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Dear Sir,

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
REPORT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

1. I enclose herewith copies of the Commission's Report No 226.

2. The Commission's final proposals have now been submitted to the Home Secretary, who, if he decides to accept them will make the necessary order under section 51(2) of the Local Government Act 1972 to bring the revised arrangements into effect.

3. The Council are asked to place a copy of the report on deposit at their main office, and to arrange for the display of notices in the form annexed to this letter as soon as practicable at places where public notices are customarily displayed. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the 1972 Act the report should be made available for inspection until the expiration of 6 months after the Home Secretary has made an order to give effect to the Commission's recommendations, with or without modification. The Council are also asked to arrange for the publication of the notice as soon as practicable for two successive weeks in local newspapers. A copy of each insertion should be sent to the Commission with a note of the name of the newspaper in which the notice appeared and the date of publication. The Commission will reimburse the cost of publishing these notices on receipt of the Council's invoice.

4. Copies of this letter together with a copy of the report are being sent to the bodies and persons who received the Commission's original consultation letter or who submitted comments.

Yours faithfully,

[N. Digney]

N Digney
NOTICE OF SUBMISSION TO THE HOME SECRETARY

NOTICE IS GIVEN that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England have submitted to the Home Secretary their report proposing the future electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Brent.

Copies of the report can be inspected during office hours at the offices of the

[Please insert address]

M DIGNEY
Secretary
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR
THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Brent in accordance with the requirements of section 50(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that London borough.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 10 June 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Brent Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the London Boroughs Association, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.

3. Brent Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward.
They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 25 February 1976 Brent Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 32 wards, each returning two councillors, and 2 single member wards, to form a council of 66 members.

5. The Borough Council's submission included copies of correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We considered this, together with the comments which had been sent to us direct. These included proposals for an alternative scheme of wards from a joint local political association; objections to changes affecting the present Tokyngton ward from a residents' association, supported by a petition containing over 400 signatures; representations from another residents' association about the proposed Northwick Park and Kenton wards; and suggestions by a local resident for modifications to a number of wards.

6. We studied the Council's draft scheme and the alternative scheme. We concluded that the alternative scheme offered no obvious advantages over the Council's draft scheme, which we considered would provide a satisfactory basis for the future representation of the borough in compliance with the rules of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines. We decided to adopt the Council's scheme as the basis for our draft proposals.

7. We examined the comments and criticisms which had been made and decided to propose two new 3-member wards, Tokyngton and Preston, in place of the Council's 2-member Tokyngton, Preston and Wembley Park wards. We also decided to adjust the boundary between the Kenton and Northwick Park wards. After consulting the
Ordnance Survey, we made some minor alterations to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

8. On 5 November 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 6 January 1977.

9. Brent Borough Council accepted our draft proposals but suggested a revised boundary between the proposed Preston and Tokyngton wards to give a better balance of representation.

10. The joint local political association which had previously submitted an alternative scheme made new proposals for a revised scheme of wards. Another political association objected to the proposed Preston and Tokyngton wards, preferring the three 2-member wards proposed in the Council's draft scheme. They also suggested a modification to the proposed Roe Green ward. A branch of a local political party reiterated the representations which they had made previously to the Borough Council about the proposed Northwick Park and Sudbury wards. The local resident mentioned in paragraph 5 above, wrote again suggesting modifications affecting the proposed Church End, Gladstone and Willesden Green wards. We received eight letters from residents objecting to the fact that the present Town Hall ward would cease to exist.
11. In view of these comments, we decided that we needed further information
to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2)
of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr W Wilson was appointed as Assistant
Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Brent Town Hall,
Wembley on 27 April 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1
to this report.

13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the
areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals
should be confirmed, subject to certain modifications. He recommended that
the proposed Northwick Park ward should be renamed Sudbury Court ward; that the
boundaries between the proposed Tokyngton and Preston wards, the proposed
St Andrew's and Barnhill wards, and the proposed Fryent and Roe Green wards
should be realigned; that the proposed Barham and One Tree Hill wards should
be combined to form a 3-member Barham ward; and that the proposed St Raphael's and
Brentfield wards should be combined to form a 3-member St Raphael's ward.

14. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had
received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the
amendments recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted.
Subject to these modifications, we decided that our draft proposals should be
confirmed as our final proposals.

15. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this
report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors
to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new
wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.
16. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Brent Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNET (Secretary)

16 June 1977
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To: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England,  
20, Albert Embankment,  
London, SE1 7TJ.

INTRODUCTION

1. I have the honour to report that on Wednesday, 27th April, 1977, I held a meeting at the Brent Town Hall to hear representations on the draft proposals of the Commission for the revision of the arrangements in connection with the election of councillors for the London Borough of Brent.

2. The following attended the meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderman P. Hartley</td>
<td>95, Preston Hill, Harrow</td>
<td>Leader of Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor T.W. Gornall</td>
<td>95, Preston Hill, Harrow</td>
<td>Conservative Group on Borough Council and Brent Conservative Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K.B. Betts</td>
<td>Brent Town Hall, Wembley</td>
<td>Town Clerk and Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chilton</td>
<td>Brent Town Hall, Wembley</td>
<td>Former Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D. Metcalfe</td>
<td>Brent Town Hall, Wembley</td>
<td>Town Clerk’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. E.M. Lewis</td>
<td>61, Lancelot Crescent, Wembley</td>
<td>Councillor, Barham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R.J. Mitchell</td>
<td>49, Coniston Gardens, Wembley</td>
<td>Local Government Committee, Brent Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W.J. Jay</td>
<td>104, Wembley Park Drive, Wembley</td>
<td>Brent North Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P.S. Golds</td>
<td>104, Wembley Park Drive, Wembley</td>
<td>Brent North Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M.R. Rosenfeld</td>
<td>19, Clifford Court, Tanfield Avenue, London NW2</td>
<td>Wembley Park Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. Hoffman</td>
<td>33, Meadow Way, Wembley</td>
<td>Sudbury Court Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G.C. Fiegel</td>
<td>55, Blockley Road</td>
<td>Chalkhill resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.J. Wall</td>
<td>14, Buddings Circle, Wembley</td>
<td>Opposition Leader, Brent Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D.J. Jackson</td>
<td>25, Westward Way, Kenton</td>
<td>Wembley Observer - News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Levine</td>
<td>427A, High Road, Wembley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name | Address | Representing
--- | --- | ---
Mrs. N. Talmage | 6, Carlton Avenue W, Wembley | Brent North
Mrs. F.M. Proyer | 140, Carlton Avenue W, Wembley | Brent Conservative Group
Mr. D.J. Harvey | 7, Athiston Heights, Wembley | Brent Conservative Group
Mr. M. Bryn-Jones | 35, Lebanon Park, Wembley | London Borough of Haringey
Mrs. F. Rees-Hughes | 31, Clifton Avenue, Wembley | Tokyngton Residents Association
Miss A.E. Norgate | 31, Waverley Avenue, Wembley | Tokyngton Residents Association
Mr. T. Ashton | 193, Walworth Road, London S.E.17. | Greater London Labour Party
Mrs. M.S. Quirke | 30, Park Road, Wembley | Brent South Labour Party

BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DRAFT SCHEME
3. The London Borough of Brent Council consists of 60 elected members and 10 aldermen and the Borough is divided into 29 2-member wards and 2 1-member wards. Aldermen will cease to sit as members of London Borough Councils after the elections in 1976.

4. In submitting their draft scheme to the Commission, the Council stated that it retained the well-established ward boundaries in the area to the south of the North Circular Road. The present electoral arrangements to the north of this road, however, were unsatisfactory as this area was under-represented on the Council. Provision was therefore made in the scheme for a further 6 councillors to remedy the deficiency and make the total membership in the future 66. The apportionment of councillors proposed by the Council as between the three parliamentary constituencies in the Borough produced, very nearly, the arithmetically correct result, namely 24 councillors for Brent North constituency area, 22 for Brent South and 20 for Brent East.

5. The Council considered that the number of councillors per ward should be limited to two (as at present) as 3-member wards, because of their greater area and electorate, would make it difficult for individual councillors to maintain the close contact with the electorate demanded of them. The draft scheme in redressing the under-representation in the northern area, was obliged to make substantial alterations to the existing wards there, but the resulting wards, together with those to the south, were reasonably close to one another in numerical parity.
6. The draft scheme provided for thirty-two 2-member wards and two 1-member wards. The wards had been kept within the existing boundaries of the three parliamentary constituencies.

7. The electorate of the Borough in 1975 was 194,230 and this was expected to decline to 181,848 by 1981. The decline was spread fairly evenly over the proposed wards, except for three, where development was expected.

8. The Brent North, Brent South and Brent East Conservative and Unionist Associations and the Conservative Group of Brent London Borough Council submitted alternative proposals which they stated had been formulated with the objective of causing as little disruption of present wards as possible, commensurate with the principles which had been laid down. The existing ward boundaries resulted in the under-representation of the Brent North constituency area and the part of the Brent South constituency area lying to the north of the River Brent. It was, therefore, proposed that four additional councillors should be elected for these areas and ward boundary adjustments made elsewhere to achieve greater equality of representation. This would bring the total number of councillors to 64, to be returned by four 3-member wards and twenty-six 2-member wards. The Associations and the Group did not favour single-member wards as their experience since 1968 of two such wards in the Borough, had been that they were not as satisfactorily represented as 2- or 3-member wards owing to the unavoidable absence at times of their representative.

9. The Conservatives' alternative scheme was based on the same forecast 1981 electorate as that adopted by the Council.

10. The Tokyngton Residents Association objected to the proposal of the Council to transfer a part of the existing Tokyngton ward to Wembley Park ward on the grounds that the ward was compact with natural boundaries and the severance of the area in question would give rise to a number of problems. They also submitted a petition containing over 400 signatures.

11. The Sudbury Court Residents Association objected to the proposals in the draft scheme for the Northwick Park and Kenton wards and submitted an alternative proposal.

12. Mr. M.R. Rosenfeld put forward an alternative scheme, which contained 37 wards returning 67 councillors.

COMMISSION'S DRAFT PROPOSALS

13. The Commission decided to adopt the Council's scheme as the basis for their draft proposals subject to two modifications. The first resulted from the representations made by the Tokyngton Residents' Association.
against the transfer of an area of the existing Tokyngton ward to the proposed Wembley Park ward. It involved the abolition of the Council's 2-member Wembley Park ward, with part being added to the Tokyngton ward and increasing its entitlement from 2 to 3 councillors and the remainder to the Council's 2-member Preston ward, which would also become a 3-member ward. This modification produced wards which were similar to the Tokyngton and Preston wards in the Conservatives' alternative scheme. The second modification resulted from the representation of the Sudbury Court Residents' Association and involved the transfer of the northern tip of the proposed Northwick Park ward to Kenton ward. Finally, the Commission decided to adopt a number of minor boundary realignments which were recommended by the Ordnance Survey in the interests of technically better boundaries. Some of these necessitated the crossing of parliamentary constituency boundaries, but this was admissible as the Parliamentary Boundary Commission were expected to begin their review of constituencies when ward boundary revisions had been completed. Constituency boundaries could then be realigned to follow new ward boundaries.

14. The draft proposals consequently consisted of two 3-member wards, twenty-nine 2-member wards and two 1-member wards, making a total of 33 wards returning 66 councillors, the same number of councillors as in the draft scheme.

15. The Commission found the Council's forecast of the 1981 electorates acceptable for the purpose of their draft proposals and these produced an average of 2755 electors per councillor.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT PROPOSALS

16. The Council expressed their regret at the introduction of the two 3-member Tokyngton and Preston wards but were prepared to accept the draft proposals in order to reach a speedy settlement. If, however, the Commission decided, in the light of other representations received, to hold an inquiry, then the Council reserved the right to comment further and perhaps put forward a suggested alteration to the boundary between the two 3-member wards so as to achieve a better balance of representation. A boundary revision for this purpose was later suggested to the Commission.

