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INTRODUCTION

1. This is our final report on the boundaries between the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham and its neighbouring local authorities. We are recommending a number of changes to these boundaries, to reflect local affinities and to tidy up anomalies; for example, where properties are divided between two separate authorities. In particular, we are recommending that the Padnall Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham, one of a number of improvements to boundaries in the vicinity of Marks Gate, and that the bulk of the Becontree Estate should be united in the same borough. The report explains how we have arrived at our conclusions, following public consultation on our initial draft proposals for changes, and on our subsequent further draft proposals and additional draft proposals for several areas. Our recommendations are summarised in Annex A.

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

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

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

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

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

6. As with our previous London borough reports, we have thought it appropriate to note some general considerations which have been raised by our examination of this and other London borough areas.

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

8. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which it had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as it makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.
9. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since local government in the capital was reorganised in 1965, and to offer our thoughts on the issues raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We have therefore published a general report, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs" (Report No. 627), which discusses a number of the wider issues which have arisen during our review of London.

10. Our view remains that this review is not the right occasion for a fundamental reappraisal of the extent of London or the pattern of London boroughs, which would inevitably raise questions about the nature and structure of London government. However, we have seen it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which have arisen and which may need to be considered in any more fundamental review of London in the future. Our review of Barking & Dagenham has touched on the following such issues: the size of the borough (in connection with the Chadwell Heath/Marks Gate salient, paragraph 21 below); the relationship between local communities and local government boundaries (at Marks Gate, and also at the Becontree Estate, paragraph 68); and the influence of major new roads (the A406, paragraph 80).

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US IN RESPECT OF THE BOUNDARIES OF BARKING & DAGENHAM

11. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received representations from the London Boroughs of Barking & Dagenham, Redbridge and Newham; two local organisations; and 29 individuals. We also received a petition from residents of the East Road area, near Chadwell Heath.

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

12. We subsequently published three other consultation letters in connection with Barking & Dagenham's boundaries with Newham, Redbridge, and Havering (at Marks Gate only). The letter announcing our draft proposals for these boundaries was published on 2 October 1989. Copies were sent to the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Barking & Dagenham, Redbridge and Newham were asked to publish a notice announcing these
draft proposals, to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed, and to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 27 November 1989.

13. Our draft proposal for the Crow Lane area had been announced in our letter of 17 October 1988 in connection with our review of the borough of Havering. Similar arrangements were made for publicising the proposals in that letter, with a consultation period extending until 12 December 1988.

14. We received some 500 responses to our draft proposals, including representations from the four local authorities involved; Mr Neil Thorne MP; Ms Jo Richardson MP; the Ilford Conservative Association; the Dagenham Constituency Labour Party; Redbridge Labour Group; local councillors; the Marks Gate Umbrella Association; the Crow Lane Residents' Association; the Becontree Tenants' and Residents' Association; Goodmayes School; the Parents' and Friends' Association of Mayfield High School, and the School itself; the Barking Creek Action Group; the Barking & Dagenham Chamber of Commerce; local companies; Wellgate Community Farm; and members of the public.

15. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposals and our draft proposals for changes to electoral arrangements consequential to our draft proposals for Marks Gate and the Becontree Estate, was published on 27 March 1991. This received similar publicity. Comments were invited by 29 May 1991.

16. In response to this letter, we received 55 representations; from the four local authorities involved; three Redbridge borough councillors; the Mawneys Residents' Association; the Becontree Tenants' and Residents' Association; Mayfield High School; and members of the public. We also received a petition containing 113 signatures. The Metropolitan Police and the London Waste Regulation Authority advised us that they had no comments.

17. Having considered these representations, we decided to issue an additional further draft proposal in respect of Victoria Road and further draft proposals for changes to electoral arrangements at Marks Gate and the Becontree Estate. Our letter announcing these was published on 6 November 1991, and received the same publicity as our earlier letters. Comments were invited by 18 December 1991.
18. We received ten responses to this letter; from the Boroughs of Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge; the Becontree Tenants' and Residents' Association; and members of the public.

OUR PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

(1) THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN BARKING & DAGENHAM AND REDBRIDGE AND BETWEEN BARKING & DAGENHAM AND HAVERING: THE SALIENT BETWEEN CHADWELL HEATH AND MARKS GATE

19. North of Becontree, the western and eastern boundaries of Barking & Dagenham converge. North of the railway line at Chadwell Heath, they create a narrow salient, on both sides of Whalebone Lane North, which extends to Romford Road/Hog Hill Road, just north of Marks Gate. We received suggestions for boundary changes in respect of (a) the salient north of the railway, including the Marks Gate area; (b) the Chadwell Heath area and East Road; and (c) the area around Crow Lane, south of the railway.

