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INTRODUCTION

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

1. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England was set up by the Local Government Act 1972 to review periodically the boundaries of Greater London, the London boroughs, the counties and districts and their electoral arrangements, and to make proposals for changes to them in the interests of “effective and convenient local government”. The Commission is not concerned with parliamentary constituencies which are the exclusive responsibility of the Parliamentary Boundary Commission.

2. We have set out our general approach to our work in our Report No. 550: People and Places. This report is an attempt to distil our experience in undertaking our review of the boundaries and areas of the London boroughs.

The purpose of this report

3. The first periodic mandatory review of boundaries in London commenced on 1 April 1987. We have now published draft proposals and interim decisions for all of the boroughs and are in the process of reporting on them to the Secretary of State for the Environment with our final proposals. We have gained valuable insights into the issues relevant to boundaries in London from both the initial submissions and the response to our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals. We have also received representations on wider issues which are relevant to the future structure of local government in London but which go beyond our own terms of reference as a boundary commission.

4. We therefore think it appropriate to explain our approach to this first major review of London and to offer thoughts on the issues which have been raised by the representations made to us and by our consideration of them. We do this for two reasons. First, a Bill is now before Parliament which seeks to abolish the Local Government Boundary Commission and to create a new Local Government Commission. Second, we see it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which arise and which may need to be addressed in any more fundamental review of London. It is possible, for example, that the new Commission will turn to London at some stage after completing its priority work. We feel that the issues regarding London which have come to light in this first review should not be lost from sight.

3 The Bill received Royal Assent in March 1992.
5. This report is not designed to record the decisions that we are making on individual boundary proposals. These will be found in our reports on individual boundaries. Neither should any views expressed here be taken as binding on our approach on decisions we have yet to make on reviews still to be completed. We will continue to deal with all representations on their merits. Similarly, we will not regard any comments on or reactions to this report as representations on any outstanding boundary issues on which we have yet to report. Any representations must be made explicitly in response to our statutory consultation on the relevant boundary review.

THE REVIEW OF THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON

Background to our review of London

6. The history of London government - which has been well documented - shows a continuing tension between the aspirations and needs of the bodies and organisations which have an interest in the capital. As there has generally been a lack of consensus on the role of these bodies, fundamental issues have remained unresolved. For example, there is no agreed view on either the best definition of the geographical extent of “London” or the optimum size or arrangement of units within it. It is therefore not surprising that there is no agreed context against which the areas and boundaries of local government units in London can be judged.

7. In addition, local government has been affected by major changes in policy, such as the extension of competitive tendering, the emphasis on the enabling role, legislation affecting key services and the upheaval in local government finance. London government has, in addition, been affected by the abolition of the Greater London Council and, in inner London, the Inner London Education Authority. Moreover, there is no general agreement over the role and functions of local authorities. The scale and pace of change has resulted in difficulties for a body such as the Commission in assessing the merits of boundary changes and, on a wider scale, the advantages and disadvantages of the present pattern of authorities.

The submissions received

8. The start of the review had been delayed by a direction of the Secretary of State because of the need to await the abolition of the Greater London Council. When the review did commence on 1 April 1987, the local authorities were asked to publicise it. Our staff visited the authorities to explain the procedures and there was some media coverage of the intention to review. We requested submissions from local authorities
by 1 November 1987 but, because some of them could not meet this deadline, we agreed extensions where necessary.

9. The response to the review from local authorities, bodies and organisations was disappointing, although perhaps this was not entirely surprising. Among the local authorities, there was, on the whole, a desire for stability after all the changes of recent years, and with more in prospect. We were, however, surprised that professional bodies, academic commentators and community groups had not made submissions. Most suggestions from the authorities were for the minimal tidying up of boundaries, which in some cases seemed to ignore blatant anomalies in the present boundaries or communities apparently split by them. Even then, most authorities gave us little in the way of reasoned justification for proposed changes or for their objections to changes. We accept that there had been a general expectation that the review would be low key, and that many of the participants in the review viewed the prospect of more than marginal boundary alterations as an unwelcome additional complication to their activities.

10. A few representations requested more substantial change. Several members of the public wanted to make widespread changes to boundaries in parts of London. For example, we received some interesting propositions for radical change to the boundaries of the City of London and, in one case, to create a new London authority of a million people covering part of north London. There were suggestions for the redrawing of borough boundaries in west London, to follow prominent features such as motorways. Some respondents suggested that this was not the time for change, but that if we were going to embark on radical action, then a case could be made for extensive changes. An example was the claim by Kingston upon Thames for an increase in size after a wider review.

11. As we have found elsewhere in the country, we occasionally receive a significant response from members of the public calling for radical change, usually requesting reversion to former local authorities. London was no exception and we received calls for Brent to be divided and for Wembley to be restored, or joined with Harrow. Haringey, Lambeth, Southwark and Wandsworth were other areas where dissatisfaction was expressed with the present pattern of boroughs. Some representations called for the return of the former county of Middlesex.

Our guidelines

12. In undertaking reviews, we work to guidelines set out by the Department of the Environment. The relevant guidelines for London are contained in Circular 20/86, and are reproduced in Appendix A. This recognises that changes may be needed to boundaries where there are problems resulting from historic anomalies and changes in the pattern of development. However, it counsels caution on the extent of change, and
suggests that the abolition or creation of a principal area will only be appropriate where we consider that present arrangements clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government. It presents the possibility of amalgamating boroughs if major change is sought.

13. We have interpreted our remit under the Act as to examine carefully the borough boundaries and to consider all the representations made to us, no matter how large or small. However, we have taken the view that this review is not the appropriate time to redraw the local government map of London by advocating a radically different pattern of authorities. As we explained in our report People and Places (Report No. 550), we view our task as that of a good estate manager, keeping the fabric of the map of local government in good order, rather than comprehensively redrawing it. We do, nevertheless, recognise that nearly all the boundaries of the London boroughs are those of former authorities. The last major reorganisation used existing boundaries wherever possible. Most boundaries in London pre-date the establishment of the present pattern of development and in consequence there are numerous stretches of defaced or defective boundary.

Our approach to the review

14. As a result of our early investigations of London boundaries, we identified certain areas which we felt would merit greater attention in the review. These fell into two broad categories. First, apparent prima facie anomalies, such as the division of Thamesmead between two boroughs, the division of London (Heathrow) Airport between two London boroughs and a shire county and district and the way the outer London boundary took no account of the extent of the continuous built-up area in south west London. Secondly, there were those places subject to a popular demand for change, notably the call for the division of Brent.

15. We published our initial impressions of the London review in April 1988 in our Report People and Places. This explained how we envisaged considering the wider suggestions that had been made. We noted the division of some communities by boundaries and the inconsistency of the outer boundary of London in relation to the built-up area.

16. We published our first draft proposals in July 1988. These were for several boundaries in outer London but we took the opportunity to explain the submissions which had been received throughout London and our initial approach to the review. We therefore published a press notice, in which we listed the more significant suggestions for change.

17. We considered it unlikely that we would be putting forward any proposal to alter the basic pattern of London boroughs. However, practically all the boundaries dated back many years and we observed that this review was the opportunity to put right long-standing anomalies.
or those which had arisen more recently because of development. We noted again that the outer London boundary presented problems. We suggested that several communities inside London were split by boundaries and that, in some places, new roads separated communities more effectively than historic boundaries. We also stated in the press notice our intention to examine boundaries on our own initiative where they do not appear to match the pattern of modern life or where they zig-zag through continuous development for no apparent reason.

