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INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Lewisham’s boundaries with the London Boroughs of Greenwich and Tower Hamlets. In this report we propose no changes to Lewisham’s river boundary with Tower Hamlets, and only limited change to its boundary with Greenwich, with the intention of removing anomalies, for example, where properties are divided by the boundary, or where it splits areas of similar development.

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 of 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 on 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 the 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 the 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 this review. Paragraphs 65-69 and 82-87 of that report, which relate to communities in London and their sense of identity, are relevant to the issues raised by the boundary between Lewisham and Greenwich and our proposals for change.

THE BOUNDARIES COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Lewisham’s boundary with Greenwich and its river boundary with Tower Hamlets. Our final proposals for Lewisham’s boundaries with Southwark have already been submitted to you (Report No 637), as have our final proposals for Lewisham’s boundary with Bromley (Report No 641) and Lewisham’s boundaries with Bromley, Croydon, Lambeth and Southwark in the Crystal Palace area (Report No 632).

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

10. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Greenwich; these submissions were subsequently revised and joint suggestions for boundary realignments were submitted by both Councils in September 1990. However, as the original suggestions submitted by each authority were not withdrawn, we considered these in addition to the Councils’ joint submission. Responses were also received from the Metropolitan Police, the Governors of Hughes Fields School and a member of the public.
11. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published a further consultation letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions. This was published on 6 December 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 proposals and interim decisions. In addition, Lewisham, Greenwich and Tower Hamlets 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 14 February 1992.

12. In response to our draft proposals letter, we received comments from Lewisham and Greenwich, from the Metropolitan Police, London Regional Transport and from one local resident.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

LEWISHAM’S RIVER BOUNDARY WITH TOWER HAMLETS

13. We received no suggestions for change to the river boundary between Lewisham and Tower Hamlets. We considered the boundary satisfactory and therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals.

14. We received no response to our interim decision to propose no change to this boundary, and have decided to confirm it as final.
LEWISHAM’S BOUNDARY WITH GREENWICH

(a) Deptford Creek

Draft Proposal

15. Lewisham had originally suggested realigning the boundary along Deptford Creek, on the grounds that the Creek formed the natural boundary between the two boroughs. It commented that the existing boundary splits an area which has strong links with Deptford, and whose residents use Deptford High Street’s shopping facilities. It also said that the division of Deptford High Street between two authorities creates problems for the co-ordination of shopping policies. Greenwich opposed this suggestion, commenting that it had plans to redevelop both banks of the Creek, and that such a realignment would have major electoral consequences for its Council. The two Councils subsequently submitted a joint suggestion to realign the boundary along Watergate Street.

16. The Metropolitan Police also suggested realigning the boundary along Deptford Creek, commenting that the area had community ties with Deptford. The Governors of Hughes Fields School opposed the transfer of the school from Greenwich to Lewisham, which would result from a realignment of the boundary to Deptford Creek.

17. We accepted the point made by Greenwich that a realignment along Deptford Creek would be undesirable, as it would split a riverside site which is subject to major redevelopment proposals, and concluded that a realignment along Watergate Street, as suggested by Lewisham and Greenwich in their joint submission, would provide a clear and identifiable boundary. In our view, such a change would have the benefit of resolving the boundary anomalies in the area while avoiding major electoral changes to Greenwich’s west ward. We therefore decided to adopt the joint suggestion submitted by Lewisham and Greenwich as our draft
Final proposal

18. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(b) Creek Road/Deptford Church Street

Draft proposal

19. Greenwich had originally suggested realigning the boundary along the centre of Evelyn Street and Creek Road between Prince Street and Deptford Church Street. In their subsequent joint submission, the two Councils suggested realigning the boundary along the centre of Deptford Church Street and Berthon Street. A member of the public expressed concern over a possible housing development on a nature park located between Bronze Street and Berthon Street, but made no reference to the Councils' suggestions.

20. We considered the existing boundary to be unsatisfactory as it divides a community to the north and west of Deptford Church Street and also open land to the east of Deptford Church Street. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal Greenwich's original suggestion for a realignment of the boundary to the centre of Creek Road between its junctions with Watergate Street and Deptford Church Street, together with the Councils' joint suggestion for a realignment to the centre of Deptford Church Street.

Final proposal

21. Both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police supported our draft proposal. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other
representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) Deptford Creek - minor realignments

Draft proposal

22. Lewisham suggested three minor realignments to remove small stretches of defaced boundary, and to realign it to ground features. We considered that Lewisham’s suggestions would satisfactorily rectify the anomalies in the existing boundary and decided to adopt them as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

23. Our draft proposal was supported by both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) Coldbath Street

Draft proposal

24. Both Lewisham and Greenwich suggested minor boundary realignments to unite in Lewisham a Thames Water site between Coldbath Street and the Ravensbourne River. As the only access to this land is from Lewisham, we decided to adopt the Councils’ joint suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

25. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
Draft proposal

26. Greenwich originally suggested uniting Ravensbourne Park in Lewisham, but retaining the residential area in the vicinity of Elverson Road in Greenwich. The two Councils' subsequent joint submission suggested realigning the boundary to the Ravensbourne River, thereby uniting Ravensbourne Park and the residential area of Elverson Road in Lewisham. The Metropolitan Police submitted an identical suggestion.

