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Proposals for the future electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Hillingdon

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

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

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

4. On 25 February 1976 Hillingdon Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 29 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 69 members.

5. We received objections to the Council's draft scheme from a local political association and another local organisation, both of which submitted for our consideration alternative schemes for the borough. Another political association made proposals for wards in the Uxbridge Parliamentary Constituency area. Two local organisations suggested revised wards in other parts of the borough. A local councillor and three residents criticised the Council's draft scheme for a number of reasons, and eight others wrote to give the scheme their support.

6. We examined the Council's draft scheme together with the two main schemes for alternative wards. We thought that neither of the alternative schemes provided a standard of representation that was superior to the Council's draft scheme, and accordingly we decided to adopt the latter as the basis for our draft proposals. We examined the scheme of wards which had been suggested for the area of the Uxbridge Parliamentary Constituency, but noted that its adoption would cause the area to be under-represented compared with the rest of the borough.

7. We studied the other comments and suggestions which had been made to us, and having regard to the observations made by a local organisation about the barrier formed by the M4 motorway we decided to propose three new wards - Hayes South East, Hayes South West and Heathrow - in place of the draft scheme Crane, Harlington and Heathrow wards. It also appeared to us that the shape and boundaries of the West Drayton and Hounslow wards might be improved if these were rearranged to return 3 members and one member respectively.
8. After consulting the Ordnance Survey, we made a number of minor alterations to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground.

9. Subject to the modifications mentioned in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, we decided that the Council's draft scheme would provide a satisfactory basis of representation in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

10. On 25 October 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 20 December 1976.

11. Hillingdon Borough Council informed us that they accepted our draft proposals, except for the five proposed wards, mentioned in paragraph 7 above, which differed from wards in their own draft scheme. A local political party wrote to give their support to the Council's representations.

12. The local political association which had previously submitted an alternative scheme to us, wrote again suggesting modifications to thirteen proposed wards. A councillor supported the suggested modifications and also said that he supported the five new wards which we had proposed. The local organisation, which had also proposed an alternative scheme of wards for the borough, informed us that they objected strongly to our draft proposals. The political organisation which had made proposals for the Uxbridge area reaffirmed those proposals. A local organisation and a private individual wrote to us about the proposed
Heathrow ward. A residents' association objected to the proposals which affected the present Hillingdon West ward. A local organisation and a local resident both said that a council of 69 members was too large. Four other local residents all objected to various aspects of the draft proposals or to the review generally.

13. In view of these comments, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr L J Slocombe was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

14. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Uxbridge on 29 and 30 March 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

15. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and of his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the proposed Hayes South East, Hayes South West, Heathrow, West Drayton and Yiewsley wards should be replaced by the Crane, Harlington, Heathrow, West Drayton and Yiewsley wards proposed by the Council in their draft scheme of representation.

16. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We concluded that the amendments recommended by the Assistant Commissioner reverting to the wards in the Council's original draft scheme were justified by the further information elicited by him at the local meeting and should be accepted. Subject to these modifications, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals.

17. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors
to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

**PUBLICATION**

18. 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 Hillingdon Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

12 May 1977
The Secretary
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Room 123
20 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TJ

Sir

Review of Electoral Arrangements
London Borough of Hillingdon

In accordance with my appointment by the Secretary of State as an Assistant Commissioner and pursuant to the instructions contained in your letter of the 9th February 1977, I have the honour to submit the following report.

1 Date of meeting

A local meeting was held at the Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, on the 29th and 30th March 1977. The meeting was opened at 10.00 a.m. on the 29th March and at 17.30 hours that day I adjourned. On the 30th March I re-opened the meeting at 10.00 a.m. and it concluded at 18.45 hours. On the following morning - Thursday 31st March - from 10.00 a.m. until lunch time I made a series of inspections of certain boundaries and areas. Full details of the inspections are contained in paragraph 50 of this report.

2 Attendance

The signed attendance sheets have been forwarded to the Commission. All those who spoke or participated in the proceedings are listed below.

Mr George Hooper, Chief Executive, together with Alderman S Gelberg (Chairman of He-Warding Panel) Councillor P Bush (Chairman of Main Committee), and Alderman D Heather were the main speakers on Council policy and approach. They were assisted by Mr C W E Schuman (Planning Department) for population forecasts, Mr A A Playfair (Chief Executive's Department) for electoral figures and Mr D M Brogden (Capital Projects) for housing development programmes.

Mr W D Charles represented the three Conservative Divisional Associations and with him were Councillor J A Watts (Leader of the Minority Party) who dealt with the detail of Uxbridge, Councillor C Booth with the detail of Ruislip Northwood and Mr R J Bower with the detail of Hayes and Harlington.

Mr Brian Quthwaite - spoke for the Uxbridge Constituency Liberal Association.

Mr D W Harnott spoke on behalf of both the Tudor Way Residents Association and the Hillingdon Federation of Residents and Tenants Associations.

Mr P T Sherwood of the Harlington Village Association was present the first day but unable to be present later. He handed in a letter which I refer to in the body of the report.
Councillor Gordon Sullivan spoke for Conservatives in Ruislip Northwood.
Mr Gerald Edwards spoke as Agent for the Ruislip Northwood Labour Party.
Mr B Russell spoke as organizer of the Ruislip Manor Labour Party.
Mr Philip Humphris spoke as Chairman of the Ruislip Residents Association.
Mr C Gibson spoke as a resident in proposed St Martins ward.
Alderman Sherman spoke in respect of the Uxbridge proposals.
Mr James A Doole spoke as Agent for the Uxbridge Labour Party.
Councillor Norman C Hawkins spoke for the Yiewsley and West Drayton branch of the Conservative Association.
Miss Barbara Potts spoke for certain Uxbridge wards for the Liberal Party.
Mr H C Bowen spoke for the Uxbridge Conservatives.
Mr J L Woodhouse, Mr Edward Darling, Mr M Burgess, Mr Bob Lewis and Mr R H Thorndike all spoke as individual residents.
MR R H Burlton spoke as Constituency Agent for Hayes and Harlington Labour Party.
Mr W Manning spoke as Chairman of the Hayes (South) Residents Association.
Mrs A Palmer spoke as Chairman of the Frogmore Conservatives.
Mr J McDonnell spoke as sub-agent for the Hayes and Harlington Labour Party (south branch).

The Commission's Draft Proposals
In the formulation of their draft proposals the Commission had before them the Borough Council's draft scheme (69 members 29 wards), an alternative scheme of the Conservative Associations (69 members 29 wards - boundaries different in a number of places). A scheme from the Hillingdon Federation of Residents and Tenants Associations (63 members 30 wards) who thought the proposed 69 member council was too large and also disputed the growth forecast figures, a scheme from the Uxbridge Liberal Association for part only of the Borough (23 members 21 wards for the Uxbridge Constituency) and a number of miscellaneous suggestions for various parts of the Borough, and comments on other matters.

When considering these schemes it was noted that the Federation had not provided figures for 1980 but had suggested that as and when major developments reached an appropriate stage the representation of certain wards could be increased. This latter suggestion was not acceptable to the Commission or the Home Office. In view of this and the lack of forecast figures which the Commission are required to consider (Schedule 11 of 1972 Act), the Commission could not adopt the Federation's scheme. The Liberal's scheme would cause imbalance between constituencies and this too was not adopted. The Conservatives scheme had used the same forecast figures but the forecast figures had shown a less even standard of representation in 1980 than the Council's scheme.
In the circumstances the Commission decided to adopt the Council's scheme as a basis for their own proposals. Although they thought that perhaps 69 was slightly large for Hillingdon the scheme did just fall within the 2500 electors/one councillor ratio in 1980. The Commission felt some sympathy with the Harlington Village Association's observations about the barrier formed by the M.4 motorway and so decided to adopt three wards (Hayes South East, Hayes South West and Heathrow) which, with modifications, followed wards included in the Conservative alternative scheme. These replaced the Council's wards of Heathrow, Harlington and Crane. Although the new wards presented a worse standard of representation, the Commission were of the opinion that the M.4 motorway should be recognized as a barrier and form a boundary. The Commission also re-aligned the boundary between the Council's draft scheme wards of West Drayton and Yiewsley. Finally some very minor modifications to boundaries were made by Ordnance Survey in the interests of technically better boundaries. These did not affect electors. Thus then the Commission's draft proposals showed a scheme for 69 members and 29 wards.

Comments on the draft proposals

The Commission's draft proposals were issued on the 25th October 1976 and were advertised locally. A number of comments were received. I mention them here in summary form but deal with them all in later parts of this report. The comments are fully examined in those cases where the comments were pursued at the meeting but only generally with regard to the remainder.

(a) Borough Council accept the draft proposals except for the five new wards proposed by the Commission, make one possible alternative boundary proposal and mention two name changes.

(b) Hayes and Harlington Constituency Labour Party - support Borough Council's views.

(c) Hillingdon Joint Conservative Associations - object to thirteen of the proposed wards.

(d) Councillor J.A. WATTS - supports the views of the Conservative Associations and makes a further suggestion about Yiewsley and Colham wards.

(e) Hillingdon Federation of Residents and Tenants Associations - object to draft proposals, maintain their criticism of forecasts and ask for a smaller council.

(f) Uxbridge Constituency Liberal Association - maintain their earlier proposals for Uxbridge Constituency.

(g) Harlington Village Association - suggest the division into two of the proposed Heathrow ward.

(h) Mr Bob Lewis - objects to proposed Heathrow ward and supports Council's scheme.

(i) Tudor Way Residents Association - object to proposed Hillingdon West ward.

(j) Hillingdon Branch of the National Federation of Self Employed - consider whole of the changes too drastic and costly.
(k) Mr H H Thorndike - considers the Council should comprise no more than 60 members.
(l) Mr E Spanier - considers scheme is politically biassed.
(m) Mr C Wright - generally objects to proposals, considers them unnecessary and leans towards the Federation's proposals.
(n) Mr K A Barnard - objects to the alterations to wards, considers changes are unnecessary and proposals are biassed.
(o) Mr Peter V Norris - objects to proposals in Ruislip area and suggests they do not conform to criteria in certain respects.

5 Order of Proceedings
It was quite clear to me on reading and studying the papers and plans that there were a large number of matters to be considered. I therefore decided, before the meeting, to divide the programme into five sections and I notified the Borough Council accordingly. The sections were (a) method of forecasting electorate and its results (b) matters concerning Ruislip Northwood constituency (c) matters concerning Uxbridge constituency (d) matters concerning Hayes and Harlington constituency and (e) general matters. I followed this procedure with only minor changes and the statements and evidence were given in that order. The only divergence was that for the convenience of all concerned Mr Hooper made his general opening statement at the commencement of section (a) and Mr Charles made his at the opening of section (b).

7 Cases advanced at the meeting
The following paragraphs 8 to 49 deal with the cases advanced at the meeting in support of, or against, the Commission's draft proposals. The report is not in any way a verbatim note of every word that was said but is, I hope, a fair and balanced summary of the principal points made by the speakers both initially and in reply. All speakers had the opportunity of making their own views known and then of commenting on what had been said by others. Not everyone took advantage of the right of reply but most did. It was sometimes not easy to draw a hard and fast line between statements and comments but no real problems arose. My report includes them all together. There were a number of plans and documents handed in, the gist of whose contents I include either in the following paragraphs or in my consideration of the cases. My assessment of the weight of arguments advanced at the meeting is contained in paragraphs 51 to 70 below.

8 Forecasting of Electorate and results
In this section I heard submissions from the Borough Council, the Hillington Federation of Residents and Tenants Associations, the Conservatives and the Liberals.

9 The Borough Council
(n) Mr George Hooper, Chief Executive, in an opening statement outlined the
Council's approach to the whole matter of re-warding and the principles which had guided them. His first point was to remind me of the legislative provisions and of the primary and mandatory requirements in Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972 of ensuring that the ratio of electors to councillors shall as nearly as may be, be the same in every ward. It is only subject to this primary requirement that matters about boundaries being identifiable and local ties being broken are subject. He quoted from the notes on boundary making (local authority areas) as follows "Boundaries should never sever local communities except for district wards where this is essential to achieve broad equality of representation". However in following this requirement the Council had also done their utmost to ensure clear boundaries and the minimum possible disturbance of communities. When considering their proposals the Council had received proposals from the Labour and Conservative parties for the whole Borough and for Uxbridge from the Liberals. Naturally there were differences but he wished to mention the points of major agreement:—no crossing of Parliamentary boundaries, a Council of 69 members was considered necessary following the abolition of Aldermen, wards based on two or three members, agreed addition to 1980 electorate for 16 year olds coming on register in 1980/81, and the retention wherever possible of existing polling districts for the convenience of the electorate. The Council as a whole did not view with favour one-member wards because of its undesirability and inadequate elector representation. So far as elector forecasts for 1980 were concerned he would leave the detailed calculations to Mr Schuman but emphasised that the utmost care and skill had been used in their preparation. So far as housing development was concerned the Greater London Council is the strategic housing authority and Hillingdon (as a London Borough) a housing authority in its own right. Both worked together to cope with London's housing problems as a whole. From the outset Hillingdon had allotted 25% of its own housing development to the GLC and the maximum of 140 houses per annum had been increased in the coming year to 200. In his view the housing development would continue as London - both GLC and the London Boroughs - were "stress" areas for housing and building would continue. As an illustration the programme showed 3582 completions of housing units by 1980. He accepted that some programmes may not be exactly on target but the overall position would not cause any distortions in proposed electorates. The Borough Council were pleased that the Commission's draft proposals were so close to those of the Council. The scheme showed an excellent equality of electorate, a compactness and clarity of boundaries, some corrections of deficiencies apparent since 1963/64, (for instance the Bell Farm Estate and Pinkwell area of Harlington), the avoidance of breaking local ties, i.e Harlington Village, a substantial maintenance of existing polling
districts and an excellent average of elector/councillor ratios. The other schemes (disregarding Harefield) showed a much wider variation than the Council's. The figure for the Council's proposals were "in the middle of the pack" for the London Boroughs. On the generality of the matter Mr Hooper submitted that his Council's scheme was a good one, one which they wanted restored as a whole, that the Commission's alterations had worsened the position; that all their calculations and housing intake for the GLC were soundly based, the wards proposed by the Council facilitated the division into convenient polling districts, and he urged that I should recommend a full acceptance of the Council's proposals. Mr Hooper then proceeded to make a number of comments on what had been said by others. I have transposed from his opening statement the views he expressed on individual wards and will bring them in again under the appropriate sections which follow.

