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

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Haringey 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 Haringey 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 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. Haringey 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 26 February 1976 Haringey Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 23 wards returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 56 members.

5. We studied the draft scheme submitted by the Borough Council, an alternative scheme from a local political association for a council of 57 members and a comment from a local resident relating to wards in the west of the borough. We noted that the draft scheme had perpetuated old ill-defined boundaries. We considered that the boundaries in the alternative scheme were preferable, that this scheme complied with the requirements of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our own guidelines and that, subject to minor boundary amendments suggested by Ordnance Survey, it would provide a satisfactory basis for the future electoral arrangements of the borough. We adopted this alternative scheme and formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

6. On 29 November 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations 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 31 January 1977.
7. Haringey Borough Council objected to our draft proposals on the grounds of uneven representation, unsatisfactory boundaries and the division of communities. They submitted a revised scheme for 59 members which they claimed presented better arrangements than our draft proposals.

8. We received support for our draft proposals from the local political association whose alternative scheme we had adopted as the basis for our draft proposals, although they suggested minor adjustments to three wards in the north of the borough to preserve local ties.

9. An alternative scheme for a council of 58 members was submitted by a local political party and comments were received from various branches of this party, two Members of Parliament, local residents and several organisations in the borough, objecting to our draft proposals and criticising the division of established communities and the joining of areas having no common loyalties.

10. In view of these comments, we felt we needed more information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, and at our request, Mr C W G T Kirk, OBE, was appointed as Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

11. Notice of the meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at the Civic Centre, Wood Green on 11 and 17 May 1977. A copy of his report to us is at Schedule 1 to this report.

13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the Borough Council's revised scheme for 59 members should be adopted, subject to two minor boundary adjustments between the High Cross/South Tottenham and Muswell Hill/Highgate wards which were suggested by the Council at the meeting.
14. We considered our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted with one modification. We noted that the Civic Centre was not situated in the recommended Town Hall ward and we considered that this ward would be more appropriately named Woodside as in our draft proposals.

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

PUBLICATION

16. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Haringey 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.
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INTRODUCTION

1. On 22nd March 1977 the Secretary of State, in pursuance of Section 65 (2) of the Local Government Act 1972, appointed me to be an assistant commissioner to hold a local inquiry or carry out any consultation with respect to the review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Haringey.

2. In response to an invitation from the Commission dated 10th June 1975, the Haringey London Borough Council on 26th February 1976, submitted to the Commission a draft scheme for the division of this London Borough into 23 wards returning 56 councillors. This draft scheme was duly advertised. The Commission received from the Joint Consultative Committee for the Hornsey, Tottenham and Wood Green Conservative Associations an alternative scheme for 19 wards returning 57 Councillors. By a letter dated 29th November, 1976, the Commission announced their draft proposals which were in effect the same as the scheme proposed by the Conservative Association. These proposals were duly advertised and attracted a number of representations, including one from the London Borough Council, which proposed a revised scheme for 23 wards returning 59 Councillors. The Commission also received from the Local Government Committee of the London Borough of Haringey Labour Party another scheme for 23 wards returning 59 Councillors.

3. The Commission's proposals, the Council's revised scheme (with a minor amendment proposed at the meetings) and the Labour Party's scheme are set out in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 respectively. A list of the representations received by the Commission appears in Appendix 4.

4. On the 4th May 1977, I visited the Borough and inspected the wards.

5. An informal meeting was held at the Civic Centre, Wood Green on Wednesday 11th May 1977. It began at 10.30 a.m., rose for lunch at 1 p.m., resumed at 2 p.m. and at 5.45 p.m. was adjourned until 10.45 a.m. on Tuesday 17th May 1977. On that day the meeting re-assembled at 10.45 a.m., adjourned for lunch at 1 p.m., resumed at 2 p.m. and ended at 3.20 p.m. Lists of the persons present on each of the days are contained in Appendix 5; apart from myself, 40 persons were present on 11th May and 21 on 17th May.
6. Councillor David Page (Labour - Chairman of the Council's General Purposes Committee) opened the discussion by saying that the movement of population in Haringey since the last review of ward boundaries had produced inequality of representation in some wards, varying from 1,630 electors per councillor in High Cross ward to almost 5,300 electors per councillor in Alexandra - Bowes ward. In addition, Haringey like most other London boroughs had experienced a decline in population which had affected ward populations in a disproportionate fashion. The Council accepted that a review of the present electoral arrangements was necessary and had noted the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972. Within the criteria set by the Commission the Council had certain objectives:

1. Stability. The Council placed very high emphasis on the need for stability of electoral arrangements. Local Government, in recent years, had been subjected to a great deal of re-organisation which had produced a measure of confusion and lack of identification with local authorities. The London Borough of Haringey, an amalgamation of the old boroughs of Tottenham, Wood Green and Hornsey, had been produced as a result of the London Government re-organisation of 1964/5. Even after 12 years, many electors still related to the old boroughs rather than the identity of the Borough of Haringey. A complete recasting of the wards in the borough would produce unnecessary disturbance in a number of ways. First, a change of boundaries could produce confusion and estrangement between the electorate and the local authority, particularly in the eastern part of the borough with an ageing population. Voters have grown used to being part of a particular ward and voting in the same polling place. Change could mean that until they get used to the change of ward and voting at a new polling station, some electors would simply not bother to vote. Second, there were very often strong ties built up between councillors and the electorate they represented. This councillor - elector relationship was at the heart of our system of local government. Very often councillors held surgeries at particular venues within the ward they represented and the electorate had grown used to taking their problems to those councillors for advice and assistance. Unnecessary disruption would do nothing to strengthen this valuable relationship. Third, the organisation of local political party machines could be severely disrupted. Local government control by elected members depended on the smooth functioning of political party machinery, which in turn depends on the organisation at ward level. A complete recasting of ward boundaries would mean severe disruption in the machinery in the local political parties and the new ward organisation would take several years to gel.

2. The Retention of Existing Communities.

The present ward boundaries had been determined by an earlier commission and in the main reflected existing communities. Even in Inner London, communities changed slowly and it was unlikely that many new communities had been created since the last re-warding exercise. The council took the view that where a re-alignment of ward boundaries was necessary for demographic reasons, care should be taken to determine a boundary which, as far as possible, retained the existing community. In some cases, however,
it was clear that the last review of electoral arrangements produced a division of some communities in order to satisfy the requirement of numbers. The existing Crouch End ward, for example, was an anomaly in that its present eastern boundary divided the community of Crouch End whilst its western boundary divided the community around the Archway Road. Where such manifestly divided communities existed, the Council was seeking to re-unite them when considering boundary changes.

3. Natural Boundaries

Wherever change of boundary was necessary, the Council had sought to adopt the most significant natural boundary as defined in the Commission's criteria, e.g. the main north/south railway line from King's Cross, the east/west railway line from Green Lanes to Tottenham High Road and, as major roads, Green Lanes, Wood Green High Road, Tottenham High Road, Lordship Lane, West Green Road, Phillip Lane and Westbury Avenue as boundaries. It had not always been possible to achieve the most satisfactory boundary while at the same time meeting the requirements of number. In such cases, where it had not been possible to adopt a significant natural boundary, the Council had endeavoured to achieve the best possible link between the more obvious naturally occurring boundaries.

4. Size of Council

The London Borough of Haringey consisted for electoral purposes of 20 wards electing a total of 60 members. Of these, there were three wards each of 4 members, 14 wards each of 3 members and 3 wards each of 2 members. The Council took the view that any proposal to change the basis of representation should secure the greatest possible representation for its electorate. Haringey, although an Outer London borough, had a very high combination of all the indices of stress and, for many functions of local government, was regarded as an inner London borough. In particular, the eastern end of the borough had a large immigrant population in an area of very poor housing, occupied by low income families. The representative role of the Councillor in the eastern part of Haringey was a particularly demanding one and the Councillor would often find himself acting on a combination of advisor, lawyer, civil rights worker, social worker and housing aid officer. In addition to ward duties, the councillor also had an increasing burden of council committee work. In May 1978, the Council's existing 10 Alderman would retire leaving a reduced number of councillor members to shoulder the existing work-load. The Council took the view that to minimise the increase in work-load of councillors, consideration should be given to obtaining the greatest number of councillors compatible with the existing and projected population.

7. Councillor Page continued that the Council had carefully considered the Commission's proposals having regard to the Commission's own criteria and to the additional objectives of the Council. It considered that the Commission's draft proposals would mean a total re-constituting of the ward boundaries in Haringey and would produce an unnecessary disruption in the local party machines and considerable confusion and estrangement in the electorate. This could not be good for the future of local government in Haringey since it would impair the effective operation of local democracy. The Council earnestly asked the Commission to give favourable consideration to the revised scheme submitted by the Council.
In producing the revised scheme in accordance with the criteria of the Commission and the additional objectives of the Council, the Council employed the following method:-

1. The Council had sought to produce as few changes as possible to the existing ward structure.

2. It had sought to enable the greatest proportion of electors to vote in the same polling stations and the same wards as they did at present.

3. Wherever possible the existing boundaries had been retained.

4. Where an existing boundary manifestly divided a community, the Council had sought to re-unite the community when drawing ward boundaries.

5. Where new boundary lines needed to be drawn, the Council had given priority to significant natural boundaries.

6. Where, because of the necessity to create wards comprising a certain electorate, it had not been possible to adopt the most significant natural boundaries, or, in cases where it was necessary to link two strong natural boundaries, the Council had chosen the best boundary compatible with the community and the requirements of number.

The Council accepted that in cases where new boundaries were created to accommodate an existing community or in cases where the requirement of numbers meant that existing boundaries had to be substantially altered (as in the case of the transition from existing four member wards to wards of two or three members) some major departures from the Council's earlier criteria might be inevitable and that some boundaries might be arbitrary. The alteration of such boundaries, however, even by a street or two, might well produce a domino effect which would affect the wards in half of the borough. The Council was satisfied that its revised scheme met to the greatest possible extent the varied criteria demanded of it and accordingly trusted that the Commission would adopt it.

8. Councillor Page pointed out that the Commission's proposed Northumberland Park, Windsor Park and Prince of Wales wards crossed the boundary between the parliamentary constituencies of Tottenham and Wood Green and their Alexandra Park ward crossed the boundary between Tottenham and Hornsey. The general broad pattern of the London Borough was high status owner-occupiers in the west (Highgate), a bed-sitter belt in Muswell Hill and Crouch End, low-income owner-occupiers and Council tenants in Wood Green, Council estates and low quality housing in the Lea Valley, and immigrants in Tottenham, Hornsey and the eastern front of Wood Green. There had been large scale slum clearance in the Borough. There were large Greater London Council old estates in the Park ward. There was little new Greater London Council development in prospect. The Council was an education authority. 76% of the electorate would continue to vote at their existing polling stations under the Council's revised scheme as in most changes of ward localities the Council had tried to move complete polling districts. He produced a map showing by colours the various boundary changes. Finally he drew attention to two desirable minor amendments of the scheme viz:-

1. On the eastern part of the boundary between High Cross and South Tottenham wards which cut through part of the new Greater London Council Ferry Lane estate (which could be completed by 1981), he suggested that the part of the boundary between the eastern boundary of the Borough and the north/south railway through Tottenham Station should be changed to run from the Borough boundary along the east/west railway leading to
South Tottenham Station as far as the north/south railway to the point where the replaced ward boundary meets that railway. This change would put the whole of the Ferry Lane estate in High Cross wards.

2. The old peoples home in Woodside Avenue which was cut into two parts by the boundary between Muswell Hill and Highgate wards should be put wholly into one or other of these wards.

9. Mr. Bryn Jones (Senior Planning Officer with the Council) said:

1. The variation in the 1981 forecasts of the 1981 electorate in the three schemes before the meeting was insufficient to matter.

2. Forecasts from small areas had been built up to give figures for a ward. The result was accurate to the nearest 1,000 for the whole Borough.

3. The Council's forecast for 1981 had been based on past trends in each of the constituencies to which prospective development had been added. No account had been taken of possible changes in the occupying rate.

10. Lord Colville (Counsel for the Conservative Associations) introduced Councillor C. Hannington who would explain the Conservatives' reasons for their scheme which the Commission had largely adopted in preference to the original scheme submitted by the Council. He himself would seek to elucidate by question points made by any speaker.

11. Councillor Hannington (Conservative) said:

1. He had been a member of the Council continuously since its inception in 1964 and was then a member of the Planning and Development Committee, of which he had previously been Chairman. He was Leader of the minority party on Haringey Council. He had lived in Hornsey since 1949 and represented the Joint Consultative Committee of the Hornsey, Tottenham and Wood Green Conservative Associations and the Conservative Councillors on Haringey Council.

