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

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

3. The Tower Hamlets Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of
representation for our consideration. When doing so they were asked to observe
the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the
guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size
of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were
also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their
consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish
details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their
draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.
4. On 15 December 1975, Tower Hamlets Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 19 wards, each returning 2 or 3 members to form a council of 50.

5. We studied the draft scheme submitted by the Borough Council, together with the comments we had received from a local political association, a residents' association and a local parochial church council suggesting alternative arrangements in the north-eastern area of the borough in order to preserve local ties. We noted that the draft scheme was uneven in terms of equality of representation and that the suggestions which had been made offered no improvement. We considered amendments to 10 wards and decided that a more even standard of representation would be achieved by the adoption of the following modifications:
   i. the allocation of 3 councillors instead of 2 to the Bow ward;
   ii. the allocation of 2 councillors instead of 3 to the Globe ward;
   iii. the transfer of an area bordering the Grand Union Canal from St James' ward to Park ward and increasing the representation of the latter by 1 councillor;
   iv. the transfer of an area bordering Brady Street from Holy Trinity ward to St Peter's ward;
   v. the transfer of an area bordering Tarling Street from Shadwell ward to St Katharine's ward; and
   vi. the replacement of the suggested 3-member Redcoat and St Dunstan's wards by 2 new wards to be known as Redcoat and St Dunstan's returning 2 and 3 members respectively.

6. Subject to the modifications referred to in paragraph 5 above and to minor alterations in ward boundaries recommended by the Ordnance Survey, we decided that the Borough Council's draft scheme would provide a satisfactory basis for the future electoral arrangements of the borough in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.
7. On 24 November 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter and to those who had commented on the draft scheme. The Borough Council were asked to make our draft proposals and the accompanying map which defined the ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 28 January 1977.

8. Tower Hamlets Borough Council objected to all the modifications which we had introduced in formulating our draft proposals and reaffirmed their wish for their draft scheme.

9. We received objections to our proposed Globe ward from a local political association and a residents' association, who reiterated their earlier comments suggesting alternative arrangements in the north-eastern area of the borough, and from another residents' association and a tenants' association.

10. 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 S Astin, MBE, was appointed as Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at the Town Hall, Bethnal Green, on 18 May 1977. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

11. At this meeting the Borough Council, after further consideration in the light of the representational requirements of the Act, withdrew their objection to our draft proposals except for the proposed east-west division between St. Dunstans ward and Redcoat ward, for which the Assistant Commissioner, after discussion and inspection of the area, suggested alternative arrangements providing for a north/south division. In the Medway Road area, for which our draft proposals adopted the scheme submitted by the Borough Council, the
Assistant Commissioner, after discussion and inspection, accepted the validity of objections to the proposed Globe ward on the grounds of lack of local cohesion and the division of the ward by physical barriers (a canal, a major lorry route and a strip of cleared land) running east/west; and he recommended the replacement of Globe ward by the following pattern of wards, the total number of councillors being unchanged:

(i) the transfer of an area bordering Brady Street from St Peter's ward to Spitalfields ward;

(ii) the transfer of an area bordering Cambridge Heath Road from Holy Trinity ward to St Peter's ward;

(iii) the transfer of the western part of the Globe ward into the Holy Trinity ward and increasing the representation of the latter by 1 councillor;

(iv) the transfer of the eastern part of the Globe ward into a new ward named "Grove";

(v) the transfer of an area bordering Roman Road from Park ward to the new Grove ward and reducing the representation of the former by 1 councillor;

(vi) the transfer of an area bordering Mile End Road from Bow ward to the new Grove ward.

For the rest of the Borough, the Assistant Commissioner recommended the confirmation of our draft proposals.

12. 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 recommendations put forward by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.
13. 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

14. 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 Tower Hamlets Borough Council and will be available for 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.

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

14 July 1977
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

Review of electoral arrangements - London Borough of Tower Hamlets

In accordance with the instructions contained in the Commission's letter of 13th April 1977, I conducted a Local Meeting as Assistant Commissioner at the Town Hall, Patriot Square, London, E.2. on Wednesday, 18th May, 1977 to hear and discuss representations with regard to the future electoral arrangements in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

1. ATTENDANCES

I attach as Appendix "A" a list showing the names and addresses of the persons attending the meeting.

2. COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

The Commission's Draft Proposals for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets set out in the Commission's letter to the Council of 24th November 1976 proposed 19 wards returning 50 Councillors (12 wards each returning 3 Councillors and 7 wards each returning 2 Councillors).

In considering and formulating the Draft Proposals the Commission had before them:

(a) The Draft Scheme submitted by the London Borough Council which also suggested 19 wards returning 50 Councillors (12 wards each returning 3 Councillors and 7 wards each returning 2 Councillors);

(b) Comments from the Bethnal Green and Bow Liberal Association, objecting to the proposed Park Ward, Bow Ward and Globe Ward and suggesting alternative proposals for this particular area of the Borough;

(c) Comments from the Mile End Old Town Residents Association, objecting to the proposed Globe Ward and submitting alternative proposals for two wards to be created east of Grove Road; and

(d) Comments from the Rev. A. R. Royall, on behalf of the Bow Team Ministry, objecting to the proposed Globe Ward and suggesting that the area east of Regent's Canal and bounded on the north by Old Ford Road, on the east by St. Stephens Road and Coborn Road and on the south by Bow Road, should be brought together to form a new ward.

The information submitted to the Commission by the London Borough Council showed a considerable decline of population and electorate since 1970 but suggested a total 1980 electorate some 12,000 more than the 1975 electorate. The Council had estimated the 1980 electorate on the basis of planned development of likely new dwelling units in the Borough and, whilst the Commission were somewhat sceptical about this largely increased figure, they had indicated that they were prepared to accept these figures at least as an indication of the likely distribution of the electorate between wards.

