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PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London borough of Waltham Forest in accordance with 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 Waltham Forest Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Greater London Council, 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 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. The Waltham Forest Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When 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 also asked 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 26 February 1976 the Waltham Forest Borough Council submitted a scheme for dividing the borough into 19 three member wards. There was some inequality of representation between wards but the Commission noted that in the Chingford area most of the wards had an above average number of electors and that the area as a whole was under-represented by 1 councillor. Conversely most of the wards in the Walthamstow area had electorates below the average and the area as a whole was over-represented by 1 councillor. With the pattern of wards proposed it was not practicable for the Commission to make a simple adjustment to the scheme and they decided to refer it back to the Council with the advice that, in redrawing the scheme, they should bear in mind that there was no constraint upon them to keep to a pattern of 3 member wards and that there was no need for the new wards to follow parliamentary constituency boundaries.

5. On 27 August 1976 the Waltham Forest Borough Council presented their revised draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 20 wards, each returning either 2 or 3 members to form a council of 57.

6. We received comments from a political association and a local association asking that there should be no major alterations to the existing ward boundaries or to the existing number of councillors. As an alternative, the political association put forward suggestions for changes to wards in the Chingford area. Another political association offered alternative arrangements for the whole of the borough. These provided for the re-drawing of the ward boundaries to produce 30 wards each returning 2 members.

7. We considered the revised draft scheme submitted by the Council and the comments we had received. We noted that the size of council proposed in the draft scheme was in accordance with the guidelines set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 and that the present council had a membership of 56 - including 8 aldermen. We considered
the warding arrangements proposed by the Council and noted that they complied with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and with our own guidelines. We considered the alternative proposals put forward but we preferred those proposed by the Council. After consulting Ordnance Survey we made some minor modifications to the alignment of some of the boundaries proposed by the Council. Subject to these modifications we adopted the Council's draft scheme and formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

8. On 4 November 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter and to those who had commented on the draft scheme. The Council were asked to make our draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the 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 members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 30 December 1976.

9. The Borough Council accepted our draft proposals but made suggestions for minor alterations to boundaries. Both political associations and the local association expressed continued dissatisfaction with the proposals. The local association repeated their request for the existing arrangements to remain basically unaltered. One political association put forward revised proposals for the area of the borough north of Forest Road. The other political association, which had previously asked for the existing arrangements to remain unchanged, asked for their alternative proposals for wards in the Chingford area to be considered again.

10. In view of these comments, we felt we needed more information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, and at our request, Mr J N Manson was appointed as Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.
11. Notice of the meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at the Town Hall, Walthamstow on 6 April 1977 and visited the areas which were the subject of comment. A copy of his report to us is at Schedule 1.

13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to the modifications to ward boundaries sought by the Council, an alteration to the Wood Street and Forest wards proposed by one of the political associations, and the realignment of boundaries between the Leyton/Leabridge and Grove Green/Cathall wards in the interests of equality of representation.

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 recommendations made by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted and, subject to the modifications he had suggested, we decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

15. Details of these proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. 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 Waltham Forest 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. A detailed description of the proposed ward boundaries as shown on the map is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.
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TO: THE SECRETARY
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR
THE LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

Pursuant to my appointment by the Secretary of State as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local inquiry or carry out any consultation or investigation with respect to the review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Waltham Forest, I conducted a local meeting at the Town Hall, Walthamstow, Waltham Forest on 6 April, 1977.

Attendances

The following persons attended the meeting:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING OR STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.G. Knox</td>
<td>Chief Executive, London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.W. Armer</td>
<td>Senior Electoral Registration Officer, London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.E. Thraves</td>
<td>Electoral Registration Assistant, London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.A. Smith</td>
<td>Secretary, Waltham Forest Local Government Committee of the Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.A. King</td>
<td>Councillor (Hale End Ward), representing Waltham Forest Chingford Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sinclair</td>
<td>Councillor (Chingford Central)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.J. Fox</td>
<td>Agent, Waltham Forest Chingford Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hodges</td>
<td>Agent and Secretary, Leyton Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.R. Woodward</td>
<td>Chairman, Boundaries co-ordinating committee for the 3 Waltham Forest Liberal Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Davies</td>
<td>President, Chingford Division Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Brockman</td>
<td>Hon. Secretary, Chingford Division Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. Jones</td>
<td>Leyton and Leytonstone Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E. Flanders</td>
<td>Chairman, Walthamstow Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Flanders</td>
<td>Member, Walthamstow Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>REPRESENTING OR STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Wheatley</td>
<td>Member (High Street Ward), Walthamstow Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G. Taylor</td>
<td>Member, Walthamstow Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.K. Duncan</td>
<td>Member, Walthamstow Liberal and Radical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Berry</td>
<td>Chairman, Waltham Forest Ratepayers' Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Lofthouse</td>
<td>Agent, Waltham Forest Ratepayers' Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Gauntlett</td>
<td>&quot;Waltham Forest Guardian&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Old</td>
<td>Member of public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Wilkin</td>
<td>Member of public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminaries

I introduced myself as the Assistant Commissioner appointed to hold the meeting and to report to the Commission. I explained that it was not to be a formal inquiry but a meeting as informal as possible so as to encourage a full exchange of views but consistent with the need to ensure a fair hearing and that everyone who wished to speak or to comment on other views expressed either before or at the meeting would be given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Knox, the Chief Executive of the London Borough of Waltham Forest confirmed that notice of the meeting had been duly published as required by the Commission's letter of 8 March, 1977.

Mr. Wheatley expressed his strong objection to the meeting being held during normal weekday working hours, thus making it very difficult and in many cases impossible for working people like him to attend. He was very interested in the proceedings, having been involved in the detailed preparation of the proposals and representations of the Liberal Associations. Mr. Woodward and others would be presenting the Liberal Associations' case but he would have liked to have stayed throughout to hear them and to assist if required. As things were he could only stay for the first 2 hours. He also expressed his dissatisfaction that now more than a year had been allowed to elapse since February 1976 when the original draft scheme and alternative proposals had had to be submitted.

The Commission's Draft Proposals

The draft proposals of the Commission were substantially the same as the revised draft scheme submitted by the Borough Council on 30 July 1976. The variations adopted by the Commission comprised minor realignments of boundaries to follow detail as suggested by Ordnance Survey and included an adjustment at Faversham Avenue.
There are at present 16 wards in the Borough, each electing 3 councillors who with 8 aldermen compose the Council of 56 members. The draft proposals were for 20 wards each electing 2 or 3 councillors to give a Council of 57 members, none of the proposed wards being the same as an existing ward, and constituted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANN HALL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8554</td>
<td>2851</td>
<td>8084</td>
<td>2695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHALL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8426</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>2819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL END</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8875</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>8918</td>
<td>2973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINGFORD GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8956</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>9350</td>
<td>3117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLEBURY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5924</td>
<td>2962</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>3122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9445</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>9540</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9859</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>9859</td>
<td>3286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALE END</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5935</td>
<td>2967</td>
<td>5935</td>
<td>2967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATCH LANE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8792</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>9293</td>
<td>3098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLAND HILL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>5895</td>
<td>2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9152</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>9187</td>
<td>3062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOE STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9204</td>
<td>3066</td>
<td>9222</td>
<td>3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARKSWOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9223</td>
<td>3074</td>
<td>9968</td>
<td>3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA BRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9451</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>9462</td>
<td>3154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8406</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>8562</td>
<td>2854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTONSTONE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8902</td>
<td>2967</td>
<td>9231</td>
<td>3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLOYD PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8600</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>8823</td>
<td>2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. JAMES STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9754</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>9577</td>
<td>3192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8887</td>
<td>2962</td>
<td>8941</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9206</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>9465</td>
<td>3155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>170960</td>
<td>AVERAGE 2999</td>
<td>174015</td>
<td>AVERAGE 3053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objections to and Observations on the Commission's Proposals and Alternative Proposals.

Objections raised and observations made to the Commission or to me at the meeting in respect of the Commission's and other proposals concerned:

1. The size of the Council
2. The number and size of wards generally
3. Inequality of representation of electors in several wards
4. The suitability of ward boundaries in relation to local ties or communities and to ease of identification.

Size of Borough Council

Mr. Woodward, speaking on behalf of the 3 Liberal Associations in the Borough referred to the Council of 60 which the Liberals proposed in their scheme submitted to the Commission in February 1976 for 30 2-member wards and to their revised proposals, with some 3-member wards in the part of the Borough on the northern side of the North Circular Road, submitted in his letters of 29 December, 1976 and 3 January, 1977 to the Commission. He said the Liberals felt that a Council of about 60 members would be an appropriate size having regard to the Commission's guidelines for London Borough Council memberships in the range of 50 to 70 and to the electorate of Waltham Forest being about the middle of the range of electorates of all London Boroughs. They saw no reason to reduce the total membership of the Council substantially below its present membership, inclusive of aldermen, as the Ratepayers' Association's proposals would do. The disadvantages of having only 48 councillors would be significant; the individual councillor would have a larger electorate making it less easy to keep in touch with electors and at the same time would have a larger share of the present work load of the Council and its committees.

