LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

Boundaries with: BARNET LB
               CITY OF WESTMINSTER

REPORT NO. 656
Your Ref: FN/BML/PM

Our Ref: LGB/C/J/47/9

The Chief Executive
The London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Euston Road
London

24 June 1992

Dear Sir,

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972
REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON, THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET AND THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER

COMMISSION’S FINAL PROPOSALS

I enclose four copies of the Commission’s report Number 656 and one display map.

The Commission’s final proposals, as described in that report, for the realignment of Camden’s boundaries with Barnet and Westminster have now been submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment. The maps at Annex A to the report illustrate the Commission’s final proposals and the memorandum at Annex B explains the consequential changes in the borough electoral arrangements.

The Commission asks the London Boroughs of Camden, Barnet and Westminster to place a copy of the report and an exhibition map on deposit for inspection at their main offices, and to arrange for the display of a notice in the form of Annex A attached to this letter, as soon as practicable, at places where public notices are customarily displayed.

The Commission considers that adequate publicity in the area will be given if notices are published in the Camden and St Pancras Chronicle, the Hampstead and Highgate Express, the Camden New Journal, the Hendon Times Newspaper Group, the Marylebone Mercury, the Westminster and Pimlico News and the Barnet Advertiser, and has arranged for a notice in the form of Annex
A to be inserted in these newspapers for two consecutive weeks from the week commencing 29 June 1992. Your Council, Barnet and Westminster have agreed that these publications adequately cover the area in question.

The text of the notice explains that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to the Secretary of State, if he thinks fit, to make an Order implementing the proposals, though not earlier than six weeks from the day the Commission's final proposals are submitted to him.

In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the report should be made available for inspection until six months after the Secretary of State has made an Order to give effect to the Commission's proposals, with or without modification, or has announced that he does not wish to give effect to its proposals.

Copies of this letter, together with copies of the report and exhibition maps, are being sent to the main offices of the London Boroughs of Camden, Barnet and Westminster. Copies of this letter, together with copies of the report, but without the display map, are also being sent to all those who expressed an interest in the review.

Any enquiries concerning this letter should be addressed to Miss M E Croppi (telephone 071-238-5068).

Yours faithfully

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET AND THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER

NOTICE OF FINAL PROPOSALS

NOTICE IS GIVEN that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England has submitted a report to the Secretary of State for the Environment proposing realignment to Camden’s boundaries with Barnet and Westminster. Copies of the Commission’s Report Number 656 can be inspected, together with maps illustrating the proposals, during office hours at the offices of the Council at:-

London Borough of Camden, The Town Hall, Euston Road, London NW1 2RU
The City of Westminster, Westminster City Hall, 64 Victoria Street, London SW1E 6QP, and; 313-319 Harrow Road W9

Further copies of the report (which incorporates small scale maps illustrating the changes) are available from the Commission’s Office at Room 335, 20 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7JT. (Telephone 071-238-5068)

The Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in the matter and it falls to the Secretary of State, if he thinks fit, to make an order implementing the proposals, though not earlier than six weeks from the date they are submitted to him.

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO 656
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

MR K F J ENNALS CB

MEMBERS

MR G R PRENTICE
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1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Camden's boundaries with the London Borough of Barnet and the City of Westminster. We are proposing that the area of Fitzrovia should be united in Westminster and that Regents Park should also be united in that authority. We are also making a number of minor proposals to remove anomalies, for example, where the existing local authority boundary is undefined, as in the Hampstead Heath area, or where it divides properties. We also considered two other larger-scale changes, to transfer a residential area at Cricklewood to Camden, and to unite Covent Garden in Westminster. However, in the light of the response to our draft proposals for these areas, we finally decided to recommend no changes. Our report explains how we arrived at our final proposals and decisions.

2. On 1 April 1987 we announced the start of a review of Greater London, the London boroughs and the City of London as part of the programme of reviews we are required to undertake by virtue of section 48(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. We wrote to each of the local authorities concerned.

3. Copies of our letter were sent to the adjoining London boroughs; the appropriate county, district and parish councils bordering Greater London; the local authority associations; Members of Parliament with constituency interests; and the
headquarters of the main political parties. In addition, copies were sent to the Metropolitan Police and to those government departments, regional health authorities, electricity, gas and water undertakings which might have an interest, as well as to local television and radio stations serving the Greater London area and to a number of other interested persons and organisations.

4. The London boroughs and the City of London were requested to assist us in publicising the start of the review by inserting a notice for two successive weeks in local newspapers, so as to give a wide coverage in the areas concerned.

5. A period of seven months from the date of our letter was allowed for all local authorities and any person or body interested in the review to send us their views on whether changes to the boundaries of Greater London authorities were desirable and, if so, what those changes should be and how they would serve the interests of effective and convenient local government, the criterion laid down in the 1972 Act.

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

6. We took the opportunity in our Report No 550, "People and Places", to explain in some detail the approach we take to our work and the factors which we take into consideration when conducting reviews, including the guidelines given to us by the Secretary of State (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

7. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which the Commission had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being
considered by the Commission as it makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.

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

THE BOUNDARIES COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Camden's boundaries with Barnet and the City of Westminster. Our final proposals for Camden's boundary with the City of London have already been submitted to you (Report No 636). Camden's remaining boundaries, with Brent, Haringey, and Islington, are being considered separately, as part of our reviews of those boroughs.

10. One of our members, Mrs Helen Sarkany, declared an interest in the Cricklewood area and the Hampstead Heath (Extension) and, in accordance with our normal procedures, took no part in our consideration of those particular issues.

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

11. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Camden and Barnet, and from the City of Westminster. Responses were also received from six interested organisations, including the Camden Conservative Committee, and one member of the public.

12. However, following publication of our draft proposals, we were informed by Solicitors acting for the Camden Conservative
Committee that on further consideration the Committee felt that it could not sustain the suggestions attributed to it in the report. They were therefore instructed on its behalf to withdraw those suggestions.