The Council's Draft Scheme envisaged a new Council of 50 members (this was considered to be appropriate for Tower
Hamlets, as one of the smaller London Boroughs, and 50 members was at the bottom of the range of 50-70 adopted by the Commission for London) but the Draft Scheme was considered by the Commission to provide an uneven standard of representation. The Commission were able, however, to make a number of modifications, improving the equality of representation, these modifications being as follows:-

(i) The allocation of 3 Councillors (instead of 2) to Bow Ward;
(ii) The allocation of 2 Councillors (instead of 3) to Globe Ward;
(iii) A boundary re-alignment between St. James' Ward and Park Ward and an increase in the representation of Park Ward from 2 to 3 Councillors;
(iv) A boundary re-alignment between Holy Trinity Ward and St. Peter's Ward;
(v) A boundary re-alignment between Shadwell Ward and St. Katherine's Ward; and
(vi) The re-drawing of the 3 members Redcoat Ward and the 3 members St. Dunstan's Ward with the new Redcoat Ward returning only 2 Councillors and the new St. Dunstan's Ward returning 3 Councillors.

The Commission had also considered the representations which had been made (as listed above) but in each case felt that the suggestions provided wards with an unacceptable standard of representation. The Commission therefore decided to adopt the Council's Draft Scheme as a basis for the Draft Proposals, subject to the modifications listed above and to minor boundary alterations recommended by Ordnance Survey in the interests of technically better boundaries.

3. OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS received before Local Meeting

- From the Chief Executive of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets stating that the Council did not accept the amendments proposed by the Commission and wished to adhere to its own proposed ward boundaries because of their historical background and logical lines, and took particular exception to the proposed boundary changes affecting St. Dunstan's Ward and Redcoat Ward.

- From Mr. Eric Flounders, Chairman of Bethnal Green and Bow Liberal Association, again objecting to the proposed new Globe Ward and suggesting that the area east of Grove Road should be included in a ward with areas to the north and south (the area of Globe Ward west of Grove Road being then linked into St. James' Ward and/or Holy Trinity Ward).

- From Mr. G. A. Cade, a Committee member of the Mile End Old Town Residents Association, reiterating the Association's objection to the proposed new Globe Ward and suggesting that the area east of Grove Road (referred to as the Medway section of the Ward) should be linked with areas to the north and south to form a new separate ward (the western part of Globe Ward to be sub-divided and distributed into St. James' Ward and Holy Trinity Ward).
From Miss Jeanne Wiseman, Secretary of Medway Residents Association, objecting to the decision to include the Medway area in a ward which the Association believed would not allow the residents to be adequately represented in local government affairs. The Association wished the Medway area to be taken out of the Globe Ward and linked with areas to the north and south to form a new ward.

SUBMISSIONS MADE AT THE LOCAL MEETING

(1) Introduction

In making my preliminary introductions, I outlined a suggested method of proceeding with the business of the meeting and intimated that it was my intention after the meeting to visit various parts of the Borough and in particular those areas referred to in our discussion affecting ward boundary differences and difficulties in voting arrangements.

I then referred to the statutory rules to be observed in carrying out electoral reviews which were set out in Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972. I stated that, as applied to London Boroughs, the primary rule required that the ratio of the number of electors to the number of Councillors should be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the borough, taking account of any likely changes in the number or distribution of the electorate in the succeeding five years (i.e. up to 1980). As a secondary consideration, the rules stated that regard should be had to the desirability of fixing boundaries which would be easily identifiable and also to any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary. I emphasised that the Boundary Commission were required to observe the rule about equality of representation and to have regard to the other rules.

I then informed the meeting of the various comments and representations which had been received by the Commission (these are listed in paragraph 3). I then invited a representative of the Council to make a short general statement as to the relevant action taken by the Council in the procedure for the review of electoral arrangements under the Local Government Act 1972 and leading up to this Local Meeting.

Mr. F. T. Reeve, Head of the Secretariat of the Council, said that the procedure laid down by the Local Government Act 1972 was for the Boundary Commission initially to request the Council to prepare a Draft Scheme for the revision of ward boundaries. The preparation of the Scheme by the Council was completed in November 1975 and public notice was given that the Scheme was available for public inspection and that comments could be sent to the Council or directly to the Boundary Commission by February 1976. He said that subsequently there had been discussion with officers of the Commission as to certain matters in the Scheme and that in November 1976 the Commission published its Draft Proposals and these were placed on deposit for inspection and for comments thereon to be forwarded to the Commission by 28th January 1977. He said that it was as a result of the comments made on the Draft Proposals that the Commission had convened this Local Meeting.

(2) Warding arrangements generally

Alderman W. T. Guy said that he represented the London Borough Council and he first referred to the letter of 21st January 1977 (the representations of the London Borough Council...
against the Draft Proposals) in which it was said that the Council did not accept the amendments proposed by the Commission and wished to adhere to its own proposed ward boundaries because of their historical background and logical lines and also took particular exception to the proposed boundary changes affecting St. Dunstan's Ward and Redcoat Ward.

He said that since that time the Council had had a further look at the Draft Proposals and, realising the difficulty of formulating warding arrangements which would satisfy the criteria laid down by the Local Government Act 1972 and particularly the requirement as to equality of representation in each of the wards (and he said this had again been emphasised by me this morning), the Council now felt that they should not pursue their objection as to the various modifications made by the Boundary Commission, with the exception, however, of the proposed modification and re-drawing of St. Dunstan's Ward and Redcoat Ward.

To this proposal the Council took very great exception. They were particularly worried about these two new proposed wards. For many years, these wards had not been altered to any great degree - even in the days of the Metropolitan Borough of Stepney these wards had been as proposed in the Council's Draft Scheme. There was great community spirit in the wards and the Council felt that the boundaries of Mile End Road to the north and Commercial Road to the south and the dividing boundary of White Horse Lane and Bromley Street were logical lines, and the Council simply could not understand why the Boundary Commission had wished to change these wards, changing the dividing boundary from a north-to-south line to an east-to-west line. There seemed to be absolutely no good reason why this change had been made.

I explained to Alderman Guy that, taking the 1980 electorate figures, the total electorate for the whole area comprising Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward warranted only 5 Councillors and not 6 and that therefore it appeared that the Boundary Commission had felt that they had to make two new wards, a smaller ward returning 2 Councillors and a larger ward returning 3 Councillors and had therefore put forward a proposal for a Redcoat Ward to the north and a St. Dunstan's Ward to the south.

To this, however, Alderman Guy said that he believed that in this area there would be considerable increase of population (and electorate) in the next few years, but I said that no doubt this had already been taken into account in calculating the 1980 projected electorate figure.