Mr. King for the Chingford Conservative Association referred to their submission to the Commission dated 9 February, 1976 suggesting that the electorate of the Borough could be properly represented by 48 elected members. Mr. King said that this was based on their view that the decision-taking ability of any body was not proportional to its size and in many instances the reverse was the case and that the quality of decisions was inversely proportional to the size of the body. So they were not convinced of the necessity to change the present arrangements which had applied to the Council elections in 1963, 1968, 1971 and 1974. However, in the light of the Commission's draft proposals his Association did not wish to press this point any longer.

Mr. Berry said the Ratepayers' Association maintained their view previously stated in their letters of February, 1976 and August, 1976 that 48 councillors would be adequate for Waltham Forest. They thought that with the increase in the total electorates a higher ratio of electors per councillor should be accepted. With electorates of up to 4000 per councillor at present councillors were not in touch with the local people they represented and his Association did not believe that, with a reduction to about 3000 as proposed by the Commission, councillors would establish a
closer contact with the people they represented. They therefore considered that it was right, particularly in the present economic situation, to avoid the additional cost to the Council, candidates and political organizations involved of holding more numerous elections and of meeting the administrative and other expenses of having a larger Council than was necessary. His Association saw the increase to 56 councillors originally proposed by the Council as politically motivated so as to accommodate the present number of members and not on a logical basis and as making it even more difficult for smaller parties to contest elections against the larger parties who can afford the complicated machinery for organizing wards for both parliamentoary and local government electoral purposes. Also the Ratepayers' Association wished to prevent the confusion for electors affected by new ward boundaries and polling arrangements which did not correspond to those in force for parliamentary and Greater London Council elections.

Mr. Lofthouse referred to the undesirability of having councillors who did not reside in the areas they represent. This was likely to get worse with a larger Council requiring more candidates to be found. He agreed with Mr. Berry that 46 councillors could adequately represent the population and to have more would only make the administration unwieldy and more costly. Mr. Wheatley, Miss Smith and Mr. King said it was the aim of their parties to put forward resident candidates as far as practicable.

Mr. Knox said that a Council of 56 was not proposed for the reasons alleged by the Ratepayers' Association. From practical experience the Council considered that that size was suitable having regard to the work load at committees etc. now shared by that number.

Number and Size of Wards Generally

Mr. Woodward referred to the dual function of councillors, firstly, participation in making policy decisions for the whole Borough at the Town Hall (probably through their party group) and secondly, representing the views and interests of the people in their own wards and keeping them informed on what the Council was doing. This latter function meant a councillor must be able to keep in close touch with the people and area he represented. Under the present system, with several councillors sharing responsibility for one ward, their task was made more difficult by having a larger ward in terms of area and of number of electors. A councillor for a single-member ward of 3000 electors or for a 2-member ward of 6000 electors would find it easier to keep in touch with them than with the number in a 3-member ward and correspondingly he should be able to know the whole of his ward better the smaller it was. In this respect single member wards would be advantageous but the Liberals did not feel able to suggest this is view of the administrative problems and costs involved in conducting elections for about 60 wards. Their preference therefore was for 2-member wards but in the case of the Chingford area they had accepted a mixture of 2- and 3-member wards. One advantage they pointed out of a 2-member ward over a single-member ward was that a councillor proposing a
motion of interest only to his own particular ward was less likely to fail to get it discussed for want of a seconder. In the Liberals' experience the third member in a 3-member ward was often a "passenger" and there was a tendency for one or 2 of the councillors to do most, if not all, of the work.

Mr. Woodward said that the Liberals' proposals met the Commission's guidelines very successfully as respects electoral equality, local ties and clear boundaries. The Commission's proposals in all respects were far less satisfactory. A particularly bad example was Larkswood Ward where boundaries of existing communities had not been followed and the electoral ratio was too far above average. The Council's revised draft scheme was prepared in a hurry and the Liberals felt that somehow it did not fit and was in a mess. They believed several of the councillors shared this view. The Liberals urged that it would be better to adopt a completely new scheme such as theirs which would be more viable and sensible in every way.

Mr. Jones pointed to the inequality of electorates in Leyton under the Council's proposals; the worst example being Cann Hall with 2695 electors per councillor in 1981 compared to the Borough average (3053) and Larkswood Ward (3323). The Liberals' scheme of 2-member wards in Leyton made it possible to produce electorates per councillor (1976) in the range 2759 to 3042 compared to a Borough average (2898 for 59 councillors). These numbers made a strong case for the principle of 2-member wards in Leyton and its extension to the rest of the Borough as far as possible. Mrs. M. Flanders supported the 2-member principle which the Liberals' scheme had applied in Walthamstow also.

Mr. King speaking for the Chingford Conservative Association said they were firmly of the opinion that moves towards a pattern of a non-uniform number of councillors per ward was retrograde and did not assist in securing equality of representation. Furthermore, even with equality of electoral ratio, electors in 2-member wards might feel that in fact they were less well represented than electors who had the opportunity of returning 3 candidates of their choice to participate in the Council. Mr. King said that the Conservative Association's general objection to the Council's scheme, embodied in the Commission's proposals, was its failure to fulfil the requirements as to boundaries which were and would remain easily identifiable and as to ties which would be broken by particular boundaries. In their view the whole scheme had been structured merely to meet the requirement of equality of electorates. Accordingly the Conservatives urged the Commission to adopt their scheme for Chingford giving only 3-member wards. They did not accept the need for 19 councillors to increase the comparative representation of Chingford. Since 1964 Chingford had been represented by 15 councillors without any difficulties arising and the Conservatives submitted that whether this was increased to 18 or 19 it would be of no consequence as regards proper and adequate representation and the ability of councillors to carry out their task. 18 councillors fitted in with a 3-member ward pattern and if the Conservatives' scheme for Chingford and the Council's scheme for the rest of the Borough were adopted there would be a uniform and, to the electors, a more comprehensible pattern of 3-member wards with the single exception of Higham Hill Ward.
On this as on other points the Conservatives, as having the most electors supporting them, claimed to be best qualified to speak on behalf of Chingford people.

Mr. Knox said that the need for balancing the electoral ratios in the Borough was the prime consideration and for this reason the proposal for 19 members for Chingford was necessary even though it meant having to introduce a mixed pattern with 2 2-member wards. 3-member wards were preferable because they gave fuller cover for electors' requirements generally and particularly during any temporary absence of a councillor or any vacancy. In framing their scheme the Council had aimed at 3-member wards wherever possible and so at the minimum number of wards. Where 2-member wards had had to be adopted he did not think that in practice this variation from the normal would cause any confusion for the electors concerned. He did not agree that having a larger number of smaller wards (as in the Liberals' 2-member ward scheme for Leyton and Walthamstow) necessarily made it easier to define suitable wards. More wards meant drawing more boundaries and so increasing the difficulty of avoiding the severance of local ties as well as producing more irregular lines and, in the case of the Liberals' scheme, using the rear boundaries of premises where redevelopment might occur. On Mr. King's reference to 15 councillors adequately representing the Chingford wards, Mr. Knox pointed out that this ignored the contribution made by aldermen who although not allocated to particular wards did in fact attend ward meetings and otherwise involve themselves with the electors of the areas with which they were connected by residence or business.

Mr. King referred to the suggestion publicly made by the Conservatives in August 1976 (but not adopted) that a more appropriate step would have been for the political parties to have withdrawn from the scene leaving the officers of the Council the task of working out a good scheme uncoloured by politics which could have been accepted by all concerned without much further argument.

The Ratepayers' Association in their letter of 22 December, 1976 to the Commission had suggested that if a larger number of councillors for the Borough was required this could be achieved by having the existing wards with 4 councillors each. This idea was not pursued by the Association's representatives at the meeting.

**Particular Ward Boundaries**

**A. The Commission's Draft Proposals**

The meeting next discussed particular ward boundaries in the draft proposals of the Commission in relation to equality of electorates, ease of identification and local ties.
The Chingford Liberal Associations in their letter to the Commission of 29 December, 1976 had commented that the boundary between these 2 wards should not go along the middle of Brindwood Road but to the north of properties in Priory Avenue and Priory Close. It was however their view that it would be better to redraw the boundary altogether to make Valley Ward (with 2 members) extend only as far north as Hall Lane. Mr. Woodward pointed out that the Liberals' scheme adopted Hall Lane and New Road as a boundary here. The Chingford Conservative Association in their letter of 9 February, 1976 to the Commission had proposed in their original scheme to take the same line behind properties in Priory Avenue and Priory Close as an existing polling district boundary. Mr. King said that while he thought their line was better he agreed that the location of a line here would have to be arbitrary and drawn as the balance of ward electorates required. Mr. Woodward agreed that a line to be drawn here could not be derived from a boundary of community of interest. (Since the meeting I have been informed by Mr. Armer that the change proposed by the Conservative Association would involve 204 electors.)

Mr. Woodward reaffirmed the view of the Chingford Liberal Associations in their letters of 26 August and 29 December, 1976 that those 2 wards did not correspond to the real communities of North Chingford and that Chingford Green Ward was awkwardly shaped and generally too large. If there had to be a mixture of 2- and 3-member wards it would be better to reduce Chingford Green (to be a 2-member ward) and enlarge Endlebury (to be a 3-member ward). This would involve transferring to Endlebury Ward the area north and west of the Ridgeway and to Chingford Green part of the area between the Ridgeway and Larkshall Road. This latter area he said had more affinity with the Station Road area than the rest of Endlebury Ward.