18. One difficult decision which we had to make was on how to programme the work. Clearly, this would affect the publication of the draft proposals for consultation. We decided to spread the resources available to us across London, rather than to attempt to try to deal with sectors of London in blocks of work. This enabled the expertise which our Secretariat had gained in the mandatory reviews of the shire counties to be applied immediately to the review of London. We were also mindful of the competing claims of other work, notably the mandatory reviews of the metropolitan counties and our further review of Humberside.

19. This approach made it impossible for us to consider and report on all the boundaries of each London borough at the same time. Nevertheless, we have sought to respond positively to requests from individual boroughs wishing to defer their consideration of any significant boundary changes we have proposed until they could be considered in the round with the proposals for their other boundaries. Two examples are Hillingdon and Redbridge. Where radical and/or controversial suggestions have been submitted to us for an area which encompasses more than one borough, we have sought to prepare draft proposals for each review simultaneously. An example is the Mottingham area in which the Bromley, Greenwich and Lewisham boundaries meet.

20. In addition, we have noted places where several boundaries need to be considered jointly and we have published draft proposals for all the boundaries in the area in one document. An example is at Crystal Palace, where several boundaries come together. In three cases, the City of London, Brent and Kingston upon Thames, the issues needing to be considered have been so significant that we have thought it desirable to deal with all the boundaries of the borough at one time. Finally, we have, where practicable, delayed publication of draft proposals for some minor changes in areas which are close to boroughs in which major change has been considered. An example is in Sutton, affected by our consideration of Kingston upon Thames.
ISSUES AFFECTING LONDON AS A WHOLE

The number and pattern of London boroughs

21. Although we have had no intention of attempting to redraw the map of London, the review process has provided insights into the way London has been divided into boroughs. There seems to be nothing inevitable in the present division and many of the boundaries seem arbitrary when viewed in the light of modern geography. There are clear structural lines that make good boundaries, for example the River Lee (or Lea) and the Thames (although one borough was created in 1965 - Richmond upon Thames - that extends over both banks). A few boundaries follow historic lines that are still instantly recognisable, for example those that for the most part follow the Edgware Road. Some reflect later adjustments, for example along the Sidcup bypass. Most, however, are the boundaries of former authorities which have not themselves been reviewed in modern times.

22. We have noted that the pattern of authorities in London is not that which was recommended by the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London (the Herbert Commission) which reported in 1960*. That Commission proposed more and smaller boroughs. The reforms of the 1960s have been well documented. However, the result of the legislation in 1963 was the creation of a wide range of boroughs in terms of population size and area. The boroughs were brought to life in 1965, as was the Greater London Council, responsible for some strategic functions and a significant landowner, for example of areas of housing and open space. The division between the old London County Council area and outer London was partly maintained, both by the use of the former boundary (except at North Woolwich) and by the creation of the Inner London Education Authority. However, the extent of Greater London was not exactly as the Herbert Commission had proposed. Several areas, notably Epsom and Ewell, were excluded during the passage of the legislation.

23. The legislation required the amalgamation of many former authorities. Whereas a few joined together amicably, others took a long time to come to terms with the new structure. In the discussions which had preceded the creation of the London boroughs, different combinations of former authorities had frequently been suggested. However, after a time most boroughs settled down well, and many made great attempts to create a unique identity. With this background, it is hardly surprising that the desire for stability on the part of the local authorities has been such a marked feature of this review.

* Cmnd 1164.
24. We accept that it has usually been easier to construct new authorities by merging existing ones than to impose new boundaries. Further, it is not immediately apparent that the existing pattern is inherently better - or worse - than any other possible grouping of the former authorities which now makes up London. It must, however, be questionable whether it is necessarily conducive to the most effective local government in a large urban area to rely on boundaries which, in many cases, were first defined before the areas concerned were built-up.

The size of boroughs

25. The present boroughs range from about 118,000 to 258,000 population in inner London, and from about 136,000 to 318,000 in outer London. (The unique status of the City of London will be described later.) Generally, their population has declined since the boroughs were created, although there have been local variations caused by development, for example in Docklands. It is generally understood that the size of outer London boroughs was made larger than the Herbert Commission had recommended because of the need to manage education. In inner London, the creation of the ILEA supposedly allowed boroughs to be smaller. However, in the event, the difference in size ranges between inner and outer London was not as great as might have been expected.

26. Size is often a concern expressed to us in reviews. In London, calls for areas to secede from existing boroughs would imply new, smaller, boroughs. Authorities often respond to suggestions for a loss of part of their area by claiming that such action would make them "unviable". In the review, we received an interesting submission from a small London borough (Kingston upon Thames), making a case for increased size. We have noted that, since the abolition of the Greater London Council (and the ILEA), the boroughs have taken on more responsibilities, including, in inner London, education. Moreover, the smaller boroughs are already smaller than most metropolitan districts.

27. Our guidelines enjoin us to have regard to the adequacy of the resource base of London boroughs. We are mindful of the sporadic research that has been undertaken over the years on the question of authority size. Some was undertaken by the Royal Commission on Local Government in England (the Redcliffe-Maud Commission) which reported in 1969* but that is generally regarded as being inconclusive. Moreover, it refers to local authorities as they were nearly thirty years ago. During this review, we organised a small seminar on the subject. This concluded that there is no obvious optimum size but, depending on the functions local authorities are required to perform, there may be a level of size

---

* Cmd 4040.
below which operating difficulties may be experienced. However, there is no consensus on the minimum threshold for each service, nor in our view would any further research regarding the relationship between size and performance be likely to provide much useful guidance on this question.

28. There seems to be no clear rationale for the present number and size of the existing boroughs. The present arrangements for London government seem to be a compromise between two types of authority - on the one hand the boroughs are not truly strategic, while on the other hand they seem too large to represent local community loyalties given that there has been no provision for parishes in Greater London. Both the issue of appropriate local authority size and the issue of the diversity of size between authorities performing the same range of functions seem to us to be worth pursuing in the light of wider considerations about the role and functions of local authorities.

The relationship between boroughs and other bodies

29. We have noted above the thought that the present boroughs may be too small to be able to provide a strategic view. (We deal with the issue of local communities in paragraphs 82 to 87 below.) The many and varied arrangements which have been instituted or imposed to deal with matters of wider significance reinforce this opinion. London clearly consists of many closely interlocking areas, and an individual borough is seldom able to act in isolation from its neighbours on strategic issues, even though some may wish to do so.

30. The history of local government in London shows that arrangements have had to be instituted to secure co-ordination, co-operation and a strategic view of affairs. One example, extending far wider than the capital, was the establishment of the Standing Conference for London and South East Regional Planning. This body, now the South-East Regional Planning Conference, has prepared and kept under review advisory plans for the area. After the abolition of the Greater London Council, the London Planning Advisory Committee was established. It advises the Secretary of State for the Environment on strategic planning and the boroughs on planning and development issues which are of interest to more than one London borough.

31. Many London-wide functions are now undertaken by a variety of bodies. One study of metropolitan government after abolition described over 60 separate bodies dealing with London, and 24 joint committees each requiring a single borough to act as lead authority. Central government is now more involved in London affairs than before, while other organisations have taken responsibility for some London-wide services. The present arrangements result from a mixture of statutory authority and informal arrangements by the boroughs. Some bodies have become commercial enterprises and are not restricted to the Greater London area, for example the London Research Centre. Many other
bodies and committees are concerned exclusively with either some or all of the boroughs in London.