I then called on Mr. K. Simmonds, Chief Planning Officer of the Council, to give his views as to possible increases in population and electorate in this area in the future. Mr. Simmonds referred to the methods used to calculate the likely housing developments which would take place in the future and he felt that the assessment on these lines for Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward area had already been taken into the 1980 figure. He went on to say, however, that no figures had been brought into the calculation referring to rehabilitation or improvement programmes for it was by no means certain whether these programmes would bring about an increase or a decrease in population and electorate.

Mr. J. R. Searle, Agent of Tower Hamlets Labour Party, said that he felt that the wards should be fixed as proposed by the Council. He did not think that the rule in the Act
had to be so strictly enforced as to make it necessary to break up wards which had become so firmly established and accepted. To this, I had to reply that if the wards remained as proposed by the Borough Council, St. Dunstan's Ward would have an estimated 1980 projected electorate figure of 5379 giving an entitlement of 2.51 and returning 3 Councillors and this would have to be compared to East India Ward with a 1980 electorate of 5995 giving a high entitlement of 2.56 and returning only 2 Councillors. I said that East India Ward gave particular difficulties with a high entitlement for its 2 Councillors but the boundaries of that ward were so firmly fixed that it was not possible to make any logical alteration. Nevertheless, it pointed a likely anomaly and therefore something had to be done about the area of Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward.

Councillor D. Holmes, a Councillor of St. Dunstan's Ward, said he was not happy with the new dividing line proposed by the Boundary Commission for the new Redcoat Ward and the new St. Dunstan's Ward, and said that this boundary would divide the St. Dunstan's Church Parish. At this stage we had a look at the map together and we agreed that St. Dunstan's Church premises would clearly be within St. Dunstan's Ward although the Vicarage would be outside the Ward (incidentally it is outside the ward at the present time).

Councillor G. Chaney, Councillor of Redcoat Ward, said that the new east-west dividing line was unsatisfactory for it would divide the Ocean Housing Estate. He felt that the Boundary Commission should approve the wards suggested by the Council for he believed that there would be an increase of electorate in this area. He said that since 1974 the Council had seen the benefit of their scheme for housing young married couples. Prior to that young couples had tended to leave the Borough, now they seemed to be staying. Past trends showed a decline in population but the Council believed that this had now been halted and that at the present time the population was somewhat static and he felt that in future there would be some slight rise. There were many cleared sites and development would now go forward so that by 1980 there would be a large increase of population and electorate. I asked if the economic situation was likely to cause some slowing down of this programme, but I was assured that any slowing down would not be sufficient to warrant amending the 1980 electorate figures which had been submitted by the Council. I again reminded the meeting that the Borough Council had submitted a figure which was some 12,000 higher than the 1975 electorate figure, but the members and officers of the Council did not appear to feel that this figure was in any way exorbitant.

Mr. Reeve, in referring to the 1980 projections, said that in these two wards the Council believed that the 1980 electorate figure would be some 1,000 more than the 1975 electorate figure.

Mr. J. R. Searle then said that he did not like the idea of a dividing boundary severing a Council Estate, for it had been his experience that this caused a great deal of confusion in voting arrangements. He said that Tower Hamlets was not an easy area to divide into separate ward units and there were bound to be some anomalies. In answer to a question, he said that there were Ward party organisations in existing Wards and these were operative and active and the Ward committees met regularly. He said that there was also a Tenants Association on the Ocean Estate.

At this stage, I said that it appeared to me that there was particular objection to a dividing boundary which ran from
east to west (instead of north to south), but nevertheless an attempt had to be made to divide the area of these two wards in such a way as to formulate two wards - one smaller returning 2 Councillors, and one larger returning 3 Councillors - and I then invited the meeting to suggest or consider alternative lines.

After some discussion, I suggested that the meeting might consider the line running from Mile End Road in the north then in a southeasterly direction along the middle of Stepney Green to Stepney High Street then going south either along Bromley Street or Belgrave Street or even White Horse Road to the southern boundary of Commercial Road, and I invited Mr. Green to work out 1975 and 1980 electorate figures for the two new separate areas which would thereby be formed.

This new suggested line appeared to be well received by the persons present and members of the Council said that they felt that a new line along Stepney Green and then running south would be likely to be accepted by the Council. Stepney Green was a very good dividing boundary road and, furthermore, this new line would ensure that both the St. Dunstan's Church and, indeed, the Rectory was in the St. Dunstan's Ward which would be the more easterly of the two wards. I then asked what was the origin of the name "Redcoat" for the ward and was informed that this came from the Redcoat School which was now the St. John Cass School. I later ascertained that this School was within the area which would be Redcoat Ward to the west of the new suggested line.

This matter was then left by my saying that I would in the afternoon visit this area and take particular note of the suggested boundary line outlined and I would consider the electorate figures which Mr. Reeve was to supply and from this further consideration I would then write my report and make my recommendation to the Commission.

Alderman Guy then again referred to the other modifications to the Council's Draft Scheme which had been made by the Boundary Commission in their Draft Proposals, and said again that the Council were now prepared to accept the Commission's proposals. I said that I was just a little worried at the suggestion which had been made with regard to that part of Holy Trinity Ward which had been added into St. Peter's Ward, but I would be visiting that area to ensure that there was adequate communication between the added area and the ward into which it had been placed.

I then called on Mr. Eric Flounders, Chairman of the Bethnal Green and Bow Liberal Association, to speak to the comments and representations which his Association had made. Mr. Flounders said that his Association were particularly concerned as to the Medway Road area (i.e. that area comprising the eastern half of the proposed Globe Ward and bounded by Grove Road on the west, Roman Road on the north, St. Stephens Road on the east and the railway line on the south). His Association regretted that the Boundary Commission had accepted the Council's proposals for the new proposed Globe Ward for he said that their researches had shown that the people in the eastern part of the new ward (i.e. east of Grove Road) felt that they had nothing in common with the people in the western part of the ward. The western end was in Bethnal Green and the eastern end was in the distinct area of Bow. Also the western end consisted entirely of Council owned flats and maisonettes whilst the eastern end was, in the main, an area of terraced groups of houses with a mixture of ownership. He said that clearly there was a sense of community
towards Bow felt in the eastern part of the new ward, and particularly towards the other areas of terraced housing which lay to the north of Roman Road and to the south of the railway line. He claimed that all these areas shared common problems, common aspirations, common shopping streets, etc., and he referred to the federation of Tenants Associations and Residents Associations in this area formed together in a joint committee.