20. The Marks Gate area appeared to us to be homogeneous in character, despite being divided between Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge, and also to be isolated to some extent from the remainder of Barking & Dagenham by the main A12 road (Eastern Avenue) and to have better access to Redbridge. We concluded that this area (in particular, the Padnall Estate) formed an identifiable community which should be united in a single borough.

(a) THE SALIENT AND MARKS GATE

Our draft proposal

21. A member of the public suggested that the whole salient of Barking & Dagenham north of Freshwater Road/Selinas Lane (just south of the railway) should be transferred to Redbridge, to improve policing, highway maintenance and other services. However, such a radical change would affect more than 11,000 residents, and we concluded that it might be detrimental to the viability of Barking & Dagenham LBC, already the third smallest London borough in population, and the second smallest in area. We therefore decided not to pursue this suggestion and, instead, to consider less radical boundary adjustments, while recognising that such changes might not fully reflect community ties.
22. Barking & Dagenham LBC suggested that the eastern boundary in this area should be realigned further east, along a drainage channel. Havering LBC preferred a realignment further west, along Whalebone Lane North and then south-east along Romford Road. This would transfer to Havering an uninhabited part of Redbridge and an area of Barking & Dagenham with 42 residents who, in Havering's view, looked to Romford (in Havering) for shopping and other facilities.

23. We noted that the present eastern boundary is defaced and undefined in places, and decided to endorse Havering's suggestion, as far as the point where the present boundary crosses Whalebone Lane North. We could see no reason to transfer to Havering the triangle of land bounded by Whalebone Lane North and Romford Road.

24. Further to our conclusion that the other boundaries around Marks Gate are unsatisfactory, and that the area has stronger links with Redbridge than with Barking & Dagenham, we also decided to issue a draft proposal that the Redbridge/Barking & Dagenham boundary should be realigned to the A12. Marks Gate and its surroundings would thus be united in Redbridge and some 2,113 electors would be transferred to that borough. We considered that, on the evidence before us, this would improve the delivery of services to the area and would create a clearly identifiable boundary along the only major structural break in an otherwise continuous area of development.

Our further draft proposals

25. While Havering supported our draft proposals for Marks Gate, they were strongly opposed by Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge, and in many other representations. Many residents of the Padnall Estate claimed an affinity with Barking & Dagenham, as did the Marks Gate Umbrella Association and the Chadwell Heath and Marks Gate Labour Party. We received a petition (containing 1,241 signatures) and also 135 letters, which stressed the links between Marks Gate and the Padnall Estate (north of the A12), and the commitment to the area shown by Barking & Dagenham LBC.

26. Having considered these views, we accepted that they furnished convincing evidence that the area has a greater affinity of interest and stronger historical associations with Barking & Dagenham than with Redbridge, and that the public transport links identified in the representations reinforce this link. We therefore decided to withdraw
our draft proposals that the boundaries should be realigned to the A12 and to Whalebone Lane North and Romford Road, and instead to propose more modest changes in these areas.

27. We received several suggestions that the north-eastern boundary of the salient should be moved eastwards, to widen the salient. We were attracted by a suggestion from a member of the public involving the use of property curtilages bordering open land north of the railway at Chadwell Heath, and then following Collier Row Road westwards to the present boundary. However, this would place the properties on either side of Collier Row Road in different local authority areas, which we considered undesirable.

28. We concluded that an alternative realignment suggested by Barking & Dagenham, along a track and drainage channel across an area of open land between the A12 and Collier Row Road, would rectify the present anomalies and create a clearly defined boundary without causing problems at Collier Row Road. We therefore decided to issue a further draft proposal adopting the Council's suggested alignment for this section of the boundary.

29. We had also received several suggestions for improvements to the western boundary of the salient. The Chadwell Heath Residents' Association and a local resident considered that the boundary should be realigned along Billet Road and Chadwell Heath Lane. Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge jointly proposed that the Padnall Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham by realigning the western boundary of the salient along Billet Road, the edge of the estate and the A12 Eastern Avenue. The petition referred to in paragraph 25 above also favoured uniting the estate in Barking & Dagenham.

30. We considered that the local authorities' alignment would satisfactorily unite the Padnall Estate in Barking & Dagenham and was a better alternative than the other, more wide-ranging, realignments suggested by others. We therefore decided to adopt it as our further draft proposal for the western boundary of the salient.

**Our final proposals**

31. In response to our further draft proposals, a member of the public suggested that the Chadwell Heath area should be united in Redbridge by realigning the boundary to the railway line. However,
the reasons advanced seemed to us to be insufficient to outweigh the evidence which had earlier persuaded us that the Marks Gate area looks to Barking & Dagenham rather than to Redbridge.