Mr. Knox explained the Council's proposed amendment to include in Larkswood Ward Nos. 95, 97, 128 and 130 Harold Road. The boundary in the present draft proposals unnecessarily and undesirably separated these houses from the rest of Harold Road. The representatives of all parties at the meeting thought this amendment involving 8 electors was acceptable.

The Liberal Associations had in their letter of 29 December, 1976 to the Commission suggested that there might be an error in the Council's estimates of electorates for Larkswood Ward polling districts in 1981. Mr. Knox confirmed the Council's figures saying that they included an increase of 440 in respect of 225 council housing units at Suffield Hatch and that on the land not owned by the Council at Chingford Hospital housing development was unlikely to be completed in the next 5 years.
(4) Valley and Larkswood Wards

Reference was made to the suggestion in the letter from the Chingford Liberal Associations to the Commission of 26 August, 1976 that as Larkswood Ward was rather large the area immediately south of Chingford Mount Cemetery, (Alpha Road, Templeton Avenue, etc.) should be excluded and should be added to Valley Ward as that area had more affinity with the other side of Old Church Road than with an area extending to the Chingford Hospital and Highams Park.

Mr. Knox said that such an amended boundary would be an artificial device. The polling station for the area transferred would probably be across Old Church Road instead of at the school and he did not agree that this area had more community of interest with the area across Old Church Road.

Mr. Woodward said that he would not wish to press for that particular change but the fact remained that Larkswood Ward would be too large. He referred to the Liberals' proposals in their letter of 3 January, 1977 which would exclude from their Larkswood Ward the area between Higham Station Avenue and New Road and west of Larkswood Park. This area they considered to have an old established tie with the Valley Ward area south of Hall Lane and less of a tie with the area south of Higham Station Avenue and east of Underwood Road. Mr. Knox said the Council did not think that the ties referred to by Mr. Woodward were sufficiently strong to dictate the boundaries here. Mr. King said that Larkswood Ward could not be made satisfactory by just tinkering with its boundaries and a recasting of it and the surrounding wards was required.

(5) Larkswood and Hatch Lane Wards

Reference was made to the Conservatives' scheme which used Larkshall Road as a boundary, which would include in Hatch Lane Ward the area between that road and the railway. Mr. King said that 750 electors were in this area and that that boundary had been adopted to provide electoral balance between the wards. He agreed that the railway did sever communities but the existing ward boundaries did not stick to the railway. Mr. Woodward felt that the use of Larkshall Road as a boundary would be acceptable if required to balance electorates and he and Mr. Knox thought the area had approximately equivalent ties east and west of the railway. Mr. Knox pointed out that for the Commission's draft proposals a transfer of 750 electors from Larkswood Ward to Hatch Lane Ward would make the electorate of Hatch Lane Ward in 1981 even larger than Larkswood Ward's.

(6) Larkswood Ward and Chapel End Ward:

The Conservative Association had objected to the Commission's proposal to have Chapel End Ward dissected by the North Circular Road, the major road in the Borough, instead of using that road as a natural boundary and one defining established communities. The Ratepayers' Association had similarly objected and had referred to the intended dualling of Wadham Road
which would make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross the road. They proposed that the area of Chapel End Ward north of the road should be included with the rest of Larkswood Ward. The Liberals had supported these objections and had amended their original proposals so that they used the whole length of the North Circular Road as a boundary.

Mr. Knox pointed out that the boundary proposed by the Council was the Ching Brook and that adjoining the brook were sports grounds providing a further physical separation between residential areas, thus reducing community links. Although some residents in the north-east corner of Chapel End Ward (Winchester Road, etc.) might use Highams Park Station and shops in that neighbourhood the public transport services along the North Circular Road provided east-west travelling facilities well used by residents on both sides of the road. The road was not a motorway but an all purpose road, and no change of this character was being envisaged as a result of the improvement scheme. The road would thus continue to serve local traffic of all sorts between the adjoining communities. There were pedestrian subways at the "Crooked Billet" roundabout and on both sides of the railway bridge. Voters in Empress Avenue and Grove Park Avenue would be the only ones having to cross the main road. These were near the subway at the Crooked Billet roundabout giving a direct route to the existing polling station in Roberts Road. The rest of the electors north of the main road would continue to vote at the Methodist Church Hall in Winchester Road.

Mr. Woodward said that the Liberal Association thought it would be acceptable for Chapel End Ward to include Wadham Avenue and the area to the west of it but the inclusion of part of Winchester Road and the adjoining roads was wrong because the division was artificial and the people in these roads thought of themselves as belonging to the Highams Park area. Mr. King agreed with Mr. Woodward about the Winchester Road area. He said that the importance of the main road as a dividing feature must not be understated.

Mr. Knox accepted that the Winchester Road area had some community of interest with the north but pointed out that electoral balance was the primary factor. Mr. Armer said that the area of Chapel End Ward north of the main road from and including Wadham Avenue eastwards to the railway now comprised 958 electors (about 1000 in 1981).

(7) Chingford Green, Hatch Lane and Hale End Wards

Mr. Knox explained the amendment suggested by the Council for Nos. 19-31 (odd) and 36 Faversham Avenue to be in Hatch Lane Ward instead of being divided from the rest of Faversham Avenue as in the Commission's proposals. There was only pedestrian access directly between Forest Side (in Chingford Green Ward) and Faversham Avenue and the Council's scheme had avoided division of Faversham Avenue between 2 wards. (The 15 electors involved are already included as part of Hatch Lane Ward in the Table on Page 3 of this report.) The representatives of all parties at the meeting agreed that all of Faversham Avenue should be in the same ward.
Mr. Woodward said that the boundary between the 2 wards was awkward and too irregular for canvassers and others to follow correctly and the Liberal Association proposed that it should go along Whitehall Road to the Borough boundary or even to the south of Rosslyn Avenue and Courtland Avenue so as to keep all these roads with the area to the north with which there was apparently more affinity.

Mr. Knox said that Faversham Avenue and Valance Avenue were closes cut off from the development to the north and looked more to the south than to the north and were suitable for inclusion, together with Whitehall Gardens, in Hatch Lane Ward to achieve a better electoral balance. He did not agree that canvassers provided with lists of properties in the 2 wards would in practice be confused by the two loops in the ward boundary.

Mr. Woodward said that Hatch Lane Ward was a strange amalgam of two distinct communities divided at the "waist" by Hatch Lane and Mr. King agreed. Mr. Knox said that although the communities north and south of Hatch Lane might be distinguished from one another that did not mean that a warding scheme should not include them in the same ward, although appearing to be illshaped. The Chingford Hatch shopping area was a central point for the ward.

The Liberal Associations had commented on the Council's draft scheme including the Charter Road and Nesta Road in Hale End Ward and so separating them from the connecting residential roads, Henry's Avenue, etc. The natural geography of the area suggested that these roads should be in the same ward, possibly also with the inclusion of the area down to and including houses at Harman Avenue and Lodge Villas. Mr. Woodward said the Liberals strongly objected to the proposed division.

Mr. Knox said that the Council's line was artificial and arbitrary but to transfer the properties mentioned to Hatch Lane Ward would add 328 electors to an electorate already above average from an electorate already below average.

Mr. King said the Conservatives agreed with Mr. Woodward's objection and, as any line here would be artificial, it should be drawn so as to keep all the properties together within the ward to the north. Mr. Lofthouse concurred.

(8) Higham Hill and Lloyd Park Wards

The Liberal Associations had objected that the east/west boundary between these wards was artificial and awkward, wandering along a number of small roads and not at all easy to follow. Higham Hill Road, in fact a sort of minor main road, was busy and would make a far better boundary (as in the Associations' own scheme).

Mr. Knox said that the Council's boundary was to be preferred giving in 1981 a difference of only 6 electors per councillor between the 2 wards. (The Liberals scheme would produce figures per councillor of 3107 (Higham Hill Ward) 3193 (Priory Ward) 3044 (Monoux Ward) and 3012 (Pulbourne Ward).)
(9) **Higham Hill, Valley and Chapel End Wards**

The Liberal Associations had suggested that the small number of houses on the south west of Walthamstow Avenue and on the north of Billet Road from McEntee School to the "Billet" roundabout should be in Valley or Chapel End Ward and not Higham Hill Ward as they were physically separated from the main part of that ward. Mr. Knox said these premises were in the existing Higham Hill Ward with reasonable polling facilities. Transfer to Valley Ward would mean a much longer distance to the polling station.

(10) **Lloyd Park and Chapel End Wards**

The Liberal Associations had commented that at the south-east corner of Lloyd Park Ward Lloyd Park itself formed as a "natural break" a better boundary with Chapel End Ward than Chingford Road and that arrangement would bring into one ward the small area of houses south of the bus garage, on both sides of Chingford Road. Mr. Woodward added that round Bell Corner (Chingford and Forest Roads' intersection) there was a sort of community. Some 460 electors would be involved in the transfer and Mr. Knox pointed out that it would mean their having to cross the busy Chingford Road to vote and that it would adversely affect the electoral balance between the 2 wards.