2. The electoral review for London Boroughs was first raised in a letter dated 30th January, 1975 from the Commission to the London Boroughs Assn., which had been circulated to the Chief Executives of all constituent authorities on the 7th February, 1975 with a request for comments by 14th March, 1975. In Haringey, the letter had been then sent to all Councillors on 14th February, but no further action had been taken until after the Commission had sent a further letter on 10th June, 1975, giving greater procedural details. In June, 1975 the Council set up a Review of Electoral Arrangements Panel comprising four councillors from the Labour majority party and two from the Conservative minority party, charged with producing the Council's draft proposals in good time before the Commissions final deadline of 27th February, 1976. Nothing was done to make this panel active.

3. Following complaints dated 29th October 1975 from then Councillor R.J. Atkins (Conservative spokesman on the General purposes Committee) the first meeting of the panel was fixed for 14th November, 1975, but was subsequently cancelled. Further complaints from Cllr. Atkins dated 30th October, 1975, 12th November, 1975 and 9th December, 1975 failed to get an early meeting fixed. Therefore the Officers were never given guidance by the panel even though a thorough review was clearly necessary.
Both the need for a thorough review and the reluctance of the Council to undertake it were underlined by the original letter from the Home Office dated 8th January, 1964 establishing the first ward boundaries which said "The Secretary of State has accepted this recommendation for the purpose of the first elections in 1964. In his view, however, there will be disadvantages in the perpetuation of obsolete Borough boundaries as ward boundaries in the new Borough and he proposes in due course to invite the Council in the new Borough to consider the desirability of putting forward fresh proposals based on boundaries which are more easily identifiable". Between that letter and June 1975 Haringey had initiated nothing, although in the meantime the Home Secretary had invited the Council's comments.

4. It appeared that the Labour Majority Party had withdrawn the Council's Officers from the responsibility of drawing up boundary proposals and that this vital function had been carried out by a small group of Labour Councillors. The officers' role had been restricted to providing basic statistical material. At no stage did the Council or any of its Committees approve this method of procedure. This action had been concurrent with the establishment of the sham panel which had been intended merely to give the semblance of impartial consideration of the matters to be reviewed.

5. The first Council proposals were, except for two very minor amendments, Labour Party proposals brought to the only meeting of the Panel held on the 22nd December 1975. These proposals were then considered at a special General Purposes Committee meeting on 2nd January, 1976, just four working days later. All amendments, whether detailed or general, were rejected by the block votes of the Majority Party at both the Special G.P. Committee and the subsequent Special Council meeting on 8th January, 1976. Although notice of the availability of the Council scheme for public comment was not advertised in the local press until 9th January, 1976, some pre-publication issues of two of the local papers were in circulation on 8th January 1976 immediately prior to the actual Council meeting.

6. The Conservative Joint Consultative Committee wrote to the Commission objecting to the scheme thus forced through the Council on the grounds that there were serious statistical errors in the electoral figures for 1976. It further drew attention to the fact that the Commission's requirements that boundaries should be clearly identifiable and that localities should not be broken had been flagrantly disregarded. The only conclusions that could be drawn were that the Labour Party had used their majority position on Haringey Council to produce a scheme to give them maximum political advantage with regard to neither the Commission's requirements, nor the initial draft proposals from Haringey's own officers.

7. The Conservative Joint Consultative Committee therefore submitted a draft proposal correcting the major statistical error found in Haringey's original proposals and adhering to the criteria laid down by the Commission. On 29th November, 1976 the Commission published its draft proposals which broadly coincided with the conclusions reached in the Conservatives' detailed examination and review.
8. The Conservatives concerned broadly support the proposals on the following grounds:

a. Equality of representation. On the basis of Haringey's CRU estimates, those proposals contained only one ward outside levels of tolerance between a minimum of 2.80 and a maximum of 3.20 members per ward. In comparison, the Council's original proposals contained ten wards outside this tolerance in 1976 and three wards in 1981. Haringey's second scheme contained nine wards outside this tolerance in 1976 and three wards in 1981, and the Haringey Labour party's proposals had five wards beyond the tolerance in 1976 out of the eleven wards for which 1976 figures can be identified and two such wards in 1981. He produced a statement illustrating this.

b. Nineteen three member wards avoided the confusion to the electorate in having a multiplicity of wards with differing numbers of members.

c. Careful regard was had to clearly identifiable natural boundaries and to avoiding breaking local ties. Linear roads had been used where appropriate as a "community spinal chord". Whilst the definition of a community in an urban area was often difficult none of the clearly recognisable links had been severed.

9. The only slight amendment he suggested was to change the ward boundary between Woodside, White Hart Lane and Noel Park wards. This would not entail any ward going beyond the level of tolerance and would avoid the break in natural communities which the continuation of the current ward boundaries would have perpetuated. The details were:

a. **Noel Park Ward**

The boundary should go north along the Roundway and north east along the rear of the properties on south side of Gospatrick Road to Rivulet Road and then along the rear of the properties on the south side of Rivulet Road to White Hart Lane and then along the rear boundaries of the properties on the north west side of Perth Road. Thus the whole of Rivulet Road, Gospatrick Road, Stockton Road and Stockton Gardens (all of which were integral parts of the White Hart Lane estate) would go into White Hart Lane Ward, and the whole of Perth Road would go into Noel Park Ward. The net effect in 1976 electoral terms would be that Noel Park had 249 fewer electors.

b. **Woodside Ward**

At present the proposed division of Devonshire Hill Lane was arbitrary and artificial. He suggested the boundary west along the rear of the properties in Devonshire Gardens and Devonshire Road, cross Devonshire Hill Lane at the White Hart public house and continue along the rear boundary of the properties on the south side of Mayfair Gardens. This would ensure that the small homogenous section of private houses in Devonshire Hill Lane and its continuation in Mayfair Gardens were not unnecessarily divided. Further it would
ensure that the natural community in the similar Council properties to the south was not in any way disturbed. The net effect in electorate would be quite small involving only some 52 extra electors in 1976 figures.

c. **White Hart Lane Ward**

The foregoing proposals would re-unite almost all of the community on the western side of this ward and would have a net effect of increasing the ward by about 197 electors in 1976 figures.

10. The General Purposes Committee considered the Commission's proposals together with officers' comments upon them at a meeting on the 8th January 1977. He had supplied the Commission with a copy of those comments and had represented the Conservatives' response on this to the Commission. The Committee did not consider the report in any detail but simply instructed the Chairman to produce a further scheme to be sent on to the Commission, which was done by the Committee on 25th January, 1977 and ratified by the Council on 27th January, 1977. Again all comments or detailed criticisms were ignored and the Council wrote to the Commission on 31st January, 1977 with their revised scheme.

11. The Council, to justify producing entirely new proposals, had now enunciated an entirely new principle, by suggesting that some importance should be placed on the preservation of existing wards, regardless of the Secretary of State's original adverse comments. It is doubtful that the original unsatisfactory ward boundaries had improved with the passage of time. To the contrary, shifts in population had made them even less satisfactory. Moreover, the retention of an existing boundary as a justification for a proposed boundary did not fall within any of the criteria required to be considered by the Commission.

12. The other two general comments the Council made were:

i. that the Councillor's workload would be eased by 59 Councillors rather than 57. This is clearly very marginal and in any case the lot were on record as saying that it believed its correct size to be between 57 and 60 members and therefore all the schemes fall within these parameters,

ii. that Tottenham High Road should be preferred as a more significant boundary than the North/South Liverpool Street to Enfield Town railway line. Whilst this might have current validity it should be noted that the Council was pressing for building of a new North/South road through the Lea Valley and that when this was built it was probable that the Council would seek to enhance the community and shopping by a containment of traffic on the High Road and the use of environmental measures to make the High Road a uniting focal point rather than a heavy traffic divide. This new road would not be completed before, perhaps, 1992.

13. The Council's revised proposals were not sufficiently fair in terms of representation. Nine wards were beyond the levels of tolerance on 1976 figures and even by 1981 on conjectured figures three wards would be still unacceptable.
14. With regard to the proposals of the Labour Party joint committee, this was received in manuscript with no 1976 electoral figures, no justification and a discrepancy of some 113 voters in the overall totals from those that the Council were submitting. However, he had recently received a copy of a tracing of the proposed boundaries and would comment later on these. On 1981 statistics alone there were two wards beyond the accepted level of tolerance and of the eleven wards for which 1976 electorates could be identified five wards were outside the accepted tolerance.

15. It was his considered opinion and that of his colleagues on the Council and the Conservative Joint Consultative Committee that the Commission's proposals were to be greatly preferred to those in the Council's revised scheme and the Labour Party scheme. All the primary criteria regarding boundaries and communities had been met as far as was possible in an urban area. The electoral representation was clearly fairer and the element of confusion for electors had been kept to a minimum by the parity in ward sizes. Some boundaries in both the Council's second scheme and the Labour Party's scheme were particularly weak. They could not be justified by the need to find a divide between clearly identifiable communities. Neither could they be claimed to provide more equal wards either in electorates or in councillors per ward. The Commission's proposals to which these schemes had been a response were better in both factors.

12. Councillor Hannington (Conservative) then criticised the Labour Party's scheme as follows:

1. General Comment

The scheme related to a limited extent to both the Commission's proposals and the Council's second scheme. There were four wards exactly as the Commission proposed and a further seven wards exactly as the Council were proposing, except in one ward the Commission's name of St. Anns was preferred to the Council's name of Tottenham Central.

2. Procedural Failings

He had some difficulty in making detailed comment because the scheme originally came as a list of wards with numbers of councillors per ward, estimated electorate 1981 and consequential average electors per councillor in 1981. There were no 1976 figures, no textual descriptions and initially no maps available. Subsequently he had received a copy of a tracing indicating boundaries roughly, but it would clearly be seen that detailed comment on the specific boundaries and checking of the actual electorates had been impossible for either ourselves or the Council's officers.

3. Equality of Electorate

Even on the figures provided it was clear that the equality of electorate is not as good as the Commission's proposals with two wards being clearly outside the accepted levels of tolerance in 1981 (i.e. 2.80 to 3.20 for a three member ward and 1.90 to 2.10 for a two member ward). Although only the eleven wards with co-terminous boundaries to the Commission's proposals and the Council's second scheme would be assessed accurately for 1976 electorate, it would be seen that five of these eleven wards were outside the permitted tolerance. Further, it was almost certain that Prince of Wales ward would be outside the tolerance, but the 1976 figure could not be assessed from the information available.
4. Number of Councillors per Ward.

To the confusion of 13 three member wards and 9 two member wards was added a single member ward although not in an area where there was a clearly identified close-knit community which would be justification for such representation. In these circumstances parity of electors would be more difficult to maintain and there would inevitably be confusion amongst the electorate caused by the wide disparity in ward sizes.

5. Natural Boundaries and Community Ties.

Although the actual boundaries were frequently difficult to identify it was clear that often natural boundaries had been disregarded and community ties had been broken.

13. Mr. J. Elkington (Haringey Labour Party) said he was the Secretary of his Party's co-ordinating local Government Committee. He was not a Councillor. His party had looked at the Borough as a whole. Its north-western boundary was extraordinary. His party had disregarded the boundaries of the old boroughs. He agreed that the first priority was parity of electors among the wards. Each of the three schemes achieved this more or less. His concern was with the other factors - boundaries and local ties. He had used railways and main roads. The main north/south railway was for two-thirds of its length a physical boundary. In its northern part it ran in tunnel. The Commission had not observed other natural boundaries. The Wood Green/Hornsey boundary had not been rectified; it cut across roads and divided small roads into half. The Commission had substituted elusive for difficult boundaries.

14. Mr. E. Large (Chairman of the Labour Party Co-ordinating Committee) said he had been concerned with the revision in 1963/64. It was illogical to stick to the existing parliamentary constituency boundaries. It was very difficult to provide a proper scheme with all three member wards.

15. Councillor Dr. S. Whittle (Labour) explained that the Labour Party's scheme had followed the Commission's boundaries for Fortis Green, Highgate, Hornsey Woods, and Alexandra Park wards, and had changed only slightly the proposed Haringay ward.

16. Councillor V. Butler (Mayor of Haringey - Haringey Co-operative Party) objected to the Commission's proposals because in his opinion they did not conform to communities. He had suggested drawing up a scheme using natural boundaries and communities. This would achieve fair parity; some wards would resemble some of the Commission's, others some of the Council's. He argued for smaller wards as being nearer to the people. He then examined the boundaries on which he made the following points:-

i. Priory ward included two separate communities and should be divided.

ii. The boundary of Haringay ward ran along the backs of houses in Turnpike Lane. That lane itself would be a better boundary.

iii. Bounds Green would contain two communities and part of it should be in a central ward.

iv. The traffic routes in the Borough were vertical.

v. It was not necessary to use both railways as boundaries. Only the western railway was a real physical barrier. The eastern railway was not such a barrier.
vi. Tottenham High Road was a much better boundary as it divided communities.

vii. The community interest in the middle of the Borough was obvious, with the railway to the west and the High Road to the east.

viii. Parliamentary boundaries were not sacrosanct, except in the context of whether they retained or destroyed communities.

ix. The Commission should have used 1, 2, or 3 member wards to preserve communities.