17. The three Brent Constituency Conservative Associations and the Conservative Group on the Council revised their original alternative scheme in the light of the Commission's draft proposals so as to provide for a Council of 66 members, the same number as that proposed by the Commission, but although accepting some of the draft proposed wards, they still opposed the boundaries of eighteen wards and the proposed re-naming
of another. The Conservatives' scheme provided for six 3-member wards and twenty-four 2-member wards.

18. The Brent North Liberal Association agree with the Commission's modified Northwick Park and Kenton wards but strongly oppose the formation of the 3-member Tokyngton and Preston wards. They ask that these be replaced by three 2-member wards and also that a part of the proposed Roe Green ward be transferred to either the Fryent ward or Kingsbury ward. The Association regrets that the Commission have not included a greater number of single-member wards in their proposals.

19. The Sudbury Ward Branch of the Brent North Constituency Labour Party ask for the boundary between the Sudbury and Northwick Park wards to be altered.

20. Mr. M.R. Rosenfeld comments that Neasden is divided between too many wards and proposes the substitution of the proposed 2-member Church End, Gladstone and Willesden Green wards by three other wards returning 2, 1 and 3 councillors respectively.

21. Objections have also been received from Mrs. D.G. Fordham, Mr. N. Sandler, Mr. P. Amsterdam, Mr. A.D. Lunnow, Mr. D. Green, Mr. & Mrs. Karet, Mr. L. Crawford and Mr. & Mrs. Apley to the proposed abolition of the existing Town Hall ward.

INSPECTIONS

22. Before holding the meeting, I visited all parts of the Borough referred to in the representations which had been made.

23. I informed the meeting of my ward boundary and other visits and offered to make any further inspections desired. In consequence, immediately after the meeting and in the company of Alderman Hartley, Councillor Gornall, Mr. Metcalfe, Mr. Golds and Mr. Hoffman, I visited the Queensbury and Roe Green areas and the different boundaries between them which had been put forward and then the modified boundary between the Tokyngton and Preston wards which had been proposed by the Council. At the same time I also inspected further alternatives to the boundary between these wards which the Conservatives and Mr. Hoffman had suggested at the meeting.

24. Further references to the ward boundaries and the comments made on the draft proposals; particulars of the cases advanced and the views expressed at the meeting and my conclusions and recommendations are contained in the succeeding parts of this report. In view of the large number of wards in dispute and the different areas in which they are situated they are, after a description of the general issues involved, dealt with in turn in their respective constituency area groupings.
25. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive displayed at the meeting large scale maps showing the various proposals which had been submitted, and provided for those present, small scale maps of the draft proposals to assist them in following the proceedings.

26. All present at the meeting were given the opportunity of making their own statements, commenting on those of others and participating in the discussion.

THE ISSUES

GENERAL

27. The Council consider that the making of provision for the six extra councillors necessitates a general review of the wards to the north of the North Circular Road, but that any attempt to produce a slightly more equal representation between the southern wards would involve a drastic alteration of all the existing wards in that area. The Council believe there is merit in retaining the well-established boundaries of these wards.

28. At the meeting, Alderman Hartley, Leader of Brent Council, supported the draft proposals subject to a minor amendment to the boundary between the Tokyngton and Preston wards to secure better electoral equality. He opposed the alternative schemes put forward by the objectors.

29. Alderman Hartley said the first weakness of the Conservatives' alternative scheme was its frequent disregard of the well-established and natural boundaries on which the Commission's proposals were based. A further weakness was that it proposed the creation of a larger number of 3-member wards. Ever since the formation of Brent, the Council had accepted that 2-member wards should be the principle, only to be broken by the occasional allowance of 1-member wards required by particular circumstances. It was thought that the smaller wards provided a better opportunity for good local government and that the contact between the residents and ward councillors would be closer than in a larger ward represented by three councillors. The creation of larger London Borough Councils in 1964 unfortunately made the Town Hall more remote from the residents and therefore made smaller wards desirable. In fact it could well be argued that 1-member wards were the ideal solution and most conducive to a close connection between the Council and the electorate. However, the possibility of a councillor dropping temporarily out of action could not be ignored, hence the preference for 2-member wards. The only 3-member wards in the draft proposals were Tokyngton and Preston. The Council reluctantly accepted these as their scheme had
provided for three 2-member wards for the area, but they conceded that
this would cause the division of the present Tokyngton ward in a manner
which historically would not be acceptable.

30. The Conservative Associations and Group in their written comments
on the draft proposals stated that if alterations were to be made to
the northern wards for reasons other than the accommodation of extra
councillors, then there could be no justification for not reviewing
the existing southern wards (which included all those in the Brent
East constituency area), as the Conservatives proposed originally in
order to achieve greater equality of representation.

31. The Conservatives further commented that in spite of comprehensive
redevelopment and considerable transfer of population in the southern
part of the Borough, the wards there had not been reviewed since 1963,
whilst the third review in 13 years was now being made of the northern
wards. With two exceptions the proposals of the Council had been
incorporated in the Commission's draft proposals. Most of these were as
submitted to the Council by the Constituency Labour Parties. With the
present ward boundaries, the 1974 elections resulted in 35 Labour Party
candidates being elected with a total of 57135 votes and 25 Conservative
Party candidates being elected with a total of 57158 votes. The draft
proposals would make similar or even less equitable results more likely
in future.

32. Summarising their general views, the Conservatives stated that they
accepted the draft proposals for a Council of 66 members and the proposed
allocation of such members among the respective constituency areas, but
this could have been achieved with less disruption by retaining a number
of existing wards in the Brent North Constituency area as well as those
in Brent East. It was because this course had not been followed that
the Conservatives had re-submitted their original proposals for the
revision of the Brent East wards.

33. At the meeting, Councillor Gornall, representing the Brent Conservative
Associations and Conservative Group repeated their view that the present
review should either be restricted to the changes necessary to accommodate
the extra councillors or be comprehensive enough to eliminate anomalies
which existed throughout the Borough. For example, they could not see
any justification for the draft proposals altering the Queensbury ward
from an electorate of 5868 to 5656 whilst leaving Brondesbury Park ward
with an electorate of 6290 and Queens Park ward with an electorate of
4913.
34. Councillor Gornall also emphasized the Conservatives' belief that the best representation was given by 2- or 3-member wards. Further in the case of areas of large new Council development such as the Town Hall ward and parts of Stonebridge, where the problems which residents wished councillors to take up for them tended to be greater than elsewhere, it was advantageous to have three representatives. The Conservatives accordingly proposed ten wards for each constituency, the difference in representation of Brent North area of 24 councillors, Brent South 22 councillors and Brent East 20 councillors, being achieved by providing four 3-member wards in Brent North and two 3-member wards in Brent South, all the rest being 2-member wards. They submitted that their proposals would achieve as satisfactory a scheme numerically as that proposed by the Commission with a minimum of disturbance to the electors.

**BRENT NORTH AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury Ward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5292</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwick Park Ward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4752</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. These wards have been formed from the existing Sudbury and Sudbury Court wards, an area from the former having been transferred to the latter, which has been renamed Northwick Park ward.

36. The Conservatives accept the boundaries of these wards but suggest that the name of Sudbury Court ward should be retained, particularly as the northern boundary of the ward is not to extend beyond the metropolitan railway as was originally proposed. The whole of the Sudbury Court Estate which lies to the north of East Lane and the east of Watford Road is contained in the proposed ward and this area has a strong residents' association of long standing called the Sudbury Court Residents Association. One of the strongest sports clubs in the Borough is the Sudbury Sports Club and its ground is also in the ward.

37. Mr. Fiegel said that the Sudbury Court Residents' Association were happy with the proposed boundaries of the two wards but unhappy with the change of name of Northwick Park for the present Sudbury Court ward. They would be most grateful if the present name could be retained.

38. Alderman Hartley explained that the Council had proposed the change to avoid confusion with Sudbury ward but would not wish to press the matter.

39. The Sudbury Ward Branch of the Brent North Constituency Labour Party in their comments on the draft proposals, criticise the proposed boundary between the two wards as this involves the transference of part of the
Sudbury Court Estate from the existing Sudbury ward to the new Northwick Park ward and, in their opinion, has the effect of severing the community using the shopping facilities at the junction of East Lane and Watford Road. The altered Sudbury ward would have an even less clear identity than it has at present. If it is considered necessary to provide additional electors for the Northwick Park ward, the Branch suggests that polling district NAC (in the south-eastern corner of Sudbury ward) should be transferred to it instead of the area proposed by the Commission.

40. The Sudbury Ward Branch were not represented at the meeting.

41. Alderman Hartley said the alterations requested by the Branch disregarded Watford Road and East Lane as a natural boundary, and in consequence their Northwick Park ward was so drawn as to extend right down to the centre of Wembley and divide the Sudbury Estate along Repton Avenue. The Council opposed the suggested alterations.

42. Mr. Mitchell, for Brent Local Government Committee of the Labour Party supported the draft proposals for the two wards.

Conclusions and Recommendations

43. The boundary between the proposed Sudbury and Northwick Park wards along Watford Road and East Lane is more clearly defined, and less divisive community-wise, than that favoured by the Sudbury Ward Branch of the Labour Party and, in my opinion, should be retained.

44. I recommend that the draft proposals for the Sudbury and Northwick Park wards be adopted subject to the latter being renamed Sudbury Court Ward.

45. Since parliamentary constituency boundaries can be ignored for the purpose of the present review, I examined the question of transferring the small area of Barham ward lying to the north of the railway and having no direct road connection with this ward to the Sudbury ward so that the railway would form the entire boundary between the two wards. I also looked at the narrow wedge-shaped part of the Wembley Central ward which juts some way into the Sudbury Court area, but did not pursue this question when I found that there was no direct road connection with that area.

46. It is estimated that the 1981 electorate of the part of the Barham ward north of the railway will be 611 and its transfer to Sudbury ward would reduce the electorate of the Barham ward from 5559 to 4948 and its entitlement from 2.02 to 1.80 and increase the electorate of the Sudbury Ward from 5292 to 5903 and its entitlement from 1.92 to 2.14.

47. I invited the views of those present at the meeting on the question. The Council would prefer the boundary to remain where it is and Councillor
Mrs. E.M. Lewis who represented the Barham ward regarded the present boundary as satisfactory and would be averse to it being changed. As there was no support for the straightening of the boundary along the railway, I do not feel I should pursue the matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyngton Ward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9125</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Ward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7342</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. The Council draw attention to the disparity in the electorates of these proposed wards and suggest that the boundary between them should be altered to run along Wembley Hill Road and Empire Way instead of Wembley Park Drive with the following effect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyngton Ward</td>
<td>8177</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Ward</td>
<td>8290</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. Mr. Mitchell said the Brent Local Government Committee of the Labour Party supported the alteration of the boundary as suggested by the Council in order to equalise the electorates.

50. The Conservatives accept the proposed Tokyngton and Preston wards, particularly as these revert to 3-member wards similar to those in existence prior to 1968, but Councillor Gornall suggested at the meeting that the boundary between the wards should be altered to a line starting (in the north) at Bridge Road, where it crosses the metropolitan railway (Wembley Park Station), southwards along the centre of Bridge Road and Empire Way to the northern end of Raglan Court (Empire Way), then along the western boundary of Raglan Court, Beatrice Court and Alexandra Court to Wembley Hill Road, then north-westwards along the centre of Wembley Hill Road to the junction with the access road to the Green Man Public House, then south-westwards along the centre of the access road to Dagmar Avenue, then across the Avenue and southwards between Linden Lawns and Dennis Avenue to the east and Corinium Close and Lea Gardens to the west to the Marylebone-High Wycombe railway. This modification would produce estimated electorates in 1981 of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyngton Ward</td>
<td>8107</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston ward</td>
<td>8360</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.
51. Councillor Gornall added that the now line he proposed followed the top of a hill and for a part of the way ran along a polling district boundary.