OUR DRAFT AND FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS LETTERS, AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM

13. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published two further consultation letters in connection with this review of Camden's boundaries with Barnet and Westminster. The first, announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, was published on 4 January 1991. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. Camden, Barnet and Westminster were asked to publish a notice advertising our draft proposals and interim decision. In addition, they were requested to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 1 March 1991.

14. We received a total of 156 individual representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decision; the majority being forwarded in response to our draft proposal for the Cricklewood area. They included comments from Camden, Barnet and Westminster, Mr Frank Dobson MP, Mr John L Marshall MP and Sir John Wheeler MP, and five local councillors. The remainder were from local organisations, businesses and members of the public. Several of those who responded made suggestions for further boundary changes. In addition, we received one petition containing 285 signatures, and 460 proforma letters, from residents of the Cricklewood area.

15. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposals, was issued on 10 January 1992, and received similar publicity. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Comments were
invited by 6 March 1991.

16. In response to our further draft proposals letter, we received a total of eleven representations, including comments from Camden, Barnet and Westminster, four members of the public and one local business. The Metropolitan Police indicated that it had no objections to our further draft proposals. One member of the public advised us of her opposition to any boundary changes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

SUGGESTION FOR RADICAL CHANGE

17. A member of the public objected to our draft proposals for Camden's boundaries with Barnet and Westminster, and suggested either the re-establishment of the former Metropolitan Borough of Hampstead, expanded by the addition of Hendon, or the abolition of Camden, and its division between Barnet, Islington and Westminster. The suggestion was submitted on the grounds that the London Borough of Camden is an artificial construction, and that radical change is required to reflect the historic, social and geographic realities of this part of London.

18. As indicated in paragraph 7 above, we do not consider our current review to be the right occasion for a fundamental reappraisal of the pattern of London boroughs. In any event, our guidelines from the Secretary of State (contained in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86) advise us that proposals for the abolition of a principal area would be appropriate only in circumstances where we consider that present arrangements clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government. In the case of this suggestion for the abolition of Camden, we were not persuaded either that there was sufficient evidence that the present arrangements had failed, or that such evidence as had been provided supported radical change to this part of London. We therefore decided not to pursue the suggestion.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CAMDEN AND BARNET

Our proposals for change

(a) Cricklewood - boundary between Cricklewood Broadway and Finchley Road

Draft proposal

19. Camden suggested minor change where the boundary diverts slightly from the curtilage of properties in Horton Avenue. Barnet did not oppose the suggestion but questioned its necessity.

20. The Camden Conservative Committee submitted two suggestions for change along this length of boundary. The first, a realignment from Cricklewood Broadway along Cricklewood Lane and Hendon Way to rejoin the existing boundary at Finchley Road, would transfer a substantial residential area and sports ground from Barnet to Camden. The Committee considered that this area has a natural affinity with much of Hampstead to the south, and identified Vernon Court and the Westcroft Estate as two locations where the existing boundary divides properties and estates, and causes problems and confusion. The Committee's first suggestion sought to resolve the anomalies in both these locations.

21. The Committee's alternative suggestion, should its first suggestion not be accepted, was for a realignment along Cricklewood Lane to Galsworthy Road, then south, using the rear curtilages of properties, to the existing boundary at the north-east corner of the Hampstead School site. The effect of this would be to transfer a smaller area of homogeneous development, including the Westcroft Estate, from Barnet to Camden.

22. We agreed with the desirability of rectifying lengths of boundary which are undefined or defaced, such as at Vernon Court and, to the west, the residential area between Cricklewood Broadway and the Cricklewood – West Hampstead railway line. However, we considered the existing boundary to be satisfactory where it passes through open land to the north of Hampstead.
Cemetery. We therefore took the view that the Camden Conservative Committee's first suggestion went wider than was justified by the boundary anomalies. We felt that the Committee's second suggestion would provide a suitable boundary in the area of Westcroft Estate, and would better reflect the contemporary pattern of development in the western area. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal the Committee's suggestion for a realignment along Cricklewood Lane and the rear curtilages of properties in Galsworthy Road. Our draft proposal had the effect of transferring to Camden two distinct residential areas divided by the railway line; to the east, the Westcroft Estate and, to the west, the area of housing adjacent to Cricklewood Broadway. Our consideration of the boundary anomalies in the vicinity of Vernon Court is discussed in paragraphs 37-39 below.

Final decision

23. Our draft proposal was supported by the Hampstead and Highgate Labour Party. However, it was opposed by Barnet, Mr John Marshall MP, three Barnet councillors, and by individual representations from 89 residents and local organisations. In addition, we received a petition containing 285 signatures and 460 proforma letters from residents in the area of the Westcroft Estate, all opposing our draft proposal. We also received a number of suggestions for modifications.

24. Camden informed us that, while it accepted the logic of transferring the Westcroft Estate to Camden, it was not persuaded that there was a need to transfer the area west of the railway line. It submitted an alternative, smaller scale, suggestion for a minor realignment in the area of Westcroft Close. This is a cul-de-sac which forms part of the Westcroft Estate but with a somewhat separate identity, being situated on the western side of Litchfield Road, within Camden, and of newer construction than the rest of the estate.

25. Camden's suggested realignment sought to transfer to its authority an area of land adjacent to Westcroft Close, which the Paddington Churches Housing Association is in the process of
developing. The Council commented that the new development is to be linked to Westcroft Close, creating a through road, and what is to become a single residential area would be divided by the existing boundary and be served by two different authorities. It expressed the view that this would be confusing, socially divisive, and result in traffic management difficulties. Identical suggestions were submitted by the Metropolitan Police, a local councillor and the New Westcroft Close Tenants' Association.