(11) **Hale End and Chapel End Wards**

The Conservative Association had objected to both wards being dissected by the North Circular Road. Mr. King said that, the railway line notwithstanding, the triangle inside that road, Forest Road and the railway had a firm community of interest with Chapel End. Mr. Woodward thought that the severance both by the railway and by the North Circular Road produced a fine point for decision but the Liberals felt that on balance the choice should if possible be, as it was in theirs and the Conservatives' schemes, to put the triangle with the Chapel End/Fulbourne areas. Mr. Knox agreed that there was a choice as referred to by Mr. Woodward; it had been made the other way to give a better balance of electorates.

(12) **Forest, Wood Street, St. James Street and Lea Bridge Wards**

The Liberal Associations had objected that it was absurd to split the roads near Forest School, College Place, etc. and Forest Court; etc. between 2 wards and proposed that they all be included in Wood Street Ward. Mr. Woodward supported this amendment and in view of the physical separation of this area from the rest of Forest Ward Mr. Knox and representatives of the other parties at the meeting thought it should be adopted. (Since the meeting Mr. Knox has informed me and the representatives of the other parties that 200 electors in 1976 and in 1981 (estimated) would be transferred by this amendment.)

The Liberal Associations had drawn attention to the boundary between Forest Ward and the other 2 wards cutting across 4 small roads, College, Merton, Fraser and Copeland. This boundary was the old Borough boundary but was now something of an anomaly. The Council had in their letter of 18 February, 1977 proposed to the Commission an amendment to the draft proposals to transfer Nos. 17-23 (odd) and 24-34 (even) College Road.
Nos. 679-725 (odd) Lea Bridge Road and Nos. 23-37 (odd) Merton Road to Wood Street Ward (97 electors) and Nos. 29-47 (odd) and 28-44 (even) Copeland Road, Nos. 1-15 (odd) and 2-16d (even) Fraser Road, Nos. 639-669a (odd) Lea Bridge Road and Nos. 26-36 (even) Merton Road to St. James Street Ward (141 electors). This amendment would avoid dividing these small roads and use Lea Bridge Road as the more sensible boundary.

The Liberal Associations had raised a similar point about Markmanor Avenue and Theydon Street. Mr. Knox said these roads were being retained in the St. James Street Ward as at present and no difficulties had been encountered there.

The Liberal Associations had questioned the sense of the "finger" of St. James Street Ward east of Hoe Street and Mrs. Flanders said they were concerned about the polling facilities for the electors involved. Mr. Armer said they would be able to vote as at present at a polling station on their side of Hoe Street.

(13) Lea Bridge and Leyton Wards

The Liberal Associations in their letter of 26 August and 29 December, 1976 had pointed to inequalities of electorates in the Commission's draft proposals, especially in the Leyton part of the Borough. Lea Bridge and Leyton Wards with 1981 electorates of 9462 and 8562 were particular examples of the wards which required adjustment to even out inequalities. I said that some transfer of electors from Lea Bridge Ward might be practicable. After examining the road pattern I said that I would wish to consider continuing the boundary south-westwards along Capworth Street to Lea Hall Road, southeastward along that road to Radlix road, southwestwards along that road to Church Road and southeastwards along that road to Marsh Lane. Mr. Knox said this would involve about the desired number. It would be a less straightforward boundary but he did not see any particular difficulty. The other parties raised no objection. (Since the meeting he has informed me and the representatives of other parties that the number of electors involved in 1976 and in 1981 (estimated) is 476.)

(14) Grove Green, Cathall and Cann Hall Wards

The Liberal Associations had referred particularly to these wards also as examples of inequalities of electorates in the Commission's draft proposals.

Mr. King said that the railway together with the cemetery provided an effective boundary and in adopting it the Council had had in mind the new major road planned to run alongside the railway although this redevelopment would not be expected in the next 5 years. He said that if Grove Green Road became Cathall Ward's northwestern boundary some 500 electors would be transferred and agreed that there was access at 4 points across this length of railway. However he opposed such a change and submitted that the higher representation of Cathall and Cann Hall wards could with justification be accepted having regard to the nature of the area and its high density with redevelopment problems. Mr. Woodward said that the residential population of this part of the Borough tended to fall but Mr. Knox said this was due to vacation of
premises and should eventually be stopped and even reversed after redevelopment. Mr. Knox said that in the meantime a reduction of Cann Hall Ward’s electorate of 470 by 1981 was only a forecast and might be postponed beyond 1981 if redevelopment did not go ahead as fast as intended. The High Road had been taken by the Council as the natural boundary of Cann Hall Ward with Cathall Ward and there did not seem to him to be any practicable line further west. Similarly the boundary with Leytonstone Ward could not sensibly be drawn further north than Davies Lane without dissecting the Bushwood Road, Mornington Road development.

Mr. Woodward suggested that Cann Hall Ward be reduced in size with a boundary along Harrow Road and other roads to an electorate for 2 councillors (similar to his Associations' Cann Hall Ward proposal). Mr. King said his Association would be opposed to the introduction of a 2-member ward.

(Since the meeting Mr. Knox has informed me and the representatives of the other parties that moving the northwest boundary of Cathall Ward from the railway to Grove Green Road would transfer 658 electors in 1976 and 1981 (estimated).)

Mr. Knox said that the Council’s and the Commission’s proposals must be looked at as a whole. The need for a fair balance of electorates was predominant and the Council thought that in this respect their scheme was better than the others proposed. Their boundaries were reasonable, though they did not claim them to be perfect. Other boundaries could be adopted but would not necessarily be consistent with a reasonable electoral balance overall.

B. Chingford Conservative Association’s Proposals for a Council of 56 Members

The meeting discussed points arising on the Conservative Association’s scheme in so far as they had not already been discussed in connection with the size of the Council and the general pattern of wards or as possible variations of the Commission’s proposals.

Mr. King explained that the Association had taken the major roads as the prime basis of boundaries in their scheme but with slight modifications to balance electorates. The use of major roads had the effect of maintaining “natural communities” within a ward. He referred to each of the 6 Chingford wards proposed by the Conservative Association.

(1) Chingford North Ward

Here Friday Hill had been taken as a boundary. It was a major road where traffic was such a cause of concern as to require a pedestrian bridge and pedestrian restraints. The G.L.C. (L.C.C.) estate had over a period of time become effectively 2 communities east and west of the road.
(2) **Chingford Central Ward**

This was largely a well-established community comprising most of the Chingford Central Ward dating from 1963 the boundaries followed main roads and the natural barrier of Chingford cemetery but, having regard to the figures of actual 1976 electorates and estimates for 1981 supplied by the Council, the Conservative Association would now amend their proposal for the boundary between Chingford Central and Chingford West Wards on the west of Old Church Road. This would now run from Chingford cemetery northwards along Old Church Road to No. 244 in that road and then turn west behind the north side of St. Catherines Road and Heriot Avenue to Waltham Way, then north along that road and finally turn west to the Borough boundary between Nos. 281 and 283. This would transfer 962 electors in 1976 and 1981 from the Central to the West Ward.

(3) **Chingford West Ward**

This lay to the west of the heavily trafficked roads, Old Church Road and Chingford Mount Road, and was bounded on the south by an area of factory sites and playing fields.

(4) **Chingford South Ward** and

(5) **Hale End Ward**

These 2 wards comprised the rest of Chingford north of the North Circular Road which was a natural ward boundary and would include premises north of the "Billet" roundabout on the west side of Chingford Road. The boundary between these wards would be in part the railway and in part, for the sake of electoral balance, Larkshall Road which was also a major road. The community at Hale End had existed for many years and the Hale End Ward proposed comprised a major part of the present Hale End Ward plus the area south of Hatch Lane/New Road and north-west of The Avenue which joined naturally with it. The Conservative Association did not accept that the railway between Higham Park Station and Chingford Station should be regarded as a feature dividing the residential areas it traversed.

(6) **Chapel End Ward**

This was the rest of Chingford constituency less a small area at Douglas Avenue etc. (which should go to Higham Hill Ward for electoral balance) and consisted of an area long known as "Chapel End".

Mr. King submitted that the Conservatives' proposals with boundaries following natural and clear lines and containing established communities with electorates in 1976 varying by only 4% above or below average and in 1981 by 4.7% should be preferred to the Commission's proposals as being the most reasonable.

Mr. Woodward remarked that the Conservatives' proposed Hale End Ward was the same as the Liberals' except as to Larkshall Road where the variation could be accepted if justified by electoral numbers. He did however take issue on Chingford South Ward which did not as truly reflect the communities of interest as the Liberals' Larkswood Ward did.
Mr. Knox pointed out that it was wrong for electoral equality to be subordinated to the other considerations as the Conservatives suggested in their objections and in their proposals. In the case of Chingford North and Chingford Central Wards he did not agree that Friday Hill should be treated as if it divided 2 communities. The G.L.C. housing estate was laid out as a whole and as such it had its own shopping centre, library and clinic facilities. But Mr. King said that people in the north eastern part of the area preferred to shop in the Station Road area to the north.