32. Havering suggested a realignment along Whalebone Lane North, to unite Collier Row Road in its area. The effect would however be a further narrowing of the salient. The Mawneys Residents' Association suggested that Warren Farm and Collier Row Road should be united in Barking & Dagenham. This would slightly widen the salient but would leave a stretch of the boundary undefined. The Association was concerned about the future status of the (listed) anti-aircraft gun site, which our further draft proposal would transfer to Barking & Dagenham, but there is no evidence to suggest that the change would in any way imperil the monument. The issue of possible future mineral extraction, also raised by the Association, has not yet been resolved by the normal planning procedures and therefore cannot be a factor in this review.

33. We concluded that neither of these suggestions offered any particular advantage over our further draft proposal, and we have therefore decided to confirm this as final.

34. As we received no comments on our further draft proposal (paragraph 30 of this report) adopting the local authorities' suggestion that the Padnall Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham, we have also decided to confirm this as final.

**Electoral Consequences**

35. In our letter of 27 March 1991, we made proposals for changes aimed at achieving acceptable electoral arrangements for the period between the implementation of our recommended boundary changes and the next full electoral review of London, likely to take place in a few years' time. We decided to adopt a suggestion by Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge that part of Aldborough ward (Redbridge) should be merged with Marks Gate ward (Barking & Dagenham), and that part of Mawney ward (Havering) north of the A12 road should also be transferred to Barking & Dagenham. It appeared that no changes were needed to the number of councillors representing each affected ward (one for Marks Gate and three for Aldborough) to maintain satisfactory standards of representation.
36. However, we were subsequently informed that the number of electors to be transferred from Aldborough ward to Marks Gate ward would be significantly greater than we had been led to believe. We concluded, on the basis of figures provided by Redbridge, that Aldborough ward should retain three councillors, but that Marks Gate Ward should be allocated an extra councillor, becoming a two-member ward (thereby increasing the size of Barking & Dagenham LBC by one member), and we issued a further draft proposal to that effect.

37. Both Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge have confirmed that they do not object to our proposals for electoral arrangements, as revised. As we have received no other comments, we have decided to confirm these as final.

(b) CHADWELL HEATH AND EAST ROAD AREA

Our draft proposal

38. Barking & Dagenham LBC suggested that the boundary should be realigned to the rear of properties in Warren Terrace, Tolworth Gardens and Hathaway Gardens. Ilford Conservative Association suggested an almost identical alignment, as did Redbridge LBC, although it amended this to ensure that Chadville Gardens was included wholly in Redbridge. However, the three Chadwell Ward councillors and the Ilford Conservative Association suggested more far-reaching realignments along the rear of properties in East Road, transferring several streets to Redbridge. We also received four representations and a petition (141 signatures) from local residents, who did not wish to be transferred to Barking & Dagenham.

39. We concluded that the present boundary in this area is unsatisfactory, as it divides properties, and decided to adopt as our draft proposal the suggestion that the boundary should be realigned to East Road. We took the view that this would take account of the new development immediately east of Chadville Gardens and would unite a natural community, while simplifying road maintenance and refuse collection. Warren Terrace, Havering Gardens, Portland Gardens, Tolworth Gardens and Chadville Gardens would be united in Redbridge.
Our further draft proposal

40. Barking & Dagenham opposed our draft proposal for this area, as did the Chadwell Heath Residents' Association. The Council preferred the alignment described in paragraph 38 above. Redbridge at first supported this alignment, but later proposed an alternative line, to unite Havering Gardens and Chadville Gardens in its area.

41. We recognised that Barking & Dagenham's alignment would affect many fewer people than our draft proposal, and that it would resolve the present anomaly of numerous divided properties. In our view, the Redbridge alternative offered no particular advantages and would create an undesirable salient. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal and to adopt the alignment suggested by Barking & Dagenham as our further draft proposal.

Our final proposal

42. Our further draft proposal was opposed by Redbridge LBC, three Redbridge councillors, and two members of the public. The representations drew attention to the fact that the proposed new boundary would leave Havering Gardens and Chadville Gardens divided between two local authorities.

43. We considered these points, but noted that the properties at the western end of Havering Gardens which would be transferred to Barking & Dagenham were readily accessible from and close to a shopping parade in that borough. We recognised that Chadville Gardens was a cul-de-sac accessible only from Redbridge, but took the view that to unite it in that borough would create an undesirably contorted boundary; we also noted that there had been no suggestion from Barking & Dagenham that the alignment it had suggested (which we had endorsed in our further draft proposal) would complicate the provision of services to the eastern end of Chadville Gardens.