26. Barnet commented that it was not aware of any difficulties in the provision of services, by either its council or by Camden, to the area affected by our draft proposal. Nor did it consider that the existing boundary divides estates. The Council also felt that the present boundary reflects the pattern of community life, and noted that the residents attending a local meeting had expressed unanimous opposition to our draft proposal.

27. Barnet also opposed Camden's alternative suggestion for the Westcroft Close area, commenting that the existing boundary provides a separation between Camden's housing in Westcroft Close and the new housing development in Barnet. It considered that the question of the estate road becoming a through road was not relevant.

28. Mr John L Marshall MP and three local councillors emphasised the strength of local feeling against the proposed transfer; the differences in services and community charge between the two boroughs; the disruption such a transfer would entail; and their belief that residents in the area look towards Cricklewood for shopping and services.

29. The Hendon South Conservative Association expressed the view that there are no boundary anomalies requiring rectification, nor any evidence of local demand, separate community, or geographic or demographic considerations which would require such a change as we had proposed.

30. The North East Thames Regional Health Authority commented that our draft proposal would result in disruption, through the
loss of co-terminosity between local authority and health service boundaries. The North West Thames Regional Health Authority also regretted the loss of co-terminosity between boundaries, but did not oppose our draft proposal.

31. The Vice-Chairman of Hampstead and Highgate Liberal Democrats expressed his Association's reservations about our draft proposal. In his capacity as a Camden councillor for one of the wards affected by the Cricklewood draft proposal, he also considered that residents of the area which, under our draft proposal, would be transferred south into Camden do not, in the main, look in that direction, as their major shopping area is Cricklewood Broadway. He also commented that there are no libraries or primary schools to the south, and that transport links are mainly to the north and west. The councillor also opposed the transfer of the area to the west of the railway line on the grounds that the railway acts as a barrier.

32. Many of those residents who wrote to us expressed community ties with Barnet, and an appreciation of Barnet's education, refuse collection and social services, which they perceived as being superior to those provided by Camden. However, the most frequent reason given for opposing our draft proposal was the difference in community charge levels between the two boroughs.

33. The Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party supported our draft proposal on the grounds that the residents of the Westcroft Estate have definite ties with Camden, and use Camden facilities and schools, such as Hampstead Comprehensive School which adjoins the estate. They also agreed that, to the west of the railway line, the existing boundary divides an area of similar housing.

34. Notwithstanding the support for our draft proposal from the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party, we were persuaded by the strength of opposition from local residents, and from Camden and Barnet. In particular, the response from residents had stressed the community ties which they have with Barnet, facilitated by the adjacent transport link along the Edgware Road, and their satisfaction with current service delivery in the area. Also, we had received no evidence from the local authorities to suggest
that the existing boundary causes difficulties in terms of service provision.

35. We concluded that, while the Westcroft Estate had links with Camden and the housing to the west of the railway line was clearly part of the homogeneous development to the south, the representations clearly suggested that local ties throughout the area we had proposed to transfer were with Barnet. We therefore took the view that there was insufficient evidence to warrant confirmation of our draft proposal, or of a modification to transfer only the residential area to the west of the railway line.

36. We considered Camden's alternative suggestion to transfer the small area of land north of Westcroft Close to its area. Barnet had informed us that the new development on this site would be accessible from both Camden and Barnet, and that the boundary would remain clearly defined. In the light of this, we did not feel that Camden's suggested realignment was necessary. In any event, we considered that the effect of the suggestion would be to create an unwieldy salient. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal for the Cricklewood area and to retain the existing boundary in this area.

(b) Vernon Court (Hendon Way)

Draft proposal

Map 1

37. Vernon Court (Hendon Way) is divided by the existing boundary. Both Camden and Barnet submitted suggestions to unite the flats in Barnet, by realigning the boundary along Burgess Hill and Finchley Road. Camden suggested a centre-of-road alignment; Barnet suggested a side-of-road alignment in Burgess Hill.

38. We agreed with Camden and Barnet that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite Vernon Court in one local authority. We therefore decided to adopt the suggestions from the two Councils as our draft proposal for this area, subject to using side-of-road alignments in both
Burgess Hill and Finchley Road.

Final proposal

39. Our draft proposal was supported by Camden, Barnet and the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm it as final.

(c) Nos 370-382 Finchley Road

Draft proposal

40. Camden suggested realigning the existing boundary along the centre of Finchley Road, in order to unite Nos 370-382 Finchley Road in Camden. Barnet suggested a slightly different alignment which, by departing from Finchley Road to follow the south and rear curtilage of No 380, would unite Nos 370-378 Finchley Road in Camden and Nos 380, 380A, 380B and 382 in Barnet, together with the Child's Hill shopping centre.

41. We concluded that Barnet's suggestion would result in a clearly identified boundary and would facilitate service provision to the shops in the area. We therefore adopted that Council's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to adopting a side-of-road alignment in Finchley Road.

Final proposal

42. Our draft proposal was supported by Camden, Barnet and by the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm it as final.

(d) Minor realignments at Pattison Road and Platt's Lane

Draft proposal

43. Camden submitted suggestions for minor changes where the boundary departs slightly from the curtilage of properties or the sides of roads in Pattison Road and Platt's Lane. Barnet questioned whether these minor changes were necessary, but did
not actually oppose them.

44. We considered that Camden's suggestions would rectify stretches of defaced boundary, and decided to adopt them as our draft proposals for this area.

Final proposal

45. Our draft proposals were supported by Camden, Barnet and by the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm them as final.

(e) Golders Hill Park

Draft proposal

46. Camden submitted two suggestions to rectify the division of Golders Hill Park by the existing boundary. The first followed the northern perimeter of the park, to unite it in Camden. The second followed North End Way and the south-eastern perimeter of the park, to unite it in Barnet. Barnet submitted a similar suggestion to Camden's second proposal, (but using a side of road alignment in North End Way), on the grounds that the majority of the park is already within its authority.