So far as the Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations written comments were concerned Mr Hooper pointed out that the Council's approach had been based on clear research and logic whereas the Federation's estimates were largely on existing electorate and revised ward boundaries with no account of redistribution of population. The presentation at the hearing by Mr Harnott had lacked any firm statistical base and the figures appeared to be produced "out of the air". Mr Schuman had dealt with the arguments in detail. However Mr Hooper was pleased to record that the Council and the Federation were in agreement that Parliamentary boundaries should remain unchanged, re-warding should cause minimum disturbance and one-member wards are not desirable. The Council's forecasts were in his view correct - it was not a direct housing programme forecast but a distribution and shift spread over the whole Borough. The fact that the programme of building in the Willow Tree Lane area had been challenged in no way invalidated the forecasts, and he had to have regard to present policy and not look into a crystal ball.

(b) Mr C W E Schuman, Senior Planning Officer

Mr Schuman handed in a detailed paper explaining his methods and illustrated the points by a graph design chart. His paper was an extremely clear exposition of the process and methodology used and what follows is probably a very crude and perhaps inadequate summary of his submission. The process was based on a pre-determined "control total" of population for the Borough as a whole prepared by the GLC and he was completely satisfied with its accuracy. The electorate total for 1980 was established from the population predictions using a figure of 2.14 per dwelling unit. The actual electorate for 1971/72 and 1974/75 was then listed by wards and an annual percentage rate of change established and this was then adjusted to conform to GLC projections. The adjustment was then put into two forecasts - one with known public and private development units envisaged but excluding units allocated
to the GLC and the other including GLC units. Thus the method can be summarized by saying that the percentage rate of change (1971/72 - 1974/75) had been extrapolated through to 1980 and adjusted to conform to the GLC total projection and then adjusting to ward breakdown by making appropriate allowances for "in-migration" and "out-migration". In doing all this care was taken not to change the control total.

He commented on criticisms which had been made in the Federation's letter of the 18th December 1976 as follows:

(i) Electoral trends in the earlier years were not used to project figures to 1980 but to adjust ward figures within the control total.

(ii) The GLC projection is more accurate than a local projection because there is a higher degree of accuracy in projecting populations of larger areas.

(iii) He did not accept that houses stood empty as there was a constant re-shuffling from new units coming into occupation and the other ones being re-occupied.

(iv) The possible slowing up of new units by public authorities in no way invalidated the basic methodology.

(v) The addition of 40 electorate per councillor for the 16 year olds coming on the register in 1980 was the best known method for making provision for this possibility. All proper allowances had been for deaths and migration except for this small group and such an allowance would be statistically insignificant - certainly not exceeding one in forty.

(vi) The views of the Federation as to procedure on estimating were not agreed.

Mr Schuman concluded by saying that whilst all projections are subject to error, he was entirely satisfied that the methods used were the best available and provided the most objective solution to a highly complex problem.

10 Hillingdon Federation of Residents and Tenants Associations

Mr D W Harnott said he had been asked at short notice to present the case for the Federation. He started off by saying it was wrong to add in the 16 year olds at the rate of 40 per councillor and this was not a proper way to project population. He then made a detailed examination and criticism of the location of population within the Borough and its wards. In particular he thought that most of the housing would be used by people already living in Hillingdon. So far as the constituency totals for Hayes and Harlington were concerned he considered them to be too high and could be further reduced by the uncertainties - physical, procedural, political - of the Willow Tree Lane development. This could reduce the total by possibly 1800 + electors. On top of this he thought that there was a gradual drift of population from
the south to the north of the Borough but was unable to say precisely how
this was to be achieved. Hence so far as Ruislip Northwood was concerned he
considered there was a great growth potential here - possibly 1250 additional
electorate from the south. He made these views known from a study of the
trends and a belief that the Federation's estimates were more reliable than
the Council's. In Uxbridge he thought the Council's figures had been
distorted by the exceptional increase by reason of town centre re-development
and this had resulted in a considerable over-estimation by the Council.
Thus if his beliefs were right and his judgement of the trends correct
the position would be that Ruislip Northwood would be unbalanced and have
an elector/councillor ratio of over 2600. Conversely Uxbridge would also
be unbalanced with a ratio below 2500. In Hayes and Harlington there had
been insufficient allowance for the slippage in the Willow Tree Lane area.
Even if he were convinced, which he was not, that the Council's total
figures were right, then he still considered the distribution between
constituencies was wrong. At my request Mr Harriott gave me figures of what
he thought the distribution of electors in the 3 constituencies was likely
to be in 1980. I set these out below with the Council's figures alongside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruislip Northwood</td>
<td>55344</td>
<td>53691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>60530</td>
<td>63055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes &amp; Harlington</td>
<td>56599</td>
<td>57869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservative Associations

Mr W D Charles for the 3 Divisional Conservative Associations said that they
accepted both the forecast figures and the methods used in arriving at those
figures. Indeed the various alternative schemes submitted by him had used
those figures. In saying this he did however enter a caveat with regard to
the particular forecast of growth in the Yeading ward which contained the
Willow Tree Lane development. Much of the development may hinge upon policy
and future events - eg elections - and the solution of an outstanding
environmental problem. For those reasons he had thought about amending the
number of councillors to two and adding another as and when actual development
had taken place. He since understood from what I had said that this would
not be possible and did not press the point at this stage. (Note - I return
to the matter of the Willow Tree Lane development later on).

Uxbridge Constituency Liberal Association

Mr Brian Outhwaite on behalf of the Association and himself said he was
happy to accept the Borough Council's forecast figures and methods and had
no further comments to make on the matter.

Ruislip Northwood Constituency

In this section I heard submissions and comments from representatives of the
Borough Council, Conservatives, Labour Party, the Federation and individuals.
Joint Conservative Divisional Associations

Mr W D Charles indicated that he represented the three Associations of the three Parliamentary Constituencies which were comprised in the Borough and he introduced the spokesmen for the detailed comments. He explained that the Conservative proposals had been prepared on the criteria of good warding and they had paid particular regard to guidelines set out in the Commission's letter of the 10th June 1975. He observed that the Chief Executive was presenting the case for the Council and thought that in other circumstances he might well be presenting a case not dissimilar to his (Mr Charles) with the same expertise as he was now doing.

For his own part Mr Charles said he had been leader of the Conservative Group on the Council from 1964/1974, leader of the Council from 1968/1971, and ceased to be a member of the Council in May 1974. The Conservative approach was to maintain the Parliamentary boundaries, provide a scheme to serve the whole Borough in the most effective and efficient way and to distribute the councillors in fairness and equity. The warding undertaken in 1964 had been done by the four constituent authorities with possibly differing approaches so that the present review was the first on a uniform basis. The history of the present review started when the officers prepared a draft scheme and the Conservatives used this as a basis. They placed their emphasis on natural boundaries, local boundaries and community interests whilst remaining alive to the need for electoral equality. Mr Charles again returned to the projected figures for 1980 and sounded a note of warning, illustrating the Willow Tree Lane development. His point here was that whilst there was some general consensus as to London's housing needs there were different ways of tackling that need. For example a change of thinking or of politics might mean more development in inner areas and less in outer areas, economic resources may be strained, conservation problems had to be resolved and he quoted from a letter in which the Liberal Association had expressed similar views about restrictions on public and private house building.

Turning to the Commission's draft proposals Mr Charles said these had been examined most carefully on the basis of seeing how much could be accepted "in toto" and so reduce disagreement to a minimum. The upshot was that they had proposals to make by way of amendment for Manor, St Martins and Ruislip (Ruislip Northwood), for Uxbridge North, Uxbridge South and Hillingdon North (Uxbridge) and for six wards in Hayes and Harlington. The various arguments and areas for amendment had been set out fully in his letter of the 16th December 1976 and would appear clearly as the meeting developed. All their proposals were designed to serve members, officers and above all the electors in the best possible way. He was confident their proposals would be
carefully considered. He took the opportunity of commenting on the matter of single member wards. Whilst in general he preferred multi-member wards he was open to argument about one-member wards and thought that some of the difficulties which had been mentioned could be got over as all councillors could attend committees and (with consent of the Chairman) speak.

Ruislip Northwood Conservative Association

Councillor G Booth spoke as Chairman of the above Association and as a Borough Councillor for Ruislip. In a nutshell the Conservatives proposals were to retain on community grounds the existing Ruislip and Manor wards (with minor modifications). This meant that the Commission's proposals for three wards each with 2 members should be replaced by the provision of two wards each with 3 members. Mr Booth handed in plans illustrating the proposals and emphasized that their scheme had very few changes whilst the Commission's had a lot more - fewer changes would be more acceptable to the electorate. He said the Metropolitan and Piccadilly line and the consequent road patterns formed a natural boundary between Ruislip and Ruislip Manor except for a small area near Ruislip Manor Station where the community interest was in Manor ward. This deviation corresponded with a similar one in Cavendish ward. He suggested that the odd "pan-handle" shape of the proposed St Martins ward could not be supported on any grounds. Although in the north it is reasonable, soon after meeting Bury Street it begins to wiggle eastwards, round St Martins Church and in a zig-zag way to the boundary of Cavendish ward. In Ruislip there is one large major shopping area but few facilities north of the Church. Historically the Church and surrounding conservation area was the focal point of village life, it still retains its individuality and completeness, it contains the Public Library where many of the cultural societies meet and the Winston Churchill Hall could be regarded as the village hall. All arguments lead to the demand that this area should be the centre of Ruislip ward. The Commission's proposals split it at the centre and the Conservative proposals would restore it. He urged the acceptance of the revision.

He commented on Mr Edwards remarks and totally disagreed with them. He reviewed the history of these wards in the days of the Ruislip Northwood U.D.C i.e formerly St Martins and St Catherines but these had now changed. Eastcote Road would have provided a natural boundary but they could not use this because of the numbers needed to balance. In spite of what had been said he still considered Ruislip as a village which should be kept together in one ward.

Councillor Gordon Sullivan

Mr Sullivan spoke as a member of the Borough Council and one who was responsible for the preparations for the warding in the constituency. Their original proposals submitted to the Council had followed natural boundaries
and preserved community interests. Whilst they were prepared to accept
the warding in the southern part of the constituency they really could not
accept the draft proposals for Ruislip, St Martins and Manor. The boundary
can straight through the centre of Ruislip which he still regarded as a
village, as he did other villages elsewhere in the Borough. He was jealous
to preserve the old ward foundations and wanted the High Street and Church
area to be the centre of the Ruislip ward. He fully supported what Councillor
Booth had said and said the Conservative proposals were designed to secure
the preservation of community links. The Council had taken part of the
Cavendish ward to get the numbers right and the result, in St Martin's ward,
was an awkward and artificial division producing the so called "pan-handle".
He did not agree with what Mr Hooper had said about equal areas if this
produced unnecessary changes when equality could be achieved in different ways,
iz in the Conservatives alternative scheme.

17 Ruislip Northwood Labour Party
Mr Gerald Edwards, Agent, spoke for this Party. He accepted without question
the Commission's draft proposals for the three wards which were under
discussion. The Manor ward had been set up in 1964 and had worked well. What
was happening now was that because the people north west of the main railway
line associated with St Martins they were being put in that ward and people
seemed happy about that. The main railway line would form a good firm southern
boundary for the whole of St Martin's ward. He did not accept the arguments
about the boundary wandering through streets, or those points on community
grounds, the "village" concept had no relevance now, Winston Churchill Hall
was not a village hall but a hall serving a very wide area, no more natural
boundaries had been crossed than was necessary, the new proposals fitted in
well with polling district requirements and he saw no reason for change.
The Commission's draft proposals were suitable and satisfactory and he hoped
they would be adopted.

18 Ruislip Manor Labour Party
Mr E Russell, Party Organizer, said he had lived in the area for 40 years and
knew the area and the people well. The main railway line had the effect of
locking in the area of Herlwyn Avenue. There were bridges only at High Road
and West End Road and the people looked northwards for their community interests
and not eastwards to Manor. The existence of Ruislip Manor station is no
reason to extend the Manor ward northwards and was not a relevant factor
in preparing ward boundaries. Hence supports the Commission's draft proposals.

19 Ruislip Residents Association
Mr Philip Humphris, Chairman of this Association said he and his Association
regard Ruislip as a village and consider there is an integrated society and
this is based on the concept of a village. Communications were towards the natural centre - the High Street - and it should not be split. Even if people do go to Ruislip Manor Station this is not a reason for taking them out of their natural area base, ie Ruislip. Favoured the alternative proposal.