32. We consider that the arrangements made for service provision in London do have relevance for any review of borough boundaries. First, the arrangements themselves define the functions and scope of services which are most appropriately provided at borough level. This can have implications for the size of boroughs. Second, the need for joint working and planning suggests functions which are too wide to be dealt with by one borough alone. Third, the arrangements help to define that area for which it is appropriate to have a distinctly "London" approach to problems, and hence the appropriateness of the present outer London boundary. While the administrative maps of London differ between organisations, there is a significant difference between the arrangements inside London and outside.

33. Through the course of our review of London we have also been impressed by the importance and relevance of the other bodies providing services to London people. Examples are the police, fire and health authorities. All of these are organised in different ways and all have a relationship with the boroughs. Any discussion on the future of London requires a full understanding of the work of these bodies and their relationship to the role and functions of the local authorities. We believe that any more fundamental review of authorities in London should start from an appreciation of the role of the authorities and the functions that they are expected to perform. This should extend to an examination of the relationship between the boroughs and whatever arrangements may be made for the administration of wider local government and associated services to the London area.

THE OUTER LONDON BOUNDARY

Where should London end?

34. Our guidelines exhort us to be particularly careful about making proposals for the outer London boundary. They note that the distribution of functions is different on either side of it but that some of the boundaries have been overlaid by development and changes may be necessary to rectify anomalies. As we observed at an early stage in the review, we felt that the outer boundary was a particular problem. Much of the boundary is either overlaid by development or follows the boundaries of former authorities, bringing large tracts of rural countryside into London. Many of the boundaries pre-date the establishment of London in its present form, and were not amended to follow modern features when the Greater London Council was created. More recent years have seen the construction of the M25 and associated development on the edge of London.
35. As already explained, we have not seen the present review as the appropriate time for the major restructuring of London boroughs; nor do we consider it as part of our remit in this mandatory review to be making sweeping changes affecting the counties and districts outside London. We therefore have broadly accepted the area currently defined as "London", that is the former Greater London Council area. In general, this area seems reasonable as it is, bearing in mind the extent of the continuous built-up area, the long-standing policy constraint of the green belt, and now the existence of the M25. We have therefore attempted to take a pragmatic view of the outer London boundary. It would have been possible to define different "Londons" under a more wide-ranging review, for example encompassing just the central core, the former County of London or the whole area within the M25. However, we have kept to adjustments of a more modest nature, attempting to deal with the worst anomalies at the more local scale.

36. We have nevertheless noted several aspects of the outer London boundary which raise important issues. They probably cannot be satisfactorily resolved other than in a review encompassing more than just the London boroughs. Many of the boundaries which we have reviewed would be incorporated into those of any new authorities created after such a review, but others might seem rather irrelevant in a wider review. We have attempted to make sensible small-scale changes to some of them, in the light of the information we have received and the wishes of the people for (or more usually against) change. However, we recognise that more radical action would need to be considered if a good and enduring outer London boundary is to be drawn.

The green belt

37. We believe that the green belt is an important factor in defining "London". It has a permanence which has ensured a reasonably clear break between the continuous built up area of London and the settlements beyond it. Consequently, we decided at an early stage in the review to take special account of it. The relative lack of change in the green belt suggests that it is a good location for a boundary, as it will not be overrun by development in a short period.

38. It is often represented to us that boundary changes will change the status of the green belt and that, if land is transferred to another authority rather than retained in its present one, it will be used for development. In the review, we have found the existence of the green belt cited as a reason to maintain the status quo, particularly if a possible change involves bringing land into London. However, we consider that these fears are groundless. Green belts are protected for the foreseeable future and there is a presumption against inappropriate development within them. Once a green belt is defined, its status should not be affected by a change in the authority in which it lies. Moreover, we note
that many London boroughs contain areas of green belt which they defend and manage effectively.

39. It is a more difficult matter to judge the best location for the outer London boundary in relation to the green belt. One view holds that urban authorities should extend to the edge of the built-up area and no further. We have noted some decisions of the Secretary of State on our proposals for boundary changes outside London where the boundary has been drawn at the backs of the last houses before the countryside. Another view is that there may be difficulties of managing the urban fringe if the boundary is too tightly drawn. Examples are the problems caused by urban encroachment onto adjacent land, for example the tipping of rubbish, or the use of open spaces in the green belt for recreation by the urban population.

40. We consider that more study is needed on this issue and have sought not to take a rigid line. Consequently, we have confined our activities to relatively minor adjustments of what we have regarded as clear anomalies. An example of this approach is in Barnet, where we have proposed replacing a boundary both cutting through housing on the edge of London and in places extending out into the countryside (but following few clear ground features) with one following field boundaries. We recognise the green belt as an important strategic feature in determining the location of the outer London boundary, but wider considerations need to be brought to bear on the detailed alignment within it.

The M25

41. The M25 is London's outer bypass. It has some attractions in defining the area of London. However, its relation to the built-up area is not uniform around London. In the north, it follows fairly closely around the outer edge of suburban London, but only approximates to the current Greater London boundary north of Enfield. Fingers of development extend beyond it, for example up the Lee Valley at Cheshunt, while it sweeps round the whole of the Watford area and the Loughton area, both of which were excluded from the suggested Greater London area in 1963. To the south east of London, the M25 is located south of the North Downs, generally many miles away from the edge of the built-up area, while to the south west, it runs through the mixture of small towns and open land that makes up north west Surrey.

42. Early in the review, we decided that the M25 would not be suitable in its entirety as an outer London boundary. To use it would have been to propose radical change, possibly involving the creation of new London boroughs and certainly the abolition of several shire districts. Clearly, this would have been outside the guidelines for this review. We did consider the merits of using stretches of the road, for example north east
of London. In our review of Redbridge we wondered whether it could provide a suitable boundary. In 1960, the Herbert Commission had recommended that the London County Council's Debden Estate should be in Greater London. However, there had been no proposals for such a change, and to bring the Loughton area into London would have implications for the viability of the district of Epping Forest. We therefore decided not to propose major change.

43. Even where the motorway runs close to the existing boundary, it is not always a straightforward matter to use it. Many people identify with a more historic line - perhaps this occurs even more so where a new and prominent feature has changed their environment. Certainly, the M25 would normally provide a clear line for a boundary. However, there are many roads and footpaths under or over it and community life may continue across it. Over time, it may be expected to exert an influence, especially locally where it or associated developments form a barrier. In addition, it has to be recognised that, by facilitating orbital journeys it may also encourage community life to develop near its intersections with local roads, or at the inevitable out-of-centre developments which are attracted to accessible locations.

44. There are a few places where urban development extends continuously beyond the M25. The clearest example is north of Enfield, where the road is tunnelled to avoid impact on the adjacent housing. We proposed the use of the motorway as a clearly defined permanent feature, but incorporated into our proposal a line immediately to the north of the Holmesdale tunnel (as the motorway, being underground, presents no ground features that can be followed). As a general rule, we have taken the view that Greater London should not at present extend beyond the M25, but we have not felt it right to propose its widespread use as an outer London boundary.

The relationship of the boundary to the pattern of development

45. We remain of the opinion that the outer London boundary should be more in line with the geographical pattern of development. For the reasons given above, we do not think that it is practical to take the necessary radical action in this review. Our approach has had to be to make only minor adjustments to alleviate what we consider to be the main boundary anomalies in the interests of effective and convenient local government. However, three examples may be given of particular difficulties we have faced.

46. In south east London, the outer boundary extends for many miles into open countryside. Much of this area seems quite detached from the urban part of the boroughs. It is true that the Herbert Commission had recommended London extending to the crest of the North Downs. However, one reason for this was to avoid splitting the then existing authorities. We considered whether the boundary of Bromley should be
drawn in to be closer to the built up area. Much of the area affected is remote from London, has rural characteristics and may be more rural even than other parts of the Home Counties outside London. In addition, communities such as Downe have not been able to be represented by parish councils because there has been no provision for parish councils in London.