17. Mr. W. Truman (Broadwater Farm Tenants Association) said his Association had been connected with the existing Vest Green ward since 1971. The area contained many elderly people whom the Commission had put into Bruce Grove ward. They wanted to be put back into Vest Green ward as the Labour Party proposed.

18. Mrs. Sally Lambert (who lived in Bruce Grove) said many people living in Bruce Grove thought the Commission were wrong to use the railway as the eastern boundary of Bruce Grove ward. The High Road should be used instead.

19. Mr. J. Coghill (Trades Council) said he had never taken part in ward disputes before but he felt the Commission's proposals were so atrocious that he had to protest. He made the following comments:

1. **Windsor Park Ward**

   There was a Greater London Council estate south of Ferry Lane. Jerry Lane was going to be a main traffic route. The estate should be in Prince of Wales ward, with Ferry Lane as that ward's northern boundary.

2. He agreed that Tottenham High Road should be used as a boundary.

3. Ward names should be local ones, not like those used by the Commission.

4. He had lived for 21 years in Sandford Avenue (in Noel Park Ward). The area north of Lordship Lane did not belong in Noel Park. It was more with Woodside or White Hart Lane wards.

5. He objected to the area in the north-eastern corner of Bounds Green ward being included in that ward.

20. Councillor Page (Labour - for the Council) explained the Council's scheme as follows:

1. **South Tottenham and High Cross**. The external boundary of these two wards taken together was the same as for the existing wards. Their western boundary was Tottenham High Road, a major traffic route leading to the Great Cambridge Road, the northern boundary was the constituency boundary, the eastern and southern boundaries were the Borough boundary. The internal boundary was between these wards, the same as for the existing wards except that a drafting error existed to the east of the Liverpool Street to Enfield railway line. The existing boundary cut the new GLC Ferry Lane Estate and it was proposed to amend this boundary so that it followed the railway line from the point where the existing High Cross/South Tottenham boundary crossed the railway line south to the Borough boundary.
One hundred per cent of the electorate in both wards would remain in their existing wards.

2. **Bruce Grove and West Green**

The external boundary of these two wards taken together was the same as for the existing wards. The eastern boundary was Tottenham High Road, the northern boundary was Lordship Lane, the western boundary was Westbury Avenue and the southern boundary was West Green Road and Philip Lane. All of these roads were bus routes and major roads. The internal boundary had been adjusted south of Broadwater Farm and moved one road to the west from Gloucester/Hensworth Road to Clonmel Road. 100% of the electorate in Bruce Grove and 99% of the electorate in West Green would remain in their existing wards.

3. **Tottenham Central and Seven Sisters.**

The external boundary of these two wards taken together was the same as for the existing wards, except for a small group of houses to the west of Green Lanes which had been transferred from Seven Sisters to Harringay ward. The eastern boundary of these two wards was Tottenham High Road, the northern boundary was West Green Road and Philip Lane, the western boundary was Black Boy Lane, Warwick Gardens and Green Lanes, the southern boundary was the Borough boundary. The internal boundary had been adjusted by transferring the whole of the polling district TS2 from Seven Sisters into Tottenham Central; the new boundary became the East-West railway line. This was a most effective natural boundary and was crossable at only two points between Green Lanes and Tottenham High Road. 100% of the electorate of Tottenham Central and 77% of the electorate of Seven Sisters would remain in their existing wards.

4. **Green Lanes.**

This ward was the same as the existing ward except for the thin strip to the west of Green Lanes (the road) where the constituency boundary followed an old field boundary. The northern boundary of the ward was West Green Road, the western boundary was Green Lanes, the southern boundary was the east/west railway line, the eastern boundary was Black Boy Lane and Warwick Gardens. 51% of the electorate of Green Lanes would remain in their existing ward.

5. The main feature of the Commission's scheme in Tottenham was the choice of the Liverpool Street to Enfield railway line boundary which enabled the creation of the Windsor Park Ward, which sat astride the Tottenham/Wood Green constituency boundary. This railway line ran in embankment over the entire section and was easily crossed by a network of roads running east to west from Lordship Lane in the north to the Borough boundary in the south. It was not, therefore, a significant boundary in the same sense as Tottenham High Road.

6. The Commission's St. Ann's Ward and Seven Sisters Ward were both significantly divided by the east/west railway line which was not crossable between the eastern and western boundaries of St. Ann's Ward and only crossable at one point within Seven Sisters Ward. The internal boundary between St. Ann's and Seven Sisters was a particularly illogical one.

7. The Commission's West Green Ward boundary crossed Westbury Road unnecessarily in the west and Green Lanes unnecessarily in the south.
8. The inhabitants of the Broadwater Farm Estate had expressed a strong desire to remain in West Green Ward. The Commission's proposal transferred the whole estate to Bruce Grove Ward, separating the concrete part of the estate from its open space.

9. The Commission's Prince of Wales Ward contained portions of four existing wards:

- High Cross
- South Tottenham
- Tottenham Central
- Seven Sisters

The Council felt that its revised scheme demonstrated that the total departure from the existing ward pattern displayed by the Commission's scheme was unnecessary and could easily be avoided.

21. Lord Colville (for the Conservative Association) criticised various aspects of the Council's revised scheme as follows:

1. Park Ward

The eastern boundary was almost impossible to identify on the ground. Tariff Road was a short cul de sac and the ward boundary came south down the road to Northumberland Park which it bisected straight through the centre of a post-war Council housing estate. The boundary continued south down Trulock Road which was thus half severed from Almond and Commonwealth Roads. It travelled west along the rear of the northern boundary of a school and then came south down Worcester Avenue to Park Lane along which it went west to the High Road. Except for High Road, none of these was a clear identifiable boundary and Trulock and Tariff Roads were particularly bad. There would be considerable confusion for the western part of the Northumberland Park housing estate which would be voting in an entirely different ward to the rest and indeed all the electors between the boundary and the High Road would find the new boundary impossible to define on the ground. Further, the boundary along the High Road split the North Tottenham Conservation Area Extension which would quite gratuitously complicate the difficult balance in ensuring conservation of that which was historic and valuable and effective consultation with residents regarding any proposed developments in the area as a whole.

2. Coleraine

Criticism of the western boundary was as that under Park Ward. The southern boundary perpetuated the present weak predecessor borough boundary. Dowsett Road and Park View Road were not major roads and therefore not easily identifiable. This was particularly true as the roads to the north and south were all of very similar houses with a substantial degree of owner-occupation. This was another district recognised as a homogenous whole by a Neighbourhood Improvement Area declared by the Council in 1969. These areas were forerunners to the General Improvement Areas in the Town and Country Planning Act 1969 and were run under a local committee of residents supported by Haringey's officers.
3. High Cross

The northern boundary was that criticised under Coleraine ward. The southern boundary was particularly weak dividing as it did Tynemouth Road which was in fact the central road of a small community being entirely enclosed by the major roads of Ferry Lane, Tottenham High Road, High Cross Road and the Hale. Further in the east this southern boundary would divide the brand new estate being built up by the GLC at Ferry Lane which was designed to be a whole community even with its own primary school.

4. South Tottenham

The northern boundary was that criticised under High Cross Ward.

5. Seven Sisters

This was a long narrow ward for which the lines of communications and movement would be extremely difficult as they were orientated north/south.

6. The Commission's Northumberland Park and White Hart Lane wards were better than the Council's Coleraine and Park wards, as they did not divide a community as Coleraine did.

7. The Commission's Windsor Park ward used the railway as a boundary instead of High Road. This was better for the older residents. The railway cut local ties which High Road did not do. High Cross Road (the southern boundary) was a primary traffic route, with new development on each side with its backs to High Cross Road. The Greater London Council development was entirely cut off and self-contained. It should be in Windsor Park ward because its outlet was via Ferry Lane to Windsor Park. The same argument about the railway as a boundary applied to Prince of Wales ward.

8. West Green

The inclusion of Broadwater Farm estate in the north-east corner of the existing ward was an historic accident because the whole of the open space known as Lordship Recreation Ground was included in the old ward. In fact in terms of aspect and access and egress the Broadwater Farm estate related entirely to the east and Bruce Grove ward. It would be of substantial help to the local community ties if the estate were in Bruce Grove as it would enable the present relationship to continue to develop.

9. Bruce Grove

The use of Tottenham High Road as the eastern boundary in preference to the railway line used was likely to be undesirable in the long term because when the new north/south road was built in the Lea Valley, Haringey Council were likely to consider using environmental measures to enhance the High Road as a shopping centre and community focal point and the present divisive effect of very heavy traffic would be greatly diminished.

22. Mr. J. Alkington (Labour) considered access and one-way systems to be irrelevant in identifying a community.

23. Lord Colville continued that in Seven Sisters wards the decision whether to split Avenue Road between two wards was consistent with a policy referred to before and although the Conservatives were opposed to splitting roads which were not naturally divided because of their nature and volume of traffic like Green Lanes they would accept whatever the Commission decided on this issue.
He then commented on the Labour Party's scheme:

1. **Windsor Park**

Holcombe Road was a very poor boundary, particularly as it was programmed to have a small community park there which would act as a focal point not a divide. The Commission's draft proposals use of the major traffic divide at High Cross Road was quite clearly a very much more easily identified boundary and clearly acted as the boundary to very separate communities.

2. **Prince of Wales**

Those living north of High Cross Road would be cut off and very isolated from the rest of the ward by this major road. They had little prospect of developing into a self-contained community and therefore would be greatly disadvantaged by the proposed boundaries.

3. **Seven Sisters**

This was a long narrow ward for which lines of communication would be extremely difficult as they were orientated north/south.

24. **Councillor S. Whittle** (Labour Party - West Green Ward) made a statement about the schemes:

1. Generally, Devonshire Hill ward and Woodside ward were said to be outside the tolerances, but the Labour Party had started from the Commissions proposals. Haringey consisted of three discrete areas viz:

    a. west of the main railway,
    b. north of Westbury Avenue and north of Lordship Lane and Lansdowne Road and,
    c. the remainder (essentially Tottenham).

2. **Tottenham**

**Windsor Park and Prince of Wales ward**

The High Road should be the western boundary of these wards up to Lordship Lane. The Perry Lane estate was an isolated unit and had no special community with either ward. It was nearer to put it into Windsor Park ward. By 1981 the estate would contain 1250 electors. The Labour Party had placed the northern boundary of Prince of Wales ward further north so as to include more electors to balance those between the existing High Road and the railway which they had taken out of that ward. Windsor Park Ward was a closely knit community. Holcombe Road did cut off some people but the need for parity precluded a change.

b. **West Green Ward** presented many problems. He supported Mr. Truman. The constitution of the Broadwater Farm Tenant's Association included areas outside both West Green and Bruce Grove. The existing West Green ward would be adequate in 1981. These were 1700 electors in Broadwater Farm. He was not bothered about the Boreham Road/West Road triangle. He submitted the Labour Party's boundary along West Green Road and on the south west corner of this ward was better than the Commission's winding boundary. In the south-east corner the Commission's boundary crossed Philip Lane, which he suspected had been done only for the sake
of numbers of electors. He thought the existing West Green ward should be retained.

c. Green Lanes ward. This was a tightly knit area including a small development by the Council and was a justified two member ward as proposed by the Labour Party.

25. Councillor Page (Labour - for the Council) said about the remaining wards proposed by the Council east of the railway.


This was an existing four-member ward which had been reduced to three members by transferring the area on both sides of Tottenham High Road into Park Ward. The boundaries were otherwise the same. The northern and eastern boundaries were the Borough boundary; the southern boundary and the southern part of the western boundary were the constituency boundary. The revised section of the western boundary of Coleraine ran north from the constituency boundary along the High Road, east along Argyle Passage and Argyle Road, north along Sutherland Road to cross Park Lane at the point where Park Lane had been closed to vehicular traffic, along the eastern boundaries of St. Paul's and All Hallows School and Northumberland Park School, along the eastern boundary of Trulock Court and then crossed Northumberland Park to go along Tariff Road through the Industrial Estate. 71% of the electorate of Coleraine would remain in their existing ward.