Mr. Knox said that the houses just north of the "Billet" roundabout should not be warded with Chingford South Ward (or Larkswood Ward in the Liberals' scheme) across the busy main road, Chingford Road: the Council's proposals avoided electors having to cross that road. Larkshall Road was not a good boundary as the area affected had access across the railway only at its extremities. On the proposal to detach to Higham Hill Ward the part of Chapel End Ward round Douglas Avenue, Mr. Knox said 550 electors were involved for 1976 and 1981 and these would produce a well above average electorate of 6445 in 1981 for Higham Hill Ward with 2 members. He said that it could be confusing to have wards with the name "Chingford" distinguished only by reference to compass points (e.g. Chingford West Ward would actually be south of Chingford Central) and the Council had avoided this in their scheme and would wish to be allowed to suggest more suitable names for wards if either of the alternative schemes was to be adopted by the Commission.

C. Waltham Forest Liberal Associations

Proposals for a Council of 59 Members

The meeting discussed points arising on the scheme proposed by the 3 Liberal Associations in so far as they had not already been discussed in connection with the size of the Council, and the general pattern of wards or as possible variations of the Commission's or the Conservatives' proposals.

Mr. Woodward supported the Liberals' scheme with comments on their proposed wards:

(1) Hale End Ward

This was similar to the existing ward but with the addition of the area north of The Avenue. Although the electorate would be below average the electoral balance was against bringing in the area from across the railway which the Conservatives proposed.

(2) Whitehall Ward

Taking the railway as the best boundary this ward was the remaining area north of Hale End Ward and with 2 members a good electoral average was obtained.
(3) **Chingford Green Ward**

As suggested in his comments on the Commission's proposed ward, Mr. Woodward said that the area between Endlebury Road and Kings Road had more affinity with the Station Road area across Kings Road. If it was felt that an electorate of 9734 in 1981 was too large to be acceptable, a modification could be the transfer to Old Church Ward of some 340 electors by drawing the boundary along the alleyway north-west of Fairlight Avenue.

(4) **Old Church Ward**

'Silverthorn' was an alternative name which might be considered. This ward largely comprised people who regarded themselves as in South Chingford and it avoided the drawing of a boundary dividing the community in the Brindwood Road/Heriot Avenue area.

(5) **St. Edmunds Ward**

This was an improvement on the other 2 schemes because it recognized that the South Chingford community was not severed by Chingford Road.

(6) **Larkswood Ward**

This comprised the rest of Chingford north of the North Circular Road. If it was felt that Old Church Ward with some 340 electors transferred from Chingford Green Ward would be too large, the balance could be improved by transferring in turn from Old Church Ward to Larkswood Ward Lukin Crescent, Woodview Avenue and the parts of Larkshall Road and New Road in between.

(7) **Pulbourne Ward**

This and the 3 other 2-member wards covered the area between the North Circular Road and Forest Road with well-balanced electoral figures. The boundary with Monoux Ward was a natural one and used Kitchener Road where there were no houses on the east side.

(8) **Monoux Ward**

This ward also combined sensible boundaries with a balanced electorate.

(9) **Priory Ward**

The same applied to this ward which was a homogeneous community of fairly dense development.

(10) **Higham Hill Ward**

The electorate of this ward would come into balance by 1981 when the development in the Sinott Road area had added 350.
Mr. King objected to the mixture of 2- and 3-member wards and to the use of arbitrary lines which were solely dictated by balancing electorates. He did not think that "Larkwood" was an appropriate name for a ward in which some, but not all, of the Larkwood area was only the northern part.

Mr. Knox said it was difficult to make comparisons in view of the decided preference of the Council for 3-member wards. The Liberals had said that Endlebury Ward's boundary with Chingford Green Ward in the draft proposals was awkward. He submitted that the Liberals Old Church Ward was no better shape. Larkwood Ward as proposed by the Liberals was also ill-shaped and it was not sensible to exclude the area north of Higham Station Avenue. The Council's proposals produced more equal electorates than the Liberals' scheme of 4 2-member wards between Forest Road and the North Circular Road.

Referring to the other wards proposed by the Liberal Associations, Mr. Woodward said they produced very satisfactory electoral ratios within easily identified boundaries and at the same time fitted in with existing communities. However the scheme as submitted by the Liberal Associations in February 1976 needed amendment where their High Street (No. 13) and William Morris (No. 16) wards included areas north of Forest Road now proposed to be in their Higham Hill and Priory Wards. These changes reduced High Street Ward by 514 electors to 5297 in 1981, and William Morris Ward by 1423 electors to 4336 in 1981. As these electorates were too small for 2 members each the solution would be to combine them in one 3-member ward. Its electorate in 1981 would be 9633. Mrs. Flanders suggested that if this was too large an electorate the north end of the boundary with St. Mary Ward (No. 17) might be altered to follow Jewel Road, removing some 300 or more electors to the latter ward.

Mr. King opposed the 2-member ward pattern, which in any case would be broken by the amendment last discussed, and which made more difficulties in running elections without improving electoral representation.

Mr. Knox said that the larger number of wards in the Leyton and Walthamstow proposed by the Liberals meant more boundaries drawn on an arbitrary basis paying less regard to the more significant features of the localities.

Inspections

My inspections covered those locations where the suitability of proposed boundaries was an issue in relation to ease of identification or where the effect of road traffic and other factors on accessibility between areas was in dispute. Where I was able to make an assessment on the ground, I refer to it in my conclusions below.
Conclusions

Size of Borough Council

It appears to me that the sufficiency of a Council of only 48 councillors (with no aldermen) as urged by the Ratepayers' Association needs to be considered in relation to the amount of council work to be shared by the members and to the number of electors a councillor can adequately represent.

On the first point, clearly the loss of the 8 aldermen must make a significant difference and as the need for a larger number of councillors has been accepted by all the other parties represented at the meeting who are proposing a council of 56 or more, I feel that the conclusion should be that a council of 48 would probably be insufficient. On the second point, the contention of the Ratepayers' Association that a reduction of the average electorate per councillor from 4000 to 3000 would not result in councillors being more in touch with electors is paradoxical and not a view which can reasonably be accepted. Although aldermen have not been elected by or assigned to wards there is evidence that in the parts of the Borough where they reside or work they help to maintain contact between the people and the Council. Taking this into account and the forecast of electorate of the Borough in 1981, an increase in the number of councillors seems justified, even though it would mean extra expenditure on elections and redrawing of ward boundaries. A council with between 56 and 59 members would correspond very well with the Commission's guidelines for London Borough Councils.

Number and Size of Wards Generally

As the Commission in their Report No. 6 have said, only most exceptional circumstances would make it necessary to have more than 3 councillors for a ward and I can see no case for introducing a pattern of 4-member wards here. No one advocated a pattern of single-member wards and for the reasons mentioned by Mr. Woodward and, as regards multiplicity of boundaries, by Mr. Knox, I do not regard such a pattern as practicable here.

The choice then lies between wards with 3 or 2 members. More effective contact with and better representation of electors were claimed for each pattern by its supporters. The arguments either way seemed inconclusive and I suggest that the quality and effectiveness of elector/councillor relationships may depend rather more on other factors. On grounds of economy in organizing and contesting elections the existing 3-member ward pattern seems preferable, even though in certain areas some 2-member wards may be needed to obtain balanced electorates within suitable boundaries. In the case of the draft proposals 3 out of 20 wards would have only 2 councillors.
The Conservative Association's opposition to a non-uniform pattern of wards has led them to uphold their proposals for 6 3-member wards in the Chingford part of the Borough, although this would result in under-representation of that part in comparison with the rest of the Borough. With a Council of 56 the ward average would be 3053 electors per councillor in 1976 and 3107 in 1981. Thus those 6 wards with a total electorate of 56,042 in 1976 and 58,100 in 1981 would have entitlements of 18.36 and 18.70. In comparison the Commission's scheme with 7 wards for the same area with the addition of the area round Douglas Avenue provides 19 councillors for electorates of 56,592 in 1976 and 58,650 in 1981. The average electorate per councillor would for a Council of 57 be 2999 in 1976 and 3053 in 1981 giving an entitlement for those 7 wards of 18.87 and 19.21. I am unable to accept the contention of the Conservative Association that an increase in representation is unnecessary and that the retention of a uniform 3-member pattern should take precedence and accordingly I will not be recommending the adoption of their scheme.

The Liberal Association's proposals as now revised provide for 27 wards, 22 with 2 members and 5 with 3 members. Even in the Leyton and Walthamstow areas where they had devised an overall pattern of 2-member wards, the Associations have now found it necessary to introduce a 3-member ward to balance electorates. Their scheme provides for 24 councillors for the area of the Borough north of Forest Road and 35 for the rest. Taken as a whole the scheme would in 1981 leave the area to the north under-represented, to the extent of one councillor as shown by the following comparison with the Commission's draft proposals, which also provide 24 councillors for the same area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberal Associations Scheme</th>
<th>Commission's Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough electorate</td>
<td>174015</td>
<td>174015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Borough councillors</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average electorate per councillor</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of area north of Forest Road</td>
<td>73368</td>
<td>73368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement of area north of Forest Road</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>24.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, I will not be recommending the adoption of the Liberal Associations' scheme as a whole. If the Associations' proposals for the area south of Forest Road are combined with the Commission's proposals for the area to the north there would be a Council of 59 and the area to the north would still have one less councillor than its entitlement. Thus I am not able to recommend this variation.