Mr C Gibson spoke as an individual who lived in the eastern part of the proposed St Martins ward. He agreed with what had been said by Councillor Booth that the shopping and community facilities formed the centre of Ruislip and should be the centre of the ward. He equally supported the view that the south west area should go into Ruislip ward. The Ruislip Manor shopping area had, he thought, more affinity with Manor ward than Ruislip. Mr Gibson then outlined problems of schools and thought that not much consideration had been given to these in preparing ward boundaries and there was too much emphasis on polling numbers.

Mr D W Harnott said that he considered the Federation's scheme was superior to that of the Council and the Conservative scheme was even better. The proposed St Martins ward had been made to extend south of the Piccadilly line merely to make up the numbers. He too agreed that the Winston Churchill Hall served a wider area than its immediate surroundings but gave no further instances of boundaries.

Alderman D Heather spoke as a member of the Council and as a 20 year resident in Ruislip. So far as he was concerned Ruislip had always been a commuter area and never a village in his memory. The area comprised originally three wards and the Council were restoring the position. The electors in the Parkway area (north of Ruislip Manor Station) had never voted in Manor. The Herlwyn area had previously been in St Martins ward and the Council were putting them back there. The nature of the housing development in the three areas was different and this guided the Council in making the area into three wards. He fully supported the Commission's draft proposals.

The Borough Council

Mr Hooper, Chief Executive in commenting on the views expressed said that the phrase "natural boundaries" was very flexible and could be construed in any way which suited a particular speaker. All the areas in Hillingdon were criss-crossed by roads and it was a choice which had to be made as to which was selected as a boundary. The prime effort was to keep areas compact and together. He did not consider "village" was the right word to describe Ruislip. The Winston Churchill Hall was a building owned and run by the Council and was available to a very wide area. So far as the Federation's scheme was concerned he thought it was allied to that of the Council in many of its features, and was in his view nearer to the Council's scheme than that of the Conservatives.
Mr W D Charles in reply reminded us of the history of the three wards from
the days of the Ruislip Northwood U.D.C. It had been divided into two wards
because of the large population. Originally there had been six councillors
for Ruislip and then split into St Martins and St Catherine wards. What they
wanted was two wards each with three councillors in place of the draft proposals
and he considered this a viable and satisfactory arrangement.

Uxbridge Constituency

In this section I heard submissions and comments from the Borough Council,
the Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties, the Tudor Way Residents
Association, and some individuals.

Uxbridge Constituency Liberal Association

Mr Brian Outhwaite, Hon. Organiser for this Association submitted the Liberal
scheme for dividing up the Uxbridge Constituency into 21 wards with 23
councillors. Nineteen of these wards would return one councillor each and
the others two each. However polling district PF (about 1480 electors) he
thought could go into Hayes South West in the Hayes and Harlington Constituency.

He accepted the Council's forecast figures but with a proviso about targets
not being reached. The grounds on which they had prepared the Scheme were
that small wards were more personal and more truly represented local
communities, one-member wards could work properly as in cases of absence
or illness other members would rally round. In general he considered the
scheme he proposed was more democratic and could operate in the interests
of all concerned.

He appreciated that moving PF polling district did cross Parliamentary
boundaries and that his scheme would create some under-representation for
Uxbridge as compared with the remainder of the Borough.

Tudor Way Residents Association

Mr D W Harnott, Chairman of the Association objected to the splitting up
of the existing Hillingdon West ward. Whilst some adjustment might be
inevitable he said the people in his area were Hillingdon people and were
divided from Uxbridge - the River Pinn was the proper boundary. If changes
had to be made he would prefer the movement to be eastwards rather than
towards Uxbridge. He still thought the whole area could be looked at again
and another scheme produced, and considered the Conservative scheme a minor
improvement only.

At my request Mr Harnott marked on a plan the boundaries of the ward he
would like to see. I asked the Council Officers to work out the figures of
electorate and the effect on other wards, and I deal with this in my
conclusions later on in the report.

Alderman Lou Sherman expressed his total support for the Council's proposals
and objected to the Commission's proposals for a one-member ward for Yiewsley.
He was wholly against having one-member wards, it was a retrograde step to go back to such an arrangement, was not in the interests of the electorate, all of which a councillor represented, it would be a serious loss if the one member were absent from either, committee, or outside body or ward representation.

Mr J L Woodhouse spoke as an individual who had lived in the Hillingdon area for 26 years - Court Drive district. He considered that the Commission's draft proposals had the effect of taking part of Hillingdon West out of context and he objected to the Commission's proposals. Although he himself had some connections with Uxbridge the main body of people looked to Hillingdon. He much preferred the River Pinn as a boundary and thus supported the Conservative proposals, as a more natural linking of affinities.

Uxbridge Liberals

Miss Barbara Potts said she was the organizer for the Colham, Cowley and Yiewsley and West Drayton wards and gave general support to the one-member proposal but with some reservations. She did not agree with what had been said about linking of north and south area in West Drayton and Yiewsley. The railway line was the best boundary. Neither did she agree with what Mr Cole had said about there being no connection between Yiewsley and Colham. Her views could be summarized by saying she listed her preferences as follows: -
1st - Commission's Scheme 2nd - join Yiewsley and Colham, 3rd - the Council's alternative suggestion for the boundary between Yiewsley and West Drayton.

Uxbridge Conservatives

Councillor K C Bowen spoke as a councillor for Uxbridge and as a resident for 45 years and one who works there. He supported the Conservative Scheme for the Uxbridge wards. The roads went north and south and the large open spaces in the north of the ward tended to give some separateness. In supporting the one ward for the whole of Uxbridge he thought the name might be Uxbridge Town.

Yiewsley and West Drayton Conservatives

Councillor N C Hawkins spoke as a councillor for Northwood, a resident in West Drayton for 20 years and a past councillor for Yiewsley and West Drayton. He opposed the Council's scheme - both the original and the alternative - and supported the Commission's proposals. Mr Hawkins then took me on a historic review of the two wards, their local government administrative changes and the building of the Canal and railway. The effect, he said, was that the Council's line had no historic base. He disagreed about what had been said about the location of various public buildings and said such buildings were available in most wards. The road system made for good boundaries and these had been ignored in some cases. He thought that one member could cope in Yiewsley and three in West Drayton. Mr Hawkins believed the Council had only suggested the alternative boundary down Swan Road and Mill Road to avoid
upsetting people. So far as the matter of joining Yiewsley with Colham, he
considered there was little affiliation between these areas and could not
support it - the two wards should be separately represented.

Mr James A Dole Agent, presented the case for the above Party and as a man
who works in Yiewsley. He dealt with the matter in three sections and I
follow him that way in recording the statements and comments.

(a) Yiewsley and West Drayton. He did not like the Commission's alterations
to the Council's scheme and was opposed in principle to single member wards
as this diminished proper representation. Two or more members gave a wider
overall fund of experience. It was wrong in his view for Yiewsley to be
picked out as the only single member ward in the Borough. This particular
ward had acute problems associated both with urban decay and industry. The
Council had set up an industrial consultative organisation to keep in close
touch with industrial managements and it was quite wrong for one councillor
to have such a heavy work load. Apart from these important considerations
the figures did not make sense. Under the Commission's proposals the average
for Yiewsley (1980) was 2878 and West Drayton (1980) 2309 - a difference of
over 500. Except for the special position of Harefield no other ward would
have so high an average. The Council's scheme had used a well defined boundary
along Station Road and Harmondsworth Road and this produced two wards of nearly
equal size with averages very close together - 2470 and 2432. If the Commission
had altered Yiewsley ward because of its shape - the triangle at the south -
that particular area had its own polling area (Glebe PF) which naturally
associated with the rest of the ward. Even the Council's alternative proposal
was a great deal better than the Commission's proposal, both as to community
of interest and for average electorates per member. This proposal provided
good boundaries, a central community centre and linked communities. The average
figures (1980) were: Yiewsley 2367 and West Drayton 2536. For the reasons
of both quality and quantity Mr Dole urged the rejection of the Commission's
proposals and the adoption of the Council's original scheme, or as a second
choice, the alternative one.

(b) Yiewsley and Colham wards. The suggestion that had been made by Councillor
Watts to combine the Commission's proposed Yiewsley and Colham wards into one
three-member ward was completely unacceptable to Mr Dole and his Party. Whilst
it might solve the problem of a one-member ward it did so at the cost of every
other consideration - social, community and arithmetic. The proposal so far
as he was concerned was just not on. There was no historic association between
the two wards. Colham was a newer and different community, people gravitated
within Yiewsley and West Drayton, not Colham. Fallings Lane was a high
crossing - a redoubt, - and the two wards had been altered in the past and
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should not be further changed. On top of all these considerations there was the important matter of electoral equality and balance. There would be a marked disparity for wards which each would return three councillors. Taking the 1980 figures the position was - Yiewsley/Colham electorate 8173 - average 2724 - West Drayton electorate 6927 - average 2309. For all these reasons he urged the rejection of the proposal.

(c) Uxbridge South, Uxbridge North & Hillingdon North. Mr Dole said he did not agree with the Conservative's proposal to make two wards out of the three on the Commission's (and Council's) plan and explained why. It was not only a matter of arithmetic but of common sense and community to keep the Hillingdon North ward as it had been drawn. It served as a suitable ward (2 members) for the Oak Farm estate and he would suggest that as a suitable name for the ward. It had clear boundaries - Western Avenue (A.40), Sutton Court Road, the Borough boundary and Long Lane. In fact the Federation's scheme was almost identical and the Oak Farm Residents Association work to these boundaries. The residents in this ward regard the area as a community. He disagreed with the Conservatives who said Long Lane was not a valid boundary and argued that, with shopping facilities being limited, people tended anyhow to go to major shopping areas in Ruislip and Uxbridge. Mr Dole then discussed the location of schools in the area concerned and accepted there was always some crossing of ward boundaries for school catchment areas.

So far as the Uxbridge wards were concerned he agreed with the Conservative view as to preserving old Uxbridge Town but argued that his scheme achieved this in a better way - by including it in the proposed Uxbridge South ward. When Uxbridge was a Borough there were two wards - North and South - and the present proposal continued this. In arguing that Uxbridge High Street could normally be described as a good boundary the Conservatives had then departed from the idea because part of it was a pedestrian way. This to him seemed silly as many other boundaries could only be traversed on foot - for example the River Finn which the Conservatives were putting forward as their boundary. He was satisfied that the High Street was a good and proper boundary and divided up the different housing development between north and south Uxbridge in the correct way. The High Street would continue as the proper meeting point for the two communities. Mr Dole then considered the figures which would result if the Conservative scheme was adopted. Total for the three wards in 1980 is 14864 of which Uxbridge would have 8181 and Hillingdon North 6683. This showed an unbalance of electorate which could not be justified. He asked for the Conservative’s alternative scheme to be rejected and the Commission’s upheld.

Conservative Associations Proposals.

Councillor J A Watts was the spokesman for the Conservatives in relation to
Uxbridge constituency matters. He explained that he was a councillor for Hillingdon West, the leader of the minority (opposition) party on the Council, a previous Chairman of the Uxbridge Conservative Association and had at one time lived in Yiewsley for seven years. He handed in two sets of plans and overlays illustrating the various alternatives. As with Mr Dole the presentation and comments were divided into three parts and I record them in that way.

(a) Hillingdon North and Uxbridge Wards.

Mr Watts said his Association's early scheme was still regarded as a good one and he re-affirmed his opposition to the Commission's draft proposals for this area. In essence the objection is that two recognizable communities - Uxbridge and North Hillingdon - had been divided into three wards. This meant that wards had been constructed to cross community boundaries rather than follow them. The solution would be to have only two wards, each with three members, the central boundary being the River Finn - as illustrated on map.

Uxbridge, he said, was an historic town and a regional shopping centre. The present Uxbridge ward includes some parts of Cowley which are now to be in the new Cowley ward. A golden opportunity thus existed for the creation of a ward containing all Uxbridge. Alas this had not been done and the combination of Uxbridge North with part of North Hillingdon was a step backwards. He did not like the High Street - now partly pedestrianised - as a boundary. Surely it was better to keep all Uxbridge together and not separate the Church from the Church Hall. The River Finn was a recognisable boundary and better than a national line via a pedestrian precinct. He disagreed with those who said there was no crossing between the two wards of Uxbridge and pointed out that all the sports facilities were in the north east.

So far as the remainder of the area is concerned Mr Watts pointed out that Polling district LB had been removed from Hillingdon West and tacked on to the rump of Uxbridge to form Uxbridge North. This made no sense of community and the parts were separated by the river, the electric railway line and by open space. Hence the ward had neither good boundaries nor conformed to community ties. He thought that the Tudor Way area should be in Hillingdon North and this is what their scheme showed. Shopping facilities were at Hillingdon Circus and he did not think that Long Lane severed the ward but merely traversed it. The suggestion made by the Conservatives for two wards instead of three would he thought provide better warding and representation.

(b) Yiewsley and West Drayton.

He welcomed the Commission's draft proposals for these two wards and said it had preserved the historic community boundary at West Drayton. He objected to both suggestions made by the Council and the Labour Party for changes which he said would cut right across communities. The first proposal rejected
by the Commission was the use of the A408 as a boundary with the area to the west called West Drayton and that to the east Yiewsley, whereas in his view the real boundary was the Grand Union Canal dividing the area north and south. The second alternative might be regarded as a little better but would still divide the community. He would wish to see the Commission's proposals stand.

(c) Yiewsley/Colham.