I asked for names of some of the local Residents Associations which formed the joint committee to which he referred and he named the St. Stephen's Tenants Association, Montieth Tenants Association, Locton Tenants Association, St. Mark's Gate Association, Driffield Road Association, Lanfranc Tenants Association, Medway Road Residents Association and Mile End Old Town Residents Association. (I was later handed a map showing the Council Housing Estates and also the private residential terraced houses in this area and had to note that in the area to which Mr. Flounders had first referred (namely east of Grove Road and bounded by Roman Road, St. Stephen's Road and the railway) there was at least one fairly large housing estate, namely the Lanfranc Estate, with also a part of the St. Stephen's housing estate.)

Mr. Flounders went on to say that there was a threefold physical barrier between the eastern and the western parts of the proposed Globe Ward, namely (i) Grove Road itself which was a major lorry route; (ii) Regent's Canal; and (iii) the proposed Park which was being laid out by the Council between Grove Road and Regent's Canal. (It should perhaps be explained here that the Council have a project for the clearance of all premises from the area lying between Grove Road and the Canal from Roman Road on the north right down to Mile End Road on the south and certainly there is to be here a very wide and distinctive boundary.) Mr. Flounders went on to say that the eastern part of the proposed Globe Ward had no physical contact at all with the western part, save by a bridge on the very northern boundary.

The Association realised the problems posed to the Commission in calculating electorate numbers and appropriate representation but his Association felt that here the western part of the proposed Globe Ward should be allied with the proposed St. James' Ward to the north and/or the proposed Holy Trinity Ward to the south, perhaps dividing the western part of the Globe Ward and adding part to each of these two Wards. As to the eastern part of the proposed Globe Ward, he felt that this area should be added to Bow Ward and Park Ward and two new wards formed with a boundary running north to south. This would enable the Medway area to be joined to the areas to the north and south.

I then asked Mr. Flounders if his Association had worked out a suggested scheme, particularly in relation to the electorate figures and representation. He replied that his Association had not prepared details of alternative arrangements. He said that they had asked the Council for figures some considerable time ago, but had not been supplied with any details. They were, therefore, unable to submit a scheme but felt confident that the western half of the proposed Globe Ward could be merged with St. James' Ward and Holy Trinity Ward in some satisfactory way, and furthermore that the eastern part of Globe Ward could be merged with Park Ward and Bow Ward so as to form two wards with a dividing boundary running north to south. He felt that, possibly, I or the Commission could work out a satisfactory scheme on these lines.

The statement that he had asked the Council for figures some considerable time ago brought some protest from the
Council representatives who said that if a request had been made for particular figures from the Council they would have been supplied and Mr. Reeve said he was quite unaware of any request having been made. Certainly no approach had been made to the Council since January 1977 when the comments were put forward.

I then said that I was in some difficulty in dealing with the Liberal Association’s representations for already I could see difficulty in the area west of Regent's Canal, for St. James' Ward had already a 1980 electorate figure of 5766 (entitlement 2.27) returning 2 Councillors and Holy Trinity Ward had a 1980 projected electorate of 5671 (entitlement 2.23) returning 2 Councillors and from figures given to me it appeared that in the western part of the proposed Globe Ward there were likely to be in 1980 an electorate of some 3261 and when all these figures were added together an electorate of some 14,698 was arrived at with an entitlement of 5.79, giving an overall entitlement of 6 Councillors (and therefore taking the 2 Councillors which had been assigned for the proposed Globe Ward).

Then looking at the area east of the Canal, it seemed that already Park Ward had a 1980 projected electorate figure 6932 (entitlement 2.73) and returning 3 Councillors and Bow Ward had a 1980 projected electorate of 7571 (entitlement 2.97) returning 3 Councillors. To these figures had to be added the estimated 1980 electorate figure for the eastern part of Globe Ward of some 2282 giving a total electorate for the area of 16,759 with an entitlement of 6.60 (therefore possibly returning 7 Councillors - and as no ward should return more than 3 Councillors, there would have to be a possible division of the whole area into three wards).

Alderman W. T. Guy took some exception to the submission made by the Liberal Association for he claimed that they were discriminating between Council tenants and occupiers of private housing. In the Council's Draft Scheme of wards there had been no discrimination between one class of person and another.

Mr. G. A. Cade, a Committee Member of the Mile End Old Town Residents Association, then spoke on behalf of the Association to the representations submitted in January 1977. The Association reiterated its objection to the proposed new Globe Ward, which was to the effect that the Medway Road section of the Ward, comprising a different type and tenure of house and separated from the rest of the ward by an arterial road, a canal and a belt of park land under construction, had nothing in common with the western part of the ward and was totally divorced from it. He said that there was a good community feeling and common interest in this area east of Grove Road and it was his Association's view that the Medway Road area should be contained in a ward which also contained either or both of similar terraced areas of the Driffield general improvement area to the north and Mile End Old Town to the south. The Association accepted that there may be numerical problems involved in these changes but they saw no reason why the western section of the proposed Globe Ward could not be sub-divided and distributed into St. James' Ward and Holy Trinity Ward, if necessary by increasing the representation for those wards. The Association's written representations had also queried the wisdom of giving the name Holy Trinity to a Ward which no longer contained the Holy Trinity Church, which was in the proposed Bow Ward.
Miss Jeanne Wiseman, the Secretary of Medway Residents Association, was present at the earlier part of the meeting, but had to leave and, in leaving, authorised Mr. Cade to speak on her behalf. The Medway Residents Association, in their written representations, had said that the Association covered the eastern part of the proposed new Globe Ward and wished to register its objection to the decision to include this area in a ward which they believed would not allow the Association members to be adequately represented in local government affairs. The Association felt that the Medway Road area was part of a larger district stretching from Mile End Road in the south to Victoria Park in the north, the whole area being made up mainly of terraced housing in private landlord, council or owner/occupier ownership and was one of the few remaining parts of Tower Hamlets which had not been redeveloped on a large scale. The Association said they were in close touch with the Driffield Residents Association, the Mile End Residents Association as well as various Tenants' Associations from Council Estates, all being members of a joint Tenants and Residents Associations Committee for the whole area. It was claimed that, as a community, the Medway Road area had always been quite distinct from the Bethnal Green area, with a physical barrier created by the roadway and the canal and they believed that to include the area in the Globe Ward with an area west of the Canal would create insoluble problems and, if the Medway Road area were not linked with the areas to the north and to the south, there would be a break-up of what had been a viable community for some 100 years.