44. We concluded that our further draft proposal achieved the main objective of uniting properties split by the present boundary, and we have decided to confirm it as final.
(c) CROW LANE

Our draft proposal

45. Barking & Dagenham LBC suggested a boundary realignment whereby the residential area on either side of the western end of Crow Lane (which in the Council's view was separated from Romford town centre by the Westlands Playing Field and should be united with the estate to the east of Whalebone Lane South) would be transferred from Havering to its area. It also suggested that Coombewood Drive and part of Salcombe Drive should be transferred from Havering.

46. We concluded that the area appeared to be more closely associated with the outskirts of Dagenham than with Romford, and decided to adopt the Council's suggestion as our draft proposal, to unite Coombewood Drive, Salcombe Drive and the residential area on either side of the western end of Crow Lane, including Seabrook Gardens, in Barking & Dagenham.

Our further draft proposal

47. Our draft proposal was opposed by Havering LBC, the Crow Lane Residents' Association, and 31 members of the public. We also received a petition containing 317 signatures, and 119 proforma letters (including 16 from residents of Coombewood Drive), all objecting to the proposed change.

48. Havering suggested an alternative change, combining Crow Lane, Coombewood Drive and Salcombe Drive in its area, to reflect the views of local residents and their claimed affinity with Havering. Barking & Dagenham objected to this, but also withdrew its original suggestion (on which our draft proposal had been based), considering that, given the degree of local opposition to our draft proposal, the status quo should be retained.

49. Having considered these representations, we remained of the view that Coombewood Drive and Salcombe Drive looked to Barking & Dagenham rather than to Havering. However, we noted that the residents of Crow Lane claimed strong affinities with Havering, which were reflected in LB Havering's alternative suggestion. We therefore decided to withdraw the part of our original draft proposal relating to the area south of the Chadwell Heath/Romford railway, and to issue a further
draft proposal adopting the part of Havering's suggestion relating to the western end of Crow Lane, modified so that the new boundary would run eastwards along the railway line to meet the new alignment which we proposed in respect of the area north of the railway.

**Our final proposal**

50. Both local authorities endorsed our view that the development on either side of Crow Lane, west of Crowlands Sports Ground, has links with Havering to the east. However, while Barking & Dagenham supported our further draft proposal, Havering suggested that the present boundary north of the railway line should instead be moved westwards. The effect of this would be to unite Salcombe Drive and the sports ground to the west of Westlands Playing Field in Havering. The Council believed that, in any event, Coombewood Drive should remain in Havering, in line with what it claimed to be residents' wishes. We received no other representations on this issue.

51. We have reassessed our further draft proposal in the light of all the evidence submitted to us, but we are not persuaded by Havering's views. Both Salcombe Drive and Coombewood Drive are separated from built-up areas in Havering by playing fields, and appear to have close and convenient road links with Chadwell Heath. Although some 40% of the residents of Coombewood Drive objected to our original draft proposal, we received no objections to our further draft proposal, which again envisaged the transfer of Coombewood Drive to Barking & Dagenham.

52. In our view, the present boundary in the vicinity of Crow Lane artificially divides what are in practice areas of continuous development. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

(2) THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARKING & DAGENHAM AND REDBRIDGE

a. ST. CHAD'S PARK

**Our draft proposal**

53. Our attention was drawn to the poorly defined boundary, which divides properties, in the vicinity of St Chad's Park. We therefore
issued a draft proposal that it should be realigned along curtilages, removing the anomalies and creating a clearer boundary. Properties in Nursery Close and Park Villas would be transferred to Redbridge.

Our further draft proposal

54. Both Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge supported our draft proposal, but suggested a minor amendment to unite in Redbridge the allotment gardens situated to the south of Park Villas and Nursery Close. As these allotments are owned and administered by Redbridge, we decided to adopt this suggestion as our further draft proposal.

Our final proposal

55. As we received no representations in response to our further draft proposal, we have decided to confirm it as final.

b. THE BECONTREE ESTATE

Our draft proposal

56. This Estate, developed by the former London County Council and completed during the 1930s, extends from just north of the main A13 road (here known as Ripple Lane) almost to Chadwell Heath railway station, and from Mayesbrook Park in the west almost to Dagenham East underground station. The borough boundary cuts through the north-west corner of the Estate, most of which is in Barking & Dagenham.

57. We received several suggestions for changes to the boundary, from the two borough councils and from members of the public. Barking & Dagenham LBC suggested minor changes near Chadwell Heath Station and Waldegrave Road. Redbridge LBC agreed with the latter, but also suggested a more far-reaching realignment to unite most of the Estate in Barking & Dagenham, to improve road maintenance and refuse collection. One member of the public suggested moving the boundary to the east, thus dividing the Estate more equally between the two boroughs. Another suggested that the Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham by moving the boundary westwards, to Green Lane and Goodmayes Lane.