Mr Watts did not agree with the arguments that had been advanced about the undesirable features of a one-member ward for Yiewsley, nor with what had been said about affinities in the area or the difficulties as to Falling Lane. Standing Orders permitted absent colleagues being represented at Committees and other members would rally round in case of long absences. The solution, if a one-member ward was not accepted, would be more neatly done by combining Yiewsley with Colham rather than tampering with West Drayton. This is what he was asking to be considered.

In conclusion he recommended all the above suggestions for serious consideration.

The Borough Council

(a) Councillor P Bush spoke as the Council's representative, as a former councillor for Yiewsley, a resident in the area and a former Chairman of the Uxbridge Labour Party. He, and his Council, were firmly against one-member wards as a general rule and this applied most particularly to the Yiewsley ward where there would be intolerable difficulties for a single member. It was an old part of the Borough and there were many problems of housing improvement, especially around the High Street. The area had special needs because of the "artisan" type population and the heavy industrialization. There had been a long association between Yiewsley and West Drayton and the Council's proposals did not disturb the position. Although it may seem to have a peculiar shape the ward, as drawn, reflected the community trends northwards towards all the social facilities - youth centre, community centre, library, Drayton Hall and police station. There was a pressing need for 2 councillors to assist in implementing a new scheme of industrial relations with factory owners. He agreed with Mr Dole about his comments on the access difficulties in Falling Lane - only one motor access and one footway, combined with a sharp incline. The various schools and doctors were available but the "triangle" area people had to go northwards for main services. The whole area of Yiewsley was an area of high demand for the service of councillors and there were no less "taxing" areas as a partial relief. Councillor Hawkins had already said there was no community association between Yiewsley and Colham and he was firmly against the suggestion of combining them. Dealing with the Uxbridge and Hillingdon North wards, Mr Bush said he agreed with the views expressed by Mr Dole. Long Lane was a good boundary, the Residents Association accepted this, the area west of Long Lane was lightly populated.
and needed electorate added to it (which the Council had done). The two
member ward system here preserved identity of community. To have the large
recreation areas in Uxbridge North ward was a unifying influence. The shopping
centre at Hillingdon Circus was in no way a major one. It was interesting
to hear arguments about history but he thought the better approach was to
present day conditions. He urged the maintenance of the Commission's draft
proposals.

(b) Mr George Hooper, Chief Executive said the primary consideration was
electoral equality and changes proposed for the Yiewsley area could result in
some under-representation. The Council had to deal with communities as they
now existed and not with things that were relevant in coaching days.

Uxbridge High Street was undergoing a massive redevelopment for shops, offices,
and residential units and formed a clear boundary of some significance.
Communities and areas had sometimes to be re-divided but the schemes of the
council also brought communities together again. Long Lane was an established
boundary and any references to possible traffic changes had no relevance in
this connection.

36 Hayes and Harlington Constituency.
In this section I heard submissions from the Borough Council, the Conservative
Associations, the Labour Party, the Hayes (South) Residents Association and a
number of individuals.

37 Conservative Associations
Mr K J Bower, Hon.Secretary of the Hayes and Harlington Conservative
Association presented the case for the various wards in this constituency
and Mr Charles replied to the comments. Mr Bower handed in a plan illustrative
of the points he was to make, together with a sheaf of tables concerning
traffic counts. His first general point was that re-warding for Hayes and
Harlinton was akin to dealing with a solid urban borough. Over 50 years
large public and private estates had been built, communities had developed
and like areas should not be split. In most cases the natural or geographical
boundaries were nearly the same as the common interest boundaries and that
these should be used for ward boundaries. Their four major boundaries were
the M.4, the main railway line, Uxbridge Road and the Yeading Brook. They
generally welcomed the Commission's proposals for the South part of the
constituency but (a) wanted Heathrow represented by three councillors
instead of two and (b) wanted the Hayes South East Northern boundary to
be the railway line and not North Hyde Road. So far as the wards to the north,
he submitted that they failed to satisfy the criteria of being easily
identifiable and not breaking ties. This was illustrated by reference to
long textual descriptions, cutting through communities, straddling the
Yeading Brook, and making unnecessary boundaries merely to make the numbers
right when even some of the forecast figures may be dependant on outside factors. Mr Bower then turned to individual wards.

(Note: I should here observe that in all the figures for the Hayes and Harlington area there were slight, although not significant, differences between the Commission's figures and those of the Conservative's alternative proposals. I therefore arranged for Councillor Watts and Mr Playfair to meet and agree figures. This they did and the figures recorded below may differ slightly from those quoted at the hearing by Mr Bower.)

Heathrow Agrees that the M.4 is rightly chosen as a boundary by reason of the limited accesses. He produced census counts of traffic flows and personal injury accidents. Their suggestion was that there should be three councillors and the elector/councillor ratio would be nearer the average 1975 - 2019 and 1980 - 2057.

Hayes South West Mr Bower accepted this ward but would like to see it called Stockley. Although the proposed ward contained a number of separate communities - Bell Farm, Stockley, Pinkwell, Bourne etc - they all had their own linked identities and the M.4 argument was the deciding factor.

Hayes South East He was surprised that whilst the Commission had accepted the M.4 as a boundary they had not followed this argument in selecting the northern boundary of this ward. The railway line was much to be preferred than North Hyde Road. The various estates around Keith Road and George Head estate had a much closer identity than with other estates in Botwell. Also suggested the name of the ward should be Cranford Park.


Botwell The northern boundary was not easily identifiable and it cuts through the estates of Princes Park, Botwell and Townfield. He suggested that there was more identity with communities in the south of Wood End ward. The present ward boundaries between Frogbury/Belmore and Hayes/Yeading should be maintained. There would thus be no Botwell ward in the Conservative scheme.

Townfield Whilst accepting that the northern boundary did follow in part a natural boundary - the Uxbridge Road - the remainder was a contrivance and the southern boundary a disaster. Estates were split and difficult road problems created. Mr Bower handed in traffic census figures and accident figures for Uxbridge Road and said there was only one pedestrian crossing between The Grapes junction and Hayes Bridge.

Wood End The natural boundary of Uxbridge Road had been ignored, estates had been cut through and the Southeast boundary was not clear. The area north of the Uxbridge Road was not in fact isolated and had more identity with the Nash Estate than the Allied estate. His proposal was that Uxbridge Road should be the northern boundary and the estate to the north of that
removed to a re-named Charville ward.

Charville The natural boundaries of Lansbury Drive and Kingshill Avenue have been ignored, traditional communities re-divided and a polling place removed. This breaking up could cause apathy. Traffic counts were handed in. Mr Bower then described the new boundaries, all of which were easily identifiable and did not cut local ties. He suggested the name of the ward should be Proemore.

Barnhill The essential point in Mr Bower's criticism of this ward is that the Yeading Brook is the clear natural boundary and the Commission's proposals had linked communities which had nothing in common. Yeading Lane which had been used as the boundary between Barnhill and Yeading was the centre of two communities. Access over the Yeading Brook was restricted and the open space around the Brook might one day become a by-pass. Traffic figures of pedestrians crossing Yeading Lane at Willow Tree Lane were handed in. His suggestion was a revision for both Barnhill (Brookside) and Yeading so that the Brook became the dividing line.

Yeading The revised ward would be as described above. The question of development in this ward at the Willow Tree Lane estate was again raised and the various points already made were repeated. The upshot was that circumstances may well delay the development and it would be sensible to allot only two councillors to the ward for the present time.

Hayes and Harlington Constituency Labour Party

Mr R H Burlton, Party Agent presented the case for this Party and commented on the alternative proposals of the Conservative Party. Starting with the south of the constituency Mr Burlton expanded on the views expressed in his letter to the Commission of the 16th December 1976. He said the Party's approach had been consistent throughout and was the right one. To make the M.4 the most important factor was to separate communities, give undue and incorrect emphasis to the motor way, divide up Harlington and ignore all the main communications which ran north and south and not east and west. There was no connection between the Bell Farm area and Harlington. Schooling in the area would be split by the Commission's proposal, the churches were on both sides of the M.4 and provided a community link, the long established names of Harlinton and Crane would be swept away, the proposed Heathrow ward would be four miles wide and very difficult for councillors to service. The three wards proposed by the Commission would create imbalanced electorates - he illustrated Heathrow (6130) and Hayes South East (4262) each with two councillors. The Council's scheme was very much better in this respect. He urged that the Commission's proposals for this area be not approved and the Council's own proposals for Heathrow, Crane and Harlington be re-instated. Mr Burlton then proceeded to examine, first in principle, and then in detail
the whole of the constituency and the Conservative proposals. He demonstrated
with a table of figures (not here repeated) that the standard of representation
of the Conservative's proposals was far inferior to that of the Council and
that the alternative failed to satisfy the primary requirement of equality
of representation. He invited me to reject the scheme on these grounds.
He also pointed out that the Conservatives had not made it clear whether there
were to be two or three councillors for Wood End. Had increased Heathrow to
three and reduced Yeading to two. So far as the suggestion that the Yeading
Brook was concerned he thought it was pure fiction to say it divided
communities. The Brook and the adjacent playing fields were a unifying
factor, and were a meeting place for parents and children from both sides
of the Brook. He illustrated this by referring to joint representations which
had been made to the Council. The really single feature which dominates the
area is Yeading Lane and this had rightly been selected as the ward boundary.
It was not true to say that Uxbridge Road was a road of similar significance.
It was more of a local road as the main westward roads were the M.4, A.4 and
A.40. Although a dual carriage-way it did not appear so heavily trafficked
as Yeading Lane and there were four crossing points. The Mellow Lane area
enjoys as close an affinity to the south of Uxbridge Road and the Commission
had rightly put the area in Charville. The two areas are joined in the
present Frogmore ward and there is no reason to disturb the arrangement. In
fact the Conservatives had happily accepted the straddling of Uxbridge Road
in their Hillingdon East and West wards and in their original proposal;
Hillingdon South as well. The Council had deliberately chosen the boundary
between Charville and Barnhill for good community reasons and Townfield
contained nearly all the estate of that name. The Princes Park estate and
Botwell had not been bisected as suggested. He did not agree with Mr Burgess
that the Brook was a natural boundary in Yeading. In conclusion he stated
that the Council's (and Commission's) scheme was preferable on all grounds
and urged the complete rejection of the Conservative Scheme.

Mr Edward Darling spoke as a resident in present Hayes ward, near to the
boundary with Hounslow. He did not like the very long ward proposed for
Heathrow and argued strongly that the M.4 was not a dividing fact because
there were plenty of accesses - both roads and pedestrian. All the lines
of communication were north and south. The A.4 (east/west) only passes through
one village - Longford - and the other villages straggle along the north/south
roads. Mr Darling then described the various developments and indicated that
St Dunstan's Church was south of the M.4 but the parishioners came from
the Cranford Park area north of the M.4, where also were the parish hall and
rectory. These people had no real connection with Harlington. It was wrong
to lump them in with Harlington or with the other villages. The Parish Church
of Harlington, near the new fly-over, serves both sides of the M.4 as does the secondary school which is in two parts, one north and one south, of the M.4. Sipson is another north/south axis village and the airport access road has not really divided the community. Connections with Harlington were poor. Similarly Harmonsworth village had its connections with the north and Longford should be linked with it. Mr Darling showed me some aerial photographs which supported his arguments. His firm conclusion was that the M.4 was not a divisive factor and he fully supported the Council's scheme.

Hayes (South) Residents Association

Mr W Manning, Chairman of this Association presented an alternative scheme for the wards between the Uxbridge Road and the M.4, and also commented on other things that had been said. He proposed six wards each with only one councillor for the area covered by the draft scheme wards of Wood End, Townfield, Botwell, Harlington and Crane. This would keep the size of the Council down and give, with one member for each ward, a more personal relationship. On the various other schemes, he suggested that Townfield ward should go beyond the Uxbridge Road, the Mellow Lane area had more affinity with Charville than Wood End, the people in Hayes South West were Hayes people and not connected with Harlington so the boundary should be at Stockley Road. The name Bourne would be better and he agreed with the Conservative scheme of using the Railway line as a northern boundary of Hayes South East but the ward to be named Crane.

Mr W Burgess, a resident concerned with the Yeading ward was not happy with the draft proposals for Barnhill and Yeading wards. He was convinced the Yeading Brook was a good natural boundary and so supported the Conservatives.

Frogmore Ward Conservatives

Mrs A Palmer, Chairman of the Branch said she gave general support to what Mr Bower had said concerning the Chaville and Wood End boundaries. She did not like the Commission's draft proposals for this area, considered Uxbridge Road was the natural boundary and agreed with Mr Bower in his points about Lansbury Drive and Kingsmill Road.

Mr J McDonnell spoke as sub-agent for the south branch of the Hayes and Harlington Labour Party. He emphasized the separateness of the Bell Farm estate and the Pinkwell estate. The real divider, which the Council had used, was Stockley Road, a busy road and bordering on a reservoir and clay pit. The Commission's proposals for Heathrow divide the community and he wanted to see the original scheme re-instated.

Mr Bob Lewis spoke as a resident in the area for 29 years and knew the particular district well. He agreed with Mr McDonnell and said the Commission's proposals would run counter to the lines of communication. Whilst the use of M.4 might look well on a map, it was unrealistic in fact. Villages were
being divided and he had no doubt Stockley Road was the important dividing line. He urged that the Council's scheme should be restored.

**Hartington Village Association**

Mr P T Sherwood, Chairman of the Association was unable to be present on the second day of the hearing but handed me a letter which I summarize below. The Association would stand by what they had said in earlier correspondence and did not want Hartington Village split. The boundaries proposed by the Council and the Commission are both acceptable to them. On balance they preferred the Commission's proposal. They felt most strongly that the name of the ward should be "South" and not "Heathrow".