There remain for consideration the Commission's draft proposals or a combination of the Liberal Associations proposals for the area north of Forest Road and the Commission's proposals south of that road. It thus becomes a question of choosing between the alternative schemes for the area to the north where in terms of normal electoral balance the 2 schemes are about equally successful. In the Commission's scheme
deviations from average for a council of 57 in 1981 range from +8.7\% (Larkswood Ward - entitlement 3.26) to -3.7\% (Lloyd Park Ward - entitlement 2.89). The comparable figures in the Liberals' scheme are +6.3\% (Chingford Green Ward - entitlement 3.19) to -6.5\% (Hale End Ward - entitlement 2.80). On the actual 1976 electorates the Commission's scheme ranges from +2.7\% (Larkswood Ward) to -10\% (Higham Hill Ward) and the Liberals' scheme from +4\% (Priory Ward) to -6.5\% (Larkswood Ward). In respect of overall electoral equality there does not seem to be a clear case for preferring one scheme to the other.

**Particular Ward Boundaries**

In the headings to the following sub-paragraphs I refer to the wards in the Commission's draft proposals.

(1) **Valley and Endlebury Wards**

Although there is no clear community boundary which could be followed here, it seems to me from the evidence and my inspection that it would have been better to avoid dividing the two sides of Brindwood Road when there is a suitable line between it and Priory Avenue which is a polling district boundary. I would however not propose that change as it would involve a material increase in the deviation from normal of both wards.

(2) **Chingford Green and Endlebury Wards**

Chingford Green Ward as proposed by the Commission with entitlements of 2.99 (1976) and 3.06 (1981) compares favourably with the Liberals' Chingford Green Ward entitlements of 3.04 (1976) and 3.19 (1981). The areas in the balance were the Kings Head Hill/Mansfield Hill/The Ridgeway triangle, the area east of the railway and north of Whitehall Road and the Endlebury Road the Kings Road square. The balance of the evidence seemed to be for including the first 2 areas and not the last in the Chingford Green Ward as in the draft proposals.

(3) **Endlebury and Larkswood Wards**

It seems sensible to avoid separating 95, 97, 128 and 130 Harold Road from the rest of the road in Larkswood Ward and I would accordingly recommend the change proposed by the Council as only 8 electors are involved.

(4) **Valley and Larkswood Wards**

It seems to me on the evidence that the Alpha Road, New Road, Higham Station Avenue areas have some ties with Valley Ward across the line of Old Church Road and Chingford Road and also with the rest of Larkswood Ward. From my inspection the importance of those roads as a traffic route suggests that they would be likely to be divisive rather more than unifying and, as the Council and the Conservatives propose, it seems sensible not to divide the areas round Larkswood Park etc., even though that could bring Larkswood Ward's electorate nearer to parity. For the same reasons I consider that the area between Walthamstow Avenue and Chingford Road should be kept in Valley Ward. I notice that in the proposals submitted by the Liberal Associations in February 1976 their Larkswood Ward was bounded by Chingford Mount Road so as to include the area between New Road and Higham Station Avenue.
(5) **Larkswood and Hatch Lane Wards**

The inclusion of the area between Larkshall Road and the railway in Hatch Lane Ward would take its electorate over 10,000 compared to Larkswood Ward as now proposed with 9968 in 1981 and as the arguments on community ties seem equally balanced, I would propose no change.

(6) **Larkswood and Chapel End Wards**

From my inspection of Wadham Road and of the areas adjoining the boundary suggested along the line of the Ching Brook, it seems to me that, taking account of the subways at each end of that road, the alternative boundary lines have about the same significance as divisive features. At the Winchester Road end, other things being equal, the evidence seems to me to be inconclusive as to whether for community reasons it would be better to have put that and the adjoining roads in the same ward but with the size of Larkswood Ward as in the draft proposals an addition of some 1000 electors would not be acceptable.

(7) **Chingford Green, Hatch Lane and Hale End Wards**

For the reasons given by the Council I would recommend that Nos. 19-31 (odd) and No. 38 Faversham Avenue be transferred to Hatch Lane Ward. Although the boundaries here and at the south of Hatch End Ward are not straightforward it did not appear to me that there would be any difficulty in practice about recognizing them on the ground.

Hatch Lane seems an acceptable position for a ward boundary in the Conservatives' and the Liberals' schemes but equally I see no objection to the areas north and south of it being in the same ward as in the Commission's proposals.

The Charter Road and the roads immediately to the south of it are certainly more accessible to the area of Hatch Lane Ward to the north than to the rest of Hale End Ward but I would not recommend a change in the draft proposals, because that would in 1981 increase the deviation from average of both wards' electorates.

(8) **Lloyd Park and Higham Hill Wards**

Although not as straightforward as the line along Higham Hill Road proposed by the Liberals, the description of the boundary between these wards is clear and I do not think that in practice on the ground it would prove difficult to follow. Using the Liberals' line would produce in 1981 the disparity of a ward of 6215 to the west and of 8503 to the east.

(9) **Higham Hill, Valley and Chapel End Wards**

The houses between the south-western end of Walthamstow Avenue and Billet Road are not far apart from the rest of Billet Road and the centre of Higham Hill Ward. Transfer to Valley Ward across the North Circular Road would not improve their position and transfer to either Valley Ward or Chapel End Ward would impair the balance of electorates. I therefore would not propose a change.
(10) Lloyd Park and Chapel End Wards

Chingford Road is a busy traffic road and I found it not easy to cross at Bell Corner and for the reasons stated by Mr. Knox I would propose no change.

(11) Hale End and Chapel End Wards

For the Hale End Road area south of the North Circular Road and east of the railway those 2 features seem to be equivalent barriers and I would propose no change.

(12) Forest, Wood Street, St. James Street and Lea Bridge Wards

My inspection of the area confirmed the strength of the Liberal Associations objection to having the houses south-east of Forest Rise in Forest Ward from which they are practically separated by Snaresbrook Road, Whipps Cross Road and the very busy road traffic system in between. I, therefore, with the general agreement of the meeting, will recommend the transfer of these houses to Wood Street Ward.

The boundaries cutting across Merton Road, Fraser Road, College Road and Copeland Road seem to be unjustifiable and I will recommend they be amended as proposed by the Council.

The case of Markmanor Avenue is not comparable as the boundary between St. James Street Ward and Lea Bridge Ward does not intersect it and I propose no change there.

(13) Lea Bridge and Leyton Wards

To redress the electoral balance I will recommend the transfer of an area with 476 electors from Lea Bridge Ward to Leyton Ward as mentioned at the meeting.

(14) Grove Green, Cathall and Cann Hall Wards

The electoral balance needs to be improved if reasonably practicable in each of these wards. The transfer of 658 electors between Grove Green Road and the railway to Cathall Ward seems to be a reasonable move which can be justified by the figures and I will recommend it. Unfortunately no similar amendment appears to be available for Cann Hall Ward where the reduction of 470 electors originally forecast for 1981 would produce the highest degree of over-representation in the Borough.

General Conclusions

As I have indicated I will recommend the adoption of the Commission's draft proposals, with some amendments, for the area south of Forest Road. For the area north of that road my general conclusion on the boundaries in the draft proposals is that overall they appear to me to be at least as suitable in relation to community ties and to identification as the boundaries proposed by the Liberal Associations. Adding to this my
conclusion that for this area the 2 schemes have been equally successful in achieving electoral balance and a preference for a 3-member ward pattern which in any case would apply to the rest of the Borough area, I will recommend the adoption of the draft proposals, with the amendments I have indicated.

Recommendation

I accordingly recommend the following amendments to the Commission's draft proposals:

(1) That there be transferred to Larkswood Ward that part of Endlebury Ward which lies on the southern side of a line starting at the south-western corner of No. 95 Harold Road, thence northwards along the western boundary of Nos. 95 and 97 Harold Road, thence eastwards along the northern boundary of No. 97 Harold Road and crossing Harold Road to and along the northern boundary of No. 130 Harold Road, thence southwards along the eastern boundary of Nos. 130 and 128 Harold Road to the southeastern corner of No. 128 Harold Road.

(2) That there be transferred to Hatch Lane Ward that part of Chingford Green Ward which lies on the south-western side of a line starting at the north-eastern corner of No. 38 Faversham Avenue, thence south-eastwards north-eastwards and south-eastwards along the north-eastern boundary of that property and along a prolongation of that boundary crossing the footpath to the north-western boundary of No. 55 Forest Side thence south-westwards along that boundary and south-eastwards along the south-western boundaries of Nos. 55, 53 and 51 Forest Side to the south-eastern corner of No. 31 Faversham Avenue.

(3) That there be transferred to Wood Street Ward that part of Forest Ward which lies on the northern side of a line starting at the point where Snaresbrook Road meets the boundary of Wood Street Ward and thence eastwards along that road to the Borough boundary.

(4) That there be transferred to Wood Street Ward that part of Forest Ward which lies on the northern side of a line starting at the point where the northern boundary of Forest Ward meets Merton Road thence south-eastwards along that road to Lea Bridge Road thence north-eastwards along that road to the point opposite the southwestern boundary of No. 727a Lea Bridge Road.