47. Golders Hill Park is maintained by the City of London Corporation, and the current division does not appear to hinder service provision. However, the existing boundary is ill-defined and we concluded that uniting the park would avoid confusion. Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill, in Barnet, appeared to be accessible only from Camden, and we considered that they were likely to have links with adjacent houses to the south, in Camden. We felt that Barnet's suggestion would provide the most clearly defined boundary and, subject to a modification to leave Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill in Camden, decided to adopt it as our draft proposal to unite the park in Barnet.
Further draft proposal

48. Our draft proposal was supported by Camden, the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party, the Inner London Magistrates' Courts Service and the Metropolitan Police. However, Barnet opposed our proposal to leave Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill in Camden, on the grounds that the main access to these properties is obtained from the park, in Barnet, and that both houses are physically separated from those immediately to the south. The Council therefore resubmitted its original suggestion to unite Golders Hill Park, and Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill, in its authority.

49. In the light of this further information from Barnet about the access to Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill, we agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the properties to be united in its area. We also observed that the alignment adopted in our draft proposal severed the properties from their gardens, and so was in any event unsatisfactory. We therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to adopting as our further draft proposal Barnet's suggestion to unite Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill in its authority.

Final proposal

50. Both Camden and Barnet informed us that they did not object to our further draft proposal for Golders Hill Park. A resident of one of the properties affected agreed that, as Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill are park lodges, it would be logical for them to be in the same authority as the park itself. However, the resident was concerned that, as a result of the proposed change, his family would lose access to the Camden facilities which they currently enjoy, and future access to a Camden school of their choice. No other representations were received.

51. We considered the resident's comments, particularly in relation to education. However, recent Court decisions which reinforce parents' rights to send their children to the school of their choice, mean that children cannot be refused admission to a school purely because they do not live in the same borough.
We therefore concluded that there was no reason to suppose that our further draft proposal would, in itself, affect which school the resident's children could attend. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

(f) Hampstead Heath Extension (Wildwood Road)

Draft proposal

52. Camden suggested a minor realignment of the boundary to follow the southern end of Wildwood Road, thereby transferring part of Hampstead Heath Extension to its area. Barnet opposed this suggestion, on the grounds that such change was unnecessary as both the Heath and the Extension are administered and maintained by the City of London Corporation.

53. The present boundary is undefined, and not tied to ground detail. We concluded that it would be desirable for a clear local authority boundary to be identified in this area, and decided to adopt Camden's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

54. Our draft proposal was supported by Camden, the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party, and the Inner London Magistrates' Courts Service. However, Barnet opposed it, arguing that there would be no benefits in terms of effective and convenient local government; that the current boundary satisfactorily marks the division between the Heath and the Extension (Wildwood Road itself being irrelevant); and that the existing boundary has historical significance and should not be obliterated. Barnet also commented that, if a realignment to Wildwood Road was felt to be necessary, a south side-of-road alignment would be preferable, and be consistent with our other draft proposals for Hampstead Heath. No other representations were received.

55. We accepted that the City of London Corporation is responsible for the administration and maintenance of Hampstead Heath and the Extension. Nevertheless, Camden and Barnet continue to have some statutory responsibilities for the area, for
example, in relation to environmental control and licensing. It is therefore desirable, in order to avoid confusion, and in the interests of effective and convenient local government, for the boundary in this area to be clearly defined.

56. However, we agreed with Barnet that a south side-of-road alignment in Wildwood Road would be preferable. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to the adoption of Barnet's suggested modification.

(g) Spaniards End

Draft proposal Map 5

57. Camden, and a member of the public, suggested a realignment to the rear curtilages of the properties on the south side of Spaniards End and the centre of Spaniards Road, to unite properties in Spaniards End and on the west side of Spaniards Road in Barnet. Barnet suggested a similar realignment. However, it proposed retaining in Camden a triangular shaped area of land on the west side of Spaniards Road, which it considered to be part of the Heath.

58. The Camden Conservative Committee suggested that the boundary be realigned to the north of Spaniards End, to unite all the properties in Spaniards End and Spaniards Road in Camden. The Committee expressed the view that residents in this area have more affinity with Camden and with Hampstead Heath than with Barnet.

59. The existing boundary is unsatisfactory in that it divides roads and properties, and we concluded that the suggestion submitted by Camden, and a member of public, provided a clear boundary which reflected the pattern of development in the area. We therefore decided to adopt this suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a modification to use the eastern side of Spaniards Road.
Final proposal

60. Our draft proposal was supported by Camden, the Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party, and the owner of a property in Spaniards End. However, Barnet opposed the transfer to its authority of the triangular shaped area of land referred to above. Barnet informed us that the land in question is administered by the City of London Corporation as part of Hampstead Heath, and expressed the view that it should therefore be retained with the rest of the Heath, in Camden. The Council resubmitted its original suggestion for the area.

61. Barnet's suggested realignment would sever its access to the properties within its authority in Spaniard's End. However, it was clear to us that the Council considered that this was unlikely to affect service provision to the properties. Accordingly, in the light of Barnet's strong objection to the transfer of this part of Hampstead Heath, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to retaining the triangular shaped area of land in Camden.

(h) Hampstead Lane

Draft proposal

62. Camden, Barnet, and the Camden Conservative Committee all submitted identical suggestions to realign the boundary along Hampstead Lane, from the existing boundary at the Spaniards Inn to Barnet's boundary with Haringey east of Bishops Avenue.

63. The existing boundary in this area is undefined where it passes across Hampstead Heath, and we agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for this part of the Heath to be united within Camden. We therefore decided to adopt the suggestions of Camden, Barnet and the Camden Conservative Committee as our draft proposal, subject to an east side-of-road alignment along Hampstead Lane.
Further draft proposal

64. Our draft proposal was supported by Barnet. Camden also supported our draft proposal, subject to a side-of-road alignment at the Spaniards Inn, in order to retain the Gatehouse within its area. The Hampstead & Highgate Labour Party, whilst supporting our draft proposal, also questioned the need to transfer the Gatehouse to Barnet.