**Councillor P Bush** outlined the Borough Council's approach to the warding in the constituency. There had been a history of change, including Parliamentary boundaries and the Council wanted to keep further changes to a minimum. There was a good deal of mixed development in the Heathrow area but all the communications were north and south. The M.4 was not a good boundary and was not a good divider. No road links (north/south) had been lost by the construction of the M.4. The Council's scheme retains the links with village communities and provides a much better standard of equality of electorate. He asked that the Council's scheme should be restored.

**Conservative Associations**

Mr W J Charles made a number of comments on the various points which had arisen during the proceedings. He referred again to the environmental and other problems in respect of the Willow Tree Lane development which he was sure would cause delays and postponements. For this reason the Conservatives had now suggested that two councillors for the ward would be sufficient. Much had been said about natural boundaries and these were dictated by the actual communities. References to traffic safety schemes and such like were evidence of community interest and this supported him in saying that the various boundaries indicated by Mr Bower were the good natural boundaries. He then briefly ran through a number of comments listed in Mr Bower's statement all of which had been generally covered elsewhere. Mr Charles said the evidence had supported arguments in part or whole on both sides and he welcomed the evidence given by members of the public. The Conservatives had sought the widest possible consensus in their proposals. Hayes and Harlington was a difficult area because of the rapid development over the last 20 years of estates and industry which created a lot of work for councillors. The Labour Party's observations were the same as the Council's because they were the majority party.

The question of the name of the ward was important. Heathrow Airport was a national enterprise, an important source of employment and rateable value in the Borough. It was unrealistic not to accept Heathrow as a proper name.
South meant nothing. He did not mind the size of the proposed ward; Harefield was just as big. In conclusion Mr Charles said he had no doubt that a fair and reasonable decision would be made.

The Borough Council
(a) Mr George Hooper, Chief Executive dealt with a number of the comments which had appeared both in correspondence and during the hearing. He, too, was a little confused as to whether or not the Conservatives were proposing to reduce the number of councillors in the Hayes and Harlington constituency, as their written proposals had not made this clear. No doubt it would be sorted out in due course. The Council's scheme for Heathrow, Harlington and Crane wards had the prime object of getting the various groups into the right wards and this he was satisfied they had done. The Council's electoral ratios were much better. After 13 years of the Borough it was right for changes to be made to bring communities together. Much too much had been made of the effect of the M.4. No access had been lost and some more pedestrian accesses had been provided. The four villages and the detached community - Cranford Cross - had no east/west connections. The various statements on traffic and accidents had no relevance in a hearing such as this. In Heathrow the proper and clear boundary was Stockley Road, and the correct name of the ward was undoubtedly Heathrow. So far as the Willow Tree Lane development was concerned he had no doubt the building would continue, problems affecting the environment were being solved, there was massive capital committed to the scheme and procedural matters affecting a bridle way were a fringe item.

(b) Alderman S Gelberg emphasized that some changes had to be made in a re-warding scheme - for example Hayes had a four councillor ward at present. He did not regard the M.4 as a barrier, the North/south routes had not been affected, Bath Road was a worse road, there was no real point in comparing the size of Heathrow with that of Harefield - the two areas were completely different in nature.

So far as the Yeading ward was concerned he agreed with what Mr Hooper had said. The arrangements for joint building with the GLC and the allocations by the Council would continue. Had it been possible to make flexible Orders which could easily be altered he might have agreed to two members for the moment but the circumstances made it necessary to press for three.

In conclusion he again pointed out that the Council's scheme produced a much more satisfactory pattern of electoral equality than either the Commission's or the Conservatives.

Size of Council
(a) Mr R H Thorudike - a resident and an elector - spoke as an individual. His proposals had been sent to the Commission by letter dated 15th December 1976. He said he did not intend to get involved with detailed arguments
about figures or particular boundaries but to pose the simple question as to whether or not a case had been made out for a Council of 69 members. In his view it had not. Looking at the figures for 1980 a Council of 69 would give an average electorate of around 2500 and with a Council of 60 - 2875. He did not think the average elector would worry whether he was one of 2500 or 2800. In Harefield the average in the scheme was 2852. The figure of 2500 was he believed regarded as a normal minimum figure and higher ratios existed in other Boroughs. Mr Thorndike accepted that there should be a proper and equal distribution, that communities should be kept together and recognizable boundaries found. But the general population trend would show a decline in the years ahead. He drew my attention to a Council decision in June 1975 that said "any revision to be kept to a minimum". However the scheme produced showed a Council of 69 which was an increase of 9 in elected councillors. The Council's records indicated that the scheme submitted was based on the Labour Party's scheme. He asked me to draw my own conclusions from this. In Hounslow the aldermanic seats were not being replaced. As an elector he was concerned about the cost to the ratepayers of maintaining and servicing a large Council - he instanced postages, allowances, travelling expenses etc. It had been hoped when re-organization of London was done in 1963 that there would be a reduction in administration costs. If the Council was formed larger than necessary there would be insufficient accommodation especially if there was widespread co-option or the attendance of staff as of right. All this would, and did, involve changes in the role of the elected member.

Mr Thorndike concluded by saying that if I found the proposal for 60 members acceptable he was sure the interested parties could get together quickly to produce an agreed warding scheme on that basis.

(b) The Borough Council through Alderman S Gelberg and Mr Hooper replied briefly to these points. The Council were not in fact increasing the size but reducing it by one. At present there were 60 councillors and 10 aldermen. When the Borough was formed there had been 109 councillors in the constituent authorities. Since then the work load had grown. There was general agreement on all sides of the Council that the number of 69 was necessary for the effective and efficient discharge of the Council's statutory functions and the proper representation of the electorate.

Inspections

In the early morning of Thursday 31st March 1977 I made an unaccompanied inspection of Uxbridge High Street including that part which is pedestrianised. At 10-0 a.m. on that day I made a lengthy tour of other parts of the Borough and was accompanied by representatives of the Council and the political parties, namely Mr W D Charles, Councillors J Watts and P Bush, Mrs M Bull, Miss B Potts, Mr R Bower and Mr A A Playfair. I was also joined by Councillors...
G Sullivan and G Booth for the Ruislip Church and Ruislip Manor areas.

Starting from the Civic Centre I went via Honeycroft Hill and Herciea Road to see the River Pinn, proceeded to the Tudor Way area and Long Lane in North Hillingdon and thence to Ruislip Church, Ruislip Manor Station and shopping centre. From there I went via West End Lane to the Yeading Brook and the footbridge spanning it and saw also the open recreational area. Thence down Coldharbour Lane to the junction of Station Road and North Hyde Road. From there to the various roads around London Airport, - High Street, Harlington, Harlington Corner (Bath Road) along the Bath Road to the Lipson Lane junction and on to the Hatch Lane junction, up Holloway Lane, under the M.4 and to Stockley Road near the Cherry Lane roundabout. Then to Horton Bridge over the canal and railway at West Drayton, and on to Swan Road junction with Station Road, then via Tavistock Road and Trout Road to the junction of High Street Yiewsley and Falling Lane and finally to the junction of West Drayton Road and Chapel Lane. The recital of this itinerary may be confusing but in a nutshell it means I visited many of the areas and boundaries under consideration and acquainted myself briefly with the different areas.

Assessment of weight of arguments.

Having heard all the arguments and expressions of view, carefully considered all that had been said, written and pointed out on maps, and finished my inspections I am now ready to consider the various problems involved and to reach the necessary conclusions. Some of the matters have a wider impact than a particular ward or constituency and to avoid unnecessary repetition I propose to deal with these matters in the next few paragraphs and then, if required, slot them into particular decisions.

Forecasts of Electorate

The forecast of electorate and the method by which it had been calculated had been accepted by the Labour, Conservative and Liberal parties but had been criticised by the Hillingdon Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations and by one or two individuals. All the parties had been put on notice by the Commission that I would be examining this matter closely. In fact at the hearing the forecasting methods were scarcely challenged and then only in a vague way with not a scrap of hard evidence. I can sympathise with Mr Harnott in trying to deal with the subject at short notice but I thought that such comment as did appear was neither lucidly expressed nor vigorously pursued. I got no more than figures without any supporting base and a mention of trends which was wholly unsupported. I had myself approached the matter with a slightly baffled air until I had heard Mr Schuman's clear exposition. It is not necessary for me to repeat the details which appear earlier in the report but I say here and now that I accept the methodology
and results as the best possible approach to a very tricky matter of population forecasts. The actual total figures show an increase in electorate in 1980 of 5,375. During the hearing I was given the 1977 electorate figure - this was 17,1896, an increase of 912 over the 1976 figures. This means that 27% of the growth figure has been achieved in one year and this augurs well for the soundness of the methods of calculation. Having disposed of the generality of this matter I now turn to one particular feature at the hearing when the growth figures for the Yeading ward were challenged because of the situation concerning the Willow Tree Lane development. Mr Charles and his colleagues argued this matter in a serious and responsible way with a genuine concern as to what was likely to happen. It would be discourteous of me if I did not give the subject the same attention. I listened most carefully to all the arguments and to bring myself right up to date obtained some figures and information from the Council. The land was the site of a tip and some question of contamination had arisen. The information given to me supports the view that the development of this area will proceed and that all necessary and proper measures will be taken to ensure this can happen. I also saw the Architect's programme of expected completions, and houses are likely to be handed over for occupation from 1979/80 onwards. Certainly I would agree that development will be slower than at first thought. I have no doubt that the land will be developed and a most unsightly area - once described as a lunar landscape - will be brought into proper form. I refrain from pursuing the various arguments about change of political control and consequent policy changes as I believe I should deal with the position as it now exists. The consequent conclusion is that there is no valid reason to reduce the number of Councillors for Yeading from three to two. The Order when made by the Secretary of State is likely to be in operation for many years.

Size of Council

The major political parties had thought that 69 members was the right number. The Borough Council Scheme and that of the Conservatives both used that figure. The Liberals only produced a scheme for Uxbridge Constituency which was slightly less for that constituency than the others. The Federation had produced a Scheme for 63 members and one or two people had merely suggested "a smaller Council". Mr H H Thorndike made a plea for a Council of 60 members. I deal with the Federation's Scheme in the next paragraph. So far as Council size is concerned it is very difficult for an outsider to say what is the right number. First I should say that the number of 69 is within the Commission's recommended scale and the suggested normal minimum of 2500 electors per councillor is achieved. Mr Thorndike considered a case for 69 members had not been made out and he wanted me to think of 60 as the right number. One of his arguments was that it was a costly exercise having
a Council larger than needed and a reduction in numbers would save money.
Such an argument cannot be faulted on pure arithmetic but it does not stand
up to the real tests of work load and effective representation. It would be
false economy to reduce the number of councillors to save a few hundred
pounds and cause an overload which could cost hundreds of thousands. The days
of Gladstonian economy by saving candle-ends are over. Another of his points
was that he thought electors would not mind whether they were one of 2500 or
2800. I would disagree - I think an elector would mind. There was some mild
comment that a figure of 2500 would only be achieved by 1980, and the figure
for 1975 was 2482. I do not attach any special magic to the figure of 2500;
it is no more than a useful guide and I have recommended for approval a figure
below 2500 for another London Borough. Finally so far as Mr. Thorndike is
concerned he is much more of an optimist than I am when he says that if 60
is settled as the right number there could be an agreed scheme produced
quickly. I very much doubt it and my experience leads me to say that there
would be another closely contested hearing in a few months time. For all
these reasons I cannot support him in his views.
Notwithstanding the general agreement on size I asked the Council to produce
details of the Committee Structure and appointments on outside bodies and
this they did. Normally when I am handed a great wad of information I treat
it with some well-concealed reserve. In this instance I was pleased to note
that the Council had itself purged the lists and were not making appointments
on quite a lot of outside bodies. Alderman Gelberg had pointed out that in
fact the size of the Council was being reduced by one. My conclusion is that
for a Council of the size and importance of Hillingdon, 69 members is not
too many.
It only remains for me to say in this paragraph a few words about one or two
letters which the Commission had received on size of Council and method of
warding. I did not have the benefit of hearing evidence on these matters
from the writers. All I need say is that I am satisfied with the size (69)
of the proposed Council. Some people had said that the proposals were
politically biased. I dismiss this suggestion as there was quite a large
measure of agreement between the major political parties. It is unrealistic
to think that when there is a party in control the views of that party should
not prevail. My impression of the whole proceedings was that all parties were
deeply concerned with Hillingdon as a whole, and not for any narrow political
gain.

Hillingdon Federation of Tenants and Residents Associations.
I reject this scheme for a number of reasons. First because I think 69 is
the right number and not 63. Secondly there was no detailed evidence that the
ward boundaries were better than other schemes. Finally the scheme did not
comply with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972 in that it did not show electorate forecasts for the succeeding five years.

Single member wards

There was a great deal of argument as to the advantages and disadvantages of single member wards. I have no need to repeat them here but merely to set out my views and conclusions on this point. In general I do not think single member wards are appropriate in a complex and closely built up area. Although on occasion I have approved single member wards, those have mainly been to link rural parishes together or to deal with isolated urban estates. There are in my view very considerable disadvantages in using single member wards in Hillingdon despite the provisions of Standing Orders and the "rallying round" idea. I am under the impression that both Labour and Conservatives on the Council were fairly well agreed on the avoidance of single member wards. I think Mr Charles found himself rather boxed in on this matter and his arguments were less emphatic than on other subjects. I deal with the particular wards concerned later on but now say I do not think single wards in Hillingdon are appropriate or suitable.