2. Park and White Hart Lane Wards.

The Council's proposals for these two wards returned this part of the Borough to a situation similar to that which existed prior to the amalgamation of the old boroughs, with White Hart Lane enveloping the council estates and Park sitting astride Tottenham High Road. Park ward contained the North Tottenham Conservation Area with its early 19th century buildings; this section of Tottenham High Road was much less busy because much of the through traffic from the southern section of Tottenham High Road went along Bruce Grove to join the Great Cambridge Road. The northern boundary of Park ward was the Borough boundary, the southern boundary was the constituency boundary, the eastern boundary was the Coleraine Ward boundary and the western boundary ran along the edge of Bruce Castle Park through Tottenham Cemetery and along Selby Road. White Hart Lane Ward contained the whole of the GLC council estate and most of the White Hart Lane estate. White Hart Lane Ward's northern boundary was the Borough boundary, its eastern boundary was the Park Ward boundary, its southern boundary was the constituency boundary and its western boundary ran north from the constituency boundary along the Roundway then north-west along Gospatrick Road, taking in rather more of the White Hart Lane estate than did the existing ward boundary, then along Rivulet Road and White Hart Lane, then cutting across the New River playing fields to the Borough boundary in the north. This transferred a section of the existing Town Hall Ward into White Hart Lane and corrected an anomaly in the existing ward boundaries. Electors in Norfolk Avenue, Norfolk Close and the western part of Devonshire Hill Lane at present voted in St. Cuthbert's Church Hall in Wolves Lane in Town Hall Ward. To get to their polling station these voters had to leave the Borough of Haringey and travel the length of the remainder of Norfolk Avenue in the Borough of Enfield before returning to Haringey again. The proposed boundary would correct this peculiar situation. 72% of the electorate of the existing Park Ward would become part of the new White Hart Lane, the remainder would
become part of the new Park ward.

3. **Town Hall Ward**

The proposed Town Hall Ward lost the part of the existing Town Hall Ward to the west of Green Lanes and gained part of the existing Noel Park Ward to the north of Lordship Lane. This re-united the "Scotch" estate which was previously divided by Perth Road and also those parts of the White Hart Lane estate not contained within the proposed White Hart Lane Ward. The northern boundary was the Borough boundary, the southern boundary was Lordship Lane, the eastern boundary was the White Hart Lane Ward boundary and the western boundary was the High Road. 67% of the Town Hall ward electorate would remain in their existing ward.

4. **Bowes Park Ward.**

This was one of the two wards formed by dividing the existing Alexandra-Bowes Ward (a four-member ward). The northern boundary was the Borough boundary, the eastern boundary was the High Road, the southern boundary was Station Road, the western boundary was the main Kings Cross to Edinburgh railway line. 100% of the electorate of Alexandra-Bowes Ward remain in either Alexandra or Bowes Park.

5. **Noel Park Ward**

The proposed Noel Park Ward contained the whole of the Noel Park artisans estate and most of the new Wood Green Central Area redevelopment, a substantial part of which should be completed by 1981. It was proposed to make Wood Green High Road from Lordship Lane to Turnpike Lane a bus and pedestrian only area, thereby helping to make the High Road a focal point rather than a dividing factor. The northern boundary of Noel Park was Station Road and Westbury Avenue, the western boundary was the Kings Cross to Edinburgh railway line, the southeaster boundary was Westbury Avenue and Turnpike Lane. 67% of the electorate of Noel Park would remain in their existing ward.

6. **Harringay Ward**

This was a new ward recognising the reality of the community in the "ladder". The northern boundary is Turnpike Lane, the eastern boundary is Green Lanes, the western boundary is the Kings Cross to Edinburgh railway line, the southern boundary is the Borough boundary.

Harringay is a new ward and none of its electors remain in the existing ward.

26. **Councillor Page** then commented on the Commission's proposals:--

1. The Commission's Northumberland Park Ward divided the community in Coleraine in a most unsatisfactory manner. The western boundary of White Hart Lane divided the White Lane Estate rather more than did that in the Council's scheme. The electors of Norfolk Avenue, Norfolk Close and the western section of Devonshire Hill Lane were cut off from the rest of Devonshire Hill Lane and linked via the Borough of Enfield to Woodside.
The Woodside/Noel Park boundary split the "Scotch" estate. The western boundary of Woodside where it travelled west from the High Road was a particularly bad and arbitrary one. The south-eastern boundary of Noel Park perversely refused to follow Westbury Avenue. The northern boundary of Haringey made a triangular shaped excursion north of Turnpike Lane which would seem totally unrelated to either communities or natural boundaries.

2. The most peculiar ward of all was Bounds Green. This was a very long and narrow ward with no logic other than that the community in the north was linked to the community in the south by a particularly infrequent bus service. It was hard to see what the electors north of Durnsford Road have in common with those around Turnpike Lane in the south.

3. The Council felt that it was not necessary to have these irregular shaped wards and that the Council's proposed boundaries were more satisfactory and more faithfully recognised the existing communities.

27. Lord Colville (for the Conservatives) referred to proposed improvements of the Commission's White Hart Lane, Noel Park and Woodside Wards (paragraph 11(9) of this report) and answered Councillor Page and comments in a report by saying:

1. Harringay

The Hornsey Park Estate was in two entirely separate parts with regard to vehicular access and the proposed boundary east of Alexander Road recognised this fact. The alleged non-residential swathe was all land shutting the railway and did not therefore in anyway separate adjacent residential property from anything but the railway itself. Finally the suggested boundary would make for total inequality of electorate as it would increase the ward by 1442 electors.

2. Bounds Green

The northern boundary with Woodside ward was not meaningless at all. It took note that there was no vehicular connection to Whittington or Thorold Roads, came south along the boundary of a public open space and then east along the rear of the northern boundaries of properties in Nightingale Road. Great care had been taken not to split the Council tenant community centering on Commerce Road. The suggestion of using Clarence Road, present boundary, and then Commerce Road would cause great difficulties of access and movement and divided the Council estate between two wards. The suggestion of following the High Road involved some 2424 electors and would obviously be impossible.

3. Noel Park

He agreed that the present boundary to the east with White Hart Lane Ward was not a good boundary although because of further drafting errors the officers have not appreciated that it was the same as the present ward boundary. The proposal to follow Rivulet Road to the Great Cambridge Road and then south along the Roundway would be quite wrong as it would add nearly 500 voters to Noel Park which was a ward substantially larger than average at present thus making it the largest ward in the borough. Finally equality of electoral numbers between Noel ward and West Green ward required the whole of Westbury Avenue to be in West Green Ward which was very much smaller.
4. **West Green**

The electorate in the small segment in the south-west of the ward was 358 which was very relevant to an already small ward. Further they had vehicular access only from West Green Road because of a small one way traffic management scheme and therefore would have very complicated movement problems if removed from West Green ward. The suggestion regarding the boundary being moved to the centre of Summerhill Road thus splitting between two wards that residential road which carried little through traffic was a matter of policy on communities upon which the Commission could best decide. The eastern boundary south of Broadwater Farm had been drawn deliberately to put Gloucester Road back into one single ward instead of being in two as at present but as with Summerhill Road this has been most unacceptable and it was a matter of policy for the Commission.

5. The area north of Turnpike Lane had been included in Harringay ward because the triangle fronting on Turnpike Lane had a community with it but not as with the roads to the west of it which went with the Mayes Road area, and its inclusion in the Harringay ward made the figures better.

6. The Council's Town Hall ward unnecessarily divided Gospatrick Road which was part of the Old White Hart Lane Cottage estate and was a single community. The boundary ought to be the rear of the houses on the west side of Gospatrick Road.

7. The criticism of the south-western boundary of the Commission's St. Ann's ward was unjustified as Alfordon Road and St. Margarets had no connections to the east and were part of West Green. The streets on the south-eastern corner of West Green formed a self-contained community allied to West Green.

8. In answer to a comment by Councillor S. Whittle (Labour Party) that the St. Pancras railway cut through the Commission's St. Ann's ward he replied that the streets on both sides of Hermitage Road were linked by that primary road (passing under the railway) with St. Ann's.

9. On the Council's Noel Park Ward he commented that Wood Green High Road was the natural watershed in community terms; and movement within that ward would be made difficult by its east/west axis. For example, to travel from Brook Road to Ilford Road would be very time consuming and difficult. The area west of High Road had local ties with Bounds Green. The area north of Lordship Lane was quite acceptable as part of the Commission's Noel Park ward.

28. **Councillor Butler** (Mayor - Co-operative Party) said that the connection between High Road and Bounds Green Road was to be closed but there would still be a spinal connection via Mayes Road.

29. **Councillor Harrington** (Conservative) said that all three schemes split Noel Park in one way or another and commented on the Labour Party's scheme:
1. **Bowes Park**

The eastern boundary was the New River which ran largely in culvert and therefore was a boundary which we had been specifically told to disregard (i.e. any feature running through tunnels). The railway line would clearly be a far more identifiable feature with which to start the boundary. Further the proposed boundary cut in two the area for which the small local shopping parade in Myddleton Road was a natural focal point. This area was in need of unitary treatment and would suffer by continuing to be split between two wards.

2. **Woodside**

The area was disjointed and unconnected with particular difficulties in traversing from the north east to the south west of the ward. The only possible focal point was Wood Green tube station which was right on the southern boundary of the ward.

3. **Devonshire Hill**

This ward split in half the White Hart Lane Estate with the other half in White Hart Lane ward. This was particularly unnecessary because this was a two councillor ward and the Commission's proposals quite clearly indicated it was possible to keep almost the whole of the White Hart Lane Estate intact in a three councillor ward.

4. **White Hart Lane**

This two councillor ward split the White Hart Lane estate, just as did Devonshire Hill ward.

5. **Castle**

This was one of the poorest possible choices for the experiment of a one councillor ward. The area covered did not in any way relate as a community and the lines of communication were strongly east to west and yet the ward had been drawn very narrow east to west and long north to south where the communication was very poor and the Tottenham Cemetery would act as a very effective barrier.

30. **Councillor Dr. H. Whittle (Labour Party) said:—**

1. the Commission's Bounds Green ward was too large. The Labour Party had made the Wood Green wards more acceptable by using 1, 2 and 3 member wards which gave greater flexibility than by making all 3 member wards.

2. described the boundaries of the Labour Party's Bowes Park ward which was a neat area for two members.

3. contended that by incorporating part of Bounds Green in their Noel Park ward with a northern boundary along Station Road and Lordship Lane, an eastern boundary down Westbury Avenue and Turnpike to the railway, and a western boundary along the railway and the northern part of the existing Noel Park ward, a better ward had been formed.

4. argued that the boundaries of their Woodside ward were quite clear and its area was large enough for three members.
5. agreed that their Devonshire Hill ward was smaller justifying only two members. They had divided the Council estate.

6. pointed out that an environmental experiment was taking place to prevent through traffic in the area of their Castle ward; it should be given an opportunity to develop a community in this compact area.

7. said that their Northumberland Park ward followed from the other wards.

31. Mr. E. Nice said he lived in Clarence Road, in the existing Alexandra Bowes ward. These were natural communities around:-

1. Bounds Green Station.
2. Bowes Park Station and,
3. Myddleton Park,

... together forming a whole. Why should any of them be tagged on to others? The Council's Bowes Park ward was good.

32. At this stage the meeting adjourned until Tuesday 17th May, 1977.

**GENERAL POINTS**

33. when the meeting resumed, Councillor Butler, (Mayor - Co-operative Party) made a general statement as follows:-

1. He appreciated that it would be unfair to submit a scheme at this stage which challenged in toto the 'numbers' of other submitted schemes. In any event his Party had not had the access to the Council's expertise to have enabled them to produce the evidence of "figures". Instead, what was done was to take an overall commonsense view of objectives and boundary lines in relation thereto in order to see how Wards and Constituencies would then come out.

2. The objectives they had chosen were least disturbance of "census" enumerator districts, maximum retention of "community" interests; and utilisation of "commonsense" boundaries: railways, roads, rather than back garden fences; straight lines rather than wiggles, they then drew lines on the Borough map. It was interesting from this exercise that when they related their objectives and lines to the other submitted schemes, the revised Council scheme came out "tops".

3. The Council's revised scheme kept enumerator districts whereas the Commission's scheme destroyed them. The Council's revised scheme had the virtue of recognising the importance of the railway line in the western part of the Borough, but was commonsense enough to recognise the greater worth of the Tottenham High Road, as compared with the railway, in the eastern part of the Borough. The Council's revised scheme had the commonsense to recognise the "unity" of the huge and expensive Haringey Central Area by grouping all parts in one Ward (although he would have preferred this Ward to be called "Central" or "Wood Green Central" rather than Noel Park. Haringey Central Area seems to be known as Wood Green Shopping Centre, there were "Hornsey Central" and "Tottenham Central" Wards, which, would make "Wood Green Central", an appropriate name.
4. He saw no reason why there should not be 2 member and 3 member wards since he did not believe there was virtue, necessarily, in uniformity. What was important was community, rather than artificial creations. The Council’s revised Scheme stood up best by this test.