65. We were informed that the Gatehouse is of purely historic interest, and that Barnet did not object to its retention in Camden. We therefore decided to adopt Camden's suggestion as our further draft proposal.

Final proposal

66. Neither Camden nor Barnet objected to our further draft proposal. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN CAMDEN AND THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER

(a) Major suggestion for the Parish of St Giles

67. In response to our draft proposals letter of 4 January 1991, a member of the public suggested that all of the Parish of St Giles, which includes Lincolns Inn Fields, Bloomsbury, and part of north Covent Garden, should be united in Westminster. This, he suggested, would facilitate traffic and pedestrian arrangements by ensuring that St Giles Circus is administered by a single authority. It was essential, he thought, that a single authority should be responsible for dealing with the increasing traffic congestion that would inevitably arise from planned redevelopment in the area.

68. The existing boundary divides St Giles Circus and we noted that the National Association of Local Councils, in its response to our draft proposal for Fitzrovia (paragraphs 81-101 below), had also drawn our attention to the massive road scheme centred
around this junction and the impact of traffic movement patterns on the local environment and local authority operations. We acknowledged that this junction is subject to heavy traffic and projected road improvements. However, neither Westminster nor Camden indicated that the current division of St Giles Circus causes any problems. In any event, we considered that this suggestion went further than would have been necessary to address this issue, and would have the effect of dividing Bloomsbury Square. **We have therefore decided to make no proposals.**

(b) **Avenue Road, St John's Wood**

69. In response to our further draft proposals letter of 10 January 1992, we received a suggestion from a member of the public that a residential area in the vicinity of Queens Grove should be transferred to Westminster, by means of a realignment along Avenue Road. It was suggested that this area is part of St John's Wood, which lies predominantly in Westminster, and that Camden's local parking policies and street cleaning service were inadequate.

70. The present boundary is well-defined, and we had received no other representations suggesting that a boundary change in this area was either necessary or desirable. We agreed that the area in the vicinity of Queens Grove might have links with the rest of St John's Wood, in Westminster. However, we considered that any realignment along Avenue Road would necessitate a further realignment to the south side of the Swiss Cottage Road junction, and concluded that it would not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to divorce the junction's southern approach roads from the junction itself. **We have therefore decided to make no proposals.**

(c) **Osnaburgh Street**

Interim decision to make no proposals

71. The Camden Conservative Committee suggested a minor realignment along Great Portland Street, in the vicinity of the Holy Trinity Church, in order to remove an illogical, though
well-defined boundary salient, and to transfer the church and its grounds from Westminster to Camden. No other suggestions were received for this area.

72. Holy Trinity Church is accessed from Great Portland Street, to the south, and we had received no evidence to suggest that the boundary failed to reflect its community ties. We therefore felt that there was little justification for the suggested change, and took an interim decision to make no proposals.

Further draft proposal

73. Westminster supported our interim decision. Camden did not comment. However, the Metropolitan Police, whilst not opposing our interim decision, expressed some surprise that we had not sought to rationalise the anomalous boundary in the vicinity of Holy Trinity Church. It suggested that it would be logical to adopt a centre-of-road realignment along Great Portland Street to the south, thereby transferring the church to Camden. A member of the public submitted an identical suggestion, commenting that Holy Trinity Church has not been used for worship for some years, and is now an office and bookshop for the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

74. In the light of this new information regarding the use now being made of the church, we concluded that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for a clearly identifiable boundary to be established along Great Portland Street. We therefore decided to adopt the Metropolitan Police suggestion as our further draft proposal.

Final proposal

75. Camden did not oppose our further draft proposal. Westminster considered the existing boundary to be sufficiently clear, but commented that it would not oppose our proposed realignment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.
(d) **Regents Park**

Draft proposal

76. Camden suggested a realignment to the northern and eastern perimeters of Regents Park, in order to unite the park in Westminster. Westminster supported this suggestion.

77. The current boundary divides the park, which is managed and maintained by the Department of the Environment. We considered that uniting the park in one authority would facilitate liaison with the Department, and that the suggestion submitted by Camden would provide a clearly identifiable boundary. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal Camden's suggestion to realign the boundary along Prince Albert Road, Gloucester Gate and Outer Circle.

**Final proposal**

78. Our draft proposal was supported by Westminster and by Sir John Wheeler MP, who commented that the park's current division resulted in duplication of effort and resources on the part of local authorities and Members of Parliament.

79. Although our draft proposal had been based on a suggestion submitted by Camden, the Council now opposed Regents Park being united in Westminster, on the grounds that there are no discernible disadvantages in the existing arrangements. Our draft proposal was also opposed by Mr Frank Dobson MP. Both Camden and Mr Dobson indicated that they wished to continue to have the right to comment on planning proposals affecting Camden residents, and to maintain their existing relationships with the Department of the Environment.

80. Notwithstanding the comments from Camden and Mr Dobson, we do not believe that it can be regarded as conducive to effective and convenient local government for Regents Park to be divided between two local authorities. Nor, given the park's status, did we feel that uniting it in Westminster would adversely affect the interests of Camden residents. We have therefore decided to
confirm our draft proposal as final.

(e) Fitzrovia

Draft proposal

81. In the Fitzrovia area, Camden suggested a minor realignment to rectify a short stretch of defaced boundary in the vicinity of Hanway Place and Evelyn's Yard. We also received several suggestions to unite Fitzrovia in one authority, on the grounds that it forms an identifiable community which is divided by the existing boundary.