52. Mr. Hoffman, representing the Wembley Park Labour Party, said he was a resident of the present Wembley Park ward (which it was proposed to divide between the Tokyngton and Preston wards) and considered that the Empire Court and Danes Court flats in North End Road should be transferred from Tokyngton ward to Preston ward. The only access to those flats was from Bridge Road near Wembley Park Station and they had no affinity or community of interest with Tokyngton. There were 420 electors in the flats and if they were transferred as suggested, and the altered boundary proposed by the Council accepted, the electorate in 1981 would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyngton ward</td>
<td>7757</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston ward</td>
<td>8710</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Mr. Hoffman also suggested that care was required in locating the Wembley Stadium complex as the extensive use of this gave rise to serious problems which affected Preston much more than Tokyngton. It would, therefore, be more appropriate to include the complex in the Preston ward instead of Tokyngton ward as proposed.

54. Alderman Hartley, although accepting the artificiality of including the flats in North End Road in the Tokyngton ward, thought they should remain there to obtain a better electoral balance. He opposed the modification in the boundary put forward by the Conservatives as it would produce a more irregular division and shape of the wards than the proposal of the Council.

55. The Brent North Liberal Association in their written comments very strongly opposed the formation of these 3-member wards. They stated there was a complete lack of community interest between the various parts of the two over-large wards and to retain uniformity with the remaining proposals, the area comprising the two wards should be divided into three 2-member wards. This would enable the present Wembley Park ward to be retained. The Liberals added that Wembley Park was well-known for its residential, transport, commercial, trade and sporting connotations.

56. The Association was not represented at the meeting.

57. A letter from the Tokyngton Residents Association was handed to the Assistant Commissioner and read to the meeting. It stated that the Association did not oppose the suggestions that the boundary between Tokyngton and Preston wards should be realigned to provide a better balance of representation and that these wards should be replaced by three 2-member wards.
Conclusions and Recommendations

58. Although the Liberal Association expressed a strong preference for the area comprising the two wards to be divided into three 2-member wards, they did not suggest how this should be done. The Council's draft scheme provided for three such wards but in order to meet objections to these, the draft proposals re-formed the area into two 3-member wards. The draft proposals have been generally accepted subject to the alteration of the boundary between the wards and in my opinion such proposals, suitably modified to reduce the disparity between the electorates, would be satisfactory.

59. Three alternative proposals have been made for the adjustment of the boundary between the Tokyngton and Preston wards. Those made by the Council and the Conservatives almost equalise the electorates but of the two, I prefer the Council's as their line, following the centre of Wembley Hill Road and Empire Way, is much more easily identifiable than the Conservatives' line. With regard to Mr. Hoffman's further alternative, although the area to which he refers may have nothing in common with Tokyngton, it does not seem to be tied to Preston either, and if his proposal were adopted, the Preston ward would be given a peculiar shape and the representation between the wards made less equitable.

60. No support was forthcoming at the meeting for the idea that the Wembley Stadium complex might be more suitably included in Preston ward, and I do not feel justified in recommending its transfer from Tokyngton ward.

61. I recommend that the draft proposal for the Tokyngton and Preston wards be approved subject to the boundary between the wards being altered to run along Wembley Hill Road and Empire Way instead of Wembley Park Drive.

Remaining Wards (Northern Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>No. of Cllrs.</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roe Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.
62. The above are the Commission's and Conservatives' proposals for
the remaining areas in Brent North Constituency. In the case of all
wards, the 1975 electorates are a little higher than those forecast
for 1981.

63. The existing Town Hall ward is abolished under the draft proposals
and from it is formed the whole of the St. Andrew's ward and a major
part (all but 1382 electors in 1981) of the Barnhill ward. The remainder
of this ward is taken from the existing Kenton and Fryent wards. The
boundaries of the other existing wards are altered.

64. The Conservatives consider it is unnecessary to alter the existing
boundaries of the Queensbury, Roe Green, Fryent and Town Hall wards as
the first three have acceptable electorates for 2 councillors and the
Town Hall ward would be appropriately represented by 3 councillors.

65. The Conservatives propose that with the retention of the present
Town Hall ward to return 3 members, the remainder of the proposed Barnhill
ward and that part of the proposed Kenton ward east of Preston Road should
be joined to the present Kingsbury ward, less the Regal Way/Vista Way area,
to constitute a 3-member ward, which they suggest be named Uxendon ward
as only a very small part of the area (that to the east of Fryent Way
and Honeypot Lane) was in the old Kingsbury Urban District.

66. Objections to the abolition of the Town Hall ward were also made
in the eight letters already referred to. They state that the ward has
been divided to form the proposed Barnhill and St. Andrew's wards along
an unnatural and complicated line which cuts through the Barnhill
community. If it were necessary to split the ward, then the natural
boundary would be Forty Lane and Tudor Gardens. Social activities
connected with the ward would be disrupted by the draft proposals. The
objectors request the retention of the present ward and the allocation
of 3 councillors to it, or at least the alteration of the boundary between
the two new wards.

67. The objectors were not present or represented at the meeting.

68. The Liberal Association comment that the part of Roe Green ward
south of Kingsbury Road (the Old Kenton Lane area) is completely divorced
from the main residential part of the ward and should be included in the proposed
Fryent ward or Kingsbury ward.

69. It is expected that this area would contain 226 electors in 1981 and
the effect of the suggested alteration would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs.</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roe Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5538</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5869</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6146</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alderman Hartley said at the meeting that an example of the Conservatives' disregard of natural boundaries was their insistence on the retention of the existing Town Hall ward as a 3-member ward, incorporating in it the Chalkhill Estate as well as the major part of the Barnhill area. These two areas were totally apart in character and interest. Chalkhill was a large Council estate with a relatively high density providing the Council with altogether different problems from those that might affect the Barnhill area, which consisted mainly of sizeable detached houses. Forty Lane which separated the areas was a natural boundary and it would be desirable to extend the proposed boundary between the St. Andrews and Barnhill wards further along Forty Lane to Tudor Gardens and then along Tudor Gardens to Church Lane (the line mentioned in some of the letters from the individual objectors). Such a change would bring the 1981 electorate of the new Barnhill ward to 5750 and reduce that of St. Andrew's ward to 4535. An alternative change in the boundary between these wards would be to allow the line to run along Forty Lane to Blackbird Cross and then along Salmon Street. Salmon Street would be a good natural boundary and this smaller modification of the original line would mean the transfer of only 240 electors from St. Andrew's ward to Barnhill ward to make the respective 1981 electorates 4919 and 5366. The Council would prefer this alternative as the wards would be more satisfactory numerically and it would go some way towards meeting the objections made to the draft proposals.

It would be neglecting the difference in character of the two areas to make them part of the same large 3-member ward. Further, a new Uxendon ward was proposed by the Conservatives which would take in the heartland of Kingsbury (around Kingsbury station) - the Kingsbury ward would be abolished and at the southern end of this new ward would be included part of the Barnhill foothills (West Hill and side streets), whilst the remainder of the Barnhill area would form part of the Town Hall ward. Again the natural boundary represented by the Bakerloo line would be disregarded. At the northern end, the Uxendon ward would take in Old Kenton Lane right up to the Green Man public house and this whole artificial creation called Uxendon ward was bound to confuse the residents greatly.

Although Alderman Hartley had in 1966 been in favour of the inclusion of the Redhill Drive/Limesdale Gardens area in the Roe Green ward, he now considered in the light of experience, that the decision then taken to this effect was a mistake which should be corrected.
This area was totally cut off from Roe Green ward by an industrial estate. The side streets off Princes Avenue which, under the draft proposals would be included in the Roe Green ward, had greater affinity with that ward than with Queensbury.

74. For the Conservatives, Councillor Gornall said they were proposing for the North Brent wards what they considered to be the minimum alterations necessary to allow for the provision of four extra councillors, whereas the Commission's draft proposals altered the boundaries of all the eleven existing wards in the area.

75. One of the four additional councillors could be allotted to the existing Town Hall ward and one to each of the Sudbury, Preston/Wembley Park and Kingsbury/Kenton areas. This was in line with the Commission's draft proposals so far as the areas were concerned, but the Conservatives proposed different warding arrangements. He dealt in turn with the wards as defined in the draft proposals.

Queensbury

76. The existing boundary ran to the south of properties in Princes Avenue and along the centre of Stag Lane - as clearly defined a boundary as it was possible to achieve. The Commission's proposal would remove from the ward most of Princes Avenue, part of North Way and the whole of Byron Avenue, Park Gardens, Tennyson Avenue, Milton Avenue and Fairway Avenue which comprised one corner of the estate centred on Beverley Drive. In exchange the proposal added to Queensbury ward the Redhill Drive/Limesdale Gardens estate at present part of the Roe Green ward, with which it had just as much identity, if not more, than with the rest of the Queensbury ward, being bounded by Stag Lane and the Edgware Road. In 1966, when wards were reviewed, Alderman Hartley said it was not unreasonable to exclude this same area from Queensbury as it was divided from it.

Roe Green

77. The Conservatives saw no advantage in the present Roe Green ward, which was completely north of the Kingsbury Road, losing the area of Brampton Grove, Grosvenor Crescent, Manor Close and Sutherland Court and gaining the area of Old Kenton Lane which was south of the Kingsbury Road. The Bakerloo railway made a more satisfactory north/south boundary with Kingsbury ward than the western side of Roe Green Park as proposed.

Fryent

78. The draft proposals would remove Mallard Way, Allington Crescent, Hill Farm estate and Merley Court from the existing ward and add them to the new oddly shaped and uncohesive Barn Hill ward. This transfer
from Fryent ward would cause an irregular southern boundary which could not be justified on grounds of community of interest or ease of identification. Church Lane was the neighbourhood shopping centre of the Fryent ward and the roads to be transferred from the ward were adjacent to this focal point.

St. Andrew's

79. The Conservatives proposed the retention of the Town Hall ward as a 5-member ward. This included the large Chalkhill municipal estate, the Kings Drive Council estate which it was proposed to extend, the southern slopes of Barn Hill and the Salmon Street/Tudor Gardens area all centred on the Town Hall.

80. If the proposed St. Andrew's ward comprised only the Chalkhill estate i.e. the area bounded by Forty Lane, Blackbird Hill, the railway and Bridge Road, there would be an argument for it as a community entity but it would be too small statistically as a 2-member ward. Adding to it an arbitrary area to the north of Forty Lane as far as an irregular boundary drawn across Salmon Street and between Deanscroft Avenue and Dunster Drive had nothing to commend it, particularly as it would leave the area between Mallard Way and Dunster Drive to be added to the Barnhill ward.

81. The Conservatives believed there was no advantage to be gained by disturbing the present arrangements to which residents had become accustomed and they stressed the advantage of having three councillors in the ward which contained a high proportion of municipal housing including an estate which had special problems. They also believed that the new name of St. Andrew's would lead to confusion as another area in the Borough had well-known connections with this name - the site of the old St. Andrews Hospital which was purchased by the Council and had been redeveloped for housing and other public purposes. Furthermore, at least two other churches in the Borough were dedicated to St. Andrew.

Barnhill

82. The creation of this ward was both unsatisfactory and unnecessary. Those living on the western slopes of Barn Hill identified with the Preston Road area, those living on the southern slopes and the Kings Drive area identified with Wembley Park and those living in the Salmon Street area with Church Lane/Blackbird Hill. This proposed ward appeared to have been created as a residue and as such was a hotch-potch.