Primary Considerations.

When considering matters affecting an electoral review at this hearing I am bound to observe the statutory requirements of the Local Government Act 1972. The primary requirement is in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11—that the ratio of number of electors to councillors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward. This is mandatory. The other considerations in paragraph 3(3) as to boundaries and local ties are subordinate to the primary rule. All this means that I shall have to examine electoral ratios very closely and keep them constantly at the forefront of my mind. At this hearing, as at others, much evidence was given about schools, churches, natural and geographical boundaries, traffic censuses and such like. I note all these points but do have to say that people will not cease using their churches, schools or shopping and community facilities just because a ward boundary is in one place or another. There is no great Iron Curtain erected. I also treat with reserve matters about traffic control as electors do not troop daily across streets to reach polling stations.

Ward Names

There were a number of suggestions about ward names during the course of the hearing. None of these were really pushed hard and I do not propose to make any recommendations for change. The only place where a comment is needed is Heathrow and I deal with that in the appropriate place.

Ruislip Northwood Constituency

The only matter that I had to consider here was the proposal of the Conservative Associations that, for community reasons, the existing Ruislip
and Manor wards should be retained substantially as they are. They included a modification on the eastern boundary north of the Piccadilly line near Ruislip Manor Station. The effect of this proposal was to substitute two wards (Ruislip and Manor) each with three members for the Commission's three wards (Ruislip, St Martins and Manor) each with two members. I visited this area. The evidence given was completely contradictory, each side contending quite strongly that theirs was the better scheme and was good on the grounds of community, boundaries and history. I am not coming down on either side of the fence as to whether the community is a "village" or not. Unfortunately I am not helped in dealing with the matter by the electoral ratios. Although the Commission's figures are slightly, but only slightly, better in 1975 there is absolutely nothing to choose in 1980 - both are completely satisfactory. I considered both schemes well prepared, adequately documented and skillfully argued. At the end of the day I have to grasp the nettle and this I do by saying that the Commission's scheme should stand and I reject the Conservatives proposals. Nevertheless as was said on another occasion in 1815 it was a near run thing. Neither scheme was so markedly superior to the other as to make the choice an easy one. It may be cold comfort to the Conservatives if I say that had their proposals come before me as an original proposal I would have approved it.

59 Uxbridge Constituency

There are a number of matters to be considered here. The Borough Council want the Yiewsley and West Drayton wards as they proposed originally or with a further alteration and oppose the Commission's draft scheme. In this they are supported by the Labour Party. Councillor Watts had suggested a possible linking of Yiewsley and Colham wards. The Conservative Associations wanted Uxbridge North, Uxbridge South and Hillingdon North wards (each with two members) re-divided into two wards each with three members. The Liberals wanted a completely new scheme of 21 wards with 23 members. The Tudor Way Residents Association had some alterations to propose. I deal with all these in due order.

60 Yiewsley and West Drayton.

There are two questions here which are interdependent - have the right boundaries been chosen and is it right that there should be one councillor only for Yiewsley. My views on single member wards have been expressed in Paragraph 55 above, and they apply even with greater force to Yiewsley. I visited the area and found it as described - a tangled complex urban area bearing many marks of its early Victorian origins. By this I mean the ancient canal, broad swathe of main railway lines, old houses and businesses, and a series of tricky and awkward roads. It is an area of many problems, not least the industrial one, and not a ward which could be properly served.
by a single councillor. The alterations made by the Commission may have been to improve the shape of the ward but by doing this they have affected the community. I accept the arguments put forward by the Borough Council and the Labour Party that the community of interest runs north and south and is properly reflected in the Council's Scheme for this ward and for West Drayton. I also consider that the weight of argument was in favour of the Council's Scheme and against the Commission.

Finally I turn to the figures of electorate in the various schemes. These show, to my mind most strongly, that the Council's figures show a better and more even standard of representation, both in their original and alternative schemes. Taking for the sake of brevity the 1980 figures we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2878</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (alt)2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4733</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Drayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6927</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4941</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (alt)2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5072</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore for reasons of electoral equality, on community grounds, and for the avoidance of a single member ward, I shall make a formal recommendation in favour of the Council's scheme and against the Commission's draft proposals.

Yiewsley/Colham Wards.

In view of what I have said in paragraph 60 there remains very little to say on the suggestion of joining Yiewsley and Colham wards to form a three member ward.

This is really a non-starter so far as I am concerned. There was a weight of argument against it. Councillor Hawkins - a Conservative - had said there was little connection between the two wards. But even if I was not convinced on general grounds of the undesirability of the union then it would be killed stone dead by the electoral figures. I take 1980 figures only but the 1975 are even worse - electorate 6173, average 2724, entitlement 3.23. The average would be almost the highest in the Borough. I reject the proposal.

Uxbridge Constituency Liberal Association.

The proposal was for the division of the constituency into 21 wards returning 23 councillors. Thus 19 of the wards returned each only one councillor. The scheme had a number of features which made it unacceptable to me and I briefly outline them. Firstly I have already said what I think about single member wards and I would hate to see Uxbridge diced up into a lot of tiny wards. Secondly the proposal was not supported by the major political parties. Thirdly, the scheme, if grafted on to the draft proposals
for the other two constituencies would result in a smaller council - 67. Fourthly Uxbridge with 23 councillors (Liberal scheme) as against 25 (draft proposals). Fifthly the scheme would breach the parliamentary boundary by putting polling district PF (about 1400 electors) into Hayes South West with a consequent effect on that ward.

Mr Outhwaite presented the scheme in a cheerful and pleasant way but I doubt if he thought I would approve it. For the reasons set out above I reject the Liberal scheme.

Tudor Vav Residents Association.

Mr Harnott wanted to preserve together as much of the existing Hillingdon West ward as possible, although it was not clear to me at first how this was to be done. The draft proposals divided the present Hillingdon West ward between three proposed new wards - Uxbridge North, Hillingdon West and Hillingdon East. Mr Harnott did not seem particularly enamoured with the Conservatives alternative which I thought, before the meeting, went some way towards meeting his request. Finally at my request he marked up a plan showing precisely what he would like. The ward boundaries can be described as follows: bounded on the north by Western Avenue, on the east by Long Lane, on the south by Uxbridge Road and Hillingdon Hill and on the west by the River Pinn. I then asked Mr Playfair to produce electorate figures and considered these the following day. I have not the slightest hesitation in rejecting the proposal on a number of grounds. It materially affects other wards, it divides up RAF Station Uxbridge, which is a self contained unit and it produces an extremely poor electorate ratio. The following figures are self explanatory. The electorate of the proposed ward in 1975 is 3749 and in 1980, 4016, giving averages of 1874 and 2008 respectively (entitlements 1.51 and 1.58). So far as the proposed Hillingdon West ward is concerned the above scheme would reduce that ward by 1891 electors in 1975 and 2070 in 1980. For Uxbridge North the figures would be respectively losses of 1858 and 1946. Both wards would thus be seriously affected. Neither of the major political parties could support the proposal and as I have said above I reject it.

Conservative Associations alternative proposal.

The amendment can briefly be described as follows. The Conservatives had suggested that, on community grounds, the proposed Uxbridge North, Uxbridge South and Hillingdon North wards (2 members each) should be divided into two wards only - Uxbridge and Hillingdon North - each returning three members. I discovered when looking at the figures that there were some discrepancies between the figures supplied by the Conservatives and by the Council. I therefore asked Councillor Watts and Mr Playfair to meet and agree on the figures and they did so. The figures I use are therefore agreed. The difference arose very largely from an assumption by Mr Watts
that the whole of polling district LB was in the proposed Uxbridge North ward and available for transfer to Hillingdon North. In fact about 254 electors had been transferred to Hillingdon West by a change in the southern boundary of the polling district, which now runs along Court Drive but previously followed the footpath south of Court Drive, running from Long Lane to Vine Lane. I take the view that I must deal with the proposal as submitted to the meeting and illustrated on the plan produced by Mr Watts and not involve myself in matters affecting the boundaries of Hillingdon West ward. The arguments were detailed and comprehensive; once again they were completely contradictory both as to boundaries and community interest. I am left therefore to make some decision. My first conclusion is that Long Lane is a very good boundary at the west of Hillingdon North ward and encloses quite firmly the Oak Farm Estate. This boundary would suit the residents on that estate. The history of the wording of the Uxbridge area helped both sides but did not help me. I say this because pre-1965 Uxbridge North was divided by the High Street but it also had the River Pinn as its eastern boundary, although the boundary followed the River southwards and split the RAF Station. So far as Uxbridge High Street is concerned I consider this an excellent and ideal boundary and the fact that part of it is pedestrianised makes no difference to my views. The High Street—a busy regional shopping and commercial area—is just the sort of place I would expect to be a boundary. It combines its utility as a boundary with its function as a meeting place. I must not leave the question of boundaries without mentioning the River Pinn. If there were no other considerations I would say that the River might be used as a boundary. I notice however that the River runs blithely through other wards where it is not suggested as a boundary—for example Ickenham, Ruislip and Eastcote. It is also not considered as a barrier by the RAF whose Station is divided by the River. Turning now to the figures the position is as follows and I use only 1980 figures for the sake of brevity but the 1975 figures are of a similar pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4991</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5018</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservative alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8042</td>
<td>2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7122</td>
<td>2374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that there is not a great deal of difference between the figures but I would say the Commission's figures are just marginally better. Had I added in the part of LB (242 electors understated) and made a total
of 7364 for Hillingdon North the average would have been 2455 and the entitlement 2.90. For all the foregoing reasons I come down on the side of the Commission's Scheme. In rejecting the Conservatives alternative scheme I do so on the same considerations as in Ruislip - a very difficult choice but one that had to be made.

Hayes and Harlington Constituency.

There were a number of matters to be considered here. The Borough Council and the Labour Party wanted the Commission's Scheme for Hayes South East, Hayes South West and Heathrow wards replaced by their own scheme for Crane, Harlington and Heathrow. The Conservatives wanted all the wards (except Hayes South West and Heathrow) re-examined and alterations made. The Harlington Village Association wanted "Heathrow" to be called "South" or for it to be split into two wards (one member each) called Harlington and West Harmondsworth. The Hayes (South) Residents Association wanted six wards (each with one member) in the area. The single key to the whole complicated structure for the three Southern wards turns, in effect, on the type of decision I make with regard to the status of the M.4 as a boundary. I will deal with this first and all other things will neatly slot into place.

The M.4 Motorway.

I have no doubt that the weight of arguments were strongly against regarding the M.4 as a suitable or dominant boundary. Although the Conservatives accepted the Heathrow and Hayes South West wards there was no real argument specifically in favour of the M.4. The Borough Council, the Labour Party and quite a few local residents pressed strongly for the original scheme. I made a point of making a number of inspections in and around the area and saw all the road accesses which had been discussed. There is no question that the communications run north and south, as do the bus services. The motorway has not severed local communities and additionally pedestrian access has been provided to secure the preservation of the communities. I noted Mr Darling's graphic description of people trotting happily beneath the motorway to go to church and school. From the weight of evidence and from my own inspections I am firmly of the view that the M.4 motorway should not be regarded as the dominant feature in settling ward boundaries. With this point clearly established in my mind I now turn to a brief consideration of the three wards concerned.

Crane, Harlington and Heathrow wards.

I very much prefer the Borough Council's wards to those of the Commission and the weight of argument clearly supports me. The advantages of the Council's scheme can be mentioned: Harlington Village is united in one ward, little general disturbance is caused by the changes, Pinkwell Estate and Bell Farm estate are separated as I think they should be. Stockley Road is an excellent boundary, the villages of Sipson, Harmondsworth and
Longford are kept together with part of West Drayton with which there is a direct link. The proposed Heathrow ward is far too long and encompasses disparate community areas. These reasons alone would leave me in no doubt that the Council's Scheme is to be preferred but there is the additional and most important factor of electoral ratios which again support the Council. I take only the 1980 figures by way of illustration.

**Commission's Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayes S E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes S W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7471</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6130</td>
<td>3065</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council's Proposals**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5193</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7391</td>
<td>2463</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5279</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all the foregoing reasons I shall be recommending that the Council's proposals for these three wards should be substituted for those of the Commission. To tidy up a point I also reject the Conservative proposal for three councillors for Heathrow ward.

**Harlington Village Association**

This Association would be content with either proposal as the Village would be unified. They said that on balance they preferred the Commission's Scheme but I have already rejected that. They make a strong point about the name of Heathrow ward and want it called South ward. I reject this proposal on the grounds that Heathrow is the dominant feature of the ward and it would be senseless to ignore it. The Association also had suggested that if the principle of one-member wards was admitted, then Heathrow could be divided into two one-member wards called Harlington and West Harmonsworth. I reject this on three grounds: the boundary would slash down on an unidentifiable line right through the middle of the airport, one-member wards are not desirable, and the electoral ratios are hopelessly unbalanced - Harlington 3204 - entitlement 1.50, West Harmonsworth 2325 - entitlement 0.92.

**Hayes (South) Residents Association.**

This Association had suggested a number of alterations in the wards between the Uxbridge Road and the M.4. Their object was to reduce the size of the Council as well as keeping communities together. I reject the proposal for a number of reasons. Firstly one member wards are not desirable. Secondly the proposal did not project electorates to 1980. Thirdly the electoral ratios were very unbalanced - ranging from 3207 to 4521 per councillor. Fourthly it would result in a gross under-representation of Hayes - 6 councillors instead of 12. Finally no evidence was produced to indicate that the suggested boundaries were better than the draft proposals.