82. The Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association submitted two suggestions intended to unite the area bounded by the Euston Road, Great Portland Street, Oxford Street and Gower Street. The Association argued that these streets delineate the community of Fitzrovia; that its members are inconvenienced by the present division; and that its needs and service provision would be facilitated if the area were united in one borough. The first suggestion was for the whole area to be united in either Camden or Westminster. The second, submitted in the event that we were not minded to adopt its first suggestion, was for a realignment of the boundary down Newman Street to Oxford Street, thereby transferring a small area from Westminster to Camden.

83. The Charlotte Street Association supported the Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association's suggestion for major change, commenting that its members would be better served if the area was united in one authority.

84. Westminster opposed the suggestions from the two Associations, contesting the view that service provision to the area is hampered by the current boundary. The Council expressed the view that uniting the area would produce little benefit to local residents and would not therefore be justified. It did, however, support Camden's suggestion for minor change.

85. The Westminster Labour Party suggested realignments along
either Tottenham Court Road or Gower Street, to unite the area within Westminster. It considered that the existing boundary hindered the co-ordination of various services, and divided a community. The Camden Conservative Committee suggested realignments along either Portland Place and Regent Street to unite the area in Camden, or along Tottenham Court Road to unite it in Westminster.

86. The Camden and Islington Family Practitioner Committee advised us that the planning of health services in the area is inconvenienced by the existing boundary, which divides the Bloomsbury District Health Authority's area.

87. We considered whether or not there is a discrete community in Fitzrovia and, if so, its extent and the effect of the existing boundary on service provision in the area. We concluded that there was evidence of a community and that its division by the present alignment was not conducive to effective and convenient local government. In considering the submissions received, we decided that the alignments suggested by the Westminster Labour Party and the Camden Conservative Committee, to unite the area in Westminster using Tottenham Court Road and Euston Road, were the most appropriate. They would provide clearly identifiable boundaries and would most nearly reflect the local community. In particular, Tottenham Court Road seemed to us to be a major thoroughfare which divides the area to the west from the University of London precinct to the east. We therefore decided to adopt these suggestions as our draft proposal, subject to a modification to use the north side of Euston Road.

Final proposal

88. Our draft proposal, to unite Fitzrovia in Westminster by a realignment along Tottenham Court Road and Euston Road, was supported by seven members of the public and by the Westminster Labour Party. We also received a number of responses acknowledging that Fitzrovia is a community which would benefit from being united within one authority, but opposing the choice of Tottenham Court Road as the proposed realignment.
89. Camden and Westminster both opposed our draft proposal, on the grounds that change is unnecessary and would disrupt health, housing and service provision to residents with special needs, particularly the Bengali community. Westminster reiterated its support for a minor realignment in the area of Hanway Street. The Cities of London and Westminster Conservative Association supported the views expressed by Westminster. Our draft proposal was also opposed by Mr Frank Dobson MP and a local councillor, both of whom expressed concerns similar to those of the local authorities, and stressed the area's cultural and community links with Camden.

90. The North East Thames Regional Health Authority (RHA) opposed our draft proposal. The RHA advised us that the problems in local health provision and liaison that had been previously brought to our attention by the Camden and Islington Family Practitioners Committee had been resolved by a reorganisation of RHA areas to achieve co-terminosity with the local authority boundaries. It therefore considered that our draft proposal would result in further disruption to health provision in the area. The North West Thames RHA, while similarly regretting the possible loss of co-terminosity, did not consider that the possible need for a further reorganisation of its boundaries to maintain co-terminosity was a sufficient reason to oppose our draft proposal.

91. A number of respondents, who generally agreed that Fitzrovia is an identifiable community, suggested that Gower Street/Bloomsbury Street would provide the most appropriate boundary to reflect its eastern limit. This suggestion was put forward by the National Association of Local Councils, who also provided an alternative suggestion using Gower Street/Store Street. London Merchant Securities and the Edwardian Hotels Group also considered that the area between Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street forms a natural extension to the West End. Nine residents of this area informed us that they considered themselves to be residents of the community of Fitzrovia which, in their view, extends to the east of the Tottenham Court Road. The residents commented that this busy thoroughfare forms an integral part of Fitzrovia, and that the area would suffer by its
adoption as a boundary.

92. The Charlotte Street Association, whilst appreciating that our draft proposal sought to unite the community in one authority, also recommended a realignment along Gower Street. The Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association strongly welcomed our recognition of the community of Fitzrovia and restated its view that it is delineated, to the east, by Gower Street and, to the west, by Great Portland Street. Both Associations requested further consultation with the residents. The Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association considered that arguments exist for uniting Fitzrovia in either Westminster or Camden and that further consideration should be given to the latter option before we took any final decisions.

93. The Camden Borough Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain also advised us that it considered the unification of Fitzrovia to be highly desirable. However, the Committee opposed our draft proposal, as it considered the balance of argument to be in favour of uniting Fitzrovia in Camden. A local resident, and the local councillor who had commented to us, suggested that the boundary should be realigned to Great Portland Street, to unite the area in Camden, if we were not minded to retain the existing boundary or adopt only minor change. Similarly, the Gordon Mansions Residents' Association, representing the residents of flats to the east of Tottenham Court Road, opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that such a realignment would leave their area isolated between Westminster and the London University complex. The Association also opposed any suggestion that the boundary should be realigned to Gower Street, but expressed the view that it would not be opposed to uniting Fitzrovia in Camden.

94. In response to our further draft proposal letter, Camden resubmitted its objection to our draft proposal for Fitzrovia. The Council also drew our attention to a local authority initiative with private and public sector organisations in Fitzrovia and Covent Garden, which it considered would be jeopardised by a boundary change, and urged us to issue revised proposals as soon as possible.
95. We also received a late suggestion from a member of the public for the transfer to Westminster of that part of Camden which is bounded in the east by Tottenham Court Road and the north by Euston Road, on the grounds that this area, which has community links with Westminster, is being increasingly isolated from Camden by major traffic routes. This suggestion was identical to our draft proposal.