Kingsbury

83. The Conservatives saw no point in altering the present boundary between the Kingsbury and Roe Green wards. They accepted that the western boundary with Kenton ward should be changed as the inclusion of the
western slopes of Barn Hill in Kenton ward had always been an anomoly. This area as well as all that to the east of Preston Road at present in the Kenton ward, could be included in an enlarged 3-member Kingsbury ward and in part compensation, the area of Regal Way and Vista Way could be transferred from the Kingsbury ward to the Kenton ward.

84. It was submitted that the name Kingsbury was inaccurate for the present ward; for the ward proposed by the Commission and also that put forward by the Conservatives. The name Uxendon, an old Elizabethan name of the manor which stood in the area, would be more appropriate. Uxendon Hill and Uxendon Crescent would be inside the Conservatives' Uxendon ward and Uxendon Manor School just outside it.

85. If their proposals for this ward were not acceptable, the Conservatives felt they must comment on the proposal of the Commission to transfer John Perrin Place from Kenton to Kingsbury and Magnolia Court from Kingsbury to Kenton. The present boundary between these two wards in this area was the Wealdstone Brook. The draft proposals altered this to the western boundary of John Perrin Place, the centre of a short length of Preston Hill and a footpath to the east of Magnolia Court, a more complicated and less obviously defined boundary.

Kenton

86. The Conservatives did not agree to the inclusion of any area to the east of Preston Road in the Kenton ward. This area should be included in a new Uxendon ward.

87. Mr. Mitchell said the Brent Local Government Committee of the Labour Party considered that the boundary of the proposed Barnhill ward along the Bakerloo railway was much better than the existing boundary of the Town Hall ward along the rear of Beverley Gardens. They also supported the proposed new boundary between the Queensbury and Roe Green wards as it took account of community groupings and the fact that the Redhill Drive/Limesdale Gardens area was separated from Roe Green by a large industrial estate. In their view the name given to the proposed St. Andrew's ward would not cause any confusion and they supported the formation of this ward.

88. Alderman Wall, speaking on behalf of the Kingshaven Chalkhill Community Association said that the Association considered that if the existing Town Hall ward were to be split, the correct line would be along Forty Lane, Bridge Road, Bakerloo line down to the river and then along the river to Blackbird Hill. 96 per cent of the Chalkhill area consisted of Council owned property of high density and giving rise to special problems. The area had an electorate in 1975 of 4118 (entitlement 1.49).
89. With regard to the suggestion of the Brent North Liberal Association that the Old Kenton Lane area of the proposed Roe Green ward should be transferred to the Fryent ward or the Kingsbury ward, Alderman Hartley agreed there might be a case for this; Councillor Gornall thought the area should be left in Kingsbury where it was at present, whilst Mr. Mitchell said that the Labour Party would prefer it to remain in Roe Green ward as proposed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

90. The retention of the present Town Hall ward would affect the draft proposals for other wards. The ward comprises the whole of the proposed St. Andrew's ward and the major part of the proposed Barnhill ward. One of the remaining parts of the latter is adjacent to the proposed Fryent ward and the other is next to the proposed Kenton ward. If the existing Town Hall ward were retained and allotted three members in substitution for the two 2-member St. Andrew's and Barnhill wards and the groups of electors in the parts of the Barnhill ward referred to were added to the wards they adjoin, the following position would arise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fryent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6736</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>6121</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>7756</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>6786</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. It will be seen that the electorate of the Kenton ward would not be sufficient for three councillors or appropriate for two. The Conservatives' scheme would deal with this situation by forming a new 3-member Uxendon ward in the manner already described and this would have an electorate in 1981 estimated at 7655 and an entitlement of 2.78. This Uxendon ward would however, affect the proposed Barnhill, Kingsbury, Kenton and Roe Green wards. The proposed Fryent ward (in addition to the proposed St. Andrew's and Barnhill wards) would be affected by the retention of the Town Hall ward. The only remaining ward is the Queensbury ward and in respect of this, too, the draft proposals and the Conservatives' scheme are at variance. Under that scheme the Roe Green, Fryent and Queensbury wards, in addition to the Town Hall ward, would keep their existing boundaries.

92. A choice has, therefore, to be made between the seven wards for the area contained in the draft proposals and the six submitted by the Conservatives. There is a case for the retention of the Town Hall ward (although some of its boundaries are not very good) and increasing its representation to 3-members, particularly in view of the formation of the two 3-member Tokyngton and Preston wards nearby, and if it were not for the effect which this would have on other wards, I might be inclined to recommend it. I have, however, a preference for the draft proposals
for the whole area over those contained in the Conservative scheme. The ratios of electors to councillors in the draft proposals are closer to the Borough average and the revisions which have been made to the present arrangements take greater account of local ties and produce better ward boundaries than the Conservative scheme. The Uxendon ward in the latter is a particularly uncohesive and artificial arrangement.

93. The boundary between the proposed St. Andrew's and Barnhill wards whilst producing a satisfactory numerical division, is not so effective in separating the contrasting parts of the present Town Hall ward. The most appropriate division would be along the line mentioned by Alderman Wall, but this cannot be entertained because the St. Andrew's ward would be grossly over-represented by two members and grossly under-represented by one.

94. If the boundary were continued along Forty Lane and Tudor Gardens, as suggested by some of the individual objectors, there might be a greater disparity in the respective electorates (Barnhill ward 5750 and St. Andrew's 4535) than could be justified and the further alternative, put forward at the meeting by the Council, seems the most practical. This would extend the boundary along Forty Lane to Blackbird Cross and then along Salmon Street, instead of running along the rear of The Paddocks and of Greenhill as proposed. It would be a distinct improvement on the proposed boundary and meet some of the objections. The resulting electorates would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnhill ward</td>
<td>5366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew's</td>
<td>4919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95. There remains the question of the Old Kenton Lane area of the Roe Green ward which the Liberal Association suggest should be transferred to either the Fryent ward or Kingsbury ward. As this small area is separated from Roe Green ward by the main Kingsbury Road (A4096), this would be an improvement and as Fryent ward has the smaller electorate and there is direct road access to it from Old Kenton Lane, it would be preferable to add the area to that ward.

96. I recommend that the draft proposals for the Kenton, Kingsbury, Queensbury, Roe Green, Fryent, Barnhill and St. Andrew's wards be approved subject:-(a) to the boundary between the St. Andrew's and Barnhill wards being altered to continue in an easterly direction along Forty Lane to its junction with Salmon Street and thence along Salmon Street to the
junction with Deanscroft Avenue, whence it would continue along the line defined in the draft proposals, and
(b) to the transfer of the part of Roe Green ward on the southern side of Kingsbury Road to Fryent ward.

BRENT SOUTH AREA

97. No objections have been received to the draft proposals for the following wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alperton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5725</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5692</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlesden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4930</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensal Rise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5521</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5631</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonebridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4723</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlayne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5885</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. The draft proposals for the remaining wards are set out below, together with alternative proposals submitted by the Conservatives. The electorates for both 1975 and 1981 have been given because of the substantial differences between them in the case of two of the wards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Draft Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tree Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Raphaels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conservatives' Scheme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Raphaels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. Alderman Hartley said the Conservative scheme again disregarded natural boundaries and provided for the undesirable creation of 3-member wards.

100. The 3-member Barham ward they proposed was intended to stretch from Sudbury Hill Station right down to Alperton Station as well as include some of the side-streets off the Ealing Road. Residents in those streets were definitely Alperton orientated; their children would attend the Alperton school and Alperton Station on the Piccadilly Line would be their
main starting point for any journeys to London. The residents at the Sudbury end of the new ward were bound to have different interests and problems from the residents of Alperton; also the distance between the extreme parts of the ward (2½ miles) and the scarcity of public transport linking them (other than the Piccadilly line) would make the establishment of meaningful ward organisation very difficult. The draft proposals would meet these problems by the creation of a 1-member One Tree Hill ward and separate the area into the two parts which had their own separate and distinct problems.

101. As regards St. Raphaels, the draft proposals took notice of the strong natural boundary provided by the North Circular Road which the Conservative scheme totally ignored. This dual carriageway road had only very limited facilities for crossing. The residents on either side of the road were, therefore, separated from each other and were likely to be affected by entirely different problems. To the north of the road a large new council estate was in course of construction.

102. The Conservatives propose the amalgamation of the Barham and One Tree Hill wards into a 3-member ward as they say the One Tree Hill ward in the draft proposals has close geographical and community associations with the proposed Barham ward and mostly forms part of the existing Barham ward. Similarly, they propose the amalgamation of the Brentfield and St. Raphaels wards into a 3-member ward to be known as St. Raphaels. This ward would then retain its existing boundaries and name but return one more member than at present. The St. Raphaels ward in the draft proposals would have an estimated electorate in 1981 of only 2211 which was well below the Borough average of 2755 per councillor and in 1978, when elections were to be held on the new ward basis, the electorate would be under 2000.

103. At the meeting, Councillor Gornall said the Conservatives were proposing what they considered to be the minimum changes necessary to allow for two extra councillors, one in the extreme west of the Borough and the other in the area of the Stonebridge development. This was in line with the Commission's draft proposals but to avoid the unnecessary and unsatisfactory creation of 1-member wards, the Conservatives proposed two 3-member wards, Barham and St. Raphaels, the two wards with the highest projected electorates, if no changes were made to ward boundaries in Brent South.

104. Within its present boundaries, Barham ward would have an electorate in 1981 of 7131 and with the addition of the very small areas proposed by the Commission from Alperton and Wembley Central, to form part of the proposed One Tree Hill ward, Barham would have a satisfactory electorate.
for a 3-member ward of 8087.

105. The benefit of this arrangement, in addition to that already mentioned, was that all electors at present in the Barham ward would remain there and only a comparatively few electors transferred from the two adjoining areas would be affected by the change.

106. The proposed One Tree Hill ward was divided by the Piccadilly line and the elongated open space into three entities - the Farm Avenue/Chaplin Road/Bassingham Road area, the four roads off Ealing Road and the Bridgewater/Clifford road area.

107. Turning to the St. Raphaels and Brentfield area, Councillor Gornall repeated the Conservative dislike of 1-member wards and believed better representation and less disturbance would result from making the present St. Raphaels ward, which was estimated to have an electorate in 1981 of 8024, into a 3-member ward. Over 50 per cent of these electors would be living in new Council development. The North Circular Road ran through the existing ward and had not created problems.

108. Councillor Mrs. Lewis said she was a member of the old Wembley Borough Council and had objected at that time to the elongated Barham ward. It had now consolidated into a good ward, however, and changes would cause confusion as electors would not know which councillors to refer to. She supported the Conservative proposal for this ward.

109. Mrs. Quirk of Brent South Labour Party said she supported the draft proposals for the wards in Brent south.

110. Mr. Mitchell drew attention to the problems which arose when making arrangements to accommodate additional councillors. The Conservative scheme provided for an elongated Barham ward and ignored community groupings. The St. Raphaels and Brentfield wards as proposed by the Commission would be separated from each other by the North Circular Road and this was a more formidable barrier than other roads which had been referred to. The new development in the St. Raphaels area justified the creation of a 1-member ward.

111. Councillor Harvey said he was a resident of the last building in the proposed One Tree Hill ward and people in Bridgewater Road regarded themselves as belonging to Barham. The open space separated and did not draw communities. Although the present Barham ward had a long narrow shape, it did work as a ward and Alperton Station was already included in it.

Conclusions and Recommendations

112. If the existing St. Raphaels ward is to be divided into the two wards of St. Raphaels (1-member) and Brentfield (2-member) as proposed by the Commission, then the North Circular Road would make an excellent
boundary between them. (It is to be observed, however, that although this road runs right across the Borough, it is nowhere used as a ward boundary under the present arrangements).