Mr. J. R. Searle, Labour Agent, said that the existing Holy Trinity Ward had a long history and although it crossed the Canal and Grove Road barrier, it had been an acceptable and viable ward.

Mr. Gray, who said he was a private person in tenancy of a house in Tredegar Road, Bow, registered his support of the case put forward this morning by the Liberal Association and the Mile End Old Town Residents Association. He said that, in his opinion, the area east of Grove Road in the proposed new Globe Ward should be linked with wards in the Bow area.

I then asked Mr. Reeve, Head of Secretariat, if he could give me any help as to alternative ward proposals in the Bow area, but Mr. Reeve said that he had no ready alternative to the Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals. He said that the Council had formulated wards in their Draft Scheme bearing in mind the main principles of working as set out in the Local Government Act. One thing he wanted to say, however, was that, if the eastern part of the new Globe Ward were taken away, it would probably leave a very small Globe Ward which would be represented by only one member and he did not think that the Council, or indeed the Boundary Commission, would favour a ward with only one member. If, however, the western part of the proposed Globe Ward were to be split up and added into St. James' Ward and/or Holy Trinity Ward, there would be obvious difficulties and this problem would have to be looked at in some detail. Furthermore, there were likely to be difficulties in formulating new wards on the basis of a north-to-south division line in the Bow area.

Finally, Alderman W. C. Guy said that his Council would be happy to accept the Draft Proposals of the Boundary Commission as presented to the meeting this morning, subject only to there being a satisfactory answer to the problem of Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward.
I then referred to the remaining comment sent to the Boundary Commission, this being from the Monteith Tenants Association, setting out their objection to the proposal for the new Globe Ward. The Association said that they believed that part of an area they had come to regard as a cohesive community had been split up severing the Medway Road area from areas with which it had so much in common.

Mr. G. A. Cade, of the Mile End Old Town Residents Association, then raised the matter of the local meeting being held during the day time and claimed that his Association, and indeed other Associations affected by the new Globe Ward proposals, would have had very many representatives and members present at the meeting if the meeting had been held in the evening. Associations such as his were at some disadvantage in this matter and also in compiling their case for presentation at the meeting. The Council, of course, had the whole of the Town Hall organisation behind them but local organisations such as his Association had very limited resources to prepare very detailed cases.

Alderman Guy said that whatever information had been required by the Association would have been supplied by Mr. Reeve and the Council staff.

I then informed the meeting that during the afternoon it was my intention to visit the various areas referred to at the meeting this morning and, with the approval of the meeting, I would ask Mr. Reeve to accompany me on the visit.

As the meeting was brought to a close, Alderman Guy, on behalf of the Council, expressed thanks to me for the way in which the meeting had been conducted. He said that he was particularly happy with the informality of the proceedings.

5. ASSESSMENT OF ARGUMENTS

(6) It was good to see that, after further consideration, the Council had very much modified their view from the total non-acceptance of the Boundary Commission's amendments of the Council's Draft Scheme (as expressed in the Chief Executive's letter of 21st January 1977) to a realistic acceptance of most of the amendments but with the exception of the Commission's proposals for a new Redcoat Ward and a new St. Dunstan's Ward.

The Council strongly pursued their request for approval of the wards they had suggested in their Draft Scheme which showed a north-to-south dividing boundary between the two wards along White Horse Lane, Stepney High Street and Bromley Street, which gave wards as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs.</th>
<th>1975 Electorate Entitlement</th>
<th>1980 Electorate Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redcoat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6382</td>
<td>7184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dunstan's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6149</td>
<td>6379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I had to point out the unsatisfactory entitlement figure for St. Dunstan's Ward, which had no doubt prompted a search for a better dividing boundary.

The Boundary Commission's suggested Wards (which had a west-to-east dividing line) showed the following figures:
The Council representative and all those who spoke on this matter at the meeting were strongly opposed to these suggested new wards. The west-to-east boundary line was, they said, the wrong division for the area where there were strong community feelings and ties.

It was fortunate, however, that after some good open discussion of this matter a new suggested dividing boundary line was found which would provide wards which appeared to be acceptable to those present at the meeting and likely to be readily accepted by the electorate.

The new suggested boundary line would run from Mile End Road (the northern boundary) in a south easterly direction along Stepney Green and then southwards possibly along Stepney High Street and Bromley Street to the Commercial Road (the southern boundary).

At the meeting it was realised that electorate figures would have to be worked out in order to decide the most satisfactory line but it was felt that the line could not be further west than Bromley Street. In order, however, to achieve a slightly better equality of representation I now suggest that the line be Stepney Green, Garden Street, Stepney Way and Bromley Street.

It will be noted that this new line makes the least possible alteration to the existing Wards and preserves in some way the idea of a north-to-south dividing line.

Wards would be formed with electorate figures as follows:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs.</th>
<th>1975 Electorate Entitlement</th>
<th>1980 Electorate Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redcoat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4769</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dunstan's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7762</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Wards are certainly geographically better and are more acceptable Wards than the Commission's Proposals, although the electorate and entitlement figures are not improved. On balance, however, I recommend that Wards be formed as I have now suggested.

2) The remaining problems arose from the representations of the Bethnal Green and Bow Liberal Association, the Mile End Old Town Residents Association, the Medway Residents Association and the Montieth Tenants Association, who put forward strong objections to the proposal for a new Globe Ward comprising the long west-to-east oblong area bounded by Roman Road on the north, the railway line on the south, Cambridge Heath Road on the west and St. Stephen's Road on the east. The objections were that this area had no community cohesion and that there was a broad natural barrier between the western half and the eastern half. This barrier is indeed formidable - first Regent's Canal running north to south, and then some 150/200 yards to the east the busy Grove Road, described as a major lorry route, and the area in between...
used to be houses and business premises but is now almost wholly cleared and is to be made into park land (as indeed is the whole strip down to Mile End Road).