(5) That there be transferred to St. James Street Ward that part of Forest Ward which lies on the northern side of a line starting at the point where the northern boundary of Forest Ward meets Merton Road, thence south-eastwards along that road to Lea Bridge Road thence south-westwards along that road to Copeland Road, thence north-westwards along that road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No. 44 Copeland Road thence south-westwards along that boundary and north-eastwards along the southwestern boundaries of Nos. 44 to 28 Copeland Road to the southeastern boundary of No. 26 Copeland Road.
(6) That there be transferred to Leyton Ward that part of Lea Bridge Ward which lies on the southwestern side of a line starting at the point where the northern boundary of Leyton Ward meets Church Road, thence north-westwards along that road to Radlix Road, thence north-eastwards along that road to Lea Hall Road, thence north-westwards along that road to Capworth Street and thence along that road to its intersection with Manor Road.

(7) That there be transferred to Cathall Ward that part of Grove Green Ward which lies on the southeastern side of a line starting at the point where Grove Green Road meets the boundary of Leyton Ward and thence north-eastwards along that road to Dyers Hall Road and thence westwards along Dyers Road to the point where that road meets the boundary of Leytonstone Ward.

These recommendations would produce ward electorates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANN HALL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8554</td>
<td>2851</td>
<td>8084</td>
<td>2695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHALL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9084</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>9116</td>
<td>3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL END</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8875</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>8918</td>
<td>2973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINGFORD GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8956</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>9350</td>
<td>3117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLEBURY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5916</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>6237</td>
<td>3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>9102</td>
<td>3034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>3067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALE END</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5935</td>
<td>2967</td>
<td>5935</td>
<td>2967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATCH LANE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8792</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>9293</td>
<td>3098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHAM HILL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>5895</td>
<td>2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9152</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>9187</td>
<td>3062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOE STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9204</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>9222</td>
<td>3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARKSWOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9231</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>9976</td>
<td>3325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA BRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8975</td>
<td>2992</td>
<td>8986</td>
<td>2995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8882</td>
<td>2961</td>
<td>9038</td>
<td>3013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTONSTONE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8902</td>
<td>2967</td>
<td>9231</td>
<td>3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLOYD PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8600</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>8823</td>
<td>2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-JAMES STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9695</td>
<td>3298</td>
<td>9718</td>
<td>3239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8887</td>
<td>2962</td>
<td>8941</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9503</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>9762</td>
<td>3254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57  170960  Average  2999  174015  Average  3053
In concluding my report I wish to express my thanks to those attending the meeting for the courteous and informative way in which they presented their proposals and observations and to the officers of the Borough for the assistance they gave in the provision of maps and other information and in the arrangements for the meeting.

The Warren,
Hertingfordbury,
HERTFORD, Herts.

Assistant Commissioner,
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England.

17th May, 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANN HALL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHALL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL END</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINGFORD GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDLEBURY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALE END</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATCH LANE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHAM HILL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOE STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARKSWOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA BRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYTONSTONE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLOYD PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JAMES STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

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

CHINGFORD GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets Whitehall Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 106 and 108 Whitehall Road, thence northwestwards to and along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of said property, thence westwards along said northern boundary and continuing westwards along the northern boundary of No 104 and 102 Whitehall Road to the eastern boundary of No 2 Valance Avenue, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwestwards along the eastern boundaries of Nos 4-10 Valance Avenue and the western boundaries of Nos 51-55 Forest Side, crossing the footpath and continuing northwestwards along the western boundaries of Nos 59-71 Forest Side to the northern boundary of No 36 Faversham Avenue, thence westwards along said boundary and continuing westwards along the northern boundaries of Nos 34-2 Faversham Avenue to the eastern boundary of the Waltham Forest School, thence southeastwards along the said eastern boundary to Whitehall Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 69 Whitehall Gardens, thence northwestwards to and along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 68-42a in said road to the southern boundary of the British Red Cross Society Hall, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the southern and western boundaries of said hall and continuing along the northeastern boundary of No 40 Whitehall Gardens to the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to King's Road, thence northwestwards along said road and the road known as The Green to and southwestwards along the road known as The Ridgeway to the road known as Mansfield Hill, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 15 Mansfield Hill, thence westwards to and along said southern boundary to the western boundary of No 15 Mansfield Hill, thence northwards along the western boundary of Nos 15-65 Mansfield Hill to the southern boundary of No 67 Mansfield Hill, thence westwards along said southern boundary to the road known as Waltham Way, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of No 73
Mansfield Hill, thence northwestwards to and along said southwestern boundary and continuing northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of Nos 1 to 4 Low Hall Close to the western boundary of the last mentioned property, thence generally northwards along said western boundary, crossing the western end of Low Hall Close and continuing northwards along the western boundary of No 5 Low Hall Close to the southern boundary of the Playing Field, thence westwards along said southern boundary to its end, thence due westwards to the River Lee Diversion, thence southwestwards along said River Lee diversion to a point due east of National Grid reference TQ 3689093690 being on the western boundary of the Borough, thence due west from said point to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards, eastwards and southwards along the western, northern and eastern boundaries of the Borough to the point of commencement.

ENDLESBURY WARD

Commencing at the point where Brindwood Road meets the road known as Waltham Way, thence northwestwards to and along the access road between Nos 195 and 197 Waltham Way to the access road to the rear of said properties, thence due westwards to the River Lee Diversion, thence northeastwards along said diversion to and northeastwards, southeastwards, northeastswards and southeastswards along the southern boundary of Chingford Green Ward to the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway, thence generally southeastswards along said railway to a point opposite the northern boundary of Nos 50 to 54 Lukin Crescent, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary to Larkshall Road, thence southwestwards to and crossing said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Chingford Hospital, thence northwestwards to and along said northern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the eastern boundary of No 128 Harold Road, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of No 130 Harold Road to the road known as Colvin Gardens, thence northwestwards along said road and Gunners Grove to the
eastern boundary of No 2 Gunners Grove, thence southwards along said boundary to
the southern boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along said boundary
and continuing northwestwards and westwards along the northern boundary of
Chingford Mount Cemetery to Old Church Road, thence southwards along said road to
a point opposite the path at the north of the All Saints Church (C of E), thence
westwards to and along said path to the rear boundary of No 3 Brindwood Road,
thence northwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundary of No 1 Brindwood
Road to the northern boundary of said property, thence westwards along said
northern boundary to Brindwood Road, thence generally westwards along said road
to the point of commencement.

VALLEY WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Chingford Green Ward
meets the western boundary of Endlebury Ward, thence southwestwards, eastwards,
southwards and eastwards along the western and southern boundaries of Endlebury
Ward to Old Church Road, thence southwards along said road and continuing south-
wards along Chingford Mount Road and Chingford Road to Walthamstow Avenue (North
Circular Road), thence northwestwards along said avenue to National Grid
reference TQ 3655391770, thence southwestwards in a straight line to National
Grid reference TQ 3637591632 being on the western boundary of the Borough,
thence generally northwestwards and northeastwards along said Borough boundary
to the southern boundary of Chingford Green Ward, thence eastwards along said
boundary to the point of commencement.

LARKSWOOD WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Valley Ward meets the
southern boundary of Endlebury Ward, thence generally eastwards and south-
eastwards along said southern boundary to the Chingford to Liverpool Street
railway, thence southwards along said railway to the brook known as the Ching,
thence generally southwestwards along said brook to the eastern boundary
of the Walthamstow Greyhound Stadium thence southwards along said eastern
boundary to and generally westwards along the southern boundary of said stadium
to its end, thence due west from said point to Chingford Road, being the eastern
boundary of Valley Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the
point of commencement.

HATCH LANE WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Endlebury Ward meets the
southern boundary of Chingford Green Ward, thence generally eastwards along
said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence south-
westwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along said borough boundary to
Chingford Lane, thence northwards along said lane to a point opposite the
northern boundary of No 2 The Charter Road, thence westwards to and along said
northern boundary to the northeastern boundary of No 4 The Charter Road, thence
northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and the northeastern boundaries
of Nos 6 and 8 The Charter Road to the eastern boundary of No 16 The Charter
Road, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary
of No 18 in said road to the northern boundary of the last mentioned property,
thence northwestwards along said northern boundary, crossing The Charter Road
to the northern boundary of No 20 in said road, thence continuing northwest-
towards along the said northern boundary/the eastern boundary of No 28 The Charter
Road, thence northeastwards and westwards along the eastern and northern bound-
dary of said property and the northern boundary of No 34 The Charter Road to
the eastern boundary of No 36 The Charter Road, thence northwards and westwards
along said eastern and northern boundary of said property and northern boundary
of No 38 in said road to Crealock Grove, thence southwards along said grove
to The Charter Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite
the eastern boundary of No 42 The Charter Road thence northeastwards to and
along said boundary and northwetwards along the northeastern boundary of said property and Nos 44 and 46 The Charter Road to the northern boundaries of Nos 48 to 56 in said road thence southwestwards along said northern boundaries to the western boundary of the last mentioned property, thence southwards along said western boundary to The Charter Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 66 The Charter Road, thence northwetwards to and along said northeastern boundary and southwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said property to the northern boundary of No 68 The Charter Road thence westwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of No 9 Tamworth Avenue to Tamworth Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to The Charter Road, thence westwards and northwetwards along said road to National Grid reference TQ 3923591900, thence due west from said point to the brook known as The Ching thence southwestwards along said brook to Brookfield Path, thence generally northwards along said path to the southern boundary of the Highams Park High School Sports Ground, thence southwestwards, northwestwards, southwestwards and northwetwards along the southern and southwestern boundary of the sports ground to the rear boundary of the Dairy in Handsworth Avenue thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundary of Nos 8 to 2 Handsworth Avenue to the southwestern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwetwards along said southwestern boundary, crossing Handsworth Avenue to the rear boundaries of No 422 to 428 Hale End Road, thence westwards along said rear boundaries to the northwestern most corner of the last mentioned property, thence due west from said point, crossing The Avenue to the eastern boundary of Larkswood Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Endlebury Ward to the point of commencement.