5. Finally, there was great simplicity about the ‘straightline, keep to obvious and well known boundaries’ approach of the Council’s revised scheme. There was least variance of any of the schemes from what the public will regard as “commonsense”. The Commission’s Bounds’Green ward proposal was an example of the opposite, i.e. an obsessive regard for numbers had produced a freak. Of course the Council’s revised scheme was not perfect in relation to the "objectives" he had in mind, but it was nearest. The Council had had the benefit of hindsight with its revised scheme. Its first scheme had been based on the false assumption that Parliamentary boundaries were sacrosanct. Freed from that inhibition it seems to have produced as good as possible a scheme, free from the political bias of other schemes (Conservative, Labour) and based on what must be greater local community knowledge than the Commission had, and with the added advantage of retaining the census advantage of enumerator districts.

34. Councillor Hannington (Conservative) said that, provided all the existing polling stations were retained, about 86% of the electors would be able to continue to vote at their present polling stations if the Commission’s proposals were adopted.

35. Councillor Dr. S. Whittle (Labour Party) expected that for the Labour Party’s scheme the percentage would be between 76% and 86% but it had not been worked out.

Councillor Page (Labour for the Council) said that the Council’s revised scheme would enable 75% of the electorate to vote in the same ward and at the same polling station as in the past. The percentage of those who would continue to vote at the same polling station but not necessarily in the same ward as in the past had not been worked out but would certainly be higher than 75%.

HORSEY AND ALEXANDRA PARK

36. Councillor Page (Labour for the Council) described the Council’s scheme as follows:-

1. Alexandra ward.

This was the second of two wards created by the division of the existing four-member Alexandra/Bowes Ward. The boundary dividing Alexandra from Bowes Ward was the Kings Cross to Edinburgh railway. The railway constituted a significant physical boundary from the constituency boundary in the south until the point where it entered a tunnel at Durnsford Road; it re-emerged from the tunnel at Cline Road and continued in open section until the Borough boundary in the north. The tunnel was not so striking a boundary as the surface railway line but was a clearly recognisable one. It had not been built upon and takes the form of an open green mound crossed at only one point, Blake Road, between the bridge at Durnsford Road where the railway entered the tunnel, and the spot at which it emerged close to the Borough boundary. The houses on either side of the tunnel looked away from the railway and this was clearly shown by the shape of the development around Scout Park. It was arguable whether the electors to the north of Durnsford Road and the west of the railway line related more to those south of Durnsford Road or those east of the railway line. The Council would contend however, that the tunnel provided an acceptable and recognisable boundary and, linking as it did the two surface sections of railway line, formed part of a clear, straight
and logical division between the two wards. The rest of the Alexandra Ward boundary followed the existing constituency boundary in the south and also along the northern section of the western boundary. The only departure from the existing ward boundary lay in the southern section of the western boundary where the constituency boundary followed a rather illogical line. Here the Council had produced a straighter boundary which was clearly identifiable on the ground. 100% of the electorate of Alexandra/Bowes Ward would remain in Alexandra and Bowes Park Wards.

2. **Fortis Green Ward.**

Fortis Green Ward was very much the same as the existing ward with minor alterations in its boundaries with Alexandra and Muswell Hill Wards. The northern and western boundaries were the Borough boundary, the southern boundary was the existing ward boundary with Highgate, the northern section of the eastern boundary was the ward boundary with Alexandra. The Council proposed a fairly minor alteration to the southern section of the eastern boundary, that with Muswell Hill ward, in order to produce a tidier and more logical line. The existing boundary skirted around Muswell Hill to put the whole of the shopping centre at Muswell Hill Broadway and Fortis Green Road in Muswell Hill Ward. The proposed boundary did the same thing but followed a more direct route along Queens Avenue and Fortismere Avenue. In numerical terms, there was not much to choose between the two solutions. The Council felt that its proposed boundary would be simply a much tidier one. 95% of the electorate of Fortis Green would remain in the existing ward.

3. **Highgate Ward.**

The proposed Highgate Ward was the existing ward less polling district HC. The Council had made a drafting error in the north/eastern corner of the ward: the eastern boundary running south from Woodside Avenue bisected a new council development at the corner of Woodside Avenue and Muswell Hill Road. This was an old peoples home and these electors should clearly vote in Muswell Hill. The Council proposed a revision of this boundary such that it would follow the western boundary and then the southern boundary of the new development before rejoining the existing ward boundary at the rear of the houses in Muswell Hill Road. The eastern boundary continued southward along Muswell Hill Road and crossed the Archway Road to run along Southwood Lane until it reached Southwood Lawn Road. The boundary then headed due east and followed what appears to be a rather illogical route. This was in fact the existing polling district boundary and separated the houses along Southwood Lawn Road and Cholmeley Crescent, which had access on to the Archway Road, from the houses to the west of the boundary, which had access into Highgate Village. 65% of the electorate of Highgate Ward would remain in their existing ward.

4. **Archway Ward.**

The Council's proposal was to create a new Archway Ward by linking polling district HC from the existing Highgate Ward with polling district HK from the existing Crouch End Ward. This recognised the identity of the community on both sides of the Archway Road. The recent public inquiry into the Greater London Council's proposal to widen the Archway Road had produced a tremendous reaction from the local community, which feared it would be divided if the road widening scheme came to fruition. Each side of Archway Road clearly related more to the other than to Crouch End or Highgate Village. The northern boundary of Archway Ward ran straight through Queens Wood instead of following the existing boundary with Muswell Hill along the property boundaries of houses backing on to the Wood. The northern section of the eastern boundary with Crouch End followed the existing ward boundary along Stanhope Road and continued along that road to the Borough boundary.
5. **Crouch End Ward**

The proposed ward reunited the divided community of Crouch End. The existing ward boundary split Crouch End in two by running down the middle of Crouch End Hill and Crouch End Broadway. Crouch End was an old established community with its own shopping centre and had grown from a village community. The focal point of this community lay clearly at the Clock Tower in Crouch End Broadway from which roads radiated like spokes from the hub of a wheel. The proposed boundaries of Crouch End Ward had merit not because they presented physical barriers, but because they encompassed the very real community centred around Crouch End Broadway. In the boundaries to the north and east it was impossible to say where one community ended and another began. Some boundaries must necessarily be somewhat arbitrary. The boundary with Hornsey Vale was a good one in that Ferme Park Road was a recognised through-route for traffic between Central Hornsey and Finsbury Park. It was also a bus route. The boundaries with Hornsey Central and South Hornsey lay along residential streets; it was arguable whether one street was a more appropriate boundary than the next one. Because Crouch End was a previously divided community, only 52% of the electorate in Crouch End Ward would remain in their existing ward.

6. **Muswell Hill Ward**

This ward lay at the centre of the Council's proposals in Hornsey. Its northern and southern boundaries were naturally defined by parkland and woodlands. Its western boundary encompassed the community around Muswell Hill Broadway. The western boundary enabled the communities at the top and bottom of the hill itself to be linked without encroaching into Central Hornsey. The proposed ward in shape and character was very similar to the existing ward. 89% of the electorate of Muswell Hill would remain in their existing wards.

7. **Hornsey Central, Hornsey Vale and South Hornsey Wards**

These three wards taken together constituted the lower income end of Hornsey. The housing was a mixture of council owned, private rented and low/middle income owner occupied. There was a high incidence of housing stress and all three of the Borough's Housing Action Areas lay in these wards. Hornsey Central had an identity of its own, centred around Hornsey High Street, as did the triangular shaped area in South Hornsey defined by the two railway lines and the Borough boundary. The areas in between Hornsey Vale and Stroud Green had been linked together to form a new Hornsey Vale Ward. The Council's proposal was for three wards of two members each. This area could have been divided into two wards of three members each had a convenient natural boundary presented. Hornsey Vale, however, consisted of a series of parallel roads running north to south intersected only by Western Park. This would not be an acceptable boundary because it did not divide Hornsey Vale in suitable proportions. The southern boundary of Hornsey Central, however, was an existing polling district boundary and a bus route and was quite acceptable. The southern boundary of Hornsey Vale was the east/west railway, the eastern boundary of the three wards was the Borough boundary, and the other external boundaries were those with Muswell Hill and Crouch End Wards.

77. Mr. R. Simon (Labour) said she lived in Southwood Lane. It was wrong to divide the top and bottom of the lane. The Labour Party's scheme (which had the same Highgate ward as the Commission) was more sensible.
38. Councillor Page commented on the Commission's proposals:—

1. The most noticeable feature of the Commission's scheme in Hornsey was the manner in which it had departed totally from the existing ward structure. Existing communities recognised by the present ward pattern had been unnecessarily divided. Some very curiously shaped wards had been produced.

2. The proposal to take the boundary of Alexandra Park Ward almost up to Colney Hatch Lane would mean that some 2,000 electors of Alexandra Park would be in Hornsey constituency and the rest in Wood Green. The electors in Wood Vale, Woodland Rise, Woodland Gardens and Onslow Gardens in Hornsey Woods, having been cut off from the rest of Muswell Hill, were isolated from the remainder of Hornsey Woods Ward by Highgate Wood, Queens Wood and the Crouch End Playing fields. The community of Crouch End continued to be divided but in a new and novel way. Central Hornsey was split right down the High Street. Muswell Hill was divided by a boundary running behind The Broadway. The most unsatisfactory aspect was the way in which some of these curiously shaped wards sought to link disparate neighbourhoods while dividing existing communities.

3. The existing Central Hornsey ward was divided into three, one portion being attached to each of three new wards. In order to stretch the long narrow Priory ward from Muswell Hill to the railway line and swallow two-thirds of Central Hornsey, it had been necessary to divide the community at Muswell Hill and isolate the electorate of Wood Vale, Woodland Rise, Woodland Gardens and Onslow Gardens. The wedge shaped Crouch End ward had engulfed another portion of Central Hornsey at the expense of perpetuating the division of Crouch End. The remainder of Central Hornsey disappeared into the long Stroud Green Ward. The electorate of Central Hornsey would effectively lose its voice by being split into three and lumped together with three larger communities.

4. The Council considered that the Commission's scheme divided communities in Hornsey in a manner that was both unnecessary and wrong and that the Council's proposals provided a pattern of wards which more faithfully represented identities of communities in Hornsey.

39. Mr. R. Blanchard (a Central Hornsey resident) was much opposed to the Commission's proposals because they led to the disappearance of Hornsey Central. It had been done because manual workers lived there. Those workers wanted to keep their identity.

40. Councillor Hannington (Conservative Association) commented:—

1. Alexandra and Bowes Park wards. The Labour Party's scheme was the same as the Commission's. The Council's was different. Wroxham Gardens was joined by Blake Road to the east but it was cut off from the west. The tunnel did not act as a cut-off. Colney Hatch Lane in the west was a divider. The Council's boundary was false and arbitrary.

2. Highgate Ward. He agreed that the Old People's Home and the group of Council houses by Woodside Avenue should be in the same ward. The bottom of the hill was part of Highgate and the people living there had always seen themselves so. Miltons was separate from Highgate. There had been few local people at the motorway inquiry; most had come
3. **Priory Ward**  He saw Broadway as a divider rather than as a centre. Muswell Hill Broadway was a major shopping centre serving a very wide area. High Street was a clear divider but the Conservatives had used Priory Park as a boundary. He disagreed with Councillor Page's comments. Priory Ward was a gradual mixture. The Commission's proposals did substantially affect a number of existing wards. There was an enormous disparity among the areas in Hornsey. None was homogeneous, even in terms of income.

4. **Crouch End Ward**  He did not accept that Crouch End centred on Broadway which had always shown the boundary going along Crouch End Hill and Broadway. The Labour Party's Scheme used the same boundary. (Mr. Blanchard said Councillor Hannington wanted it both ways). Councillor Hannington continued that there was no identity of community across High Street which divided St. Mary's from the Campthorne Estate.

41. **Councillor Jeremy Corbin** (South Haringey - Labour Party) said Councillor Hannington was wrong. There were close ties between the tenants associations of the new and old Council estates across High Street which was not a divider.

42. **Councillor Miss C. Jackson** (Muswell Hill & Central - Conservative) said the old Central Hornsey ward had four polling districts for the four communities, Campthorne was one. There were two distinct communities in Priory ward viz. H1 and H2 polling districts. Polling district H6 which linked them was changing. The boundary between polling districts H6/H7 was difficult. The Priory Ward bound the communities in mixed development which was better than separating them.