The eastern half of this proposed ward is comprised largely of terraced groups of property with mixed ownership. The western part, it was said, consisted of Council owned flats and maisonettes. There was some accusation that the objectors were bringing in arguments of class distinction, but it was submitted that the electors of the eastern part had different problems, e.g. property improvement aspirations. The objectors felt that it would be much more appropriate, in the new ward arrangements, for a ward to be formed linking the eastern part (of the proposed Globe Ward) with similar areas to the north and the south.

I must say that I felt that a strong case had been made out against the pattern and delineation of the proposed Globe Ward - the western and eastern parts are clearly not linked - the western end looks to Bethnal Green and the eastern end looks to Bow (although only part of the eastern end was in the old Metropolitan Borough of Bow, half was in Bethnal Green and part was in Stepney). There was also some merit in the idea that this eastern part should be linked in a new ward with similar areas to the north and south (and certainly here there seems to be a strong federation of local associations which work within a joint committee).

Unfortunately the objectors, in submitting their case, had done nothing more than put forward some general ideas for an alternative scheme of wards in this area, namely (a) to divide Globe Ward into two parts; (b) to form a new ward linking the eastern part with similar areas to the north and south; (c) to form a new ward of the remainder of the Bow area, now proposed as Park Ward and Bow Ward; and (d) to divide the western part of Globe Ward and put part with St. James' Ward and part with Holy Trinity Ward.

These general ideas were not supported with any details of electorate, entitlement and possible representation and when I pointed out some of the likely difficulties (e.g. Park Ward already had 3 Councillors and Bow Ward had 3 Councillors and a further 2300 electors were supposed to be taken in - probably giving an entitlement of 7 Councillors - and that would mean 3 wards not 2 wards - and then no doubt some similar repercussive problems would arise in the western area) the objectors expressed the hope that I would work out the necessary alternative scheme and then no doubt consider whether or not I could recommend appropriate amendments to the Draft Proposals.

This I have now done, after being supplied with a great deal of information as to electorate figures, etc. by Mr. Reeve, Head of Secretariat, and other Council Staff members and I set out below a scheme of amended wards (which I have formulated) and which would give effect to the proposals put forward by the objectors - and later I will compare this scheme with the Draft Proposals.

(3) First I looked at the western part of Globe Ward and (using only 1980 figures) some 2619 electors had to be merged into another ward or wards. St. James' Ward already had 5766 (2.27) and Holy Trinity Ward 5671 (2.23). Looking further west, however, to Spitalfields Ward and St. Peter's Ward, I felt that other slight amendments could be made which might also be an improvement of pattern. Wards could be formed as follows:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spitalfields Ward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Councillors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area as in Draft Proposals</td>
<td>6250</td>
<td>7054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD area south of Railway and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Vallance Road and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(This is the area the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Commission moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Holy Trinity Ward to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's Ward)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 323</td>
<td>+ 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6573</td>
<td>7377 (2.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **St. Peter's Ward**          |      |        |
| (3 Councillors)               |      |        |
| Area as in Draft Proposals    | 6623 | 6953   |
| DEDUCT area above             | - 323| - 323  |
|                              | 6300 | 6630   |
| ADD (from Holy Trinity Ward)  |      |        |
| area south of Railway         |      |        |
| and between Brady Street,     |      |        |
| Whitechapel Road and          |      |        |
| Cambridge Heath Road          |      |        |
| (Almost the whole of this     |      |        |
| area is linked with most of   |      |        |
| St. Peter's Ward in existing |      |        |
| Ward)                        |      |        |
|                              | + 1434| + 1434 |
|                              | 7734 | 8064 (3.18) |

| **Holy Trinity Ward**         |      |        |
| (Increase from 2 to 3         |      |        |
| Councillors)                  |      |        |
| Area as in Draft Proposals    | 5505 | 5671   |
| DEDUCT area above added into  |      |        |
| St. Peter's Ward              | - 1434| - 1434 |
|                              | 4071 | 4237   |
| ADD western part of Globe Ward|      |        |
| (i.e. west of Regent's Canal) |      |        |
|                              | + 2810| + 2619 |
|                              | 6881 | 6856 (2.70) |

It would appear that these wards west of Regent's Canal would be quite satisfactory.

(4) Now as to warding arrangements east of Regent's Canal. I first considered the feasibility of a ward bounded by Regent's Canal on the west, Mile End Road/Bow Road on the
south, Hertford Union Canal on the north, and for its eastern boundary the most suitable line seemed to be the boundary of existing wards (viz. Driffield Road, Lyal Road, Selwyn Road, Coborn Road) which also was the eastern boundary of the old Metropolitan Borough of Bow. I was informed that it was anticipated that the 1980 electorate would be 4927 giving an entitlement of 1.94.

This, in itself, would make a satisfactory ward returning 2 Councillors, and it has been suggested to me that an appropriate name for the ward would be "Grove Ward".

It was estimated that by 1980 there would be some 17,401 electors in the area of Park Ward, Bow Ward and the eastern part of Globe Ward. Of these, as shown above, some 4927 electors would be in the suggested new ward, leaving 12,474 (entitlement 4.91) in the remaining area, which could be divided (retaining the general dividing line of Roman Road) into Park Ward (returning 2 Councillors) and Bow Ward (returning 3 Councillors). I find that this suggested dividing line of Roman Road in the Draft Proposals (and indeed in the Council's Draft Scheme) continues rather unsatisfactorily through the Parnell Road Housing Estate, which lies between Parnell Road and the Railway, and here I would suggest an amended line of Roman Road, Parnell Road, Old Ford Road to the River Lea (north of Iceland Road) and then northwards along the River to the Borough Boundary.

This would give wards with approximate 1980 electorate and entitlement figures as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1980 Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Ward</td>
<td>5273</td>
<td>(2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ward</td>
<td>7201</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These wards too, I think, could be regarded as satisfactory.

Having outlined a possible alternative scheme a decision now has to be taken as to whether or not an amendment on these lines is justified.

It must be said that most of the wards of the London Borough proposed by the Council (and followed by the Boundary Commission) are different from the pattern of existing wards and Globe Ward is, I feel, very unsatisfactory. Much of the criticism and objection raised against this proposed ward is in my view quite justified.