58. Having considered these suggestions, we concluded that the Estate was a homogeneous community, and that its present division
between two local authorities hindered the effective delivery of local services. In particular, the scale and diversity of the Green Lane shopping area appeared to attract shoppers from both sides of the present boundary. We concluded that, to reflect local community ties, the Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham.

59. Goodmayes Park forms the only clearly recognisable break in development to the north-west of the Estate. We therefore decided to propose that the eastern edge of the Park should form the new boundary, and to adopt Redbridge's suggestion that the boundary should follow Station Road to the point where it joins the railway line, so that it would no longer split properties. We also decided to adopt a suggestion by a member of the public, that the boundary should follow the railway line and a drainage channel. The effect would be to transfer an area of recent development south of the railway line to Barking & Dagenham; this area is at present in Redbridge but has no direct access from that borough.

Our further draft proposal

60. While our draft proposal was supported in principle by both borough councils (and by the Becontree Residents' Association and two members of the public), they suggested that the more recent development known as the Mayesbrook Estate, immediately south west of Chadwell Heath BR Station, and Mayfield High School both had closer links with Redbridge than with Barking & Dagenham. We also received objections from Mr Neil Thorne MP and Ms Jo Richardson MP; from 286 residents of the Mayesbrook Estate, Dunkeld Road and Mayesbrook Road (with two petitions totalling 563 signatures); and from Mayfield High School. The representations supported the borough councils' view that the Mayesbrook Estate and the School should remain in Redbridge. Similar claims were made by residents of Dunkeld Road, Mayesbrook Road, and nearby areas. Alternative boundary alignments were submitted.

61. Our attention was also drawn to recent residential development at The Maltings, Mayesbrook Road. It was suggested that this estate should be united with adjacent development in Barking & Dagenham.

62. We carefully considered all these representations. Two points appeared particularly relevant. Firstly, Mayfield High School has close connections with another school and a sixth-form college which
are both located in Redbridge. Moreover, the only vehicular access to the High School is from Pedley Road, with pedestrian access from Mayfield Road and Castleton Road; all three roads are in Redbridge. Secondly, while the Becontree Residents' Association agreed that the Mayesbrook Estate is a separate entity, they suggested that Dunkeld Road and its surroundings have affinities with the Becontree Estate.

63. We concluded that the Mayesbrook Estate and Mayfield High School appear to have more affinity with Redbridge than with Barking & Dagenham and that, on balance, they should remain in the former borough. We decided therefore to issue a further draft proposal that the boundary should be realigned to the south side of Mayfield Road and then run northwards along the western side of Station Road to meet the new boundary envisaged by our original draft proposal near Chadwell Heath railway station. This would ensure that full access to the Estate and to the School is possible from the borough (Redbridge) in which they are located.

64. However, we accepted the view of the Becontree Residents’ Association that Dunkeld Road and Mayesbrook Road look more to Barking & Dagenham than to Redbridge, and we concluded that the same was true of The Maltings. We recognised that properties in Dunkeld Road differ in some respects from those on the main part of the Becontree Estate, but concluded that they are separated from Redbridge by Goodmayes Park and that the edge of the Park would form an easily identifiable boundary. While we recognised that The Maltings, a new estate, is different in character from the Becontree Estate, we noted that access to it is only possible from the east. We therefore decided not to propose any further boundary changes in the vicinity of Dunkeld Road and Mayesbrook Road, but to adopt as our further draft proposal the suggestion by both Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge that The Maltings should be united in Barking & Dagenham, by realigning the boundary to the path that runs along the southern edge of Goodmayes Park.

Our final proposal

65. Redbridge did not comment on our further draft proposal. Barking & Dagenham indicated its preference for our original draft proposal, and suggested an amendment to retain Burnside Road in its area, on the grounds that local residents regard the street as part of the Becontree Estate. Mayfield High School and two local residents
welcomed our conclusion that the School should remain in Redbridge.

66. Two other residents of the Estate indicated that they wished to remain in Redbridge, one citing his close links with Ilford. The Becontree Tenants' and Residents' Association stated that a majority of residents agreed that the Estate should be united in Barking & Dagenham, but suggested that the ownership of council properties in the areas affected should also be transferred. It claimed that Redbridge intended to retain ownership after a boundary change, which in its view would lead to a lack of accountability. We received no responses to our further draft proposal in respect of The Maltings.