47. South west London presents the other extreme. The boundary here cuts through continuous urban development. One section of boundary is even based on an old parish boundary created in the 1930s but which was then already being obliterated by new development. Many communities outside the boundary are within the strong influence of London and the major centres of the south western suburbs. While they clearly have an identity of their own - and we suspect that this identity is reinforced by their desire not to be in London - we consider that they relate more to Greater London, its main areas of employment and its strategic centres.

48. Early in the review, we expressed our concern about this boundary and asked our professional adviser to visit the authorities to collect information about the provision of services and the pattern of community life. We are very grateful for the information which we received. During the review, we have also received several interesting and closely argued submissions on the nature of the authorities in south west London, particularly the suggestion by Kingston upon Thames that it could define its “objective community”. We considered that there was a strong case to align the boundary with the edge of the built-up area, thus bringing into London boroughs parts of Surrey.

49. However, we noted the very strong wishes of the people in the areas affected against change. To take such a step could have the effect of bringing into London the whole of Epsom and Ewell and part of Elmbridge districts, as well as adjustments to districts to both the east and the west. Even to deal satisfactorily with the area where the boundary appears to run through a continuous area of housing would be likely to weaken the already small borough of Epsom and Ewell. We doubted that this was the intention of this review, or even whether it could be accomplished easily through our enabling legislation, and therefore proposed more limited change to deal with the more glaring boundary anomalies. Nevertheless, we have expressed the view when dealing with the issue of Kingston upon Thames that it would be desirable at some stage to have a wider review of these boundaries in the future.

50. The third example consists of places where development spills over the outer London boundary and where it is almost impossible to find a clear line to separate “London” from the authorities outside. We have considered this problem particularly in Bexley, Croydon, Hillingdon and Redbridge. At present, the boundary crosses “fingers” or “blocks” of development in an arbitrary way. Often there are small centres outside to
which people relate, as well as the powerful pull of London and its suburbs. Taking the boundary around the “finger” or “block” would mean encroaching upon the districts outside. In the four boroughs mentioned above, this could mean radical change to, respectively, Dartford; Caterham and Warlingham in Tandridge; Moor Park in Three Rivers; and Chigwell, Loughton and Buckhurst Hill in Epping Forest. The alternative, to move the boundary in towards London, would imply going a considerable distance and affecting many more people in the London boroughs. We have therefore been forced to make modest adjustments, trying to create a clear and logical boundary in the light of the many representations made to us, but recognising that it may not be possible to avoid placing - or maintaining - the boundary between two similar houses in the same street.

51. Although we have not felt able to revisit the battleground of the Herbert Commission, which wanted to extend London further out than Parliament subsequently enacted in 1963, we consider that that Commission’s approach had much to commend it. Despite the increasing importance of orbital movements and the growth of free standing towns outside London, the influence of the centre of London and its strategic centres remains strong. Transport improvements continue to tie the area together, particularly the public transport system for those without access to a car. The Herbert Commission applied three tests to find whether an area should be part of Greater London. How strong is it as an independent centre on its own? How strong are its ties to London? How strongly is it drawn outwards to the country rather than inwards towards London? We find these tests no less relevant today.

52. We recognise the fears of those who wish to keep their identity outside “London” and who have fought successfully to remain outside its administrative expression. We have not considered that this is the time to propose major change, but believe that it will be an important challenge in any future review to consider proposals for significant adjustments of the outer London boundary. On the basis of the extent of the built-up area, the existence of the green belt and of what is known about the links which exist across the present boundary - for journeys to work, shopping, education and leisure - we doubt that the present boundary makes much sense as a line defining a group of authorities forming the conurbation of London. A better boundary based on these factors would follow more closely the edge of the continuous built-up area of London.
CENTRAL AND INNER LONDON

The City of London

53. All reviews of London need to recognise the special importance of the City of London to London government. The historical and financial importance of the City, together with its international and ceremonial role has meant that it has survived intact as a unit of local government even though it is, at just over 5,000 resident population, considerably smaller than other London boroughs. Its small size and unique electoral arrangements suggest a different relationship between its electorate and the council than exists in the other London boroughs. This is likely to give rise to practical differences, because most of the services provided by the City are for a very large non-resident population and for the business community. As well as performing important functions in London’s commercial core, the City Corporation is also responsible for several functions outside its area. One example is the ownership and management of open space: Hampstead Heath has recently been added to a land holding which includes Epping Forest. Another example is housing owned by the Corporation. It has, too, some unexpected functions; for example it is responsible for the health and welfare of imported animals at Heathrow Airport.

54. We felt it necessary to consider whether radical change should be contemplated in the interests of effective and convenient local government. Such change might either be the enlargement of the City or its abolition and absorption into a neighbouring borough or boroughs. We have no powers to propose the abolition of the City, and have therefore disregarded the proposals that have been made to us for this. The enlargement of the City could possibly bring benefits through the more effective provision of services covering a larger area. However, to bring the City’s population up to even that of the smallest London borough would require massive change, with repercussions on the neighbouring boroughs. We considered that this would constitute restructuring and should not be entertained in this review.

55. We received representations that the entire boundary of the City should be left intact for historical reasons. We noted, however, that the present boundary is unsatisfactory in several places. It divides properties and cuts across the present building pattern. We therefore proposed limited changes to unite properties and areas in one local authority area. We hoped that this would simplify financial arrangements, planning procedures and other local authority functions which are duplicated or complicated by the present boundaries. To have attempted more than some improvement to certain boundaries would have called into question the existence of the City at its present size.
56. Particular difficulties have been experienced where new developments or proposed developments straddle the existing boundary. They are clearly associated with the commercial life of the City, but bring life to the surrounding boroughs. While they are no longer significant for rate income, they are often perceived as adding prestige to the inner London boroughs. Where major developments have been constructed, we have attempted to take a view of the desirability of their being in either the City or the neighbouring borough. Where developments are only proposed and are not firm commitments, we have tried to ensure that any boundary change could not be interpreted as intervening in the planning process.

57. We have considered whether more radical action should be taken on the City's boundaries but have formed the view that there was only scope for limited action in this review. We recognise that the City is unlike any other London borough. We agree with the conclusions of the Herbert Commission that logic has its limits and that the position of the City lies outside them, at least in this review.

The central area

58. Borough boundaries seem to bear no relation to the central area of London, such as that defined for census purposes or in planning studies. The present boroughs were formed from the amalgamation of former metropolitan boroughs and their boundaries divide the central business district arbitrarily. The important commercial centre of the West End is divided between the City of Westminster and Camden. As well as parts of the commercial core, both have residential and inner areas extending away from the centre. The South Bank, containing many new offices and important transport termini, is divided between two boroughs, Lambeth and Southwark, which have their main areas - and electorate - stretching to the south.

59. It is arguable that, until the demise of a Greater London authority, such divisions were of lesser importance, because there was always an authority which could take a strategic view. Despite a network of inter-borough organisations, it seems inevitable that the focus of each borough will be on its own interests. An example of this occurs in planning, where each borough has a clear responsibility to prepare a unitary development plan for the whole of its area, but where such co-ordination as can be achieved is either advisory or imposed from the Department of the Environment. It is perhaps not surprising that there have been calls for London to have a "voice", and suggestions have been made for the enhancement of the role of either the City or the City of Westminster (both of which have Lord Mayors) to speak for London, as well as for other radical changes.
60. We consider that there would be merit, in a wider review, in an investigation of the benefits of a closer alignment of local government and the commercial heart of London, perhaps by including the whole of it within one or more boroughs. The implications for the pattern of boroughs covering the remainder of Inner London would also need to be examined. A particular difficulty would be how best to reconcile the traditional interests and boundaries of the City of London with the needs of central London as a whole.