The Council representatives said that there were ward organisations which were quite active, but these seem to be for existing wards. I believe that the amended pattern of wards which I have outlined above would be found to be more nearly like the existing ward patterns and, I think, likely to be more readily accepted by the electorate in general. I also believe that the Council will find it easier to fit Polling Stations and Polling Districts into this amended alternative ward scheme.

This amended scheme retains the Council membership at 50 Councillors and, after due consideration, I feel I can confidently recommend this scheme of wards for approval.
6. **VISITS**

After the meeting, in company with Mr. Reeve, Head of Secretariat, and his assistant Mr. Tushaw, I visited various parts of the London Borough, particularly the Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward area; the general area of the proposed Globe Ward; Holy Trinity Ward; St. Peter's Ward and the eastern part of Spitalfields Ward; and a large part of Park Ward and Bow Ward.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

I recommend that, subject to the following amendments, the wards and ward boundaries and member representation as outlined in the Commission's Draft Proposals for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets be confirmed:

(a) The boundary of Spitalfields Ward at its northeastern end to be amended to be along Buxton Street, north along Vallance Road, east along the Railway and south along Brady Street (so taking into Spitalfields Ward the area bounded by Vallance Road, the Railway and Brady Street), and so forming a ward giving a 1980 projected electorate of 7377 (entitlement 2.90) and an allocation of 3 Councillors.

(b) The boundary of St. Peter's Ward at its southern end to be amended to be along Cambridge Heath Road, Whitechapel Road, Brady Street, west along the Railway and north along Vallance Road (so taking into St. Peter's Ward the triangular area between Cambridge Heath Road, Whitechapel Road and Brady Street and omitting the area bounded by Vallance Road, the Railway, Brady Street and the southern boundary of the burial ground) and so forming a ward giving a 1980 projected electorate of 8064 (entitlement 3.18) and an allocation of 3 Councillors.

(c) The boundary of Holy Trinity Ward to be amended to be along Cambridge Heath Road on the west, Roman Road on the north, Regent's Canal on the east and Mile End Road on the south (so taking into Holy Trinity Ward the area lying between the Railway, Cambridge Heath Road, Roman Road and Regent's Canal (previously placed in the proposed Globe Ward) but taking out of the ward the area (now placed in St. Peter's Ward) lying between Cambridge Heath Road, Whitechapel Road, Brady Street and the Railway) and so forming a ward giving a 1980 projected electorate of 6856 (entitlement 2.70) and an allocation of 3 Councillors.

(d) That the proposed Globe Ward be omitted from the scheme.

(e) That a new ward be formed, to be named Grove Ward, the boundary of which be Regent's Canal on the west, Hertford Union Canal on the north, the line of Driffield Road, Roman Road, Lyal Road, Stanfield Road, Selwyn Road and Coborn Road on the east, and Mile End Road on the south, this ward having a 1980 projected electorate of 4927 (entitlement 1.94) and an allocation of 2 Councillors.

(f) The boundary of Park Ward to be amended to be along Hertford Union Canal from its junction with Regent's Canal to the Skew Bridge, then south along Driffield Road, thence east along Roman Road, north along Parnell Road and east along Old Ford Road to a point north of Iceland Road, thence to the River Lea and along the River Lea northwards to the Borough boundary (so taking out of the Ward the area north of Roman Road and bounded by Regent's Canal on...
the west, Hertford Union Canal on the north and Driffield Road on the east and also taking out of the Ward an area of part of the Parnell Road Housing Estate and premises to the east) and so forming a ward having a 1980 projected electorate of 5273 (entitlement 2.08) and an allocation of 2 Councillors.

(g) The boundary of Bow Ward be amended to be along Bow Road on the south; Coborn Road, Selwyn Road, Stansfield Road, Lyal Road on the west; and Roman Road, Parnell Road, Old Ford Road and the River Lea on the north (so taking out of the ward the area to the west of Coborn Road, and adding into the ward the area between Lyal Road/Selwyn Road and St. Stephen's Road and also a small area in the northern part of the ward east of Parnell Road) and so forming a ward having a 1980 projected electorate of 7201 (entitlement 2.84) and an allocation of 3 Councillors.

(h) The boundary dividing Redcoat Ward and St. Dunstan's Ward to be amended to be along Stepney Green, Garden Street, Stepney Way and Bromley Street (so giving a general north-to-south dividing line instead of east-to-west) and forming wards with the following 1980 projected electorate figures, member entitlements and member allocations:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redcoat Ward</td>
<td>6143</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2 Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dunstan's Ward</td>
<td>7420</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3 Councillors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For map showing new Wards and Ward boundaries - See Appendix "B" - and for new Ward boundary descriptions - see Appendix "C")

8. APPENDICES

The following supporting documents are appended:-

Appendix "A" - Names and addresses of persons present at the meeting

Appendix "B" - Map (9" to mile) of the Borough showing the recommended new boundaries of St. Peter's Ward, Park Ward, Grove Ward, Bow Ward, Holy Trinity Ward, Spitalfields Ward, Redcoat Ward, St. Dunstan's Ward

Appendix "C" - Ward boundary descriptions for the new recommended Wards listed above in Appendix "B"
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### REVIEW OF WARD BOUNDARIES IN TOWER HAMLETS

**LOCAL MEETING - Wednesday, 18th May, 1977**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.T. Reeve</td>
<td>Head of Secretariat, London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Flounders</td>
<td>3, Tredegar Terrace, Bow, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gray</td>
<td>39, Tredegar Road, Bow, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.A. Cade (Meotra)</td>
<td>20, Aberavon Road, Mile End, London, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Wiseman</td>
<td>107, Antill Road, Bow, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Morsman (Cllr)</td>
<td>11, Pepys House, Bethnal Green, E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Rogers</td>
<td>Old Ford Vicarage, St. Stephen's Road, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Searle</td>
<td>349, Cambridge Heath Road, E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.T. Guy (Alderman)</td>
<td>8, Priory Street, Bow, E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Chaney (Cllr)</td>
<td>37, Louise de Marillac House, E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Long (Cllr)</td>
<td>71, Solander Gardens, E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Armsby (Cllr)</td>
<td>5, Sheridan House, E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Holmes (Cllr)</td>
<td>28, James House, Solebay Street, E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Ramanooop (Cllr)</td>
<td>Stratford Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jones</td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer, London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Simmonds</td>
<td>Electoral Registration Assistant, London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. T. McMillan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Names of Proposed Wards and Numbers of Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ward</th>
<th>No of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East India</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansbury</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limehouse</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcoat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dunstan's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Katharine's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitalfields</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS – DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

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

WEAVERS WARD
Commencing at the point where Quaker Street meets the northwestern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said Borough boundary to the footpath between Hackney Road and Durrant Street, thence generally southeastwards along said footpath to Durrant Street, thence southwards along said street, Squirries Street and Vallance Road to Buxton Street, thence westwards along said street and Quaker Street to the point of commencement.