67. Having considered these representations, we concluded that Barking & Dagenham had not provided sufficient evidence to outweigh the reasons we had identified for leaving the Mayesbrook Estate in Redbridge. Having received no objections to our proposal from residents of Burnside Road, we took the view that the Council's arguments could apply equally well to other roads on the periphery of the Estate which it had not sought to bring into its area. We noted the views of the Residents' Association on the question of the ownership of council properties, but this is not a matter which we can address within our statutory remit.

68. While local communities in other parts of London often appear to be independent of the pattern of local government (a point noted in Report No. 627), we have found that there is a clearer identification between residents of some former public housing estates and particular authorities. This appears to be the case with the Becontree Estate, as our proposal that it should be united in a single authority attracted relatively little opposition. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our further draft proposal for this area.

Electoral Consequences

69. Our draft proposals for the Becontree Estate would have the effect of transferring 4,369 electors from Goodmayes Ward in Redbridge to Barking & Dagenham. In our letter of 27 March 1991, we therefore proposed the creation of a new 2-member ward with the suggested name of "East Goodmayes". This would increase the size of Barking & Dagenham LBC by two members.
70. However, this letter omitted to mention the effect of this change on the standard of electoral representation in that part of Goodmayes ward which would remain in Redbridge. Recognising that Goodmayes ward would be left with only 4,037 electors but would retain three councillors, we wrote on 15 April 1991 to the local authorities concerned proposing that the number of councillors representing the ward should be reduced to two. This would reduce the size of Redbridge LBC by one member.

71. Barking & Dagenham and the Becontree Tenants' and Residents' Association suggested that the name of the new ward should refer to Becontree, to distinguish it clearly from the neighbouring Goodmayes ward in Redbridge. We therefore decided to issue a further draft proposal that the proposed new ward should be named "Becontree Ward".

72. We received no objections to our revised proposals for changes to electoral arrangements, and we have therefore decided to confirm them as final.

    c. SOUTH PARK DRIVE

Our further draft proposal

73. Redbridge suggested that Barking Abbey School, which is owned and administered by Barking & Dagenham LBC, should be transferred to that borough. Barking & Dagenham did not comment on this suggestion. This appeared to be sensible in principle, but we took the view that the alignment suggested by Redbridge was not altogether satisfactory. We decided to adopt Redbridge's suggestion as our further draft proposal, but to modify it to align the boundary to the roadside edge of the pavement in South Park Drive, a well-defined boundary feature.

Our final proposal

74. As we received no comments on our further draft proposal, we have decided to confirm it as final.
d. VICTORIA ROAD

Our further draft proposal

75. Redbridge suggested that, to unite properties in Victoria Road and provide a clearly identifiable boundary line, the present defaced and undefined boundary should be realigned along the northern edge of the Woodgrange Park/Barking railway line, and then along the centre of the stretch of Loxford Water west of Ilford Road. This would transfer 116 properties to Redbridge. Barking & Dagenham did not comment on this suggestion.

76. We agreed that to unite Victoria Road in one authority would permit more effective delivery of local authority services, and that the resulting boundary would be clearly identifiable. We decided to adopt this suggestion as our further draft proposal, subject to a modification, suggested by Ordnance Survey, that the boundary west of Loxford Road should follow the north bank of Loxford Water.

Our additional further draft proposal

77. While neither of the local authorities commented on our proposal, we received twelve letters of objection from members of the public together with a petition containing 113 signatures. Several residents of Victoria Road provided evidence of links with Barking & Dagenham, pointing out that Barking Town Centre was closer than Ilford (Redbridge) to the area, and stating that the Triangle, at the junction of Tanner Street and Ilford Lane, acted as a focal point for the local community. Residents felt that the change was disproportionate, and that Loxford Water is not in practice a barrier between communities, as it is culverted and is crossed by several roads, including Ilford Lane, which leads to Barking Town Centre.

78. Having considered these representations, and the additional information provided, we accepted that this area has strong historical and community links with Barking & Dagenham, and concluded that minor changes would be more appropriate. We therefore decided to withdraw our further draft proposal and to issue an additional further draft proposal that the boundary should be realigned to the northern curtilages of properties in Victoria Road, and to the southern edge (the Woodgrange Park/Barking railway line) of the area of open land at the western end of Victoria Road, thereby
transferring this open area to Redbridge.

Our final proposal

79. Both local authorities and two residents of Victoria Road supported our additional further draft proposal. Barking & Dagenham endorsed the view that the community in this area had long-established ties with the borough. We have therefore decided to confirm this proposal as final.

(3) THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARKING & DAGENHAM AND NEWHAM

THE RIVER RODING AND THE A406

Our draft proposal

80. From a point just south of the London Underground District Line, the boundary turns away from the River Roding and skirts the west side of the A406 road and school playing fields before recrossing the A406 and rejoining the river just north of Jenkins Lane. The River Roding and, in particular, the road are significant barriers. This boundary was recognised in the 1960s as being anomalous, and it appears to have become even less appropriate since the completion of the A406 (which at the start of this review was however still under construction). The influence of major new roads on the future geography of London is touched on in Report No. 627.