Inner London

61. During the review the ILEA was abolished. It had been created in 1965 to provide education in the inner London boroughs, so continuing the education arrangements of the former London County Council, and because there were then some doubts about the ability of the smaller inner London authorities to run education services. We were concerned to ensure that the implications of the major step of abolition were incorporated into the review and therefore wrote to the Department of the Environment to enquire whether our guidelines were going to be revised to take the altered arrangements into account. We were told to work within the existing guidelines and this we have continued to do.

62. We felt it necessary to ask the question whether the existing boroughs would be sufficiently large to manage education in addition to their other responsibilities. There had already been reports which suggested that there were severe problems in inner London authorities. For example, one report by the Audit Commission in 1987 had suggested that there was a crisis of management, leading to near breakdown. Clearly, if that had been shown to be the case as a result of the existing boundaries, or the size and shape of the existing boroughs, there would have been a failure of effective and convenient local government which would have required us to make proposals to effect improvements.

63. We have noted above (in paragraphs 25 to 28) that we had investigated the issue of the size of authorities. The problems seemed most acute in the inner London area. The smaller boroughs were below what was traditionally thought of as a viable size for education purposes and several seemed to have severe problems of inner city deprivation. There was some evidence that they found it difficult to attract staff. In the event, the change in the arrangements for education has been managed with local government’s usual adaptability, while the advent of local management of schools with the associated changes in the financial regime means that much has changed in the service as a whole. With the ILEA’s responsibility now in general taken over by the inner London boroughs, these have the same functions as the outer London boroughs.
64. The inner London boroughs, like the outer, now have additional responsibilities in the management of social services. This will be challenging given the pattern of deprivation in the capital but, despite the difficulties facing the inner London boroughs, we see no reason why they should not, on grounds of size alone, manage any less well than the smaller outer boroughs. **We have therefore concluded that although a case for radical change to the pattern of Inner London boroughs can be made, we should not consider a major restructuring of local government in this review.**

**COMMUNITIES IN LONDON**

The sense of identity

65. Although London is a large place with a highly mobile population, it has often been observed that it is a collection of communities, or villages, rooted in history, ethnic origin or a common interest in aspects of the life of the capital. There was a strong sense of pride in identifying with Bow or Bethnal Green, Camden Town or Camberwell, rather than with “London”. In the outer suburbs, the older labels persist: Barnet, Hertfordshire; Edgware, Middlesex; or Sutton, Surrey. This was partly reflected in the former administrative pattern, although the metropolitan boroughs in inner London were themselves an amalgamation of former communities and the outer boroughs an amalgamation of former county boroughs, non-county boroughs and urban and rural districts.

66. Communities in inner London had often developed around particular commercial specialised functions, for example instrument making or markets. In outer London, communities were either based on the free-standing villages or small towns which were submerged by the growth of the metropolis, or new communities which developed around transport nodes, particularly around tube stations in north and west London. In local authority terms, this was partly reflected in the former authority units until these were amalgamated in 1965.

67. In formulating boundary proposals that will serve effective and convenient local government we are required to have regard to whether an area or boundary accords with the wishes of the local inhabitants and reflects the pattern of community life. Factors representing the pattern of community life include community of interest within an area and sometimes a sense of separation from other areas stemming from social, geographical, economic and cultural influences. In drawing up proposals for London we have, therefore, as in other reviews, attempted to identify distinct communities. We have considered, and in some cases proposed, boundaries that will preserve and, if appropriate, unify communities where it has appeared that a different boundary might enhance thriving communities.
In a large continuous built-up area such as London there are many difficulties in identifying such distinct communities in the first place, let alone bringing about administrative boundaries that can respect them. It is clear that people are more mobile and have a greater diversity of interests than in the past. Their community of interest may be with their peers of similar age, lifestyle, or religion over a large geographical area rather than necessarily with the other people in the immediate area around their home. While many people living in London will be able to identify an area or neighbourhood that they relate to, these are generally quite small geographically - perhaps from about the size of an electoral ward down to the few streets immediately around their home.

Where the Commission has studied and tried to define communities in London it has generally found little agreement on their extent. Some people indeed seem rather more concerned about their postcode (which may affect insurance premiums or the targeting of mail shots to their homes). The general resistance to change has meant that even where it appears that strong communities exist, proposals for their unification within a single authority have proved more unpopular than the continuation of the status quo. We have therefore been more cautious in making final proposals than we expected at the outset of the review. It seems as if the concept of community is largely independent of the pattern of local government in London, even to the extent that people in the same recognisable community do not necessarily mind it being split between different authorities.

Campaigns for the return of former authorities

We have noted in previous reports, for example People and Places (Report No 550), that people often wished to return to former local authorities. After a time these feelings may fade and we do not, for example, detect any longing for a return to the county authorities which existed prior to the London County Council. The fact that Surrey’s cricket ground is in Lambeth is but one reminder of the former administrative geography. Middlesex ceased to exist as an administrative county in 1965 and, while there are a few calls for its reinstatement, generally it can be said that administratively it is hardly missed, although its Guildhall still stands in Parliament Square.

During our review of London there have been requests from a number of areas for a reversion to the boundaries and authorities that existed before the reorganisation of London local government in the 1960s. There have been campaigns to detach Wembley from Brent, to divide Haringey in two, separating Hornsey from Tottenham, and to alter the pattern of inner London boroughs south of the River Thames into units representing their inner and outer parts. As an important component of our work is to take into account the wishes of the people, we have treated these campaigns with seriousness.
72. We have not found solid evidence which convinces us that these sweeping changes would be justified. Our guidelines state that radical changes would be appropriate only where the Commission considers that present arrangements clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government, and we cannot say that local government has failed in this way. We do not think that the answer is to go back to the past, although we recognise that many of the inhabitants of several London boroughs do not identify with them.

The internal characteristics of boroughs

73. We have become aware of feelings of separation and alienation which sometimes exist between parts of the same borough. These appear to be based on the belief that one part of a borough is different from the rest, or that one part soaks up all its resources. We do not doubt the strength and sincerity of the feelings expressed by those who have written to us seeking radical change. We consider each case on its merits, having regard to the guidelines within which we work. The campaigns to divide Brent and Haringey and to unite Streatham in Wandsworth, and the calls which have been made for two new authorities to replace Southwark and Lambeth, have included the claim that the existing boroughs are a marriage of incompatible parts.

74. As is required by our guidelines, we have considered the community of interest in several areas of London. However, in the context of a local government pattern consisting of authorities of substantial size, it is impossible (even if it were desirable) for any authority to conform to a particular homogeneous grouping of residents. In practice, all local authorities, irrespective of size, contain a degree of social diversity and contain minority groups. Since the former authorities were themselves often the product of the amalgamation of areas with different characteristics, the pattern of authorities created in 1965 inevitably shows considerable socio-economic diversity within most of them.

75. We are also aware of claims that are made that revenue raised in one part of a borough is spent in other parts, or that councillors favour a particular area of a borough at the expense of others. We consider that it would be very difficult to prove or disprove these assertions, especially as the exercise would need to cover several years to be meaningful. In any event, the determination of spending priorities is entirely a policy matter for each local authority within the overall statutory framework and financial constraints set by Parliament. It is not for us to seek to influence such questions through the alteration of boundaries.

