggested uniting Nos 29-75 Mottingham Road in its own area, realigning the boundary to the centre of Mottingham Road would resolve the problem of split properties. However, we took the view that, as Nos 29-75 Mottingham Road include Mottingham Library, which is owned and maintained by Bromley, the greater part of the village centre should be united in that authority. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal the suggestions submitted by Greenwich and by Bromley to realign the boundary to the centre of White Horse Hill and Mottingham Road, and Bromley's suggestion to unite Nos 29-75 Mottingham Road in its area.

Final Proposal

33. Our draft proposal was supported by two local residents. However, it was opposed by some residents of Mottingham Road, who submitted four individual letters and a petition bearing 27 signatures. The residents commented that they are satisfied with the services provided by Bromley and that they wished their properties to be united in that Borough. Greenwich did not comment.
34. We also received two alternative suggestions for realignments. One resident suggested realigning the boundary to the rear of properties in Nottingham Road, thereby uniting all the properties in that road in Bromley. Another suggested realigning the boundary along the rear of properties in Nottingham Road, between Court Road and Porcupine Close, on the grounds that this would unite all the shops in Nottingham Village in Bromley.

35. The existing boundary splits 22 properties in Nottingham Road. Although they front onto Bromley, the major part of each of these properties lies in Greenwich. We considered the alternative suggestions submitted to us for uniting properties in Bromley but none appeared wholly satisfactory. Nor would they produce as clear and as identifiable a boundary as our draft proposal. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(e) Mainridge Road/Hillview Road

Draft Proposal

36. The existing boundary in this area splits No 12 Hillview Road. Greenwich suggested a realignment along the rear of properties in White Horse Hill and Hillview Road, thereby uniting all the properties in Hillview Road and Mainridge Road in Greenwich. Bromley originally submitted an identical suggestion, but subsequently withdrew it, suggesting as an alternative a minor realignment to follow the curtilage of No 12 Hillview Road, thereby uniting the property in its authority, and a further realignment to the rear of Nos 41-45 Greenaway.

37. We received 39 letters from residents of Hillview Road, Mainridge Road and Walkden Road opposing Greenwich's suggestion, together with a petition containing 41 signatures from residents of Hillview Road, who suggested uniting the whole of their street in Bromley. Another petition, signed by 64 residents of Hillview
Road, Mainridge Road, and Walkden Road, also opposed Greenwich's suggestion, proposing instead that those roads should be united in Bromley. Greenwich residents in Mainridge Road and Lydstep Road submitted a petition containing 49 signatures seeking a transfer to Bromley. The grounds given by these residents were that they had strong social and community ties with Chislehurst and Bromley and that they look to Bromley for services.

38. While recognising the wishes of the residents in the area for their properties to be transferred to Bromley, we did not consider such an extensive realignment to be justified given the minor nature of the anomaly along the existing boundary, the remainder of which appears to be satisfactory. We considered that the division of No 12 Hillview Road could be rectified by realigning the boundary along the east side of the property's curtilage, as suggested by Bromley. We therefore decided to adopt Bromley's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

39. In response to our draft proposal, Greenwich resubmitted its original suggestion to unite Mainridge Road and Hillview Road in its area, by realigning the boundary to the rear of properties on White Horse Hill and Mainridge Road. It commented that this would lead to more effective management of local government services in the area and would provide a more logical boundary.

40. We also received a petition bearing 76 signatures, and three letters from residents of Mainridge Road and Hillview Road, opposing our draft proposal and restating residents' view that this area looks to Chislehurst in Bromley for all facilities and should, therefore, be transferred to that Borough. One of the letters was forwarded to us by Mr Peter Bottomley MP, who supported the residents' requests that we give further consideration to the area's transfer to Bromley.
41. While acknowledging residents' comments that they use facilities in Chislehurst, we were not wholly convinced that they did so to the exclusion of similar facilities in the Nottingham area. As indicated in paragraph 25 above, Greenwich provides a number of facilities in the Nottingham area. Accordingly, we considered that there was insufficient justification to warrant the transfer of Mainridge Road and Hillview Road to Bromley. Similarly, we concluded that Greenwich's suggestion, to transfer properties in Hillview Road and White Horse Hill to its authority went wider than was necessary to rectify the minor anomaly in the existing boundary.

42. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(f) Green Lane/Edgebury/Brownspring Road

Draft Proposal

43. The existing boundary in this area splits a number of properties and a school playing field. Greenwich suggested realigning the boundary along the north western side of No 181 Green Lane to rejoin the existing boundary. It then suggested a realignment to the west side of the curtilage of No 2 Edgebury, along Edgebury and the rear of properties in Brownspring Drive to Imperial Way. The suggested realignment then followed the western side of the curtilage of No 152 Imperial Way, the rear boundaries of properties in Imperial Way and north along the east side of Stonefield Assessment Centre, to meet the existing Bromley/Bexley boundary at Sidcup Road. Bromley suggested a similar realignment, the only difference being that it suggested uniting Nos 183 and 185 Green Lane in its area.