113. The existing St. Raphael's ward straddles the North Circular Road and because of the new Council housing development which is taking place, it will have an electorate of 8024 in 1981 and an entitlement of 2.91. The creation of a 1-member St. Raphael's ward on the side of the road where the new estate is situated avoids allotting 3 members to the ward and departing from the Council's principle of 2-member wards. The ward adjoins the proposed 3-member Tokyngton ward, however, and it seems to me that it would be far more logical and appropriate to retain the present ward to return 3 members, than to divide it into a 1-member ward and a 2-member ward, particularly having regard to the fact that in splitting it the standards of representation would be reduced, the 1-member St. Raphael's ward having an entitlement of only 0.80 and the Brentfield 2-member ward on the other hand having an entitlement of 2.11.

114. The only other 1-member ward in the draft proposals is the One Tree Hill ward which is largely formed out of the present Barham ward. I looked at the line drawn across the Barham ward to produce the One Tree Hill ward and apart from the fact that it proceeds in various directions and is not easy to identify, it does not seem to form a natural division between communities. The present Barham ward is long and narrow. The proposed small additions from Alperton and Wembley Central wards would not stretch it any further but merely broaden the southern end. The ward, with these additions, would have an electorate in 1981 of 8087 and an entitlement of 2.94 and I consider that it would be much more satisfactory to make it into a 3-member Barham ward than to divide it somewhat artificially into a 1-member One Tree Hill ward and a 2-member Barham ward as proposed.

115. I recommend:-

(1) That the proposed Barham and One Tree Hill wards be combined to form the 3-member Barham ward.

(2) That the proposed St. Raphael's and Brentfield wards be combined to form the 3-member St. Raphael's ward, and

(3) That the draft proposals for the Alperton, Wembley Central, Harlesden, Kensal Rise, Manor, Roundhead, Stonebridge and Chamberlayne wards be adopted.

BRENT EAST AREA

116. The following are the draft proposals and those of the Conservatives
for the wards in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentwater</td>
<td>6161</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5993</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brondesbury Park</td>
<td>6290</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>4916</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5903</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church End</td>
<td>4897</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5404</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricklewood</td>
<td>6175</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5836</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>5439</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5439</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilburn</td>
<td>6180</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5335</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapesbury</td>
<td>6077</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6077</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Park</td>
<td>4913</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5471</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willesden Green</td>
<td>5851</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5851</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56899</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>56899</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117. The electorates in 1981 are not expected to be substantially different from those in 1975.

118. Only three of the wards are the same in both schemes - Gladstone, Mapesbury and Willesden Green.

119. It has already been stated that the Conservatives in their comments on the draft proposals contended that if existing wards in the other areas are to be altered for reasons other than the accommodation of the additional councillors allotted to them, then there should be a revision of the wards in Brent East, in order to achieve greater equality of representation throughout the Borough.

120. Mr. M.R. Rosenfeld in his comments suggests a different boundary between the proposed 2-member Church End, Gladstone and Willesden Green wards to obviate the splitting of Neasden between too many wards. He proposes that those parts of the Church End and Gladstone wards lying to the north-west of the Cricklewood - Acton Wells railway should be joined together to form a 2-member ward to be called Neasden; that the remainder of the Gladstone ward should form a single-member ward and the remaining part of Church End ward, lying to the south-east of the railway should be joined to the proposed Willesden Green ward to form a 3-member ward, which could be called Willesden or Church End and Willesden Green.

121. Mr. Rosenfeld did not give any electorates for his wards (apart from stating that the single-member ward would have over 3000 electors)
but these have been provided by the Council as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neasden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4949</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willesden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8185</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122. Alderman Hartley supporting the draft proposals at the meeting, said that they followed existing ward boundaries which had been in use ever since the formation of Brent. By way of example of the disregard of natural boundaries inherent in the Conservative scheme, he referred to their boundary between the Carlton and Kilburn wards. Here the draft proposals followed a line which had been in use for decades. The former Borough of Willesden always drew the northern boundary of the Carlton ward so as to follow the railway line, which plainly divided the area into two distinct neighbourhoods, linked only by two railway bridges, which were well apart. The Carlton area had its own community life based on its schools and community centre and recognised by separate tenants' and residents' associations which were in no way shared by the people residing to the north of the railway line. Whilst it was conceded that the Conservative scheme provided for slightly greater numerical equality, Alderman Hartley submitted that this advantage was only very marginal and not sufficiently important to justify the disregard of the old historical boundary based on the railway line. The same disregard of a railway as the boundary was shown in the division between the Queens Park and Carlton wards. Kilburn Lane, with its side streets, Allington Road and Claremont Road had been part of the Carlton ward for many decades and was separated from the present Queens Park ward by the railway line. If the change in the Carlton ward boundary proposed by the Conservatives were adopted, the need for further changes would arise in the boundary between Kilburn and Brondesbury Park. Here again the natural ward boundary provided by the railway which had been in use ever since the days of Willesden Borough was replaced by an arbitrary line putting 700 residents, hitherto in Brondesbury Park, into the new Kilburn ward. Further, the ward boundaries proposed by the Conservatives for the Brentwater and Church End wards disregarded arrangements which had been in operation for many years. The Braemar area had always been part of Brentwater. Again any numerical advantages were so minor as not to justify tampering with the old boundary.

123. With regard to Mr. Rosenfeld's proposals, which redrew the boundaries of Willesden Green, Church End and Gladstone wards in order to secure the
single representation of the Neasden area, it was Alderman Hartley's submission that the boundaries of the three existing wards were so old-established and well-known to the residents that any redrawing there would cause needless confusion. It must be one of the aims of a boundary revision to avoid wholesale changes if at all possible. The Council had had to deal with tremendous problems in the Neasden area, which comprised several wards, and the councillors for those wards had striven to give it the attention it required. It was not necessary to put the whole area into the melting pot to obtain a Neasden ward.

124. Alderman Hartley concluded by saying that the elimination of aldermen and the accommodation of more councillors made necessary a major operation of re-warding in the areas in which the additional members were required. He was pleased that as the Brent East area already had the representation to which it was entitled on a Council of 66 members, it could be left undisturbed. In dealing with the warding of the Borough the Council had tried to be fair and avoid party considerations.

125. Councillor Gornall pointed out that the 1981 electorates in the wards of Brent East, all of which are 2-member, varied from Church End (4897), Queens Park (4913) and Carlton (4916) to Kilburn (6180) Brondesbury Park (6290) and Cricklewood (6175). He said that the average ward electorate in Brent East in 1981 would be 5690, and the greatest variations from this mean were + 504 (9%) and - 793 (14%). The Conservative proposals showed a variation from the mean of + 387 (7%) and - 286 (5%), half the existing variation. This was achieved by minor alterations to seven of the ten wards.

126. As Brentwater (6161) and Cricklewood (6175) had electorates considerably higher and Church End (4897) an electorate considerably lower than the average, a better balance would be achieved by transferring the area of Braemar Avenue and Lyndhurst Close from Brentwater to Church End and the new development on the old St. Andrews hospital site from Cricklewood to Brentwater. The Braemar Avenue area, although on the north side of Neasden Lane had no other road connection with the rest of Brentwater ward. The revision of the boundary between Cricklewood and Brentwater would not disturb any existing electors.

127. Brondesbury Park (6290) and Kilburn (6180) had considerably higher than average electorates and Carlton (4916) and Queens Park (4913) considerably lower electorates, so minor amendments to boundaries should be made by transferring that part of Carlton ward lying to the west of Salusbury Road to Queens Park ward; the southern part of Kilburn ward bounded by
Donaldson Road, Victoria Road, Kilburn High Road and the railway to Carlton ward and the eastern part of Brondesbury Park ward bounded by Willesden Lane, Christchurch Avenue, Kilburn High Road and the railway to Kilburn ward. The narrow strip between Kilburn Lane and the railway (in the present Carlton ward) was more associated in a community sense with the West Kilburn area of the City of Westminster than with Brent and its inclusion in the Queens Park ward, with which it had physical connections by way of Chamberlayne Road and Salusbury Road, was more reasonable than its inclusion in the Carlton ward, with which it was connected at the eastern end only.

128. Kilburn was a large area spread along both sides of the A5 from Maida Vale to Cricklewood. The present Brent ward of Kilburn consisted of a small, densely populated part of the Kilburn area and the part it was proposed to add to the Kilburn ward from Brondesbury Park extended northwards to the cross roads where Kilburn station was situated. The southern part of the present Kilburn ward could be included in the Carlton ward, which as stated was part of the general Kilburn area. The transfer of the small part of the Brondesbury Park ward adjacent to Kilburn station to Kilburn ward could be justified as the residents associated with Kilburn High Road rather than Brondesbury Park.

129. Councillor Gornall was opposed to Mr. Rosenfeld's proposals, particularly as they included a 1-member ward. He concluded by saying that although some parts of the Brent East area were difficult to divide into wards, they could not be weighted and given over-representation. Northern wards were being altered for smaller electoral changes than the Conservatives were proposing for the Brent East area and community interests were just as important in that area as elsewhere. The Conservatives' scheme contained positive and constructive proposals for higher standards of representation between the wards in the area whilst causing a minimum of disturbance to electors.

130. Mr. Rosenfeld said at the meeting that Neasden had been badly served in the past and as proposed. The problem arose originally because of the area being split in the formation of parliamentary constituencies. Neasden was a separate community and should be better served with a separate ward. Gladstone also had a compact community and the lower part of Church End should be linked with Willesden Green. These community interests were the basis of his alternative proposals. He questioned the 1981 electorates of his suggested wards as estimated by the Council at -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neasden</td>
<td>4949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>3053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willesden</td>
<td>8185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27.
and thought the Neasden figure should be higher and that for Willesden lower.

131. He suggested a modification of his proposals by transferring to the Neasden ward from Brentwater ward, Eastleigh Close, The Circle and nos. 560 to 634 North Circular Road. This would improve the boundary between the two wards and the community of Neasden. The transfer would involve 240 electors and he estimated the electorate of Neasden ward at 5804 (1977) and 5600 (1981).

132. Mrs. Forbes said she was a member of Brent East Labour Party and supported the draft proposals, which retained the obvious and well-established ward boundaries and recognised the communities of the area. She preferred 2-member wards and therefore opposed Mr. Rosenfeld's suggested 3-member ward. Consideration had been given to adding to Queens Park ward the long narrow strip of Carlton ward (as proposed by the Conservatives), but it was thought better to retain the present boundary along the railway.

133. With regard to the suggestion of the Conservatives that the re-developed ex-St. Andrew's Hospital site should be transferred from Cricklewood ward to Brentwater ward, the main access from this development was on to Dollis Hill Road in the Cricklewood ward and, like the other properties in the road, the site should remain in that ward.

134. Mr. Golds, Honorary Secretary of the Co-ordinating Committee of the three Constituency Conservative and Unionist Associations in Brent, said that the North Circular Road ran through Brentwater and Church End wards and yet objection was taken to the transfer of the Braemar Avenue area to Church End ward on the ground that it was separated from the ward by Neasden Lane, a lesser road.

135. It was necessary to even out the electorates in Brent East and as there were more railway lines in the area than in any other London Borough they could not be followed slavishly as ward boundaries.

136. The people living in the narrow strip of Carlton ward were drawn naturally to Queens Park and it was strange that it was proposed to retain this in the Carlton ward. The argument for preserving the name of Neasden could be met by re-naming Brentwater ward, Neasden ward. Elsewhere in the Borough, it was proposed to alter ward boundaries to make small changes in the electorates, but not in Brent East.

137. Councillor Harvey said the minority party were anxious that the Borough should be treated as a unit and that the former Wembley Borough area should not be treated differently from the former Willesden Borough. There were no cogent electoral reasons for altering wards in one part of the Borough and not doing so in another. The area should be looked at
as a whole and such alterations made to the present arrangements as were necessary to equalise electorates.

138. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that more changes were necessary in the north because of under-representation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

139. I have carefully examined the draft proposals, the Conservatives' alternative scheme and that of Mr. Rosenfeld for the wards in Brent East and have visited the areas to compare the different ward boundaries which have been proposed.

140. The rules to be observed in carrying out electoral reviews are set out in the Local Government Act, 1972. These require that the ratio of the number of electors to the number of councillors shall as far as possible be the same in every ward, taking account of any likely changes in the number or distribution of the electorate in the succeeding five years, and that regard shall be had to the desirability of fixing boundaries which will be easily identifiable and to any local ties that would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary.

141. It is in accordance with these rules that the whole of the warding arrangements in the Borough has to be examined and there can be no question of reviewing one part and not another as appears to have been feared.

142. The ratios of electors to councillors produced by the Conservatives' alternative scheme are better than those of the draft proposals, but on the other hand the new ward boundaries contained in the scheme are much inferior. Railways form the boundaries between the proposed Carlton and Queens Park wards, the Carlton and Kilburn wards and the Kilburn and Brondesbury Park wards, but in the Conservative scheme, these are replaced by less obvious road boundaries resulting in the railways running through instead of bounding the wards. The proposed Cricklewood ward's north-western boundary runs along the rear of Dollis Hill Lane and brings within the ward the properties on both sides of the Lane, but the Conservatives provide for the new development on the site of the old hospital, alone of the properties in the Lane, to be included in Brentwater ward. The Conservatives would exclude from this latter ward, the Braemar Avenue area in the west and transfer it across a main road (Neasden Lane A4088) to Church End ward, and this would also have the effect of substituting for the natural boundary of the River Brent, one along the rear of properties.

143. The advantage of slightly better electoral balance is, therefore, outweighed by more serious boundary disadvantages and as the imbalance in the wards defined in the draft proposals is within reasonable limits,
I do not consider that a case has been made out for the replacement of these wards by the Conservative scheme.

144. With regard to Mr. Rosenfeld's proposals, the comments made on them at the meeting were unfavourable and I find it difficult to accept that Neasden as a whole would be better served by replacing the proposed three 2-member wards in the area with an irregular arrangement of wards returning 2, 1 and 3 members respectively.

145. I recommend that the draft proposals for the Brentwater, Brondesbury Park, Carlton, Church End, Cricklewood, Gladstone, Kilburn, Mapesbury, Queens Park and Willesden Green wards be adopted.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

146. In summary, my recommendations are that the draft proposals of the Commission for the revision of the electoral arrangements in the London Borough of Brent be adopted subject to the following amendments:

(a) the Northwick Park ward being re-named Sudbury Court ward;
(b) the boundary between the Tokyngton and Preston wards being altered to run north-eastwards along Park Lane to its junction with Wembley Hill Road, thence south-eastwards along Wembley Hill Road to Empire Way; thence north-eastwards along Empire Way and Bridge Road to the Bakerloo railway;
(c) the boundary between the St. Andrew's and Barnhill wards being altered to continue in an easterly direction along Forty Lane to its junction with Salmon Street and thence along Salmon Street to the junction with Deanscroft Avenue, whence it would continue along the line defined in the draft proposals;
(d) the transfer to Fryent ward of the part of the proposed Roe Green ward on the southern side of Kingsbury Road;
(e) the proposed Barham and One Tree Hill wards being combined to form the 3-member Barham ward, and
(f) the proposed St. Raphaels and Brentfield wards being combined to form the 3-member St. Raphaels ward.

147. The resulting wards and their representation would then be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUDBURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUDBURY COURT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKYNGTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30.
KENTON 2
KINGSBURY 2
QUEENSBURY 2
ROE GREEN 2
FRYENT 2
BARNHILL 2
ST. ANDREWS 2
ALPERTON 2
WEMBLEY CENTRAL 2
HARLESDEN 2
KENVAL RISE 2
MANOR 2
ROUNDWOOD 2
STONEBRIDGE 2
CHAMBERLAYNE 2
BARHAM 3
ST. RAPHAELS 3
BRENTWATER 2
BRONDESURY PARK 2
CARLTON 2
CHURCH END 2
CRICKLEWOOD 2
GLADSTONE 2
KILBURN 2
MAPESBURY 2
QUEENS PARK 2
WILLESDEN GREEN 2
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WILFRID WILSON
Assistant Commissioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALPERTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNHILL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENTWATER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRONDES BURY PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBERLAYNE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH END</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRYENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADSTONE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARLES DEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENSAL RISE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN TON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILBURN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGSBURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANOR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPES BURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS BURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUNDWOOD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST ANDREW'S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST RAPHAEL'S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONE BRIDGE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUD BURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUD BURY COURT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKYNGTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEMBLEY CENTRAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLES DEN GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river or canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

QUEENSURY WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets Carlisle Road, thence southwards along said Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 147 Stag Lane, thence southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 147 to 153 said Lane and westwards along the southern boundary of last mentioned property to Stag Lane, thence southwards to and along Stag Lane to the junction with Fairway Avenue, thence southwards along said Avenue to the access path adjacent to No 2 Fairway Avenue, thence northwards to and along said path continuing southwards along said path to the rear of Nos 2-104 Fairway Avenue, thence southwards along said path adjacent to No 104 Fairway Avenue to said Avenue, thence southwards along Fairway Avenue to North Way, thence southwards along North Way to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 118 Princes Avenue, thence southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 118 and 120 said Avenue, crossing the footpath and continuing southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 122 to 232 Princes Avenue to Winchester Avenue, thence southwards along said Avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 5 said Avenue, thence southwards along said southern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the Bakerloo railway line, thence southwards along the railway to Princes Avenue, thence southwards along Princes Avenue to Berkeley Road and southwards along Berkeley Road to the access path adjacent to No 93 said Road, thence southwards along said path to the rear boundary of No 155 Princes Avenue, thence southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 155 and 157 Princes Avenue and thence southwards along the access path to the rear of Nos 159-195 Princes Avenue and continuing northwards along said path adjacent to 195 Princes Avenue, to Princes Avenue southwards along said Avenue to the Borough boundary, thence generally northwards, northeast-
wards and southeastwards along the Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

ROE GREEN WARD

Commencing at a point where Wakemans Hill Avenue meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said Avenue to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 1 said Avenue, thence southeastwards to and along said eastern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the northern boundary of No 22 Forest Gate, thence southwestwards along the northern boundaries of Nos 22 to 19 Forest Gate, and 20 to 19 Standcroft and 18 to 17 Highcroft, thence southeastwards along the western boundaries of Nos 15 to 1 Highcroft, and continuing southeastwards along the western boundary of No 64 Springfield Mount to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 66 Springfield Mount, to said boundary thence westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 66 to 76 Springfield Mount, and continuing southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 63 and 61 Springfield Gardens, crossing the footpath and continuing along the rear boundaries of 59-33 Springfield Gardens thence westwards and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 79 to 1 Coniston Gardens, and continuing southwestwards along the western boundary of No 132 Kingsbury Road to said Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of Roe Green Park, thence northwestwards to and along said western boundary and continuing northwestwards along the western boundary of Kingsbury High School playing field to the rear boundary of No 105 Princes Avenue, thence westwards along said rear boundary to the access path to the rear of Nos 107 to 139 Princes Avenue, thence westwards and northwards along said path to said Avenue, thence southwestwards to the southern boundary of Queensbury Ward, thence generally northwards and northeastwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along the Borough boundary to the point of commencement.
FRYENT WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Roe Green Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards and southwestwards along the Borough boundary to a point in prolongation of the southern boundary of Woodfield School, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the southern and western boundaries of said School to the southwestern boundary of No 16 Glenwood Avenue, and continuing northwestwards along the eastern boundary of the Sports Ground to the northeastern corner of said Sports Ground, thence southwestwards along the northern boundaries of the Sports Ground and parcel No 8118 as shown on Ordnance Survey Plan TQ 2087, Edition of 1956, to the southwestern boundary of No 17 Dors Close, thence in a straight line to the northeastern boundary of No 63 Church Drive, thence southwards and westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 63 to 127 Church Drive, thence northwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property to Church Drive, thence westwards along said Drive to and northeastwards along Church Lane to Mallard Way, thence westwards along said Way to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 2 Mallard Way thence northwestwards to and along said eastern boundary and generally westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 52 Mallard Way thence southwestward along the western boundary of last mentioned property to said Way thence westwards to, and northwards along Salmon Street to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 199 said Street, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary and continuing to NG Ref TQ 2006387647 thence southwestwards following the fence which encloses properties Nos 195-161 Salmon Street and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of 159 to 101 Salmon Street and the northern boundaries of the unnumbered properties to the north of the Fryent Way/Salmon Street intersection to Fryent Way, thence northwards along Fryent Way to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 177 Valley Drive, thence northeastwards to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 177 to 111 said Drive crossing the footpath, to the rear boundary of No 109 said drive,
thence northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 109 to 103 said drive to the western boundary of Kingsbury Sports Ground, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of Roe Green Ward, thence southeastwards and generally northeastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

ST ANDREW'S WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Fryent Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along the Borough boundary to the northern side of Brent Reservoir, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along the northern and western boundaries of said Reservoir to the centre of the top of the weir, thence westwards in a straight line to the River Brent, thence generally southwestwards along said River to its junction with the Wembley Park to Neasden railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to Bridge Road, thence northeastwards along said Road to the junction of Forty Avenue and Forty Lane, thence eastwards along Forty Lane to the B454 road, thence northwards along said road to Salmon Street, thence northwestwards along said street to Deanscroft Avenue, thence north eastwards along said Avenue to Kingsmere Park, thence northwestwards along Kingsmere Park to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 78 Deanscroft
Avenue, thence northeastwards to and along said rear boundary and continuing northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 76 to 50 Deanscroft Avenue to the access path to the rear of Nos 48 to 2 said Avenue, thence eastwards and northwards along said access path to Dunster Drive, thence eastwards to and northwards along Church Lane to the southern boundary of Fryent Ward, thence eastwards, northeastwards, southeastwards and eastwards following said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