81. Barking & Dagenham suggested that the boundary between the LU District Line and the River Thames should be realigned to the A406 road, including its (at that time proposed) extension to the East London River Crossing. In the Council's view, this road represented a major barrier. Newham preferred that the boundary should follow the course of the River Roding throughout. Seventeen local businesses stressed their links with Barking & Dagenham, but most took the view that the A406 was a suitable boundary.

82. We agreed with Barking & Dagenham in principle but took the view that construction of the A406 extension was insufficiently advanced to permit its use as a boundary. We concluded that the River Roding, with few crossing points in the area concerned, was a greater barrier and would provide a suitably well-defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Newham's suggestion as our draft proposal.
83. **Barking & Dagenham** opposed our draft proposal, pointing out that the line of the extension of the A406 to the River Thames had by that stage (autumn 1989) been fixed; that there were more crossing points along the River Roding than were planned for the A406; and that the river-side industrial area north of the A13 road would be divided by our proposed alignment. The Council noted our proposal (in a separate review) that the Newham/Redbridge boundary should be realigned to the A406 and reiterated its view that this road should also form the boundary between Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge.

84. We also received 30 letters, and a petition containing 23 signatures, from businesses which wished to remain in Barking & Dagenham. The Barking Creek Action Group commented that the western bank of the River Roding had little in common with Newham and that our draft proposal would split a business community.

85. **Newham** supported our draft proposal, arguing that the River Roding is already a substantial barrier to movement, with fewer crossing points than the A406 which, in its view, had been designed to avoid creating a barrier. The Council pointed out that to align the boundary to the road, as Barking & Dagenham wished, would create access problems for Newham's Works Depot, the Cuckold Haven Nature Reserve and an area requiring special pollution controls, while the Thames-side area south of the A13 was closely related to Docklands redevelopment schemes and had access only from Newham, to the west.

86. Having considered these representations, we saw no reason to change our view that, while the A406 road would be a better boundary north of the A13 than the River Roding, the elevated section south of the A13 would be unsuitable for this purpose. We also concluded that, on the evidence before us, there was no strong reason to transfer to Barking & Dagenham the area between the A406 and the River Roding south of the A13. Accordingly, we decided to withdraw our draft proposal and to issue a further draft proposal that the boundary west of Hand Trough Creek should be realigned to the northern side of Jenkins Lane at the point where it passes under the A406 and should then follow the western side of the A406 northwards, to the LU District Line. (We subsequently published a draft proposal, in the context of our review of the borough of Newham, that the Newham/Redbridge boundary north of the railway lines should follow
the western side of the A406 as far as Romford Road/Ilford Hill.)

Our final proposal

87. Barking & Dagenham opposed our further draft proposal and reiterated its preference that the boundary should be aligned to the A406 as far south as the River Thames. This view was supported by the Barking & Dagenham Chamber of Commerce and by several local businesses, which advocated that the area of land between Barking and Hand Trough Creeks and the A13/A406 road junction should be transferred to Barking & Dagenham.

88. Newham preferred our original draft proposal, but suggested an alternative whereby the boundary would be realigned to the eastern edge of the A406, from Hand Trough Creek northwards to the northern perimeter of the industrial estate on the opposite side of the River Roding to Cowbridge Lane. The Council pointed out that our further draft proposal would divide Cuckolds Haven Nature Reserve, which it administers, and would also transfer to Barking & Dagenham a site south of the District Line railway which it (Newham) is developing as an amenity area. The Council also believed that the A406 should remain in its area to facilitate its role in maintaining the road, for which it is the agent of the Department of Transport.

89. While we have carefully considered these responses, we have concluded that our further draft proposal is in principle the most appropriate way to address the boundary issues which they and the earlier representations have raised. We remain of the view that while major roads often act as clear breaks (if not necessarily barriers) between communities, elevated roads (for example, the A406 south of the A13) are unsatisfactory as boundaries unless these can be aligned to suitable ground features beneath or in the vicinity of the elevated sections. Moreover, the main access to the industrial area south of the A13 and east of the A406 is from Newham.

90. The site identified by the Chamber of Commerce, between the A13/A406 junction and the Creeks, is accessible only from Newham; it also contains the Nature Reserve administered by that borough and we do not consider that any particular benefits would result if it was transferred to Barking & Dagenham. Nor are we persuaded that it would be beneficial to unite in Newham the open area just south of the District Line, which appears to be accessible from either borough.
91. Our proposal that the boundary should be realigned to the western side of the A406, or to related ground features (so that the whole stretch of the road between Hands Trough Creek and the District Line was within the area of Barking & Dagenham) was consistent with our separate proposal that the Newham/Redbridge boundary as far as Romford Road should also be realigned to the western side of the A406 (thus transferring this section of the road to Redbridge).