HALE END WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Larkswood Ward meets the southern boundary of Hatch Lane Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence
southeastwards along said borough boundary to a point being the prolongation
eastwards of Forest Road, thence southwestwards along said prolonga-
tion and Forest Road, to the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway thence
northwards along said railway to and along the eastern boundary of Larkswood
Ward to the point of commencement.

CHAPEL END WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Valley Ward meets
the southern boundary of Larkswood Ward, thence generally northeastwards
along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Hale End Ward, thence
southwards along said western boundary to Forest Road, thence southwestwards
along said road to Chingford Road, thence northwards along said road to a point
being the prolongation southeastwards of the northeastern boundary of the
Omnibus Depot, thence northwards along said prolongation and said north-
eastern boundary to the most northern corner of the Omnibus Depot, thence
northwestwards in a straight line to the access path, to the north of the
properties Nos 246 and 248 Carr Road, thence westwards along said path to a
point opposite the western boundary of Nos 2 and 4 Brettenham Road, thence
northwestwards to and along said western boundary to Brettenham Road, thence
westwards along said road to Rushbrook Crescent, thence northwestwards along
said crescent and continuing northwestwards along Ardleigh Road and North
Countess Road to Billet Road, thence eastwards along said road to the south-
western boundary of Valley Ward thence eastwards and northwards along the
southwestern and eastern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

HIGHAM HILL WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the
southwestern boundary of Valley Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards
along said southwestern boundary to the northwestern boundary of Chapel End
Ward, thence westwards and southwards along said northwestern boundary and
western boundary of said ward to Pennant Terrace, thence westwards along
said terrace to North Countess Road, thence southwards along said road to
the road known as Priors Croft, thence westwards along said road to Warwick
Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Mount Pleasant Road, thence
southwestwards along said road to Higham Hill Road, thence southwards along
said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Allotment Gardens,
then westwards to and along said northern boundary to Lowther Road, thence
southwards along said road to Lancaster Road, thence southwestwards along
said road to Blackhorse Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane to the
Metropolitan Water Board access road to High Maynard Reservoir being opposite
No 288 Blackhorse Lane thence southwestwards along said access road to its end
at the crossing of the Lee Flood Relief Channel thence due westwards in a
straight line to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

LLOYD PARK WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the
southern boundary of Higham Hill Ward, thence generally eastwards along said
ward boundary to the western boundary of Chapel End Ward, thence southeastwards
along said ward boundary to Forest Road thence southwestwards along said road
to the western boundary of the Borough thence generally northeastwards along
said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

HIGH STREET WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the
southern boundary of Lloyd Park Ward, thence southeastwards and northeastwards
along said southern boundary to Palmeston Road, thence southwards along said
road to Elmsdale Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Erskine Road,
then southwards along said road to Hatherley Road, thence eastwards along
said road to Hoe Street thence southwards along said street to the Chingford to
Liverpool Street railway thence southwestwards along said railway to the western
boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards and northeastwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

HOE STREET WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of High Street Ward meets the southern boundary of Lloyd Park Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing eastwards along the southern boundary of Chapel End Ward to Shernall Street, thence southwards along said street to the Chingford to Liverpool Street railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to Orford Road, thence southwards and southwestwards along said road to and southeastward along Beaulah Road to Grove Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Hoe Street, thence generally northwards along said street to the eastern boundary of High Street Ward, thence northwards, westwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

WOOD STREET WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Hoe Street Ward meets the southern boundary of Chapel End Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing northeastwards along the southern boundary of Hale End Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said borough boundary to Snaresbrook Road, thence westwards along said road to Lea Bridge Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Merton Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the southern boundary of Hoe Street Ward, thence eastwards northwards and generally northeastwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of said ward to the point of commencement.
FOREST WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Wood Street Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said eastern boundary to Woodford Road, thence southwards and southwestwards along said road to the North Circular Road, at Green Man roundabout thence continuing southwestwards along said road to Whipps Cross Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Preston Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Colworth Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Hainault Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the Barking to Kentish Town railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to High Road Leyton, thence northwards and northwestwards along said High Road and Hoe Street to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 361 Hoe Street thence northeastwards along said northwestern boundary to the rear of the properties Nos 63 to 1 Clarendon Road, thence northeastwards along said rear boundaries to the southeastern boundary of No 26 Copeland Road, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 89 Livingstone Road, thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary to Livingstone Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 38-44 Copeland Road, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundaries and northeastwards along the southern boundary of the last mentioned property to Copeland Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Lea Bridge Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Wood Street Ward, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

LEYTONSTONE WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Forest Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said borough boundary to the footpath that leads to Davies Lane, thence southwestwards and westwards along said footpath to and northwestern along said lane to High Road Leytonstone, thence southwards along said road to the Barking to Kentish Town railway thence northwestwards along said railway to and south-
westwards along the London Transport Central Line railway to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 125 Dyers Hall Road, thence westwards to and along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of Nos 127 to 135 Dyers Hall Road to the eastern boundary of No 317 Grove Green Road, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Nos 319 to 323 Grove Green Road, crossing Dyers Hall Road to the eastern boundary of No 325 Grove Green Road, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundaries of Nos 327 to 359 Grove Green Road, crossing Madeira Road, to the prolongation southeastwards of the northeastern boundary of No 363 Grove Green Road, thence northwestwards along said prolongation and continuing northwestwards along the northeastern boundaries of Nos 363 to 383 Grove Green Road, to the southeastern boundary of No 385 Grove Green Road, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the Barking to Kentish Town railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to the southeastern boundary of Forest Ward, thence generally northeastwards, southeastwards and northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

CANN HALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Leytonstone Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and generally southeastwards along said eastern boundary and generally southwestwards and northwards along the southern boundary of the Borough to and continuing northwards along High Road Leytonstone, to the southern boundary of Leytonstone Ward, thence northwards and eastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.
CATHALL WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Leytonstone Ward meets the western boundary of Cann Hall Ward, thence southwestwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said borough boundary to the Stratford to Leytonstone railway, thence northwesternwards and northeastwards along said railway to High Road, thence northwesternwards along said road to Grove Green Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Dyers Hall Road thence eastwards along said road to the southern boundary of Leytonstone Ward, thence southwards and generally eastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

GROVE GREEN WARD
Commencing at the point where the southwestern boundary of Leytonstone Ward meets the northwestern boundary of Cathall Ward thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to High Road, (Leyton), thence generally northwesternwards along said road to the southern boundary of Forest Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward boundary and continuing southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of Leytonstone Ward to the point of commencement.

LEYTON WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Cathall Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwesternwards along said borough boundary to National Grid Reference TQ 3663586604, thence northeastwards in a straight line to the southern end of Marsh Lane, thence northeastwards
along said lane to Church Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Radlix Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Lea Hall Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Capworth Street, thence northeastwards along said street to the southwestern boundary of Forest Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward boundary to the western boundary of Grove Green Ward, thence generally southwards along said western boundary and continuing generally southwards along the western boundary of Cathall Ward, to the point of commencement.

LEA BRIDGE WARD

Comencing at the point where the northwestern boundary of Leyton Ward meets the southwestern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards and northwestwards along said Borough boundary to Lea Bridge Road thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the access road to Essex Cottages thence northwards in a straight line to the northeast corner of the Playing Field to the rear of No 49 Lea Bridge Road, thence northeastwards in a straight line to the centre of the footbridge crossing the Tottenham to Stratford railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to a point being a prolongation of the northern boundary of the Tinned Sheet Works, thence northeastwards to and along said northern boundary to Staffa Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 69 Overton Road, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 68 to 1 Overton Road and continuing northeastwards along the northern boundary of the Shoe Factory to the northern boundary of No 2 and 4 Bitcham Road, thence northeastwards along said northern boundary to Bridge Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Hibbert Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of Nos 102 and 104 Hibbert Road, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of said property, thence southwards along said northeastern boundary to the rear boundary of the properties Nos 64 to 2 Wetherden Street, thence northeastwards along said rear boundaries
to the western boundary of Nos 258 and 260 Markhouse Road, thence northwards along said western boundary and the western boundary of Nos 254 and 256 Markhouse Road to the northern boundary of said property, thence northeastwards along said northern boundary to Markhouse Road, thence northwards along said road to Boundary Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the southwestern boundary of Forest Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to the northwestern boundary of Leyton Ward, thence southwestwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to the point of commencement.

ST JAMES STREET WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of High Street Ward thence generally northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to and southwards and westwards along the western and southern boundaries of Hoe Street Ward, to and southwards along the western boundary of Wood Street Ward to the northwestern boundary of Forest Ward, thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to and continuing along the northwestern boundary of Lea Bridge Ward to the western boundary of the Borough thence northwestward along said boundary to the point of commencement.