BRENTWATER WARD

Commencing at a point where the south eastern boundary of the St Andrews Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough at Brent Reservoir, thence generally eastwards and southeastwards following the eastern boundary of the Borough to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 348 Dollis Hill Lane, thence south westwards along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 346 Dollis Hill Lane, thence northwestwards, westwards and southeastwards along the eastern, northern and western boundaries of last mentioned property, and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 344 to 338 Dollis Hill Lane to Conway Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 336 Dollis Hill Lane, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 336 to 272 said Lane, thence in a straight line, crossing Coles Green Road to rear boundaries of flats 268 and 270 Dollis Hill Lane, thence westwards along the rear boundaries of said property to and northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 16 Coles Green Road and in prolongation of the latter to the southern boundary of No 72 Alder Grove, thence in a straight line crossing Alder Grove to the southeastern boundary of No 67 said Grove, thence southwesterly along the southern boundary of last mentioned property to and northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 67 to 33 Coles Green Road, to the access road leading to Coles Green Road,
thence in a straight line to a point, National Grid Reference TQ 2241086434, being a point on the northeastern boundary of Mackensie House, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of Mackensie House to the eastern boundary of the allotment gardens, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of said allotment gardens to Brook Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 103 said Road, thence westwards to and along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the allotment gardens, thence northwestwards and westwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of said allotment gardens and continuing westwards along the southern end of Nutfield Road and the southern boundary of No 55 said Road, to and northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 55 to 13 said Road to the southeastern boundary of No 90 Crest Road, thence westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 90 to 112 said road, thence in a straight line to the southeastern corner of No 114 Crest Road, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 114 to 140 said Road, and northwestwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property, and in a straight line crossing Crest Road to the southwestern boundary of Braintcroft Primary School, thence northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of said School, and generally westwards along the southern boundary of said School and the eastern boundary of No 77 Randall Avenue to said Avenue, thence southeastwards along said Avenue to Tanfield Avenue, thence southwestwards along said Avenue to a point due east of the southeastern boundary of Kenwyn Court, thence westwards to and southwestwards along said southeastern boundary to the centre of the access path, thence northwestwards along said access path to the rear of Nos 103 to 29 Kenwyn Drive, thence in a straight line to the northeastern boundary of No 2 Cairnfield Avenue and southwestwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to said Avenue, thence southeastwards along said Avenue to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 1 Cairnfield Avenue, thence southwestwards along the northern boundary of
said property and in prolongation thereof to the centre of the access path to the rear of No 7 Avondale Avenue, thence generally southeastwards along said access path to the rear of Nos 7 to 3 Avondale Avenue and continuing southeastwards and generally southwards along said access path to the rear of Nos 2 to 32 The Circle crossing Ashcombe Park to the centre of the access path to the rear of No 34 The Circle, thence southwestwards along said access path to the rear of Nos 34 to 64 The Circle and in prolongation thereof to Chartley Avenue, path thence westwards along said Avenue to the rear access/to Nos 570 to 560 North Circular Road, thence southwards to and along said access/to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 560 North Circular Road, thence southwestwards to and along the southern boundary of last mentioned property and in prolongation thereof, crossing the North Circular Road to Neasden Lane, thence northwestwards along Neasden Lane to the southeastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, thence generally northeasterwards along said southeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

CRICKLEWOOD WARD
Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Brentwater Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough thence southeastwards following the Borough boundary to Chichele Road, thence southwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 2 said Road, thence to and along said northeastern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southerly along the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 26 Chichele Road, the rear boundary of Cricklewood Congregational Church, and the rear boundaries of Nos 28 to 34 Chichele Road, the rear boundary of Argyll Mansions, and the western boundary of No 20 Rockhall Road, thence in a straight line crossing said Road to the eastern boundary of No 1 Rockhall Road, thence southwestwards along said eastern boundary to and westwards along the northern boundary of No 46 Chichele Road, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 46 to 66 said Road, crossing Anson Road in a straight line to the northeastern boundary of Anson Primary School, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the eastern and
southern boundaries of said School to the southwestern boundary of said School, thence generally westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 8 to 208 Melrose Avenue, thence southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of last mentioned property, thence in a straight line crossing Melrose Avenue to the southeastern boundary of 14-24 and 26-42 of Gladstone Court, thence westwards along the southern boundary of said Gladstone Court to Park Avenue North, thence northwestwards along Park Avenue North crossing the junction of Kendal Road and Anson Road to and generally northwestwards along the path leading to Park Side to Park Side, thence northwestwards along Park Side to Dollis Hill Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to and northwestwards along Brook Road to the southern boundary of Brentwater Ward, thence generally eastwards following said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

MAPESBURY WARD

Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Cricklewood Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough thence southeastwards following the Borough boundary to the Bakerloo railway line east of Kilburn Station, thence generally northwestwards along said railway, crossing Walm Lane and continuing on the Metropolitan line to a point, National Grid reference TQ 2312684927, thence in a straight line to and northwards along the path adjacent to No 37 Jeymer Avenue to said Avenue, thence westwards along said Avenue to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 49 Riffel Road, thence northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 49 to 107 said Road and eastwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to said Road, thence northwards along said Road to Melrose Avenue, thence in a straight line to the southwestern boundary of No 118 said Avenue and northwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property to the southern boundary of Cricklewood Ward, thence generally eastwards and northwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

BRONDESBURY PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Mapesbury Ward meets
the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeasterly along the Borough boundary to the railway between West End Lane station and Brondesbury Station, thence generally southwestwards along said railway between Brondesbury Station and Willeaden Junction to Tiverton Road, thence northwards along said Road to the access road leading to Aylestone School, thence northwards along said access road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 77 Okehampton Road, thence southwards to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 77 to 63 said Road, and northwards along the western boundary of Aylestone School to the southwestern boundary of the garages on the western side of Clement Close thence northeasterwards along the southern boundary of said Close and in a straight line to the southwestern boundary of No 1 Clement Close, and continuing northeasterwards along the southern boundary of said property, the southern boundary of Clement Close and the garages to the rear boundary of No 37 Ayleston Avenue, thence northwards along the rear boundaries of and Nos 1 to 5 Chudleigh Road Nos 37 to 29 said Avenue to and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 30 to 36 Milverton Road, thence northwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property to the northwestern boundary of said property, thence in a straight line to the southeastern boundary of No 50 Milverton Road, thence southwestwards along the southern boundary of said property to and northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 50 to 60 said Road, thence northeasterwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to Milverton Road, thence northwards along said Road, to and southwestwards along Sidmouth Road to the western carriageway of Chambers Lane, thence northwestward along Chambers Lane to Grange Road, thence northwards along said road to High Road, thence northeasterwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 1 Park Avenue, thence northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 19 said Avenue, the entrance to the Convent of Jesus and Mary and continuing northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 25 to 43 Park Avenue, thence in a straight line crossing Acland Road to the southeastern boundary of No 15 Acland Road, thence northwards along
said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of 49 Park Avenue and continuing northeasitwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to said Avenue, thence northwestwards along said Road, crossing St Paul's Avenue and continuing northwestwards to the end of Park Avenue, thence due north to the railway, thence southeastwards following the Bakerloo Line to the southwestern boundary of Mapesbury Ward, thence southeastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

KILBURN WARD

Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along the Borough Boundary to the Kilburn High Road to Kensal Green railway, thence in a straight line to the southeastern corner of No 1/Kilburn High Road, thence westwards along the southern boundary of No 1/Kilburn High Road to the southwestern corner of said property, thence northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 and 2/Kilburn High Road to the railway, thence southwestwards along the railway to a point in prolongation of Woodville Road, thence northwestwards to and along said Road and continuing northwestwards along Donaldson Road to Lonsdale Road thence southwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 40 Donaldson Road, thence to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 42 and 44 said Road to the southeastern boundary of Paddington Cemetery, thence northwestwards along the eastern boundary of said Cemetery to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 16 to 2 Tennyson Road and continuing along the western boundary of No 37-91a Willesden Lane to said Lane, thence northwestwards along said Lane to the southern boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward, thence northeastwards along the southern boundary to the point of commencement.

CARLTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Kilburn Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards, south-
westwards, northwestwards and again southwestwards to Chamberlayne Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to the Bakerloo railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the southwestern boundary of Kilburn Ward, and continuing northeastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

QUEENS PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Kilburn Ward meets the northern boundary of Carlton Ward, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to Chamberlayne Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to the Kensal Rise to Brondesbury Park railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the southwestern boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward, thence northeastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the northwestern boundary of Kilburn Ward, thence generally southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

KENSAL RISE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Carlton Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards and northwestwards along the Borough boundary to the road known as Kenmont Gardens, thence northwards along said road to Harrow Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Wrottesley Road, thence northwards along said Road to the Willesden Junction to Kenseal Rise railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the north western boundary of Queens Park Ward, thence southeastwards along the western boundaries of Queens Park Ward and Carlton Ward to the point of commencement.

CHAMBERLAYNE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward meets the northern boundary of Queens Park Ward, thence southwestwards along the
northern boundaries of Queens Park Ward and Kensal Rise Ward to College Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to Doyle Gardens, thence westwards along Doyle Gardens to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 1 said Gardens, thence northwestwards to and along said eastern boundary to and generally northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 67 Doyle Gardens thence southwestwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property to said Gardens, thence in a straight line to the northwestern boundary of No 72 Doyle Gardens, thence southwesterly along the western boundary of last mentioned property and the western boundary of Nos 81a and 81b Herbert Gardens, thence in a straight line to the northwestern boundary of No 98 said Gardens thence southwestwards along the western boundary of last mentioned property and north-westwards along the southern boundary of No 43 All Souls' Avenue to said Avenue, thence in a straight line to the southeastern boundary of No 50 said Avenue, and north-westwards along the southern boundary of last mentioned property to and northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 50 to 58 All Souls' Avenue, crossing Herbert Gardens and continuing northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 60 to 80 All Souls' Avenue to and north-westwards along Doyle Gardens to a point opposite the northwestern corner of King Edward VII Recreation Ground, thence northeastwards and northwards along the western boundary of said Recreation Ground to Donnington Road, thence north-westwards along said road to Harlesden Road and northeastwards, north-westwards and northeastwards along Harlesden Road to the western boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward, thence generally south-eastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

MANOR WARD

Commencing at a point where the south-western boundary of Chamberlayne Ward meets the northern boundary of Kensal Rise Ward, thence southwesterly and southwards along the northern and western boundaries of said Ward to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westerly along the Borough boundary
to Scrubs Lane thence northwards along said Lane to Harrow Road thence northwestwards along said road to High Street Harlesden, thence northwesterly along said street to Park Parade thence northeastern along said Parade to Harlesden Road, thence northeastern along said road to Longstone Avenue, thence northwesterly along said Avenue to a point opposite the northern boundary of Roundwood Park, thence eastwards to and along the northern boundary of said Park to the northwestern boundary of the Liberal Jewish Cemetery, thence northeastern along the northwestern and northern boundaries of said Cemetery to the access road leading to said Cemetery, thence northeastern along said access road and in prolongation thereof to the northwestern boundary of Chamberlayne Ward, thence generally southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

HARLESDEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Manor Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough thence generally westwards along the Borough boundary to Bramshill Road, thence northwesterly along said Road and continuing northwesterly along Nicoll Road and Craven Park Road to Fortunegate Road, thence northeastern along said Road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 1 said Road, thence northwesterly to and along said western boundary to and northeastern along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 57 Fortunegate Road, and northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 12 Glynfield Road to Tunley Road, thence eastwards along said Road to Glynfield Road, thence in a straight line to the southern boundary of No 1 said Road thence northeastern along said southern boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 67 to 143 Fortunegate Road and in prolongation thereof to Church Path, thence southeastwards crossing Fortunegate Road and continuing along said Path to Curzon Crescent, thence in a straight line to the southern boundary of Carisbrooke Court and generally southeastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 7 to 137 Drayton Road, thence southeastwards along the eastern boundary of last mentioned property to said
Road, thence eastward along said Road to the western boundary of Manor Ward, thence generally southwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

ROUNDWOOD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Harlesden Ward meets the western boundary of Manor Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along the northern boundary of Harlesden Ward to the road known as Craven Park, thence northwestwards along said road to the Old Oak Common to Cricklewood railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to a point in prolongation of the western boundary of St Mary's Church Cemetery, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the proposed extension of Garnet Road, thence southeastwards along said proposed extension and in prolongation thereof to Church Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to Church Road thence northeastwards along Church Road to Roundwood Road, thence southeastwards along said road to and northeastwards along Franklyn Road to a point being in prolongation northwestwards of the western boundary of Willesden New Cemetery, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and said boundary to Roundwood Road, thence eastwards and southwards along said road to and continuing along the western boundary of Manor Ward to the point of commencement.