43. **Councillor Hannington** (Conservative) said Clovelly Road and Priory Road were nonsense as a community boundary in the Council Muswell Hill Ward. He criticised the Council's Crouch End and South Hornsey wards because the boundary along Tregaron Avenue and Elm Grove divided a community centred on St. Peter's Church and school. The area in South Hornsey ward was cut off and should be in Crouch End ward. The Stroud Green community had clear links from north of the railway as far as Hornsey Vale. He then commented on the Labour Party's scheme.

1. **Stroud Green**

The boundary at Ridge Road created a highly artificial division as the houses and communities on each side of the ridge were very similar. Three roads connected all the way through and therefore a north/south boundary was much to be preferred to an east/west boundary. There was a risk that Chettle Court, a newly developed block of council flats would become an unwanted appendix tucked away in the northern-most corner whilst the community facilities provided there could make a strong ward centre in the area lacking such amenities.

2. **Weston Park**

The small area south of the Crouch Hill reservoir would be too cut off in community terms.
3. **Priory**

With the spinal principle of Muswell Hill/Priory Road accepted, why was it suggested the ward should be reduced to two members by ignoring the continuation of Priory Road as Hornsey High Street?

4. **St. Mary's**

Again this was a small two councillor ward there was no real identity of community and the area south of Rokesly Avenue will have no relationship to the rest of the ward. For a small ward movement from the northern end to the southern end would be remarkably awkward.

44. Councillor Dr. Whittle (Labour Party) said the problem of Hornsey was its north-west/south-east polarity with clear distinctions en-route. In the south-east were high density dwellings mainly occupied by manual workers. In the north-west were low density dwellings occupied by professional people. The Labour Party objected to the Commission's proposals for the south-east. Priory Ward was the weak point in the Commission's proposals. It was long and mixed up communities. The Labour Party's scheme rectified it by installing a central ward (St. Mary's), which was a close knit community. The Commission's Stroud Green ward went into Hornsey. The Labour Party's Stroud Green corresponded more closely with Stroud Green community.

45. Mr. K. Browne (Labour) objected to the long thin wards proposed by the Commission because communications within them were difficult.

46. Councillor J.B. Cauty (Labour) who represented South Hornsey, was concerned about the Commission's Priory, Crouch End and Stroud Green wards which divided South Hornsey unsatisfactorily. The Labour Party's scheme provided the best representation for local ties and covered most of the area of the Stroud Green Community Association. The Commission's Crouch End ward covered too diverse an area. In answer to a question by Council Page he agreed that Hornsey Vale, Hornsey Central and South Hornsey were homogeneous and should not be linked with more difficult areas.

47. Mr. L. Baines (Conservative - Greater London Council member) said he had had a long connection with Stroud Green. He thought the railway was not a good boundary. The Commission's Stroud Green ward was homogeneous. He supported the Commission's Crouch End ward, even though it straddled a long area but it could well be linked together. In the Council's Crouch End ward the new Council housing estate had not yet formed any affinities. The Labour Party's scheme included in their St. Mary's ward the area around Elmfield Avenue which consisted mainly of owner-occupied semi-detached houses having no links with the Council estate and he realised that it was impossible to get perfect wards in social terms.

**CONCLUDING STATEMENTS**

48. Councillor Hannington (Conservative) made a concluding statement in which

1. He asked for his written general comments on the Council and Labour Party schemes and the Council Officers' report of 5 January, 1977 and his comments on it to be taken into account by the Commission.

2. He emphasised the critical effects in terms of community which the major lines of communication through the Borough had. The huge railway from Kings Cross to the north cut off the west of the Borough. Tottenham High Road and Green Lane/Wood Green High Road were major shopping attractions as well as primary traffic routes and acted as community focal points.
3. He remarked on the proposals that more than half had a remarkable similarity in style and presentation (expressing shock or horror, alleging usually without specific example the breaking and the disregard of natural boundaries and calling for a public inquiry). It was for consideration whether these objections seemingly from separate sources were in fact representative of one unified political interest.

4. The greatest criticism received prior to this meeting had been of the wards in the west of the Borough (more than half of Haringey Labour Party Local Government Committee's objection No.32 was taken up with this). However he presumed that the acceptance in the Haringey Labour scheme of Fortis Green, Alexandra Park, Highgate and Hornsey Wood wards meant that they disregarded and withdrew their previous objections. In the light of these contradictions the Commission would have to consider the extent to which their remaining objections were diminished.

He also assumed that a number of written objections were superseded by the new Labour Party position exemplified in their scheme, specifically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crouch End   Labour Party Ward Branch Regarding Hornsey Woods. No.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate     ditto - Highgate. No.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Bowes ditto - Alexandra Park. No.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green ditto - Hornsey Woods. No.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and nearly one third of the objections of Hornsey Labour Party. No.25.

The Labour Party delegates at the meeting could assure him no doubt they did speak for Haringey Labour Party.

5. Entitlement

The Labour Party Scheme's figures were unverified and nearly half of those for 1976 which could be tested were outside the normal tolerance, although this position improved for 1981 on the basis on conjectural figures. The Council's second scheme was the worst of the three in terms of 1976 and 1981. Neither had proved the need for a mixture of two and three and even one member wards. The Commission's draft proposals were the best of the three and he would have thought quite acceptable. His minor amendments did not change this and in some key areas helped improve the figures. Further, there was the added advantage of the easily understood three members per ward system.

6. Boundaries

It had been said earlier that there were a number of strong boundaries in terms of major roads and railways and therefore there was some choice, but he criticised three examples of proposed boundaries viz:

a. Boundary between Park and Coleraine wards in the Council's scheme.

b. Boundary between Woodside and Bowes Park wards in the Labour Party's scheme which cut straight through a local shopping centre and followed the New River in culvert.
c. Broadwater Farm where the ward boundary should clearly naturally be along the boundary of the open park to the west thus preserving the links to the east and the south with Bruce Grove ward.

The Commission's proposals had no boundaries as lacking in justification as these. He also requested the Commission to look carefully at his suggested improvements bearing in mind that the use of property boundaries was a feature in all three schemes.

7. Community Ties

The Council's scheme broke the following communities:

- Northumberland Park Estate
- Windsor Park Neighbourhood Improvement Area
- Antill Road Area
- White Hart Lane Estate
- Bounds Green Residents Association
- Crouch End/South Hornsey particularly the community centred on the Church of St. Peter in Chains and the school of St. Gildas

The Labour Party's scheme broke:

- Windsor Park
- White Hart Lane Estate
- Myddleton Road Area

The Commission's proposals in his view out no community ties at all. The only areas of criticism had been Broadwater Farm which he rejected because the community was not in any way divided, merely its true aspect recognised; and Haringey Central Area which was not a community at all but was a planning concept largely geared to shop and office development. Further all three schemes accepted the validity of linking small complete communities in a ward particularly if lines of communication within the ward were good.

8. He accepted the necessity of adjusting the parliamentary constituency boundaries and had no criticism of the Council's or Labour Party's schemes on that ground alone.

9. He therefore maintained that on all the basic principles the Commission's proposals were better and that they should be preferred.

49. Councillor Dr. Whittle (Labour Party) referred to the east/west polarity. One could not just put a grid over Haringey divided into 3 member wards without producing anomalies. The Labour Party's scheme gave flexibility. They had taken full account of the need for parity. The 1976 figures would be ignored. There were only two slight excesses in 1981. They had tried to take account of localities. Councillor Harrington's criticism of Castle Ward that one could not drive through it was irrelevant. He then commented on various wards and their boundaries and asked me to visit Castle ward.

50. Councillor Page (Labour – for the Council) made the following points:

1. With three different schemes it was very hard to decide upon the merits or de-merits of each case. There had been much argument on what were and were not communities: some had been contradictory; communities were very subjective things.
2. The proposals submitted by the Council had been produced by the Council's Officers in consultation with himself as Chairman of the General Purposes Committee. The other two schemes had been prepared by the two political parties, one of these having been adopted as the Commission's draft proposals. He examined the similarities and differences between the three schemes.

3. The Labour Party's scheme had been content to adopt the boundaries proposed by the Conservative Party in the west of Hornsey. It had adopted the Council's boundaries for most of Tottenham. The areas where all three schemes differed were in their treatment of Wood Green and the areas adjoining the Kings Cross to Edinburgh railway line.

4. The Commission had produced, in its draft proposals, ward boundaries which departed significantly from the constituency boundary of Wood Green in the east and the west of the Borough. A future parliamentary boundary commission would not be able to ignore the fact that some 2,000 Hornsey electors formed part of the electorate of the predominantly Wood Green ward of Alexandra Park and some 3,500 Wood Green electors formed part of the predominantly Tottenham ward of Windsor Park. The treatment of these boundaries must inevitably be a sensitive issue for the political parties and might well have had a bearing on their treatment of Wood Green. In borough election terms the political battleground was in the middle of the Borough and it was interesting to note the way in which the scheme of both parties had produced wedge shape wards (but pointing in opposite directions) which divide an existing community and linked it with larger ones. The effect of the Labour Party's St. Mary's and Weston Park Wards in extinguishing the existing Crouch End Ward was strikingly similar to that in the Conservative proposals of Priory and Crouch End Wards upon Central Hornsey.

5. The Council's approach had been a significantly different one. It had sought to maintain existing boundaries rather than change them, retain existing communities rather than divide them and minimise the disruption to local polling arrangements and the effect this would have on the electorate. The Council had clearly stated its objectives and had demonstrated the way it set about achieving them.

6. In the east of the Borough, where the argument had been chiefly about boundaries, the Council had adopted, to a greater extent than the Commission's scheme, major roads which produced good, clear, identifiable boundaries. In addition, most of the boundaries were existing ones and so had the benefit of being already well known.

7. In the west of the Borough where the argument had been chiefly over communities the Council scheme was the only one which maintained the four principal communities, those of Crouch End, Hornsey Central, Highgate Village and Muswell Hill, undivided and in their own wards.

8. The Council considered that its revised scheme met the Commission's criteria and the additional objectives of the Council in a better way than did the Commission's scheme. It was confident that the Borough's interests would best be met by the adoption of the Council's revised scheme and earnestly commends this scheme to the Commission for its approval and adoption.

51. Councillor Butler (Mayor - Co-operative Party) pointed out that the Council's scheme took account of the enumeration details for the 1971 census.
52. Councillor Dr. Whittle (Labour Party) explained that the north-western edge of the Greater London Council's White Hart Lane estate was not in the Labour Party's White Hart Lane ward but in their Devonshire Hill ward. The division was Great Cambridge Road which was a good boundary.

53. Councillor Hannington (Conservative) pointed out that the Commission's proposals included the housing action areas in the ward (Stroud Green) whereas the Council's scheme put them in two wards.

**CONSIDERATION**

54. 1981 Forecasts At an earlier stage the Conservative Associations disputed the Council's figures for the electorate, but at the meeting no particular point was made about the various figures in the three schemes which are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>1976 Electorate</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>159,641</td>
<td>156,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council's revised</td>
<td>159,572</td>
<td>156,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council's method of forecasting was to project past trends in each parliamentary constituency adjusted for prospective development and add the totals. It seems to me that the differences in the 1981 figures in the three schemes are insignificant for the purpose of the present exercise.

55. The need for ward changes.

1. A review of the Haringey wards is needed, not only for the normal reason that alterations in the population have thrown the existing wards out of balance, but also because when those wards were approved in January 1964 by the Secretary of State he expressed the view that there would be disadvantages in the perpetuation of obsolete Borough boundaries as ward boundaries in the new Borough. On 10 December, 1965 the Secretary of State invited the Council to submit to him a representation about (inter alia) the number of wards and the boundaries of any of those wards. In the event, the Council did not respond to that invitation but deferred action until the Commission invited them to submit a scheme.

2. I believe it to be a sound approach to a review of wards to provide as little disturbance as practicable to the settled habits of voters. In this case, while that approach holds good, the positive need to secure the removal of anomalous existing ward boundaries is added to the basic requirement to devise wards with a reasonable parity of electors among them.

56. The approaches of the proposers of the three schemes differ. The Conservative Associations (on whose scheme the Commission's proposals are based) desired 3 member wards throughout. The Council sought in their revised scheme (to which I refer as the Council's scheme), the minimum alteration to existing voting arrangements. The Labour Party looked to flexibility to achieve the criteria. All three profess to have found the best boundaries and to have related their wards to local communities.
57. The schemes have the following distribution of wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Total No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>3 member</th>
<th>2 member</th>
<th>1 member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Party</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission's scheme achieves a closer parity among the wards than do either of the other schemes, although oddly enough the total of the variations in entitlements is 1.76 as against 1.74 for the Council's scheme and 1.88 for the Labour Party's Scheme. The Council have one ward (Bowes Park) for 3 members where the entitlement is rather high at 3.28. The Labour Party have a high entitlement of 3.23 for their 3 member Woodside Ward. If entitlement were the only consideration, the Commission's scheme would be the best. The Local Government Act 1972 however requires that regard be had to the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable and also to any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary. Therefore it is necessary to examine the schemes to see how each measures up to these requirements.