Our conclusions on Fitzrovia

96. We noted the opposition to our draft proposal from both local authorities, the requests for further consultation, and the relative lack of responses from individual residents of the area to be transferred. We also noted that the opposition to our draft proposal had centred on arguments that the existing boundary causes no problems; that unnecessary disruption would result from any attempt to unite Fitzrovia in one authority; and that Gower Street or Great Portland Street offered a more appropriate boundary.

97. Our draft proposal to unite Fitzrovia in Westminster recognised that the area is the focus of a community, and that its current split between Camden and Westminster is unlikely to be conducive to effective and convenient local government. The responses to our draft proposal, whilst not disputing the existence of Fitzrovia as a community, raised questions about its precise delineation, in particular, whether the community for which it is the focus is rather more broadly based, and whether parts of it overlap or have links with similar communities in other areas of London.

98. Our initial view, that Fitzrovia is the basis of an identifiable community, received considerable support from local community associations and from other organisations and individuals, including a number of those which either opposed the detail of our proposed boundary realignments, or proposed that the area be united in Camden. This, in our view, substantiates our initial conclusion that Fitzrovia should be united in a single borough, and that the minor boundary changes suggested by Camden and Westminster do not adequately address the issue of an
identifiable community being split by the existing boundary.

99. In the light of the responses we received on this issue, we have given further consideration to whether Fitzrovia should be united in Camden or Westminster. We recognise that Fitzrovia is a mixed community, both in terms of residents and business use. A number of respondents had commented on the area's ethnic, cultural and community links with Camden. We do not dispute that these are likely to exist in respect of part of the residential community. However, it was clear to us that the affinities of other residents, and of the business community, are to the west, with Westminster. We have concluded that the balance of evidence points to Fitzrovia having greater affinity with the West End, and it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the area to be united in Westminster.

100. We received a number of comments on the detail of our draft proposal, suggesting that, if the area is to be united in Westminster, Gower Street should be used as the boundary. However, after careful consideration, we concluded that we would not be justified in extending our draft proposal further to the east, particularly as the area between Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road, which includes residential, university and hospital buildings, is an area where the two communities of Fitzrovia and Bloomsbury overlap, but where the university influence is stronger. Tottenham Court Road is a major thoroughfare. So is Gower Street by virtue of traffic management measures, but it runs through the university and residential area rather than delineating its extent.

101. Accordingly, we have reaffirmed our view that Fitzrovia is an identifiable community; that it should be united in Westminster; and that Tottenham Court Road provides the most appropriate and clearly defined eastern boundary. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
102. The Covent Garden Community Association suggested that an area bordered approximately by Kingsway, High Holborn, the Strand and Shaftesbury Avenue should be united within one borough, either Camden or Westminster. The suggestion was submitted on the grounds that this area contains both a long-standing and close-knit residential community and, having a large day-time working population and receiving many tourists, has special needs. The Association argued that the present boundary has resulted in confusion and difficulties with service provision.

103. The suggestion that this area should be united in one borough was supported by the Camden Conservative Committee and the Westminster Labour Party. Both suggested realigning the boundary along New Oxford Street, from the junction with Charing Cross Road and Tottenham Court Road, and then High Holborn and Kingsway to rejoining the existing boundary at Sardinia Street, uniting the area in Westminster. Both organisations preferred uniting Covent Garden in Westminster on the grounds that the major part of the area is already within that authority, and that uniting it in Camden would leave a narrow finger of Westminster between the Strand and the Thames.

104. Westminster opposed the suggestion that Covent Garden be united in one borough, expressing the view that the boundary in this area was no less satisfactory than elsewhere between Camden and Westminster. The Council took the view that the existence of the Covent Garden Consultative Committee ensured sufficient communication between local residents and both of the local authorities involved.

105. We considered that Covent Garden is a clearly defined, well-established community, the division of which by the present boundary appeared to have resulted in planning difficulties, and some problems with the provision of services. We concluded that uniting Covent Garden within one borough would facilitate the provision of efficient and convenient local government and that,
in view of the geography of the surrounding area and the fact that most of Covent Garden is already in Westminster, it was most appropriate for the community to be united in that authority. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal the suggested alignment along New Oxford Street, High Holborn and Kingsway.

Final decision

106. Our draft proposal was supported by the London Tourist Board, the Westminster Labour Party, three local businesses and 15 members of the public. Many of those who supported our proposal commented that Westminster provides more efficient street cleaning and refuse collection services than Camden. The North West Thames Regional Health Authority stated that it did not oppose the proposal.

107. However, our draft proposal was opposed by Camden, Westminster, Mr Frank Dobson MP, a local councillor, the Cities of London and Westminster Conservative Association, the Camden Borough Committee of the Communist Party, the North East Thames Regional Health Authority, four residents and one local business.

108. Camden opposed our draft proposal on a number of grounds. The Council informed us that it has 375 council homes in Covent Garden, plus a number of Housing Association homes over which it has nomination rights, and expressed concern that this housing would be transferred to Westminster. It commented that its housing policy ensures that a significant amount of fair rent property is available in Covent Garden, and that this results in the area being, with Fitzrovia, one of the few parts of the West End where a diverse residential community continues to flourish. The Council also cited the level of social service provision that it provides to the area, commenting that it is difficult to assess the full impact on residents of a transfer to a borough with different policies. It considered that the disruption that would result would not be counterbalanced by any perceived advantages.

109. Westminster said that the existing boundary does not cause any planning problems or confusion; that the proposal extends
well beyond Covent Garden; and would, if implemented, affect Health Authority boundaries, divide the Museum Street community and introduce planning difficulties in New Oxford Street, High Holborn and Kingsway.

110. Both Camden and Westminster maintained that the 1978 Covent Garden Action Plan facilitates planning for the area and safeguards the interests of existing residential communities, obviating the need to unite Covent Garden in one authority.