76. One of the most extensive campaigns was for the restoration of Wembley, or for the merger of Wembley and Harrow, either of which would have the effect of undoing the merger of Wembley and Willesden, which made up the borough of Brent. We decided to request information
about Brent and about parts of Harrow, to assist our investigation of the
merits of such a radical change. We noted some problems of service
delivery and the sense of separateness which some residents of the
northern part of the borough felt from the southern part. However, the
borough was not unusual in being divided by transport routes, or by
exhibiting parts with different socio-economic characteristics. We
considered various possibilities for change, from the splitting of the
borough into two to the merger of its parts with neighbouring boroughs.
However, we did not consider that the problems affecting the delivery of
services were the result of the size, shape or boundaries of the authority.
Nor did we consider any alternative to be satisfactory, or worth the
considerable disruption which would be caused to the pattern of boroughs
in this part of London. Several neighbouring boroughs would have been
drawn into any search to find acceptable alternative boundaries.

77. Campaigns for major changes such as have been suggested in this
review make us aware of the strength of feeling towards local councils in
certain areas of London. However, we need to consider the extent to
which the underlying reasons for proposals for radical change are a
consequence of the size, shape or boundaries of a borough, rather than
the result of the particular policies and priorities of its present council.
We hold the view that it is not our function to make changes to local
authority boundaries for the purposes of influencing levels of
services in any authority. That is the responsibility of the council
to its electorate. Nor would it be right to indulge in social engineering
by altering boundaries to include or exclude certain types of people.

New communities

78. No place is static and London is no exception. Although much of
the fabric of London has been in existence since the creation of the
boroughs, there have been important developments on unused, derelict
or redundant land. Two new developments are of particular note and we
have considered whether the boundaries of boroughs adequately reflect
the present pattern of development. These are Thamesmead, split
between Bexley and Greenwich, and Docklands, split between Greenwich,
Lewisham, Newham, Southwark and Tower Hamlets.

79. The new town of Thamesmead was developed on former marshes
by the Greater London Council acting jointly with Greenwich and Bexley.
It was planned to contain 60,000 population, but amendments to the plan
brought the projected population down to 40,000. Before this review,
proposals had been made to unite it in one borough, to recognise its
single community. The fact that it has been transferred to a single trust -
Thamesmead Town Limited - suggested to us that its identity as one
community has been confirmed. Yet it is administratively divided between
two boroughs with separate development plans and with different standards
of service provision, and whose centres of interest pull it in opposite
directions. Despite the calls in this review for minimal change, we decided exceptionally to make proposals to unite Thamesmead in Greenwich.

80. East of the City, the London Docklands Development Corporation has taken over responsibility for a large area of land formerly covered by derelict docks and associated activities. There has been considerable change in much of the area, particularly in the development of commercial buildings, housing and infrastructure. At an early stage in the review, we considered whether we should reflect these developments by proposing changes to the pattern of boroughs. We thought, however, that this would be premature, noted that the area would be subject to more change in the future and considered that the scale of any proposals would of necessity cause consequential effects to the pattern of boroughs in the area.

81. Boundary changes in London should not normally precede the establishment of new communities, but there may be a case to undertake a boundary review when a community has become established.

Small communities

82. We have described above (in paragraphs 65 to 69) the difficulties we have faced in defining communities. It is clear that in London, the term “community” has come to mean several different things. The forward plans of the post-war years identified communities which needed protection or enhancement through planning policy. A particular area of concern was the architectural heritage, especially the conservation of historic villages and estates. Conservation groups were also active in defending their areas against the motorway proposals of the 1970s. Late in the life of the Greater London Council, that authority identified “community areas” which were predominantly working class but said to be under pressure from commercial development.

83. Our experience has tended to cast doubt on the more traditional view of communities in London and the need for them to relate to single local authorities. We began the review thinking that we should at least investigate those more visible communities which are divided by boundaries. However, even seemingly “village” communities, such as Highgate (split between Camden and Haringey) and Blackheath (split between Greenwich and Lewisham) seem able to accept being divided between authorities. In the case of Highgate, we found, on making a draft proposal to unite the village, that the inhabitants were generally opposed to change, and discerned few advantages and some disadvantages in bringing the area into one authority.
84. A particular difficulty has been to define the extent of the community. Again in Highgate, the one clear line that could be used to define the edge of the village - the A1 road - was felt by residents to be unsatisfactory because it was itself the focus of community interest. In Blackheath, the village has no clear edge that could be used, even if there had been support for change. The problem of defining possibly overlapping communities is greatest in dense urban areas. This was demonstrated in the response to our draft proposal to unite Fitzrovia, which is at present split between Camden and the City of Westminster. We made a proposal to unite it in Westminster, although, as in other areas, we received a substantial response against change, or for using different alignments.

85. Some of the most determined resistance to change has been in areas where the boundary separates identical properties in the same street and where the sense of community would appear to argue for unification in one authority or the other. We mention the difficulties we experienced at the boundary between Barnet and Enfield as just one example, but it has occurred throughout London. We find it difficult to believe that people's real patterns of community life are radically different at each end of a homogeneous suburban street, or that it is likely to be efficient to have local government services delivered (or administered) by two different authorities.

86. In contrast to the very negative views expressed about most of our attempts to create better boundaries, we have in some cases found a more positive response where we have sought to unite former public housing estates. In these cases, residents' sense of identity often attaches to the estate, especially where it was built by one authority. We have received proposals for estates to be unified by members of the public or residents' associations, emphasizing the community of interest between the estate and one authority, together with access to local facilities. This seems to remain in some areas of council housing even after the widespread take-up of the Right to Buy legislation. We have therefore proposed boundary changes to unite such estates in one authority. Examples are the Becontree Estate, split between Barking and Dagenham and Redbridge, and the Silwood Estate, split between Southwark and Lewisham.

87. With these exceptions, there has been a general resistance to change, down to a very local level. This has made proposals for even minor adjustments of the boundary to create a clear boundary and assist in the local delivery of services sometimes difficult to sustain. We are not sure whether this is because of fear of change, the existence of vested interests in the status quo, or a lack of comprehension of the relationship between the local authority and the citizen. It is possible that there are genuine differences between two halves of the same street, so that they indeed look in different directions, but it seems more likely that differences in attitude are due to the incidence of the community charge or in the
application of policies towards services. These are matters which ought not to be a consideration in boundary reviews but which understandably weigh heavily in people's views. The fact is that local government in London exhibits considerable polarisation between the policies and attitudes even of adjacent boroughs. The identification of small communities and their links to local authorities are subjects on which some research should be commissioned.

BOUNDARIES AND OTHER FEATURES

88. Because the boundaries of the boroughs are mostly based on historic lines, dating from before the urban development that created the present built-up area of London, many do not relate well to definable features. This has meant that we have had to accept some boundaries meandering through areas of similar character. Our attempts to remove the worst anomalies have, as we have described, frequently met with resistance, and we have consequently refrained from pursuing many which seemed desirable at the outset of the review. We are therefore led to the conclusion that more significant boundary changes will need to be based on clear simple criteria for the definition of boundaries, or on the more ruthless application of criteria. Such criteria might be either physical or administrative, and we mention some of these in subsequent paragraphs.

Education

89. The possible disruption to the pattern of education provision, and in particular school catchment areas, is often a strong and emotive issue when boundary changes are being proposed. Schools themselves often provide a focus of community interest and identity. This is particularly true of primary schools where close links may be developed between parents who meet each other regularly when dropping-off and collecting their children and when attending school functions, but can also be true of secondary schools where facilities are used by the local community. Such schools may therefore serve to illustrate the sense of community that exists in an area.