58. Each of the three parties criticised the boundaries chosen by the others. While none of them is faultless, it seems to me that on balance the boundaries in the Council's scheme are the most easily identifiable on the ground. For the reasons given in paragraph 55 some of the boundaries of the existing parliamentary constituencies are unsatisfactory and, quite properly, the schemes have departed from them where a better ward boundary can be found.

59. 1. The relationship of the wards to local ties differs in each of the schemes. What forms a local community is so much a matter of subjective opinion that it is difficult to reach a confident judgment on every one of the competing arguments advanced at the meeting. There were however three criticisms of the Commission's proposal which, in my opinion, had force.

2. The first concerns the treatment of the area in Hornsey along the west of the railway, which it was said is occupied mainly by low income manual workers. The Commission split this area among their Priory, Crouch End and Stroud Green wards, thus mixing it (particularly in Priory Ward) with a preponderance of higher income groups so that the former group would have less chance of being directly represented on the Council. Normally one would expect a community to consist of a mix of social/economic groups. Indeed, it might be thought artificial to devise wards each limited to one such group. In this case, however, I think Councillor Page was right when he argued that the wards should be planned to allow the group living along the railway to have its own voice on the Council, which is the forum where differences between groups should be resolved. Thus I consider the Council's proposed Hornsey Central, Hornsey Vale and South Hornsey wards are to be preferred to the Commission's three wards and also to the Labour Party's St. Mary's Weston Park and Stroud Green wards.
3. The second weighty criticism was of the Commission's Bounds Green ward. The argument at the meeting led me to conclude that this ward does not relate to a single community. To my mind the Council have proposed a more logical pattern here than either the Commission or the Labour Party.

4. The third related to the Commission's St. Ann's and Seven Sisters wards, both of which cross the railway. The arguments for seeing the railway as a boundary seemed to me to be strong. Consequently, I prefer the Green Lanes, Tottenham Central and Seven Sisters wards of both the Council's and the Labour Party's schemes.

5. On the other hand, the Commission's Highgate ward (used also by the Labour Party) seems to me better than the Council's pattern in this part of the Borough. The Council's Highgate and Archway wards were criticised because they included the areas on both sides of Archway and separated the top and bottom of Highgate Hill. I am far from convinced that the furor at the Archway public inquiry demonstrates a continuing community of interest between the two sides of that major road. In my opinion, however, these criticisms of the Council's scheme are not nearly as strong as the criticisms of the Commission's proposals to which I have already referred.

6. I do not regard the other criticisms of the schemes as raising any fundamental issues. The Council have suggested an amendment to overcome the complaint that their scheme split the new estate off Ferry Lane.

60. From what I have written it will be apparent that I feel unable to recommend the adoption of the Commission's proposals unchanged. I have tried to adapt those proposals so as to remove what I regard as the serious defects I have mentioned, but could not do so satisfactorily. I then examined the possibility of devising a pattern of wards which incorporated the best features of each of the schemes. I failed in this endeavor also, because of the domino effect a change in one group of wards has on the others. Thus I have been compelled to select one of the three schemes which were before the meeting, even though none is perfect.

61. After considering carefully the representations made to the Commission and all that was said at the meeting, my opinion is that the Council's scheme best meets the needs of the Borough, in spite of the Bowes Park ward sectors being somewhat under-represented in 1981 and the defects of the Highgate and Archway wards because:

1. It makes less changes of the existing pattern than do either of the other schemes;

2. On balance it provides better boundaries than the other schemes; and

3. It seems best to fit local communities.

RECOMMENDATION

62. I recommend that the Council's revised scheme be adopted, subject to amendment,

a. to include in Highcross ward the whole of the Ferry Lane development, and

b. to include in Muswell Hill ward the whole of the Old People's Home in Woodside Avenue.

App. 2 & 6. Appendices 2 and 6 with the plan attached to Appendix 6 show the wards in the Council's revised scheme. The verbal
description of the ward boundaries includes the amendments for Ferry Lane and the Old People's Home. Appendix 7 contains large scale plans showing the amendments.

CONCLUSION

63. Finally, I would like first to pay tribute to the careful way in which the Council and the various parties prepared their representations and the helpful and courteous manner in which the speakers put their points of view; and second to record my thanks to the Chief Executive and the other members of the Council's staff for so readily making available to me the additional information for which I asked them.

20th June 1977

[Signature]
### Appendix 1

THE COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,872</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounds Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,680</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,398</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,665</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,393</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sisters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,081</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ann's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harringey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,279</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,056</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey Woods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,114</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,502</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,414</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                             | 57                | 159,641      | 57.01        | 156,708      | 56.98        |

Average per Councillor 2,801 2,749
## Appendix 2

**BOROUGH COUNCIL'S REVISED SCHEME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,008</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boves Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,637</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,244</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,419</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,001</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,055</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey Vale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswell Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,732</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,642</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sisters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,649</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hornsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tottenham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,455</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | Average per Councillor | 2,705 | 2,650 |
## Haringey Labour Party's Scheme

### Appendix 3

#### Haringey Labour Party's Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1976 Electorate Entitlement</th>
<th>1981 Electorate Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowes Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harringay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,738</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey Woods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ann's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,173</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sistres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,646</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,912</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,448</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average per Councillor: 2,697

**NOTE:** No figures for 1976 were supplied.
Appendix 4

LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED BY THE COMMISSION

1. Hornsey, Tottenham and Wood Green Conservative Associations submitted their own proposals and comments on a joint report by the Borough Planning Officer and the Electoral Registration Officer.


3. Hornsey, Tottenham and Wood Green Conservative Associations objected to the Council's revised scheme.

4. Mrs. Joyce Butler M.P. objected to the Commission's proposals, particularly for Wood Green as the boundaries were artificial and natural community interests set aside.

5. Mr. Norman Atkinson M.P. objected to the Commission's scheme as the proposed boundaries infringed the natural separation of communities.

6. The Mayor of Haringey asked for an impartial enquiry as there could be the possibility that the Commission had been somewhat politically motivated.

7. Mr. D. Billingsley of 259 Albert Road, Wood Green, protested against the Commission's proposals as they would result in the breaking up of existing communities.

8. Winkfield Road Tenants Association complained that the Commission's proposals dismembered communities.

9. Mr. Lee McEwen of 21 Acacia House, Douglas Road, Wood Green called for natural boundaries to be adhered to.

10. Mrs. A.A. Hujler (former Tottenham councillor) of 108, Seymour Road, Haringey thought natural boundaries of the utmost importance.

11. Mr. E.E. Nice of 8, Barnes Court, Clarence Road, N22 was concerned about the conversion of Alexandra Bowes ward into a elongated shape with no common interest at either end.

12 - 20. Criticism of the Commission's proposals because of failure to observe natural boundaries were received from

Mrs. Betty Stanley of 49, Marlborough Road.
Mr. F. Newer of 59, Creighton Avenue.
Councillor Ron Turner.
General & Municipal Wardens Union (Tottenham Branch).
Mr. D.C. Rumble of 61, Outram Road.
Mr. J. Hall of 4, Earlam Grove, Wood Green.
Mr. J. Cogholl of 68, Dongola Road, Tottenham.
Mrs. J.L. Smithers of 124 Seymour Road.
Mr. E.W. Day of 73 Higham Road, Tottenham.

Mr. J.T. Harris of 25 South Close, Highgate had lived in Highgate all his life but under the Commission's proposals would live in Hornsey Woods, a ward with no centre and not one community. He made detailed criticisms of the boundaries.
22. Central Branch, Hornsey Labour Party contended that the Commission's proposals destroyed the natural community around Hornsey High Street, Muswell Hill and the Campsbourne Estate were two separate communities, and should not be joined in Priory ward.

23. Crouch End Branch Hornsey Labour Party objected to Crouch End ward because:

1. it included the area north of Queens Wood which was part of the Cranley Gardens community (most of which was put into Priory Ward),

2. its eastern boundary bisected the natural focus of Crouch End village i.e. the Broadway,

3. its south-western boundary was along the disused Highgate/Finsbury Park railway rather than the natural dividing line of Archway Road

and argued that Hornsey Woods ward failed to meet the Commission's criteria.

24. South Hornsey Branch, Hornsey Labour Party said the changes would create a feeling of non-identification to the areas at the extreme ends of Stroud Green ward. The southern end had an active community association for "Triangle". The proposals put together 3 different communities with no common bond.


26. Highgate Ward, Hornsey Labour Party objected to the Commission's proposals on principle and because of the practical result, and gave examples to support that objection.

27. Wood Green Labour Party objected to the proposals for Wood Green constituency and particularly for the existing Alexandra Bowes ward and made detailed criticisms of Alexandra ward and Bounds Green ward.

28. Broadwater Farm Community & Tenants' Association objected to any change in the existing West Green ward.

29. Naomi E. Sergeant McIntosh of 4, Talbot Road protested against the re-warding; particularly in the Highgate end of the Hornsey area. The Commission's proposals did not accord with existing communities and shopping centres. Priory and Hornsey Wood wards were extraordinary. She illustrated her criticisms with details.

30. Stroud Green Branch, Hornsey Labour Party objected to the Commission's proposals because they had little regard for identifiable communities, crossed constituency boundaries and would cause a need for new polling stations, which would cause unnecessary disruption for voters and election organisers.

31. London Co-operative Society (Haringey Borough Co-operative) objected to the Council's revised proposals and stated their intention to present alternative proposals. (Note:- In the event no alternative proposals were officially submitted).

32 & 33. London Borough of Haringey Labour Party submitted detailed objections to the Commissions proposals and put forward an alternative scheme.
Appendix 5

LIST OF PERSONS PRESENT AT MEETING


Haringey Borough Council
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
Haringey Conservative Association
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
- ditto -
Haringey Labour Parties
- ditto -
- ditto -
Greater London Labour Party
Tottenham Labour Party
Wood Green Labour Party
Harrow East Labour Party
Harrow West Labour Party
Haringey Borough Co-operative Party
Haringey Trades Council
Broadwater Farm Tenants Association
Haringey Computer Development Office
London Borough of Haringey
Haringey Electors

London Borough of Barnet
Principal Legal Assistant Barnet Corporation
Hornsey Journal
On Tuesday 17 May, 1977.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor David Page</th>
<th>Haringey Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C.A. Bloor</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D.W. Croughton</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. Bryn Jones</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss B. Murray</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F.W. Wilkins</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Miss C.D. Jackson</td>
<td>Haringey Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor C. Hannington</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. Haines</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. J. McGregor</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. S. Whitby</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J.B. Corbyn</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Dr. S. Whittle</td>
<td>Haringey Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K. Brown</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J.G. Ellington</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Large</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. B. Simon</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W.L. Akerman</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor V. Butler (Mayor)</td>
<td>Hornsey Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Blanchard</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Rayner</td>
<td>- ditto -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Haringey Labour Party
Tottenham Labour Party
Haringey Borough Co-operative Party
Hillfield Avenue Tenants Association (Central Ward)
Haringey Computer Development Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDRA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWES PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE GROVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLEMAINE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROUCH END</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORTIS GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN LANES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRINGAY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH CROSS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHGATE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORNSEY CENTRAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORNSEY VALE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSWELL HILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOEL PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN SISTERS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH HORNSEY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH TOTTENHAM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTTENHAM CENTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GREEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE HART LANE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODSIDE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY

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.