27. The existing boundary creates a small Greenwich salient into Lewisham and divides two residential roads. We agreed that the Ravensbourne River would provide a clear and identifiable boundary, and decided to adopt Lewisham's and Greenwich's joint suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

28. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. London Regional Transport informed us of a proposal to divert the Ravensbourne River to allow the proposed Docklands Light Railway extension to follow the existing course of the waterway.

29. The private legislation dealing with the extension of the Docklands Light Railway has yet to complete its passage through Parliament, and it may be some years before the Ravensbourne River is diverted and the extension actually constructed. We therefore felt it would be premature to modify our draft proposal to take account of the development proposals for this area. In any event, we did not consider that the possible future diversion of the river would present any problem in view of the powers available to the Secretary of State under section 73 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 1992) to alter the boundary to the new course of
the river. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(f) **Lethbridge Estate**

*Map 5*

**Draft proposal**

30. Lewisham had originally suggested realigning the boundary in this area along the centre of Lewisham Road and Blackheath Hill. However, in their subsequent joint submission, Lewisham and Greenwich suggested that the boundary should be realigned along Lewisham Road, Sparta Street, and then northwards along the west side of Landale Court and Robertson House.

31. We agreed that the Councils' joint suggestion would unite the Lethbridge Estate and would resolve the anomalies along the existing boundary. We therefore decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

**Final proposal**

32. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham, but opposed by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. The Metropolitan Police expressed a preference for Lewisham's original suggestion for a realignment along the centre of Lewisham Road and Blackheath Hill. This, they considered, would provide a clearer and more logical boundary.

33. We gave further consideration to Lewisham's original suggestion in the light of the support given to it by the Metropolitan Police. However, it appeared to us that the effect of such a realignment would be to divide a major road junction and split a shopping area. We reaffirmed our view that our draft proposal offered a better boundary, satisfactorily uniting the Lethbridge Estate in Lewisham. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
34. Lewisham had originally suggested realigning the boundary along the A2 Shooters Hill Road, St Germans Place and South Row, on the grounds that such a realignment would rationalise the boundary. Greenwich had originally suggested realigning the boundary along the Ravensbourne River and the Lewisham to Blackheath railway line. It expressed the view that this would unite the whole of the Heath and the Blackheath community in one borough, and that the maintenance and preservation of the Heath could be carried out more effectively and efficiently by one authority. It also commented that residents of the area perceive themselves to be part of the Blackheath community, irrespective of the borough in which they actually reside.

35. The subsequent joint submission from Lewisham and Greenwich did not include any suggestion for change to the boundary in the area of Blackheath.

36. The existing boundary in this area divides both Blackheath and Blackheath Village between Lewisham and Greenwich, and we considered the desirability of seeking to unite them in a single borough. However, the Heath appeared to us to be a focal point, not only for the residents of Blackheath Village but for the wider Blackheath community, which we felt is less well defined and includes residents of both Lewisham and Greenwich. We therefore took the view that uniting Blackheath Village in one local authority could not be considered in isolation from the desirability of seeking also to unite the wider Blackheath community.

37. We had received no views from local residents on boundary changes in this area in response to our letter of 1 April 1987. Nevertheless, we felt that a further investigation of community ties and the provision of local government services in the area was required before we could formulate any draft proposals for change. We therefore sought further information from Lewisham and
Greenwich, and from the Blackheath Society.

38. In response to our request for further information, Lewisham explained that the maintenance of the Heath is co-ordinated by a joint advisory group consisting of representatives of both boroughs, and that an informal arrangement exists whereby each borough maintains a small section of the Heath which is outside its respective area. Lewisham considered that this arrangement had worked well, and believed that a realignment along the A2 Shooters Hill Road, as it had originally suggested, would reflect the current informal arrangements between the two boroughs.

39. Greenwich expressed similar satisfaction with the present arrangements for the maintenance of the Heath, and also believed that a realignment along the A2 Shooters Hill Road, formally recognising the current management arrangements between the two boroughs, would be desirable.

40. The Blackheath Society said that it had hoped that, after the abolition of the Greater London Council, the management of the Heath would be vested in a single body, and expressed some dissatisfaction over current arrangements for its maintenance. The main part of the Heath is situated in Lewisham, which authority the Society considered to be better funded and equipped to manage the Heath. However, from its experience of the two authorities, the society felt that the "pendulum of enthusiasm" for the Heath's maintenance could, over time, swing between Lewisham and Greenwich. The Society also pointed out that there were those who felt that uniting the Heath in one authority would destroy the pattern of ancient boundaries, and who therefore favoured only minor change, such as aligning the boundary to the A2 Shooters Hill Road.