90. While we have continued to pay careful attention to the impact that they may have on education locally, the immediate impact of boundary changes has been reduced by recent legislation. Court cases in Greenwich, Bromley and Kingston have established that parents' rights to send their children to the schools of their choice make it unlawful for a local authority to give priority to residents of its own area where schools are oversubscribed. In general, parents can still choose the school that is closest geographically, even if it is located in and run by another local authority. However, there may be problems where schools have links with each other in one borough, which a boundary change could affect, while the location of specialist resources can sometimes be an issue.
Although the relationship between schools and local authorities is changing, it seems likely that education will remain an important factor in boundary reviews in the future.

**Major roads**

91. We have observed several instances where new roads have been built close to an existing boundary which is riddled with anomalies. The boundary appears to bear no relation to the pattern of community life, while the road provides a highly visible and often geographically divisive feature. Movements across the road are confined to a few crossing points, while the road itself has a strong impact on the environment. Our approach has been to examine the merits of aligning the boundary to the road. In taking this view, we have been mindful that there are often differences between roads. Some continue to facilitate movements and provide frontage access. Others are segregated and cause considerable separation, particularly to movements on foot.

92. In addition to our examination of the potential of the M25, described at paragraphs 41 to 44 above, we have considered the use of several major roads. The M1 and A41 north of Barnet and Harrow was one example where there was a clear break, and we were able to propose the unification of Elistree Village in Hertfordshire. We investigated the use of the M4 between Ealing and Hounslow, and the A406 between Enfield and Haringey but decided to propose no major changes. The case of the A406 or North Circular Road provides an interesting example of the inter-relationship of roads and boundaries.

93. The North Circular Road is a well-established feature in north London, as it was constructed as an arterial road before the Second World War. In recent years it has been dramatically improved, so that several stretches are at or near motorway standard. It is a clearly defined feature and tends to run between town and community centres rather than pass through them. Its potential as a division has been drawn to our attention in the review of Brent, although, as explained in paragraph 76 above, we did not pursue the suggestion to divide that borough in two. Further to the east, however, it runs for several miles a short distance to the north of the boundary between Enfield and Haringey, a boundary that was difficult to identify in places and which appears to divide the community as well as dividing several properties. We asked the two authorities to provide information on the area between the boundary and the road, so that we could assess the merits of the use of the road.

94. The response to this suggestion was hostile. The case was made that local government services could be provided across the North Circular Road without difficulty. Representations were received to the effect that a strong community of interest extended across the road, separate from that existing in Haringey to the south. We therefore decided to propose
no major change to the boundary, relying instead on minor action to resolve detailed anomalies. We had also made a draft proposal for the use of the road as a boundary between Barnet and Haringey, on similar grounds. Again, the response was negative, and we decided to withdraw the proposal.

95. There is good evidence to suggest that, in addition to the normal dislike of change and the fear or dislike of the authority which the residents might join, people take some time to adjust to new and improved roads. At least in the short term, they do not let them alter previous patterns of community life, while in some cases better crossing points may mean that movement between parts of the community may be easier than before. We have not wished to pursue those cases where the wishes of the people are so clearly against the change. However, we believe that London's major new roads will assist in defining its geography and that, were there to be a more general restructuring, some of them would form highly visible and, in many cases, convenient boundaries.

Open space

96. On the whole, we have felt it desirable to unite areas of major open space in London within one authority to avoid confusion of responsibilities and to simplify the administration and maintenance of the area. In so doing we have also sought to draw a clear boundary. This may mean taking the whole of the open space into the authority which has the majority of it at present, as we proposed at Victoria Park in Tower Hamlets. However, our consultations on boundary changes have shown that parks and areas of open space are often regarded locally as focal points for surrounding communities for leisure and other activities. Despite the fact that they may form clear structural breaks dividing built-up areas they are often seen by residents as unifying these surrounding areas, so a view has to be taken on the desirability of change in each particular case.

97. In the past, when several parks were the responsibility of one authority - the Greater London Council - the fact of division mattered less, because they were maintained by one authority. There are also examples where areas of open space are owned and administered by a local authority or agency other than the borough whose boundary is involved. Hampstead Heath and Golders Hill Park, on the boundary between Barnet and Camden, are now run by the City of London. Regents Park, between the City of Westminster and Camden, is an example of a park maintained by the Department of the Environment. Although it seems to be the case that division of open areas is not a serious hindrance to effective and convenient local government, we have normally taken the view that unifying the area in one authority will facilitate the necessary liaison between the owner and the authority involved.
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

98. This review has led us to conclude that a distinction needs to be drawn between the small-scale adjustment of boundaries and more significant action. Our investigations of boundaries in London have on occasion led us to propose wider change. We have, however, encountered various obstacles. Most of those concerned with local government are opposed to change and seem to prefer the status quo. Change of medium scale, falling between minor boundary adjustments and radical structural proposals, has usually generated intense local hostility, partly perhaps because it is tied to the present structure. Proposals for radical change, even to one London borough, can have knock-on effects which reverberate throughout other boroughs and can even imply major structural change throughout large parts of London. The few calls we have received for very substantial change have, perhaps inevitably, generally been for the recreation of past authorities, the implementation of which would have had serious repercussions on adjoining London boroughs.

99. There is no general agreement on either the best geographical definition of “London” or the optimum size and arrangements of units within it. In such circumstances, without a fixed starting point, it is difficult to judge whether any proposals we might have made, had our remit been a wider one, would have produced a significant improvement to effective and convenient local government, our touchstone under the enabling legislation. We therefore find ourselves concluding, in common with other observers of English local government, that there needs to be a clearer view of the role and functions of local government, both generally and in London, before the existing units can be evaluated and more fundamental decisions made on their boundaries.

100. Some London boroughs came under criticism during our reviews both as service providers and as organisations representing local communities. It is a matter for conjecture whether and, if so, how far the shape, size or boundaries of the boroughs are the cause of any reported problems, and it is not for us to comment on the standards of service or the distribution of resources determined by elected representatives. However, some of the present boroughs result from enforced marriages between previous authorities which had been very different in character and social composition. Such artificiality can produce a weakened sense of loyalty to the local authority, a divorce between sense of community and local administration, and a suspicion, whether or not justified, that resources are skewed to or away from particular areas.

101. The pattern of administration covering any one part of the capital is now so complicated, with many joint arrangements and functions taken on by both local government and non local government bodies, that it is difficult to see how accountability could be improved without a fundamental reappraisal of the role of the borough in London’s government. Such
re-appraisal should consider the need for strategic action on a London-wide basis and the relationship between that and the responsibilities of individual boroughs.

102. The information gathered in this review has also pointed to a mismatch between the boundaries of the boroughs and the more local communities which make up London. We accept that communities may be difficult to define in the densely built-up area of London. In many cases, identifiable communities do not seem to mind being split between authorities. This suggests that arrangements for the provision of local government services is of little interest to them. However, one of the roles of local government is to represent local communities and it may be that greater attention should be given in the future to the relationship between the authority and the identifiable communities in its area. We are aware that some authorities have begun experiments in becoming closer to neighbourhoods, and suggest that these are evaluated to see if they have any implications for the pattern of authorities and their boundaries in London.

103. London is unique in England in not having had statutory provision for parish government. There would clearly be difficulties in the urban area in the establishment of more local authorities. The cost of additional authorities would also have to be taken into account, as well as the possibility that some may not be able to attract support. However, we consider that there would be merit in the investigation of suitable forms of local representation, perhaps in conjunction with the evaluation of different forms of borough approaches to neighbourhoods, mentioned above. Local identity is clearly strong, at least in parts of London, but is not sufficiently catered for by the present pattern of boroughs.