WILLESDEN GREEN WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward meets the northern boundary of Chamberlayne Ward at Harlesden Road, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the northern boundaries of Chamberlayne Ward and Manor Ward to the eastern boundary of Willesden Jewish Cemetery, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to Glebe Road, thence eastwards along said Road to and northwestwards along Pound Lane to High Road, thence northeastwards to and northwestwards along Dudden Hill Lane to the Metropolitan railway, thence southeastwards
along said railway to the western boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward, thence generally southeastwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

GLADSTONE WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Cricklewood Ward meets the northwestern boundary of Mapesbury Ward, thence southwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the northern boundary of Brondesbury Park Ward, thence westwards along the northern boundaries of said Ward and Williams Green Ward to Dudden Hill Lane, thence northwards along said Lane to the southwestern boundary of Brentwater Ward, thence generally northeastwards and southeastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the northwestern boundary of Cricklewood Ward, thence southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

STONEBRIDGE WARD
Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Harlesden Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards, northwards and north-eastwards along the Borough boundary to the River Brent, thence northeastwards along said River to Heather Park Drive, thence eastwards to and northeastwards along the North Circular Road to the Watford Branch railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to a point in prolongation of the eastern boundary of the playground in Stonebridge Recreation Ground, thence northeastwards to and along said prolongation and said eastern boundary, thence in a straight line to the southwestern boundary of the garages to the rear of No 171 Hillside, thence
northeastwards following said boundary to the southwestern boundary of No 171 Hillside, and continuing along the western boundary of said property to Hillside, thence eastwards along Hillside to Craven Park thence southeastwards along Craven Park to the southwestern boundary of Roundwood Ward thence continuing along said southwestern boundary to Harlesden Ward, thence southwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

ST RAPHAEL'S WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Roundwood Ward meets the northern boundary of Stonebridge Ward, thence generally westwards along the northern boundary of said Ward to the North Circular Road, thence northeastwards along said Road to Harrow Road, thence northwards along said road to the River Brent, thence generally northwards along said river to the Old Oak Common to Wembley Hill Station railway, thence eastwards and generally southwards along said railway to the western boundary of Roundwood Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CHURCH END WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Willesden Green Ward meets the northern boundary of Manor Ward, thence generally westwards along said northern boundary to and generally northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of Roundwood Ward to the eastern boundary of St Raphael's Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of said Ward to the River Brent, thence generally northwards.
along said river to the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the southwestern boundary of Brentwater Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the western boundary of Gladstone Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said western boundary to and southeastwards, southwestwards and southeastwards along the western and southwestern boundaries of Willesden Green Ward to the point of commencement.

ALPerton ward

Commencing at a point where the River Brent meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards and northwards along the Borough boundary to the Grand Union Canal, thence southeastwards along said Canal to Enling Road, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along Enling Road to a point due west of Stanley Close, thence due east to and northeastwards along said Close to a point in prolongation of the southern fence of the enclosure south of the rear boundary of No 2 Clayton Avenue thence northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 4 to 86 said Avenue, thence southwards and eastwards along the western and southern boundaries of No 88 said Avenue to the rear boundary of No 18 Hillfield Avenue, thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 18 to 52 said Avenue, crossing the footpath and Dorothy Avenue and continuing southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 54 to 60 Hillfield Avenue, thence northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 62 to 82 said Avenue, thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 90 to 128 Lyon Park Avenue and in prolongation thereof to Woodstock Road, thence eastwards along said Road, crossing Lyon Park Avenue to the access path which commences between No 163/165 said Avenue thence northeastwards along said access path to its end between 19 Lomond Close and 49/51 Highmead Crescent and continuing northeastwards along the northern boundary of Nos 29-21 said close, thence northeastwards in a straight line to the Wembley Central to Kensal Rise railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the northwestern boundary of Stonebridge Ward, thence southwestwards along said north-
western boundary to the point of commencement.

BARHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Alperton Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along the western boundary of the Borough to the Sudbury Hill (Harrow) to Sudbury and Harrow Road railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to Maybank Avenue, thence northeastwards along said avenue to and southeastwards along Harrow Road to the aforementioned railway, thence eastwards along said railway to a point being the prolongation northwards of the western boundary of No 32 St Anne's Road, thence southwards along said prolongation and said boundary, thence southwards in a straight line across the end of St Anne's Road to the western boundary of No 33 St Anne's Road, thence southwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence eastwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 31 to 23 St Anne's Road to the rear boundary of No 42 Thurlow Gardens, thence southwards along said boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 40 to 2 Thurlow Gardens, and the western boundary of No 612 High Road, thence southwards in a straight line across High Road to the eastern boundary of No 553 High Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 33 Napier Road, thence westwards along the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence southwestwards in a straight line across Napier Road to the rear boundary of No 36 Chaplin Road, thence generally westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 36 to 54 Chaplin Road, crossing Talbot Road and continuing generally westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 56 to 76 Chaplin Road, thence southwards along the western boundary of the last mentioned property to Chaplin Road, thence eastwards along said road to Norton Road and southwards along said Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 72 Eagle Road, thence eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 72 to 50 said Road, crossing Thurlby Road and continuing eastwards
along the rear boundaries of Nos 48 to 30 Eagle Road, crossing Scarle Road and continuing eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 28 to 14 Eagle Road, crossing Swinderby Road and continuing eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 8 to 2 Eagle Road and southeastwards along the eastern boundary of No 2 Eagle Road to and eastwards along said road to Ealing Road, thence southeastwards along Ealing Road to the northwestern boundary of Alperton Ward, thence generally southwestwards and westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WEMBLEY CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Alperton Ward meets the eastern boundary of Barham Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to a point due south of the southeastern boundary of the electricity substation to the rear of Fairley Court, thence northwards to and along the eastern boundary of said sub station, thence northeastwards along the detail to and northwards along the rear boundaries of the garages, the rear boundaries of Nos 12 to 24 Harrowdene Road, the rear boundaries of the garages to the northwestern boundary of flats Nos 65, 66, 67 and 68 Milford Gardens, and continuing northwards in a straight line to and along the rear boundaries of the garages adjacent to the Engineering Works to and northwards along the western boundaries of the Engineering Works and Alliance Works and continuing northwards along the rear boundary of Nos 29-35 Lancelot Crescent, thence following the centre of the access path to the rear of No 37-67 Lancelot Crescent and Nos 1-23 Lancelot Avenue thence following the rear boundaries of Nos 25-33 and Nos 36-34 said Avenue to its junction with the access path and in prolongation thereof to the Bakerloo railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway to the Wembley Hill to Sudbury and Harrow Road railway, thence eastwards along said railway to a point due north of the northeastern end of Ecclestone Place, thence due south to Ecclestone
Place and continuing southwards to a point in prolongation of the western boundary of No 1 Wembley Hill Road, thence southeastwards to and along the western boundary of last mentioned property and in a straight line crossing High Road to the northwestern boundary of St Joseph's Catholic Church, thence southwards along the western boundary of said Church, the eastern boundary of St Joseph's RC Primary School, the eastern boundary of the playing fields and the eastern boundary of Elsley School crossing Tokyngton Avenue to the northwestern boundary of 328 said Avenue thence southwards following the western boundary of said property to its southwestern corner thence in a straight line to the northeastern boundary of Alperton Ward, thence generally westwards along the northern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

**TOKYNGTON WARD**

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of St Raphael's Ward meets the northwestern boundary of Stonebridge Ward, thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to and northwinds along the northeastern boundary of Alperton Ward to and northwards along the eastern boundary of Wembley Central Ward to and westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to Park Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Wembley Hill Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Empire Way, thence eastwards and northeastwards along said way, Wembley Park Drive and Bridge Road to and southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of St Andrews Ward to the western boundary of Church End Ward, thence generally southwards along the western boundaries of Church End Ward and St Raphael's Ward to the point of commencement.

**SUDBURY WARD**

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Wembley Central Ward meets the northern boundary of Barham Ward, thence generally westwards along the northern boundary of said Ward to the western boundary of the
Borough, thence generally northeastwards along the Borough boundary to Watford Road, thence southeastwards along said Road to East Lane, thence eastwards along said Lane to a point in prolongation of the eastern boundary of Vale Farm Sports Ground thence southwards to and along said prolongation and said eastern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the access road leading to the car park north of the Club, thence westwards along said access road and the centre of the hedge to a point opposite the north-eastern boundary of the car park, thence to and along the eastern and southern boundaries of the car park to the junction of the fence to the east of the Club, thence southeastwards along said fence, crossing Vale Farm Sports Ground to the northwestern boundary of No 28 Repton Avenue, thence generally eastwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property and the rear boundaries of Nos 87 to 101 Eton Avenue, flats 9 to 20 Eton Court and Nos 107 to 117 Eton Avenue, and continuing eastwards along the northern boundary of No 74 Sudbury Avenue, crossing said Avenue to and continuing eastwards along the southern boundaries of No 71 said Avenue and No 67 Harrowdene Road, crossing said road to and along the southern boundary of No 80 said road to the western boundary of Wembley Central Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

PRESTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of St Andrews Ward meets the northwestern boundary of Tokynton Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to the northern boundary of Wembley Central Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said boundary to and continuing along the Kenton-Wembley Central (Bakerloo railway line) to the Harrow on the Hill Baker Street (Metropolitan railway line), thence southeastwards along said railway to the rear boundary of No 253 Preston Road, thence northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 253 and 255 said road, and eastwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to said road, thence south-
wards along said road to the Metropolitan railway, thence southeastwards along said railway and the Bakerloo railway to the point of commencement.

BARNHILL WARD
Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of St Andrews Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Preston Ward, thence northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of Preston Ward to the junction with the Bakerloo railway line, thence northeastwards following said railway to the footbridge over said railway leading to Shakespeare Drive, thence eastwards and northeastwards along said footbridge and the footpath leading to Fryent Way to the northwestern boundary of Fryent Ward, thence southeastwards, northeastwards, eastwards and southwards along the western boundary of said ward to the northwestern boundary of St Andrews Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SUDBURY COURT WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Sudbury Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards following said western boundary to the Harrow on the Hill-Baker Street (Metropolitan railway), thence eastwards along said railway to the western boundary of Preston Ward, thence southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the northern boundary of Wembley Central Ward, thence westwards and southwards along the northern and western boundaries of said Ward to the northeastern boundary of Sudbury Ward, thence westwards, northwards, westwards and northwestern along the northern and northeastern boundaries of said Ward to the point of commencement.

KENTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Barnhill Ward meets the eastern boundary of Preston Ward at the junction of the Bakerloo and
Metropolitan railways, thence northwestwards along the northern boundary of Preston Ward to the northern boundary of Sudbury Court Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along the Borough boundary to Gooseacre Lane, thence southwards along said Lane to a point due east of the northeastern boundary of No 10 said Lane, thence due west to said northeastern boundary, and westwards along the northern boundary of last mentioned property to and southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 10 to 20 Gooseacre Lane, thence westwards along the northern boundary of No 20 said Lane and the rear boundaries of Nos 16 to 22 Brookside Close to the eastern boundary of Woodcock Park thence southwards along said eastern boundary to NG ref TQ 1782688808, thence in a straight line to NG ref TQ 1783388703, thence southwards, eastwards and again southwards along said eastern boundary to Wealdstone Brook, thence generally southeastwards along said Brook to Falcon Way, thence in a straight line to the northeastern boundary of Uxendon Manor Primary School, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along the eastern boundary of said School to the rear boundary of No 158 Regal Way, thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 158 to 112 said Way, thence in a straight line crossing Lindsay Drive to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 110 to 98 Regal Way to Wealdstone Brook, thence generally southwards along said Brook to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 34 Regal Way, thence to and generally southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 34 to 2 said Way and the rear boundaries of the properties known as "Langdale" and "Chimneys" to Preston Hill, thence northeastwards along said Hill and The Mall to the path leading from The Mall to the Bakerloo railway, thence southeastwards along said path to the western boundary of Barnhill Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

KINGSBURY WARD
Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Roe Green Ward meets the western boundary of Fryent Ward, thence southwestwards along the western
boundary of Fryent Ward and the northern boundary of Barnhill Ward to the
eastern boundary of Kenton Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said
eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards
and northwards along the Borough boundary to the southwestern boundary of
Queensbury Ward, thence eastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward
to and generally southwards along the southwestern boundary of Roe Green
Ward to the point of commencement.