41. We noted the lack of support for any suggestion that we should seek to unite the wider Blackheath community in one borough. In the light of this, we decided to consider only those minor issues relating to Blackheath and Blackheath Village.
42. As part of its response to our request for further information on the Blackheath area, the Blackheath Society pointed out that the only access to Bennett Park, in Greenwich, is from Lewisham. The Society proposed uniting this area in Lewisham, but did not suggest an alignment.

43. We understood the desirability of seeking to unite Bennett Park in Lewisham and considered a number of possible realignments. However, given the pattern of development in the area, these all created more boundary anomalies than they resolved. We therefore concluded that there was no obvious means by which Bennett Park could be united in Lewisham. No proposals in respect of the village had been received. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals in respect of Blackheath Village.

Final proposals and decision

44. In response to our interim decision, we received comments from Lewisham, Greenwich and from the Metropolitan Police.

45. We also received a suggestion for radical change from a local resident, to unite Blackheath Village in one authority. He suggested that our proposed realignment of the boundary to Shooters Hill Road (discussed in paragraphs 49-50 below) should be extended eastwards to join Kidbrooke Park Road and then southwards as far as Eltham Road. His suggested realignment then followed Eltham Road eastwards, either to join Westhorne Avenue at the junction of the two roads, or to follow Sidcup Road from its junction with Eltham Road, southwards to join Westhorne Avenue.

46. This suggestion would transfer a significant number of properties and electors to Lewisham, and have the effect of uniting the wider Blackheath area within one authority. However,
it had not been supported by any other local residents, or by either of the local authorities. Indeed, the virtual lack of comments from Blackheath residents, or from the Blackheath Society, suggested to us that they were broadly content with the existing boundary, and did not seek change. Accordingly, we have decided not to pursue the suggestion for a major boundary realignment.

47. Both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police supported our interim decision to make no proposal for Blackheath Village. We received no other comments or suggestions for change, and have decided to confirm as final our interim decision to make no proposals.

(ii) The Heath

Draft proposal

48. As indicated in paragraphs 39 and 40 above, there appeared to be no problems with the maintenance of the Heath, and both Lewisham and Greenwich had expressed satisfaction with the present management arrangements. We therefore felt that the boundary should be realigned along Shooters Hill Road to formalise the arrangements already in place, and decided to adopt Lewisham’s original suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to modifications to unite in Lewisham two small areas of open space with the southern and eastern parts of the Heath.

Final proposal

49. Both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the A2 Shooters Hill Road. Greenwich, while supporting our draft proposal in principle, suggested that it be modified slightly, by realigning the boundary to the north side of the Shooters Hill Slip Road, and the west side of St Germans Place. Greenwich considered that, as the properties fronting onto these roads would remain in its
area, it should also retain the responsibility for maintenance of the roads.

50. We agreed that Greenwich’s suggested modification would aid service provision and clarify road maintenance responsibility. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to realigning the boundary to the north side of the Shooters Hill Slip Road, and the west side of St Germans Place.

(h) Lee Road/Eltham Road

Draft proposal

51. Lewisham suggested realigning the boundary to follow the centres of Lee Road and Eltham Road, to remove a small stretch of undefined boundary. We agreed that Lewisham’s suggestion would rectify the boundary defacements in this area, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

52. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(i) Cambridge Drive/Upwood Road

Draft proposal

53. Lewisham and Greenwich jointly suggested realigning the boundary along the rear of properties in Woodville Close, along the eastern and southern sides of the Old Colfeians Sports Ground, and then southwards between Nos 66 and 68 Upwood Road and Nos 93 and 95 Upwood Road.

54. The existing boundary splits properties in Woodville Close
and Upwood Road, and divides a sports ground, the access to which is from Greenwich. We therefore decided to adopt the joint suggestion from Lewisham and Greenwich as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

55. Both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police supported our draft proposal. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(j) Colfe's School

Draft proposal

56. Lewisham and Greenwich had each originally suggested uniting Colfe's School in its respective area. In their subsequent joint submission, the Councils suggested that the boundary should be realigned along the northern, western and southern edges of the school playing field, to unite it and the school in Greenwich.