**Conservative Associations Alterations.**

The Conservatives had proposed a number of alterations to the proposed
wards of Botwell, Charville, Barnhill, Yeading, Townfield, Wood End and Hayes South East. Their arguments were based on the use of natural boundaries such as the Uxbridge Road and Yeading Brook and on community grounds. Mr Charles said, very fairly, that the proposals were closely linked and had ripple effects throughout. I agree, it was really a matter of all or none. Here again no figures had been provided but I got an agreed set after discussions between Councillor Watts and Mr Playfair. Speaking generally these figures were very close to those provided originally in the Conservatives main alternative scheme. The discussion on the Conservative amendments raged fast and furious and I am grateful to Mr Bower (Conservative) and Mr Burlton (Labour) for a reasoned and detailed argument. I listened with bated breath as the details of every road, community and brook were hotly contested - no avenue was left unexplored. The arguments were quite fairly balanced but I am going to reject the proposed amendments on the grounds of electoral equality. The Commission's draft proposals show a much more even spread. An extract of some of the details for 1980 is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frogmore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7667</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8181</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6587</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8295</td>
<td>2765</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservative Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission's Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also reject, as already indicated, the suggestion that Yeading ward members should be reduced to two.
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Recommendations.

I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals for a Council of 69 members elected from 29 wards be approved subject to the following modifications :-

(1) The Commission's proposed wards of Yiewsley and West Drayton be replaced by those proposed by the Council in their original scheme.

(2) If the above is not accepted then the Council's alternative scheme for the two wards replace those of the Commission.
(3) The Commission's proposed wards of Hayes South East, Hayes South West and Heathrow be replaced by the wards of Cranes, Harlington and Heathrow as shown in the Council's original scheme.

I am, Sir

Your obedient Servant,

[Signature]

L J SLOCOMBE
Assistant Commissioner

12th April 1977
# Schedule 2

## London Borough of Hillingdon: Names of Wards and Numbers of Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ward</th>
<th>No of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanchill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botwell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarke</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charville</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearnfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastcote</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harefield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon West</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ickenham</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Hills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruislip</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townfield</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Drayton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood End</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiewsley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

HEATHROW WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the M4 Motorway, thence eastwards along said motorway to Sipson Road, thence north-westwards along said road to Station Road, thence north-westwards along said road to the road known as Porters Way, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of the RAF Station, thence northwards to and along said western boundary and continuing northwards along the eastern boundary of the Helical Gear Works and in prolongation thereof to the Reading to Paddington railway, thence south-eastwards along said railway to a point opposite the western boundary of the Government offices, thence south-westwards to and generally south-westwards along said western boundary to Stockley Road, thence south-westwards along said road to the M4 motorway, leading to Heathrow Airport thence southwards along said motorway to Bath Road thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of Argonaut House, thence south-eastwards to and along said western boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards, southwards, north-westwards and northwards following the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the Borough to the point of commencement.

WEST DRAYTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Heathrow Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence north-eastwards and north-westwards along said Borough boundary to the footbridge crossing the River Colne connecting Ford Lane and Packet Boat Lane, thence eastwards along said bridge and south-eastwards along the footpath to and north-eastwards along Packet Boat Lane to the Grand Union Canal, thence south-eastwards along said canal to a point opposite the north-western boundary of the River Pinn Works, thence
northeastwards to and along said northwestern boundary and southeastwards and generally northeastwards along the perimeter fence between the Aluminium Warehouse and the Refrigeration Works to High Street, Yiewsley thence south eastwards and southwestwards along said street to Station Road, thence generally southeastwards along said road to Church Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 1 West Drayton Park Avenue, thence southeastwards to and generally southeastwards along said northeastern boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 3-35 in said avenue thence eastwards and southwards along said rear boundaries and continuing southwards along the eastern boundary of No 45 West Drayton Park Avenue to the northern boundary of No 47 West Drayton Park Avenue, thence eastwards along said northern boundary to the western boundary of the Youth Centre, thence southwards along said western boundary and generally eastwards along the southern boundary of said Youth Centre to Harmondsworth Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Heathrow Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

YIEWSLEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Heathrow Ward meets the eastern boundary of West Drayton Ward thence northwards and generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwestwards along High Road to the River Pinn, thence northeastwards along said river to a point due west of the intersection of the western and rear boundaries of No 70 Heather Lane, thence due eastwards to said intersection and continuing eastwards along the rear boundary of said property and the rear boundaries of Nos 72-78 Heather Lane to the access road leading to Leacroft Close, thence southwards along said access road and Leacroft Close to Falling Lane, thence generally eastwards along said lane to Kingston Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 8 Elm Grove, thence eastwards to and along said southern boundary, the southern end of Elm Grove, the southern boundary of No 7 Elm Grove, the
southern boundary of No 36 Chestnut Avenue and the southern boundary of No 59 Chestnut Avenue to the easternmost point of said property, thence north-eastwards in a straight line to the junction of Chapel Lane, Gould's Green and Stockley Road, thence generally southwards along Stockley Road to the northern boundary of Heathrow Ward thence north-westwards and generally southwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

COLHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Yiewsley Ward meets the River Finn, thence north-eastwards along said river to a point being the prolongation southwestwards of the northern boundaries of the properties on the northern side of the road known as The Coppice, thence north-eastwards to and along said northern boundaries from Nos 134-2 The Coppice, the northern boundary of the garages adjacent to No 2 The Coppice and the northern boundary of No 39 Royal Lane to Royal Lane, thence northwards along said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of Hillingdon Hospital, thence south-eastwards to and south-eastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary and north-eastwards along the southern boundary of Lansdown Cottage to Colham Green Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to Moorcroft Lane, thence north-eastwards and north-westwards along said lane to Field Heath Road, thence north-eastwards along said road to Harlington Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to West Drayton Road, thence south-eastwards and north-eastwards along said road to Corwell Lane, thence south-westwards along said lane and Gould's Green to the northern boundary of Yiewsley Ward, thence westwards and north-westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

COWLEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of West Drayton Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards along said borough boundary to The Culvert, thence eastwards and north-eastwards along said Culvert
to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the Joinery Works situated to
the southeast of The Culvert thence southeastwards to and along said eastern
boundary and the northeastern boundary of the Fencing Works adjacent to the
said Joinery Works, to a point being the prolongation southwestwards of the
southern boundary of the Electricity Sub Station, thence northeastwards to
and along said southern boundary to the rear boundary of No 42 Cowley Mill
Road, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries
of Nos 41 and 40 Cowley Mill Road and northeastwards along the southeastern
boundary of No 40 Cowley Mill Road to Cowley Mill Road, thence southeastwards
along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 35 Cowley Mill
Road, thence southwards to and along said western boundary and eastwards,
southwards and eastwards along the southern boundary of said property to
Wallingford Road, thence northwards along said road to Cowley Mill Road,
thence eastwards along said road to the access road to the Gas Works west of
the Public House, No 34 Cowley Mill Road, thence southwards along said access
road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 34 Cowley Mill Road, thence
eastwards to and along said rear boundary and eastwards and northeastwards
along the rear boundaries of Nos 33-1 Cowley Mill Road to Cowley Mill Road,
thence eastwards along said road and northeastwards along Chiltern View Road
to Whitehall Road, thence southeastwards along said road and southwards along
Cleveland Road to Station Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the
road known as Nursery Lane to the south of Burnel University, thence north-
eastwards along said unnamed road to the River Pinn, thence southwards along
said river and the western boundary of Colham Ward and southwestwards
along the northwestern boundary of Yiewsley Ward to the northeastern boundary
of West Drayton Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along the
northeastern and northern boundaries of said ward to the point of commence-
ment.
HILLINGDON WEST WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Colham Ward meets the eastern boundary of Cowley Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary and northwestwards along Whitehall Road to a point being the prolongation westwards of the rear boundary of No 19 Orchard Waye, thence eastwards along said prolongation and said rear boundary and continuing eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 20-33 Orchard Waye, the northern boundary of the Builder's Yard situated to the north of Nos 34 to 34b Orchard Waye and the northern boundary of No 34 Hillingdon Road to Hillingdon Road, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said road to Park Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Honeycroft Hill, thence northeastwards and southeasterwards along said hill to Vine Lane, thence southwesterns and southeasterwards along said lane to Court Drive, thence northeastwards and southeasterwards along said drive to Long Lane, thence southwesterns and southwestwards along said lane to Uxbridge Road, thence southwesterns along said road to Lees Road, thence southwesterns along said road to Harlington Road, thence southwesterns along said road to the northern boundary of Colham Ward, thence generally southwestwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

UXBRIDGE SOUTH WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Cowley Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said Borough boundary to Oxford Road, thence southwesterns along said road to a point being the northwesterly prolongation of High Street, thence southeasterwards along said prolongation and High Street to and southeasterwards, southwesterns, westwards and southeasterwards along the western boundary of Hillingdon West Ward to the northern boundary of Cowley Ward, thence generally westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
UXBRIDGE NORTH WARD
Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Uxbridge South Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said borough boundary to Western Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to Long Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to the northern boundary of Hillingdon West Ward, thence westwards, northwards, westwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the northeastern boundary of Uxbridge South Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ICKENHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Uxbridge North Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said borough boundary to the Marylebone-Birmingham railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway to the Metropolitan-Piccadilly railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to Austin's Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane and continuing along the track to Yeading Brook, thence southwestwards along said brook to Western Avenue, thence northwestwards along said avenue and the northern boundary of Uxbridge North Ward to the point of commencement.

HAREFIELD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Ickenham Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and northwards along said western boundary and eastwards and southeastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to Jackets Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the footpath leading southwestwards from said lane to Northwood Road keeping to the south of Battlers Wells Wood, thence southwestwards along said path to the stream that flows southwards through Scarlet Spring and the Dell, thence south eastwards, southwards and southwestwards along said stream to Breakspear Road North, thence southeastwards along said road and continuing along Breakspear Road South to Tile Kilns Lane, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said lane to the footpath leading southeastwards from said lane to Clack Lane,
thence southeastwards along said path to Clack Lane, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said lane to the Canal Feeder that runs from Clack Lane southwards across Ruislip Golf Course to High Road, thence southwards and southwestwards along said feeder to the northern boundary of Ickenham Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTHWOOD WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Harefield Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said northern boundary and southwards along the eastern boundary of the Borough to Hillside Road, thence northwestwards along said road, Northwood Way and Green Lane to the Metropolitan railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 22 Highland Road, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 24-96 Highland Road to the rear boundary of No 39 Cranbourne Road, thence northwestwards along said rear boundary and northwestwards and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 41-79 Cranbourne Road and southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of St Vincent's Hospital to the path that leads from said hospital across Park Wood to Kings College Road, thence southwestwards along the said footpath to a point at grid reference TQ 0915389596, thence southwestwards in a straight line to a point on the path that runs between Reservoir Road and Ducks Hill Road at grid reference TQ 0859389533, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said path to Ducks Hill Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of Mad Bess' Wood, thence southwestwards to and along said northern boundary and the western boundary of said wood to the eastern boundary of Harefield Ward, thence northwestwards, northeastwards and northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.
RUISLIP WARD

Commencing at a point where the River Pinn crosses the eastern boundary of Harefield Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Northwood Ward, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary to the footpath that runs to King's College Road, thence southwards, southwestwards, and southeastwards along said footpath across Park Wood and along the said road to Eastcote Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of the Works in Highgrove Way, thence southeastwards to and along said northeastern boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 3-41 Highgrove Way, the eastern boundary of No 37 Warrender Way, the eastern end of Warrender Way and the eastern boundary of No 46 Warrender Way to the rear boundary of the last mentioned property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 44-2 Warrender Way to the rear boundary of No 27 The Ridgeway, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 29-47 The Ridgeway to Hawtrey Drive, thence northwestwards along said drive crossing The Ridgeway, to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 24 Old Hatch Manor, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundaries and the rear boundaries of Nos 22-10 Old Hatch Manor to the rear boundary of No 29 Windmill Hill thence northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 29 and 27 Windmill Hill and thence northeastwards, northwestwards, and southwestwards along the southern, eastern, and northern boundaries of No 25 Windmill Hill crossing Windmill Hill and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 24-8 West Hatch Manor and northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 4 and 2 West Hatch Manor and continuing northwestwards along the western boundary of No 2 West Hatch Manor to the road known as West Hatch Manor, thence southwestwards along said road to Manor Way, thence northwestwards along said way to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 58 Manor Way, thence southwestwards to and along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of the property known as Leaholme, thence generally southwestwards,
northwestwards and northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1-12 Manor Close and southeastwards along the northern boundary of No 12 Manor Close to Manor Close, thence northeastwards along said close to Manor Way, thence northwestwards along said Way and southwestwards along the road known as Midcroft to a point opposite the western boundary of No 4 Midcroft, thence northwestwards to and along said western boundary southwestwards along the southern boundary of the Church Field Gardens and northwestwards along the western boundary of said gardens and the eastern boundary of St Martin's Church (C of E) to Eastcote Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Bury Street, thence northwestwards along said street to the River Pinn, thence southwestwards along said river to the point of commencement.