FORTIS GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of the Borough meets Muswell Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 37 Windermere Road, thence eastwards to and along said southeastern boundary to the southwestern boundary of No 35 Windermere Road, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary and continuing along the southwestern boundary of Nos 33 to 1 Windermere Road and the southwestern boundary of the Hall adjoining St Andrews Church, crossing Alexandra Park Road to the northeastern boundary of No 28 Alexandra Park Road, thence southeastwards along said northeastern boundary and continuing southeastwards along the northeastern boundaries of Nos 90 to 2 Coniston Road and the northeastern boundary of No 29 Muswell Road to Muswell Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Elms Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to and crossing Dukes Avenue, to and southeastwards and southwestwards along the path leading to Muswell Hill Primary School, to the northwestern boundary of said school, thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the road known as Muswell Hill, thence northwestwards along said road following the southern carriageway of the roundabout at the junction with Muswell Hill Broadway to Queens Avenue, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said avenue to Fortismere Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue, crossing Grand Avenue to the eastern boundary of No 34 Grand Avenue, thence southwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of St Luke's Woodside Hospital, thence generally westwards and southeastwards along said northern and western boundary of said Hospital to Woodside Avenue, thence southwestwards along
said avenue, to a point due east of the northern boundary of No 51 Woodside Avenue, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary and the northern boundaries of No 49 to 41 Woodside Avenue and Nos 91 to 47 Fordington Road, crossing the path to the west of the last mentioned property to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards, northwards, southeastwards and northeastwards along said western and northern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

HIGHGATE WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Fortis Green Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing eastwards along Woodside Avenue to a point opposite the eastern boundary of St James’s C of E Primary School, thence southwards to and along said eastern boundary to the path leading from Lanchester Road to Muswell Hill Road, thence eastwards along said path to the prolongation northwards of the western boundary of Nos 57 and 59 Cranley Mansions (Muswell Hill Road), thence southwards along said prolongation and the western boundaries of Nos 57 to 39 Cranley Mansions and continuing southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 35 to 5 Muswell Hill Road to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to Muswell Hill Road, thence generally southwards along said road, crossing Archway Road and continuing southwards along Southwood Lane, to Southwood Lawn Road thence generally southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 37 Southwood Lawn Road, thence southwestwards to and along said northwestern boundary to the southwestern boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary and continuing southeastwards along the southwestern boundaries of Nos 35 to 31 Southwood Lawn Road, to the western boundary of the property known as Southwood Heights, thence southwards, southwestwards and southeastwards
along said western boundary and continuing southeastwards along the south-
western boundary of the properties Nos 45 and 43 Cholmeley Crescent to
the southern boundary of No 12 Kingsley Place, thence westwards along said
southern boundary to the rear boundary of No 39 Cholmeley Crescent, thence
southwards, southeastwards and eastwards along the rear of the properties
Nos 39 to 7 Cholmeley Crescent to the southwestern boundary of the
property known as Cholmeley Dene, thence southeastwards along said south-
western boundary and continuing southeastwards along the southwestern
boundary of No 46 Cholmeley Park to the southern boundary of said property,
thence southwestwards in a straight line to the northern most point of the
garages on the northwestern boundary of Cholmeley Lodge, thence generally
southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of said garages and said
lodge and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of the Borough,
thence westwards and generally northeastwards along the southern and
western boundary of the borough to the point of commencement.

ARCHWAY WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets
the eastern boundary of Highgate Ward, thence generally northwestwards
along said eastern boundary to a point opposite the southwestern boundary
of No 44 Muswell Hill Road, thence southeastwards to and along said south-
western boundary and continuing southeastwards in a straight line across
Queen's Wood to the northwestern most corner of No 105 Wood Vale, thence
southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of said property to the
southeastern boundary of said property, thence northeastwards along the
southeastern boundaries of No 105 to 95 Wood Vale, to the southern most
point of No 93 Wood Vale, thence southeastwards in a straight line to the
southwestern boundary of Fitzroy Court, thence southeastwards along said
southwestern boundary to and crossing Shepherd's Hill to Stanhope Road,
thence southeastwards along said road to the southern boundary of the
Borough, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

CROUCH END WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the northeastern boundary of Archway Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of No 93 Wood Vale, thence generally northeastwards along the southeastern and eastern boundaries of Nos 93 to 85 Wood Vale to the northeastern corner of the last mentioned property, thence due east from said point to the track leading to the Electricity Sub Station, thence generally northeastwards along said track to said Electricity Sub Station, thence northeastwards along the track leading from the Electricity Sub Station to the Scouts Hall adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the Hornsey Central Hospital, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along the track adjacent to the southwestern and southeastern boundaries of said hospital to Park Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Lynton Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Middle Lane, thence northwards along said lane to Elmfield Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to Tottenham Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Ferme Park Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Dashwood Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Womersley Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the road known as Elm Grove, thence southwestwards along said road and Tregaron Avenue to the road known as Crouch Hill, thence southeastwards along said road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.
MUSWELL HILL WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Archway Ward meets the eastern boundary of Highgate Ward, thence generally northwards and westwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of said ward to the southeastern boundary of Fortis Green Ward, thence generally northwards and generally eastwards along said southeastern boundary to the rear of the properties on the southern side of Duke's Avenue, thence northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 28 to 102 Duke's Avenue and in prolongation thereof to the unnamed road running from Duke's Avenue to Priory Road, to the west of The Paddock thence southeastwards and southwards along said unnamed road to the southern entrance gate of Alexandra Park, thence southeastwards to and along the southwestern boundary of said Park, and northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of said Park to the western boundary of No 120 North View Road, thence southeastwards along the western boundaries of Nos 120 to 186 North View Road and continuing southeastwards along the western boundary of No 46 Clovelly Road to Clovelly Road, thence eastwards along said road to Priory Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to Priory Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 41 Priory Road, thence southwards to and along said western boundary to the southern boundary of said property, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of the properties known as Nos 1 to 31 Wellington in Ashford Avenue, thence southwards along said western boundary and continuing southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 33 to 41 Ashford Avenue, to the southern most corner of No 41 Ashford Avenue, thence southeastwards in a straight line to National Grid reference TQ 3013488975 being a point in Middle Lane, thence southwards along said lane to the northern boundary of Crouch End Ward, thence generally southwestwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary and continuing southwestwards and generally northwestwards along the northern boundary of Archway Ward to the point of commencement.
ALEXANDRA WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Muswell Hill Ward meets the eastern boundary of Fortis Green Ward, thence generally north-westwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said borough boundary to the King's Cross to Welwyn Garden City railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the subway between Coburg Road and Penstock Footpath, thence southwestwards along said subway to Penstock Footpath, thence southeastwards, southwestwards and north-westwards along said footpath and continuing north-westwards along the southwestern boundary of the Water Works to the southern boundary of the Playing Field, thence north-westwards, generally westwards and southwestwards along said southern boundary and the southeastern boundary of Alexandra Park to the northern boundary of Muswell Hill Ward, thence southwestwards, generally north-westwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

HORNSEY CENTRAL WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Crouch End Ward meets the eastern boundary of Muswell Hill Ward, thence generally north-westwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Alexandra Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the King's Cross to Welwyn Garden City railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to its intersection with Turnpike Lane and High Street, thence south-westwards along High Street to Tottenham Lane, thence generally southwards and southwestwards along said lane to the northern boundary of Crouch End Ward, thence southwestwards and north-westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.
HORNSEY VALE WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Crouch End Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Hornsey Central Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the King's Cross to Welwyn Garden City railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the Kentish Town to Barking railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to Stapleton Hall Road, thence northwards along said road to Granville Road, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said road to Ridge Road, thence westwards along said road to Ferme Park Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Crouch End Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

SOUTH HORNSEY WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Crouch End Ward, thence northwestwards and generally northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the southwestern boundary of Hornsey Vale Ward, thence eastwards, southeastwards, southwestwards and northeastwards along the southwestern and southeastern boundary of said ward to the King's Cross to Welwyn Garden City railway, thence southwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards and southwestwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

HARRINGAY WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of South Hornsey Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of Hornsey Vale Ward to Turnpike Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Green Lanes, thence southwards along said lane
to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards, southeastwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

NOEL PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Harringay Ward meets the eastern boundary of Hornsey Central Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of Alexandra Ward to the footbridge crossing the King's Cross to Welwyn Garden City railway, south of Wood Green Station, thence northeastwards along said footbridge to Station Road, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said road, crossing High Road to Lordship Lane, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said lane to Westbury Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue crossing Green Lanes to and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of Harringay Ward to the point of commencement.

BOWES PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Noel Park Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Alexandra Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and generally southeastwards along said borough boundary to High Road, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Noel Park Ward, thence generally westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

WOODSIDE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Noel Park Ward meets the eastern boundary of Bowes Park Ward, thence generally northwards along
said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said borough boundary to a point opposite the southwest corner of No 52 Norfolk Avenue thence southeastwards in a straight line to the northwest corner of No 88 Therford Close being the eastern boundary of the allotment gardens thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of the New River Sports and Recreation Centre, to White Hart Lane, thence eastwards along said lane and southeastwards along Rivulet Road to Gospatrick Road, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said road to Great Cambridge Road (Roundway) thence southwards along said road to Lordship Lane, thence westwards along said lane to the northern boundary of Noel Park Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

WHITE HART LANE WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Woodside Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said borough boundary to the eastern boundary of Tottenham School, thence southwards along said eastern boundary and in prolongation thereof to Selby Road, thence southwards along said road to White Hart Lane, thence southwards and southwestwards along said lane to a point opposite Church Path, thence southeastwards to and along said path to the northern boundary of All Hallow’s Church thence westwards, southwards and eastwards along the northern, western and southern boundary of said Church to Church Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Lordship Lane, thence westwards along said lane to the eastern boundary of Woodside Ward, thence generally northwards and northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.
WEST GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Noel Park Ward meets the southern boundary of Woodside Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing eastwards along the southern boundary of White Hart Lane Ward to a point opposite the western boundary of No 205 Lordship Lane, thence southwards to and along said western boundary to the western boundary of the Engineering Works and garage, thence southwards and southeastwards along said western boundary to the western boundary of No 285 Mount Pleasant Road, thence generally southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 285 to 237 Mount Pleasant Road and continuing southwards along the western boundary of Nos 5 and 7 Adams Road, crossing Adams Road to the western boundary of Nos 2 and 4 Adams Road, thence southwards along said western boundary and continuing southwards along the western boundary of Nos 215 to 207 Mount Pleasant Road, crossing Griffin Road to the western boundary of No 201 Mount Pleasant Road, thence southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 201 to 167 Mount Pleasant Road thence in a straight line to and along the rear boundary of No 163 Mount Pleasant Road to a point being the prolongation northeasterwards of the northern boundary of No 139 The Avenue, thence southwestwards to and along said northern boundary crossing Willan Road to the rear boundary of No 143 The Avenue, thence southwestwards along the rear of the properties Nos 143 to 201 The Avenue, and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of No 106 Gloucester Road, crossing Gloucester Road to the northern boundary of No 145 Gloucester Road, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the western boundary of said property, thence southwards along the western boundary of Nos 145 to 139 Gloucester Road, crossing The Avenue and continuing southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 137 to 129 Gloucester Road and the western boundary of No 75 Higham Road to Higham Road, thence westwards along said road to Clonmell Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to Philip Lane, thence southwestwards and
northwestwards along said lane, and West Green Road to the eastern boundary of Harringay Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Noel Park Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

GREEN LANES WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Harringay Ward meets the southern boundary of West Green Ward, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary to Black Boy Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to St Ann's Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of St Ann's General Hospital, thence southwards to and along said western boundary to the Kentish Town to Barking railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Harringay Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

TOTTENHAM CENTRAL WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Green Lanes Ward meets the southern boundary of West Green Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing along Philip Lane to High Road, thence southwards along said road to the Kentish Town to Barking railway, thence westwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Green Lanes Ward, thence northwards and generally northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

SEVEN SISTERS WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Harringay Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Green Lanes Ward, thence
northeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing northeastwards along the southern boundary of Tottenham Central Ward to High Road, thence southwards along said road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

SOUTH TOTTENHAM WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Seven Sisters Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards along the eastern boundary of Tottenham Central Ward to the road known as Tottenham Green East (South Side), thence eastwards along said road to Tynemouth Road, thence south-eastwards and eastwards along said road to Broad Lane, thence southwards along said lane to National Grid reference TQ 3423389253, thence due east from said point to the Liverpool Street to Cambridge railway, thence southwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and westwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of the borough to the point of commencement.

HIGH CROSS WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of South Tottenham Ward meets the eastern boundary of Tottenham Central Ward, thence north-eastwards along said eastern boundary and continuing along High Road to Dowsett Road, thence eastwards along said road and Park View Road to its end, thence due east from said point to the eastern boundary of the Borough thence generally southwestwards along said borough boundary to the eastern boundary of South Tottenham Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and generally westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.
BRUCE GROVE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Tottenham Central Ward meets the eastern boundary of West Green Ward, thence generally northwards, northeastwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of White Hart Lane Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing along Lordship Lane to High Road, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing along the western boundary of High Cross Ward to the northern boundary of Tottenham Central Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Bruce Grove Ward meets the eastern boundary of White Hart Lane Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said borough boundary to a point being in prolongation northwards of Tariff Road, thence southwards to and along said road to the road known as Northumberland Park, thence northwestwards along said road to Trulock Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to its junction with Almond Road, thence southwestwards to the northwestern corner of No 35 Almond Road, thence southwestwards along the western boundary of said property and continuing southwestwards along the western boundary of the properties Nos 1 to 18 Park Lane Close, to and crossing Park Lane to Sutherland Road, thence southwards along said road to Argyle Road, thence westwards along said road and the path known as Argyle Passage to High Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Bruce Grove Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.
COLERAINE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of High Cross Ward meets the eastern boundary of Bruce Grove Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and northwards, eastwards and generally northwards along the eastern boundary of Park Ward to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards and generally southwestwards along the northern and eastern boundary of the Borough to the northern boundary of High Cross Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.