44. Greenwich also submitted a more radical suggestion, to unite the whole of the Edgebury Estate in its area, on the grounds that these properties form an integral part of the development in Greenwich, and that the principal access to the estate is from
45. We received six letters from residents of the area supporting the suggestions by Greenwich and Bromley to unite split properties in Bromley, and a letter from a Greenwich resident asking that Domonic Drive should also be transferred to Bromley. In response to Greenwich's radical suggestion to unite the Edgebury Estate in Greenwich, we received a petition containing 361 signatures from the Edgebury Tenants' and Residents' Association and six individual letters, all opposing the suggested transfer to Greenwich.

46. We considered that Greenwich's more radical suggestion would unite the Edgebury Estate with development to the north, in Greenwich, but would split the Estate from the school in Belmont Lane which serves it. We also observed that there is access to the estate from both Boroughs; via Molescroft, in Greenwich, and via Belmont Lane, in Bromley. There was considerable local opposition to Greenwich's suggestion, and the residents who wrote to us, many of them Bromley tenants, stated that their affinities were with Bromley and not Greenwich. In the light of the foregoing, we considered that there would be no justification in terms of effective and convenient local government for uniting the estate in Greenwich.

47. Of the suggestions for more minor change, we observed that Bromley's suggestion would unite in one borough the properties in Green Lane to the south of Hillview Road, whereas Greenwich's suggestion would leave them divided between two boroughs. We considered that Bromley's suggestion would provide a clear boundary which, from the representations we had received, also appeared better to reflect peoples' affinities in the area. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal, Bromley's suggestion to unite split properties in Bromley, and the Stonefield Assessment Centre in Greenwich.
Final Proposal

48. Our draft proposal was supported by three members of the public, but was opposed in part by Greenwich.

49. Greenwich did not comment on our proposed realignment in the vicinity of Green Lane. However, it opposed that part of our draft proposal relating to the Edgebury Estate. It said that the 22 properties in Slades Drive and Imperial Way, which under our draft proposal would be transferred to Bromley, are in no way disadvantaged by the present boundary, and submitted a new suggestion to retain most of these properties in Greenwich.

50. One resident of Domonic Drive asked that her property should also be transferred to Bromley, suggesting that other residents of Domonic Drive and Brownspring Drive might also feel that their affinities are mainly with Bromley rather than Greenwich. Another resident of Domonic Drive suggested realigning the boundary along the centres of Domonic Drive and Brownspring Drive, on the grounds that he looks more towards Chislehurst, in Bromley.

51. We took the view that Slades Drive and Imperial Way formed part of the Edgebury Estate, the larger part of which is in Bromley. We observed that all direct vehicular access to Slades Drive is from Bromley, and concluded that it would be more conducive to the provision of effective and convenient local government if Bromley were to provide services to all the properties in this area.

52. We considered that the suggestion to realign the boundary to Domonic Drive and Brownspring Drive was unsatisfactory, as it would divide similar developments on either side of these roads. Accordingly, we have reaffirmed our view that our draft proposal would provide the clearest and most logical boundary in this area, and decided to confirm it as final.
ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

53. Our final proposals will have 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

54. 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

55. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Greenwich and Bromley 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 six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposals letter of 21 August 1991, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed          K F J ENNALS    (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary
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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>Bromley LB Mottingham Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Mottingham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Mottingham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Tarn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bromley LB Tarn Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Mottingham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Mottingham Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Tarn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bromley LB Tarn Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Mottingham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bromley LB Mottingham Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP NO. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bromley LB Mottingham Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP NO. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP NO. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bromley LB Chislehurst Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Coldharbour Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNEX B
### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

**Boundary between Greenwich and Bromley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Lane</td>
<td>Realignment to the centres of Winn Road and Nottingham Road.</td>
<td>Paragraph 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hallows/Highcombe Close</td>
<td>Realignment along the rear of properties in West Hallows and Highcombe Close.</td>
<td>Paragraph 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Road</td>
<td>Realignment to unite 29-75 Nottingham Road in Bromley and along the centres of Nottingham Road and White Horse Hill.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 33-35, Maps 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainridge Road/Hillview Road</td>
<td>Realignment to unite No 12 Hillview Road in Bromley, together with a minor realignment to the rear of Nos 41-45 Greenaway.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 39-42, Map 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane/Edgebury/Brownspring Drive</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Edgebury, Edgebury Estate and Imperial Way in Bromley and the Stonefield Assessment Centre in Greenwich.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 48-52, Map 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>