NORTHWOOD HILLS WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Ruislip Ward meets the southern boundary of Northwood Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and northeastwards, northwestwards and southeastwards along the southeastern boundary of Northwood Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards and southeastwards along said borough boundary to a point opposite the northern boundary of the property known as Thatched Cottage, Cuckoo Hill, thence southwestwards to and along said northern boundary, southeastwards and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 42-26 Raisins Hill and southwestwards along the southern boundary of No 78 Catlin's Lane to Catlin's Lane, thence northwards along said lane to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 2 Wrenwood Way, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 4-24 Wrenwood Way, the rear boundary of No 9 Selway Close and the southern boundary of No 10 Selway Close and continuing southwestwards along the southern boundaries of the property and land to the west of No 10 Selway Close to the footpath that runs between Wrenwood Way and the rear of No 20 Chamberlain Lane, thence westwards and northwestwards along said footpath to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 106 Haydon Drive, thence
southwestwards to and along said northern boundary and the northern boundaries of Nos 114, 138-148 and 45-51 Haydon Drive to Joel Street, thence southeastwards along said street to a point opposite the path leading from Joel Street to the rear boundary of No 54 Wiltshire Lane, thence southwestwards to and along said path to said rear boundary, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 52-44 Wiltshire Lane and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of No 44 Wiltshire Lane to Wiltshire Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the northern boundary of the property known as Cherry Cottage, thence southwestwards to and along said northern boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 1-11 Egerton Close to the western boundary of No 11 Egerton Close, thence southwards along said western boundary, the western end of Egerton Close and the western boundary of No 20 Egerton Close to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 38 Coniston Gardens, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 40-70 Coniston Gardens to the western boundary of No 70 Coniston Gardens, thence southwards along said western boundary to Coniston Gardens, thence westwards along said gardens to Fore Street, crossing said street to the eastern boundary of parcel number 0003 on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 10-1189 Edition 1960, at grid reference TQ 1003489005 thence southwestwards in a straight line to the northern most point of No 7 Dormywood, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 7-4 Dormywood, and the rear boundaries of Nos 122-92 Broadwood Avenue to the eastern boundary of Ruislip Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

EASTCOTE WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Ruislip Ward meets the southern boundary of Northwood Hills Ward, thence northeasterwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said borough boundary to the Metropolitan and Piccadilly railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway line to Field End Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Elm Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue
to Lime Grove, thence northwestwards along said Grove to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 2 Myrtle Avenue, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 4 and 6 Myrtle Avenue, thence in a straight line to the rear boundary of No 14 Myrtle Avenue, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of No 16 Myrtle Avenue to the rear boundary of the said property, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 16-60 Myrtle Avenue continuing along the northern boundary of the plot of land west of No 60 Myrtle Gardens and the rear boundary of No 17 The Uplands, and crossing the footpath to the rear boundary of No 4 College Drive, thence northwestwards along said rear boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 6-32 College Drive and thence northwestwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of Ruislip Ward to the point of commencement.

ST MARTINS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Ickenham Ward meets the eastern boundary of Harefield Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Ruislip Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Eastcote Ward, thence southeastwards along said western boundary and the eastern boundary of No 15 The Uplands to the road known as The Uplands, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the footpath that leads between No 14 The Uplands and No 55 Myrtle Avenue, thence southeastwards to and along said path, crossing Acacia Avenue, and Elm Avenue, to the Metropolitan and Piccadilly railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to a point being the prolongation northwestwards of the western boundary of No 3 Willow Grove, thence southeastwards to and along said western boundary to Willow Grove, thence northeastwards along said grove to a point opposite the western boundary of No 2 Willow Grove, thence southeastwards to and along said western boundary and the western boundary of No 132 Shenley Avenue, to Shenley Avenue, thence northeastwards along said avenue to Cranley Drive, thence southeastwards along said drive to
a point opposite the northern boundary of No 1 Cranley Drive, thence north-eastwards to and along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 3-21 Cranley Drive, the eastern end of Grosvenor Vale and the rear boundaries of Nos 23-45 Cranley Drive to the rear boundary of No 10 Denbigh Close, thence northeasteastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundary of No 9 Denbigh Close to the rear boundary of No 95 Cornwall Road, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 93-1 Cornwall Road to the western boundary of No 1 Cornwall Road, thence southeastwards along said western boundary to Cornwall Road, thence southwestwards along said road crossing West End Road to the southern boundary of No 202 West End Road, thence southwestwards along said southern boundary and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 216-170 Herlwyn Avenue to the eastern boundary of No 168 Herlwyn Avenue, thence due southwestwards from said point to the Marylebone-Birmingham Railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway and the northern boundary of Ickenham Ward to the point of commencement.

MÄNÖR WARD

Commencing at a point where Marylebone-Birmingham Railway line meets the eastern boundary of St Martins Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the footpath that leads southeastwards between No 111 and No 113 Linden Avenue, thence southeastwards along said footpath crossing Linden Avenue, Chelston Road and continuing southeastwards along
said footpath to the west of Bourne Secondary Modern School and Bessingby Fields crossing Whitby Road to and along the access road southwest of No 82 Whitby Road and in prolongation thereof to Yeading Brook, thence south-westwards along said brook to the Marylebone-Birmingham Railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

CAVENDISH WARD
Commencing at a point where Yeading Brook meets the eastern boundary of Manor Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of St Martins Ward to the southern boundary of Eastcote Ward, thence northeastwards and following said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the borough, thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary to Yeading Brook, thence southwestwards along said brook to the point of commencement.

DEANSFIELD WARD
Commencing at a point where Marylebone-Birmingham Railway line meets the southeastern boundary of Manor Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Cavendish Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said borough boundary to Malvern Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Field End Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 323 Long Drive, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 321-225 Long Drive, and continuing along the northern boundary of Deane Park and the rear boundaries of Nos 191-177 Long Drive crossing Queens Walk and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 175-81 Long Drive and the northwestern boundary of Queensmead County Secondary Modern School to the northeastern boundary of No 63 Long Drive, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said boundary, the rear boundaries of numbers 61 to 53 Long Drive and the southeastern boundary of Kelvedon Court to Victoria Road, thence northwestwards along
said road to Long Drive, thence southwestwards along said drive to the Marylebone-Birmingham Railway line, thence northwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

BOURNE WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets Yeading Brook (southwest of Westways Farm) thence northwards and generally northwestwards along said brook to the eastern boundary of Ickenham Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of St Martins Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary and the southwestern boundary of Manor Ward and southeastwards and northeastwards along the southwestern and southeastern boundaries of Deansfield Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

HILLINGDON NORTH WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Uxbridge North Ward meets the southern boundary of Ickenham Ward thence southeasterwards along said southern boundary and the southwestern boundary of Bourne Ward to a point opposite the drain being the southern boundary of parcel No 7600 on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 08-0983 Edition of 1965, thence northwards to, and northwards and southwestwards along said drain to the southern boundary of parcel number 6200, thence generally southwards along said boundary and the southern boundaries of parcels Nos 3600, 3073, 1268, 9760 and 7753 and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of the Piggery to the western boundary of said piggery thence southeasterwards along said boundary to Gainsborough Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of parcel number 5729 thence northwards to and along said boundary, the southwestern boundary of parcel number 5335 and the southwestern boundary of parcel No 4348 to the western most point of said parcel, thence northwards in a straight line to Sutton Court Road, thence
northwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Uxbridge North Ward, thence northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HILLINGDON EAST WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Colham Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Colham Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the eastern boundary of Hillingdon West Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Uxbridge North Ward to the southern boundary of Hillingdon North Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary to NG Ref TQ 0846783214, thence southwestwards in a straight line to and southwestwards along the access road to the piggery, thence continuing southwestwards and southwards along Pole Hill Road to Charville Lane, thence eastwards along said lane to a point opposite the western boundary of parcel No 3481 on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 08-0982 Edition of 1965, thence generally southwards along said western boundary and southwards along the western boundary of parcel No 3858 to Mellow Lane East, thence northwestwards along said lane to Hewens Road, thence southwards and southeastwards along said road to Uxbridge Road, thence southeastwards along said road to West Drayton Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

WOOD END WARD

Commencing at a point where Harlington Road meets the southeastern boundary of Colham Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary and the eastern boundary of Hillingdon East Ward to Mellow Lane East, thence southeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of the Heinz Offices, thence eastwards to and along said boundary to the path leading to Mead House Lane, thence southwestwards along said path to a point opposite the northern
boundary of No 12 Mead House Lane, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and northeastwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along the northwestern, northeastern and southeastern boundaries of the property known as The Paddocks Farm, to NG Ref TQ 089882185, thence due southwards to the northern boundary of Hayes Park Hostel, thence eastwards along said boundary, southeastwards and generally southwestwards along the eastern boundary of said hostel and westwards along southern boundary of said hostel to Hayes End Road, thence southwards along said road to Uxbridge Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the access way between No 535 and No 533 Uxbridge Road, thence southwestwards along said access way to Grange Close, thence southwestwards along said close and Queens Road to Wood End Green Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Botwell Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Barra Hall Circus, thence westwards and southwestwards along said Barra Hall Circus to Judge Heath Lane, thence westwards along said lane to a point opposite the western boundary of Marriner Court, thence southwards to and southwestwards along said western boundary and southwestwards and northwesterns along the eastern and southern boundaries of the lockup garages on the eastern side of Voltaire Way to Voltaire Way, thence northwards along said way to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 1 Judge Heath Lane, thence westwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 3-61 Judge Heath Lane to the western boundary of No 61 Judge Heath Lane, thence northwards along said western boundary to the southwestern boundary of No 63 Judge Heath Lane, thence northwesterns along said boundary to Beechwood Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 65 Judge Heath Lane, thence southwestwards to and along said southwestern boundary and the eastern boundary of No 69 Judge Heath Lane to the rear boundary of last mentioned property, thence westwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 71-101 Judge Heath Lane to the western boundary of No 101 Judge Heath Lane, thence northwards along said western boundary to Judge Heath Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Princess Park Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Dawley Road, thence northwestwards along said road and Harlington Road to the point of commencement.
CHARVILLE WARD

Commencing at a point where Lansbury Drive meets Uxbridge Road, thence north-westwards along said road and generally north-westwards along the northern boundary of Wood End Ward to the eastern boundary of Hillingdon East Ward, thence northwards and north-eastwards along said eastern boundary and generally north-eastwards along the southern boundary of Hillingdon North Ward to the western boundary of Bourne Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally south-eastwards along said boundary and continuing southwards along Yeading Brook to a point opposite the north-western boundary of Parcel No 3500 on OS 1:2500 plan Tq 10/1182 Edition of 1971, thence south-westwards to and along said boundary and south-eastwards along the south-western boundary of said parcel to the south-eastern boundary of the unnamed property to the south of No 4 Pine Place, thence south-westwards along said boundary to the north-eastern boundary of Grange Park Primary School, thence south-eastwards along said boundary and south-westwards and north-westwards along the south-eastern and southern boundaries of said school to the north-eastern boundary of No 101 Gledwood Drive, thence north-westwards, south-westwards and south-eastwards along the north-western, south-western and south-eastern boundaries of said property to the rear boundary of No 99 Gledwood Drive, thence southwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of No 202 Balmoral Drive to Balmoral Drive, thence north-westwards along said drive to Lansbury Drive, thence south-westwards along said drive to the point of commencement.

BARNHILL WARD

Commencing at a point where Uxbridge Road meets the eastern boundary of Charville Ward, thence generally north-eastwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence south-eastwards along said Borough boundary to Yeading Lane, thence south-westwards along said lane to Uxbridge Road, thence north-westwards along said road to the point of commencement.
YEADING WARD

Commencing at a point where Dorchester Waye meets the eastern boundary of Barnhill Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said eastern boundary to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 56 Camden Avenue, thence northwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 54-2 Camden Avenue to the western boundary of No 2 Camden Avenue, thence northeastwards along said western boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 1-6 Cambrook Court thence northeastwards along said rear boundaries and in prolongation thereof to Brookside Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Dorchester Waye, thence northwestwards along said way to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 159 Dorchester Waye, thence northeastwards to and along said eastern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 157-3 Dorchester Waye to the northwestern boundary of No 3 Dorchester Waye, thence southwestwards along said boundary to Dorchester Waye, thence northwestwards along said waye to the point of commencement.

TOWNFIELD WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Yeading Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said borough boundary to a point being the prolongation southeastwards of Pump Lane thence northeastwards along said prolongation and said lane to Coldharbour Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Botwell Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Central Avenue, thence generally northeastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 49 Central Avenue, thence northwards to and along said southern boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 13 and 14 Sixth Avenue and northwards northwards northwards and northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 13-2 Fifth Avenue to Townfield Road, thence northwards along said road to Church Road, thence northwards along said road to Freemans Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane and Barra Hall
Circus to the eastern boundary of Wood End Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Charville Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing southeastwards and northeastwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of Barnhill Ward to the southwestern boundary of Yeading Ward, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary to the point of commencement.

BOTWELL WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets North Hyde Road, thence generally northwestwards along said road to NG reference TQ 0922479382, thence due northwards to Keith Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Dawley Road, thence northwards along said road to the Paddington-Reading Railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Yiewsley Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Colham Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of said ward to the southern boundary of Wood End Ward, thence southeastwards, northwards and eastwards along said southern boundary to the southwestern boundary of Townfield Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of said ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CRANE WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Botwell Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and westwards along said Borough boundary to the eastern boundary of Heathrow Ward, thence northwards and westwards along said ward boundary to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the Ariel Hotel, thence northwards to and along said eastern boundary to the northeastern corner of said property, thence northeastwards in a straight line to NG reference TQ 0918178357 being a point on Harlington Bridge where it crosses the M4 motorway, thence northeastwards along High Street and Station Road to the southern boundary of Botwell Ward, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
HARLINGTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Botwell Ward meets the western boundary of Crane Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Heathrow Ward, thence westwards, northwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Botwell Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.