57. As the school building and the majority of the school grounds are in Greenwich, we decided to adopt the Councils' joint suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

58. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(k) Horncastle Road

Draft proposal

59. Lewisham suggested a realignment to the rear of properties
in Horncastle Road, to correct a stretch of defaced boundary. We agreed that Lewisham’s suggestion would tie the boundary to firm ground detail and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

60. Our draft proposal was supported by both Lewisham and the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(1) Woodyates Road

Draft proposal

61. Lewisham and Greenwich jointly suggested realigning the boundary along the southern curtilage of No 193 Woodyates Road, to unite the property in Lewisham. We agreed with the desirability of uniting the property, and decided to adopt the Councils’ joint suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

62. Our draft proposal was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police. Greenwich did not comment. We received no other representations and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(m) Conington Road/Lewisham Road

63. Greenwich and Lewisham submitted a joint suggestion to realign the boundary along Lewisham Road and Conington Road. However, the existing boundary is not defaced at any point, and we concluded that the suggestion would lead to an undesirable extension of a Greenwich salient into Lewisham, which we did not consider to be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore took an interim decision to make no
proposals.

64. Our interim decision was supported by Lewisham and by the Metropolitan Police but was opposed by Greenwich.

65. Greenwich asked that the Councils' joint suggestion for a realignment along Conington Road and Lewisham Road be reconsidered, in order to unite the former Greater London Council Orchard Housing Estate in Greenwich. The Council commented that the main access for vehicles is through the estate roads which lead into Greenwich rather than Lewisham; that the Lewisham part of the estate is surrounded by non-residential properties and industrial premises; and that all associated residential property is located to the west, in Greenwich. It also reported the view of Council officials working on the Estate, that residents are more likely to use such facilities as shops, social clubs and churches which are provided on the Estate than those elsewhere.

66. Greenwich also commented that residents of the Orchard Estate are likely to use the extension to the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) which is planned for the area, and that its Council is in close consultation with the DLR authorities over the planning, design and operation of this facility.

67. We considered Greenwich's suggestion and the further information provided. While Greenwich had stated that its suggested realignment would unite the Orchard Estate in Greenwich, we observed that there appeared to be a related area between Lewisham Road, Blackheath Rise and Princes Rise, which would remain in Lewisham.

68. We also considered the impact on the area of the extension to the Docklands Light Railway. However, the DLR extension, once constructed, will serve residents of both Greenwich and Lewisham, and the DLR authorities are in consultation with both Councils. The interests of the residents of the Orchard Estate should be safeguarded, regardless of the borough in which they are
situated.

69. In the absence of any boundary anomalies in this area, we maintained our view that the suggested realignment would produce an undesirable Greenwich salient into Lewisham and would not be conducive to more effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our interim decision to make no proposals.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

70. 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

71. 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

72. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Lewisham, Greenwich and Tower Hamlets asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that 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 6 December 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
7 May 1992
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<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>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Evelyn Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A B C E</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A C E</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B D</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Grinling Gibbons Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Greenwich LB West Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Ladywell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greenwich LB St Alfege Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Blackheath Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Blackheath Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB St Alfege Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greenwich LB St Alfege Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Blackheath Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Vanbrugh Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Blackheath Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Blackheath Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB Blackheath LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Margaret Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Sutcliffe Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Sutcliffe Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Sutcliffe Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B D</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Sutcliffe Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB St Mildred Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greenwich LB Middle Park Ward</td>
<td>Lewisham LB St Mildred Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Creek</td>
<td>Realignment along Watergate Street to provide a clear and identifiable boundary.</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Road and Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Realignment to the centres of Creek Road, Deptford Church Street and Berthon Street to tie the boundary to firm ground detail.</td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Creek-Minor realignments</td>
<td>Realignment along the centre of Deptford Creek to remove small stretches of defaced boundary.</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldbath Street</td>
<td>Realignment between Coldbath Street and Ravensbourne River to unite a Thames Water site in Lewisham.</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elverson Road and Ravensbourne River</td>
<td>Realignment along the Ravensbourne River to unite Ravensbourne Park and the residential area of Elverson Road in Lewisham.</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge Estate</td>
<td>Realignment along Lewisham Road, Sparta Street and then Northwards along the west</td>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
side of Landale Court and
Robertson House to unite
the Lethbridge Estate
in Lewisham.

Blackheath

Realignment along the
A2 Shooters Hill Road,
St Germans Place and
South Row to rationalise
the boundary.

Lee Road/
Eltham Road

Realignment along the
centres of Lee Road
and Eltham Road to
remove a small stretch
of undefined boundary.

Cambridge Drive/
Upwood Road

Realignment along the
rear of properties in
Woodville Close, along
the eastern and southern
sides of the Old
Colfeians sports ground
and then southwards
between Nos 66 and 68
Upwood Road and Nos 93
and 95 Upwood Road to
remove anomalies.

Colfe's School

Realignment along the
Northern, western and
southern edges of the
school playing field,
to unite it and the
school in Greenwich.

Horncastle Road

Realignment to the
rear of properties in
Horncastle Road to
correct a stretch of
defaced boundary.
Realignment of the boundary along the southern curtilage of 193 Woodyates Road to unite the property in Lewisham.