111. Mr Frank Dobson MP considered that our draft proposal did not reflect the complex daily living patterns of residents of South Camden, and recommended that the existing boundary should be retained in this area. The local councillor expressed concern that our draft proposal would disrupt housing and social services provision, and result in the loss of the recently achieved co-terminosity with health service boundaries. He also recommended that no change should be made to the existing boundary but considered that, if we were minded to unite Covent Garden in one authority, we should consider realigning the boundary along the Strand so as to unite it in Camden. Similarly, the Camden Borough Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain considered it desirable to unite Covent Garden in one local authority, but also maintained that it should be united in Camden.

112. The North East Thames Regional Health Authority considered that the realignment we had proposed would have an adverse effect on health service delivery. Similarly, the Cities of London and Westminster Conservative Association commented that our draft proposal have implications for Health Authority boundaries. The representations from residents opposing our draft proposal expressed satisfaction with the services provided by Camden, and concern for the future of the sheltered housing and hostels in the area.

113. We also received a late suggestion from a company based in Covent Garden, to the effect that West Street (where its offices are situated) should be transferred to Westminster, because of strong social and geographical links with that area.
114. We were concerned that, notwithstanding the original submissions made to us that Covent Garden should be united in a single authority, we had received little in the way of response from residents of the area, or from the community associations, to support the contention that a well-established community exists in the area, and that its division by the current boundary creates problems with the provision of services. We were also aware from the information provided by Camden that our draft proposal could have a detrimental effect on certain of its services, particularly housing.

115. It may be that Covent Garden exists more as a locality than as a community area, and that residents are broadly content with the existing boundary. In any event, in the absence of any significant public support for our draft proposal, we did not feel that we would be justified in pursuing it. We have therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal for this area.

(g) Carey Street

Draft proposal

116. In response to our draft proposals for the City of London's boundaries with Camden and Westminster, published in a letter addressed to the Town Clerk of the City of London on 5 March 1990, Camden suggested that its boundary with Westminster should be realigned to follow Carey Street to its junction with Chancery Lane.

117. The existing boundary is unsatisfactory, dividing properties in the area between Lincolns Inn and Chancery Lane. We considered that Camden's suggestion would provide a clearly defined boundary, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

Final proposal

118. Camden supported our draft proposal. However, Westminster opposed it, apparently in keeping with its previous opposition
to the Commission's earlier and related draft proposal for the City/Westminster boundary at Chancery Lane and its consistent approach in urging retention of the existing, traditional boundaries in this area.

119. We reaffirmed our view that our draft proposal would provide a clearly defined boundary in this area, and have decided to confirm it as final.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

120. Our final proposals have some limited electoral consequences for the local authorities affected by this review. The details of our proposals for changes in electoral arrangements are described in Annex B to this report.

CONCLUSION

121. We believe that our final proposals, which are summarised in Annex C to this report, are in the interests of effective and convenient local government and we commend them to you accordingly.

PUBLICATION

122. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Camden, Barnet and the City of Westminster asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that we have fulfilled our statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposal letter of 4 January 1991, our further draft proposals letter of 10 January 1992 and to those who made written representations to us.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>TO:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A C E G</td>
<td>Camden LB Frognal Ward</td>
<td>Barnet LB Childs Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Camden LB Frognal Ward</td>
<td>Barnet LB Childs Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Camden LB Hampstead Hill Ward</td>
<td>Barnet LB Childs Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Barnet LB Garden Suburb Ward</td>
<td>Camden LB Hampstead Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Barnet LB Garden Suburb Ward</td>
<td>Camden LB Highgate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>Camden LB Regent's Park Ward</td>
<td>City of Westminster Regent's Park Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Camden LB Regent's Park Ward</td>
<td>City of Westminster Cavendish Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>City of Westminster Cavendish Ward</td>
<td>Camden LB Bloomsbury Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>City of Westminster St James's Ward</td>
<td>Camden LB Holborn Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

Boundary between Camden and Barnet

Vernon Court (Hendon Way) Realignment along Burgess Hill and Finchley Road to unite Vernon Court in Barnet. Paragraphs 37-39 Map 1

370-382 Finchley Road Realignment to unite Nos 370-378 Finchley Road in Camden and Nos 380, 380a, 380b and 382 Finchley Road in Barnet. Paragraphs 40-42 Map 1

Pattison Road and Platt's Lane Minor realignments to the curtilage of properties and the sides of roads in Pattison Road and Platt's Lane to rectify stretches of defaced boundary. Paragraphs 43-45 Maps 1 and 2

Golders Hill Park Realignment along North End Way and the southern-eastern perimeter of Golders Hill Park to unite the Park and Nos 1 and 2 Golders Hill, in Barnet. Paragraphs 46-51 Map 3

Hampstead Heath Extension Realignment along the southern edge of Wildwood Road. Paragraphs 52-56 Map 4

Spaniards End Realignment to the rear curtilages of properties on the southern side of Spaniards End and the east side of Spaniards Road to unite Spaniards Road and properties in Spaniards End in Barnet. Paragraphs 57-61 Map 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampstead Lane</td>
<td>Realignment from Spaniards Inn to retain the Gatehouse in Camden but then to follow the east side of Hampstead Lane as far as Barnet's boundary with Haringey.</td>
<td>62-66, Map 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary between Camden and the City of Westminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnaburgh Street</td>
<td>Realignment along the centre of Great Portland Street, transferring Holy Trinity Church to Camden.</td>
<td>71-75, Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Park</td>
<td>Realignment along Prince Albert Road, Gloucester Gate and Outer Circle to unite Regents Park in Westminster.</td>
<td>76-80, Maps 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzrovia</td>
<td>Realignment along Tottenham Court Road and Euston Road to unite Fitzrovia in Westminster.</td>
<td>81-101, Map 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Street</td>
<td>Realignment eastwards along Carey Street to its junction with Chancery Lane.</td>
<td>116-119, Map 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>