92. However, we have reconsidered these proposals in the light of Newham's role as agent for the Department of Transport. It appears sensible that the road should for the most part remain in the area of the authority responsible for maintaining it. In principle, the use of the A406 would create a robust and durable boundary in this area. Aligning this boundary to the eastern side of the road or to related ground features would not call into question the current maintenance arrangements; moreover, in our view, none of the evidence before us suggests that such an alignment would be significantly less satisfactory, in terms of effective and convenient local government, than an alignment to the western side.

93. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final, with a modification to align the boundary to the eastern side of the road or to appropriate features in the vicinity, and a further minor modification to retain the Cuckolds Haven Nature Reserve wholly in Newham. We have also decided to modify our related proposal for the Newham/Redbridge boundary in a similar way. Details of this are set out in our separate report (No 661) on our review of the borough of Newham.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENTIALS

94. Our recommendations for boundary changes in the vicinity of Marks Gate and of the Becontree Estate would have a significant effect on the standard of representation in those areas. We have considered these, and our recommendations for consequential changes to electoral arrangements are set out in paragraphs 35-37, 69-72 above and annex C. The net effect of these recommendations would be to increase the size of Barking & Dagenham LBC by three members, and to decrease the size of Redbridge LBC by one member. The other boundary changes that we recommend would have no significant electoral effects.
CONCLUSION

95. As required by section 60(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, we have carefully considered all the representations made to us. We believe that our final proposals, summarised in Annex A to this report, are in the interests of effective and convenient local government in the areas concerned, and we commend them to you.

PUBLICATION

96. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Barking & Dagenham, Redbridge, and Newham asking them to place copies of this report on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The notices will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than a period of six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you.

97. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex B illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received copies of our earlier letters setting out our proposals, and to those who made written representations to us.
signed:  K F J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
7 May 1992
# REVIEW OF THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON
## LONDON BOROUGH OF BARKING & DAGENHAM

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

The Boundaries between Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge, and between Barking & Dagenham and Havering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Paragraphs/maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks Gate /Eastern Avenue (eastern side)</td>
<td>to realign the boundary eastwards between Sylvan Avenue, Chadwell Heath; the A13; and Sungate Cottages, Mark's Gate</td>
<td>21-37; map 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks Gate /Eastern Avenue (western side)</td>
<td>to realign the boundary along Billet Road and the west side of the Padnall estate to the A13</td>
<td>21-37; map 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Boundary between Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Paragraphs/maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell Heath and East Road area</td>
<td>to realign the boundary between the A13 and Chadville Gardens</td>
<td>38-44; map 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Boundary between Barking & Dagenham and Havering

Crow Lane to realign the boundary from the A118 south to Crow Lane 45-52; map 3

The Boundary between Barking & Dagenham and Redbridge

St Chads Park realignment of defaced boundary 53-55; maps 5-6

Becontree Estate unification of estate in Barking and Dagenham from High Road to Longridge Road 56-72; maps 6-7

South Park Drive realignment of boundary to transfer Barking Abbey School to Barking & Dagenham 73-74; map 8

Victoria Road realignment of boundary to rear curtilages and southern perimeter of open land east of Victoria Road 75-79; map 9

The Boundary between Barking & Dagenham and Newham

River Roding realignment of boundary to the A406 road from the District Line Railway to Handtrough Creek 80-93; maps 10-12
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

BARKING AND DAGENHAM LB

AFFECTING HAVERING, NEWHAM AND REDBRIDGE LBs

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing Boundary
Proposed Boundary
Existing Borough Ward Bdy
Proposed Borough Ward Bdy
Other Final Proposal Boundary

Produced by Ordnance Survey for the
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NO.</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>MAP NO.</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Havering LB Mawney Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Marks Gate Ward</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redbridge LB Goodmayes Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Becontree Ward (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Redbridge LB Aldborough Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Marks Gate Ward</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redbridge LB Goodmayes Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Becontree Ward (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Redbridge LB Aldborough Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Marks Gate Ward</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redbridge LB Goodmayes Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Abbey Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Redbridge LB Chadwell Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Chadwell Heath Ward</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newham LB Little Ilford Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Abbey Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP NO.</td>
<td>AREA REF.</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Gascoigne Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB Wall End Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Gascoigne Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB Wall End Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Gascoigne Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB South Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Newham LB South Ward</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham LB Gascoigne Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>