ST PETER’S WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Weavers Ward meets the northwestern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said Borough boundary to Cambridge Heath Road, thence southwards along said road to Whitechapel Road, thence westwards along said road to Brady Street, thence northwards along said street to the Stratford-Liverpool Street Railway, thence westwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Weavers Ward, thence northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ST JAMES’ WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Peter’s Ward meets the northwestern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said Borough boundary to the Grand Union Canal (Regent’s Canal), thence southeastwards along said canal to Roman Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of St Peter’s Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St James' Ward meets the northwestern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said northwestern boundary and generally southwards along the northeastern boundary of the Borough to the River Lea, thence southeastwards along said river to a point being the prolongation eastwards of Old Ford Road (north of Iceland Road), thence westwards to and along Old Ford Road to Parnell Road, thence southwards along said road to Roman Road, thence southwards along said road to Driffield Road, thence northwards along said road to Old Ford Road, thence westwards along said road to Skew Bridge, thence southwestwards along the Grand Union Canal (Regent's Canal) to the eastern boundary of St James' Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

GROVE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of St James' Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Park Ward, thence northeastwards, southwards and eastwards along said southeastern boundary to Lyal Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Stanfield Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Selwyn Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Antill Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Coborn Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Mile End Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the Grand Union Canal (Regent's Canal), thence northwestwards along said canal to the northeastern boundary of St James' Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

BOW WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Park Ward meets the northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Bow Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the northeastern boundary of Grove Ward, thence generally north-
westwards along said ward boundary to the southeastern boundary of Park Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

HOLY TRINITY WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Peter's Ward meets the southern boundary of St James' Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the southwestern boundary of Grove Ward, thence south-eastwards along said southwestern boundary to Mile End Road, thence south-westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of St Peter's Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

SPITALFIELDS WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Weavers Ward, thence eastwards and northwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of said ward to the southern boundary of St Peter’s Ward, thence eastwards and southwards along said southern boundary to Whitechapel Road, thence southwestwards along said road and Whitechapel High Street to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

ST MARY'S WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Spitalfields Ward meets the southern boundary of St Peter’s Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of Holy Trinity Ward to Jubilee Street, thence southwards along said street to Commercial Road, thence westwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Spitalfields Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
REDCOAT WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Mary's Ward meets the southern boundary of Holy Trinity Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the road known as Stepney Green, thence southeastwards along said road to Garden Street, thence southwards along said street to Stepney Way, thence eastwards along said way to Bromley Street, thence southwards along said street to Commercial Road, thence westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of St Mary's Ward, thence northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

ST DUNSTAN'S WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Redcoat Ward meets the southern boundary of Holy Trinity Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the Grand Union Canal (Regent's Canal), thence generally southwards along said canal to Commercial Road, thence westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Redcoat Ward, thence northwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

LIMEHOUSE WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Dunstan's Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Grove Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to a point opposite the western boundary of St Clement's Hospital, thence southeastwards to and along said western boundary and continuing southeastwards in a straight line to Grid Reference TQ 3695582108 in Cantrell Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Bow Common Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to Limhouse Cut, thence southwestwards along said cut to Commercial Road, thence westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of St Dunston's Ward, thence generally northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
BROMLEY WARD
Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Bow Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Limehouse Cut, thence southwestwards along said cut to the West India Docks - Canonbury Railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to Devons Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Knapp Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road and Cantrell Road to the eastern boundary of Limehouse Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Grove Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary and the southeastern boundary of Bow Ward to the point of commencement.

LANSBURY WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Limehouse Ward meets the southern boundary of Bromley Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing southeastwards along the Canonbury - West India Docks Railway to East India Dock Road, thence westwards along said road and continuing westwards along Commerical Road to the eastern boundary of Limehouse Ward, thence northeastwards and generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

EAST INDIA WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Bromley Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said Borough boundary to East India Dock Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Lansbury Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Bromley Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.
BLACKWALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of East India Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards along said Borough boundary to a point opposite the lock at the eastern entrance to South Dock, thence westwards to and northwestwards along said lock to South Dock, thence northwards along said dock to its western entrance and continuing due west of the entrance of said dock to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence northwards along said southern boundary to the point being in prolongation southwestwards of the southeastern boundary of Dundee Wharf, thence northwards to and along said boundary and continuing northwards along Thames Place to Emmett Street, thence northwards along said street and continuing along Three Colt Street to Limehouse Causeway, thence northwards along said causeway to the Fenchurch Street - West India Docks Railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to West India Dock Road, thence northwards along said road to Birchfield Street, thence northwards along said street to the southern boundary of Lansbury Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of East India Ward to the point of commencement.

SHADWELL WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Lansbury Ward meets the western boundary of Blackwall Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said Borough boundary to a point being in prolongation southeastwards of the southwestern boundary of New Crane Wharf, thence northwards to and along said boundary to Garnet Street, thence northwards along said street to the road known as West Gardens, thence westwards and northwards along said road to the road known as The Highway, thence westwards along said road to the unnamed road leading to Dellow Street thence northwards along said road and continuing northwards along
Dellow Street to Cable Street, thence eastwards along said street to Watney Street, thence northwards along said street to Tarling Street, thence eastwards along said street to Deancross Street, thence generally northeastwards along said street to the southern boundary of St Mary's Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary and the southern boundaries of Redcoat Ward, St Dunstan's Ward, Limehouse Ward and Lansbury Ward to the point of commencement.

ST KATHARINE'S WARD

Commencing at the point where the northwestern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Spitalfields Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the southern boundary of St Mary's Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Shadwell Ward, thence generally southwestwards and southeastwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said Borough boundary and generally northeastwards along the northwestern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

MILLWALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Blackwall Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards, westwards and northwards along said Borough boundary to the southern boundary of Blackwall Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.