104. The other area of concern is how issues affecting more than one borough are handled. The present arrangements are confusing. Issues of wider importance help to identify what are distinctively "London" concerns. The boroughs understandably need to promote their own corporate identity, but in the process the cohesion of London is eroded. Whether this is desirable is a matter of some debate, but we note again that there seems to be general confusion about the identity of London.

105. The confusion over what is distinctively "London" is exacerbated by the deficiencies of the outer London boundary. It is not clear where London ends. We express some regret that we have not felt able to make more significant improvements in this review. Our remit does not extend to the major change to authorities both within and outside London that such improvements would make necessary. However, we are very much aware of the danger that particular boundary anomalies will remain for the foreseeable future because reviews on either side of the current Greater London boundary will not feel able to deal with the problem. We respect the wishes of those opposed to change, but consider that in the
long run a clearer definition of the boundary of London would assist effective and convenient local government in the communities on both sides of it.

106. Where London does have a clear identity is in the provision of the functions of a capital and world city. Although the edge of the central business district is not itself clearly defined, the central core represents “London” to many people both nationally and internationally. Yet, with the exception of the traditional City of London, there is no borough which is truly central. The centre is divided between several boroughs and there is a strong case for examining the pattern of boroughs in this area. One option would be an authority covering the central business district and enclosing the City of London, for which special arrangements might need to be made.

107. The proposals we have made in this review will help to produce more rational boundaries, tied wherever possible to significant geographical features. They will, in some cases, unite communities at present divided. They will assist in securing the more effective delivery of local authority services. However, although there will no doubt be future opportunities to review boundaries, we question whether a limited and incremental approach, such as we have had to adopt, will be adequate to address the problem of providing effective and convenient local government in London. In this report, we have concentrated on the wider issues. London has changed since the Greater London area was first defined and given a pattern of local government distinct from the rest of England. Changes to its structure and composition are still under way and could be better reflected in the organisation of local government within it.
Appendix A

Guidelines for the reviews of London and the metropolitan districts

Extract from Department of the Environment Circular 20/86
Paragraphs 6-10

The present boundaries of both metropolitan districts and London boroughs reflect their history, being derived initially from amalgamation of smaller areas, many of which had themselves been so formed. In addition, since the boundaries were first drawn, major development may have taken place overlying them, and new lines of communication have been opened and old ones closed, leading to changes in the pattern of development and in the make-up of communities. The Secretary of State considers that for the most part the purpose of the forthcoming reviews should be the examination of the need for adjustment of local government boundaries to overcome specific problems arising from historical anomalies or from subsequent changes in the pattern of development. In the interests of stability, the Commission may wish to consider the merging of existing local government areas, rather than any more widespread redrawing of boundaries, in any area where they form the view that major changes are called for.

The Act requires the Commission to consider, in the interests of effective and convenient local government, whether to propose any changes of the kinds set out in Section 47(1) of the 1972 Act as amended. The Secretary of State will consider any proposals the Commission may make accordingly. Subject to what the Commission may find, however, it is the Secretary of State's view that proposals for the more radical changes set out in Section 47(1), such as the abolition or creation of a principal area, would be appropriate only where the Commission consider that present arrangements clearly fail to provide effective and convenient local government and that a major change (such as the merging of authorities to create a new principal area) is required.

In connection with any substantial changes which are found to be necessary, it is not the Secretary of State's intention to propose minimum or maximum populations against which the Commission should compare those of existing areas. In proposing boundary alterations, the Commission will, however, wish to have in mind the need for authorities affected to have an adequate population base for the efficient and cost-effective discharge of their functions.

Changes in the outer boundaries of Greater London and the metropolitan counties have a special significance in that the distribution of functions is substantially different within and without those areas. The Secretary of State therefore considers that special care is required in considering such changes. Nevertheless, some of the boundaries have been overlaid by development, and some changes may be necessary to correct them.
Application of Criteria

In relation to the Commission's consideration of what constitutes effective and convenient local government in relation to any areas, the Secretary of State considers that the criteria set out in DoE Circular 33/78 are still relevant.

Extract from Department of the Environment Circular 33/78
Paragraph 14:

The Commission are enjoined (47(1)) to make proposals for 'effecting changes appearing to the Commission desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government'. This will be a major consideration. In considering cases put to the Commission in support of requests that they should carry out reviews, therefore, they will have regard to whether or not an area or boundary accords with the wishes of the local inhabitants, reflects the pattern of community life, and is conducive to the effective operation of local government and associated services. Some factors to be taken into account in applying these criteria are given in Annex B to this circular.

ANNEX B:

a. Pattern of community life

Factors include:-

i. community of interest within an area, and sometimes a sense of separation from other areas, stemming from social, geographical, economic and cultural influences;

ii. size and shape of the areas of local government;

iii. development and expected development;

iv. means of communication and transport facilities; and

v. accessibility of administrative, shopping, business and employment centres, educational, social, recreational, cultural and religious facilities and professional and medical services.
b. Effective operation of local government and associated services

Factors include:

i. size and distribution of population;

ii. financial resources; and

iii. pattern of administration of local services, eg. housing, social services, health, education, highways and sewerage.
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Section 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission was formally set up in November 1972, although it had operated as a Commission-designate since November 1971. It is to be dissolved on 31 October 1992.

1.2 This final report seeks to set our Commission in its historical context; summarise its 21 years' work on administrative and electoral boundaries; discuss various important issues which have emerged during these 21 years; and finally proffer some reflections and observations which may be of particular concern to the new Local Government Commission, which will be taking over our remaining work, and which may also be of interest to the general reader.

1.3 Although this is by no means an official history, we thought it useful to list the successive Chairmen, Deputy Chairmen, Members and Secretaries of the Commission (Annex A) and also all our final reports (Annex B).

1.4 Boundaries are frequently in a state of actual or potential flux, and we have been heirs to an older and more robust style of boundary adjustment:

"The division of the western midlands into shires which completely disregarded the boundaries of ancient peoples could only have been carried out by a king strong enough to ignore local resentment and quite indifferent to local traditions" (Edward the Elder, 899-924 AD)

1.5 Throughout these years of a more consultative approach to boundary change, our caravan has moved on. We have traversed and re-traversed the country. We have been set new challenges, and adopted new techniques. In many respects local government has changed around us, and we have responded to these changes. Yet a basic theme has remained constant; that of keeping England's internal boundaries in good order and up-to-date as an essential piece of estate management and a keystone of effective democratic local government.

F M Stenton: Anglo Saxon England
1.6 Our heavy workload could not have been discharged without the unflagging commitment and support of the members of our Secretariat, past and present, who have been drawn from the Department of the Environment and Home Office; we and our predecessors are most grateful to them. We pay tribute, too, to Ordnance Survey, who have met our multifarious mapping requirements with such professionalism and distinction.
2.1 The need to keep the map of English local government in good repair has been recognised from the introduction of the first modern pattern of local authorities in 1888 (in some cases, the remit of the appropriate bodies has included Wales): At first, reliance was placed on the local initiation of boundary changes and Private Bill procedures. The principle of systematic review was established in the Local Government Act 1929. County councils were required to review all county districts. Certain restrictions were applied to changes which might affect boroughs.

2.2 Many of the issues which are still relevant to the consideration of boundaries today (and which are noted in subsequent sections of this report) are apparent from these early days. These include the desirability of rationalising historic but out-of-date boundaries, the status of boroughs, the potential conflict between local government effectiveness and the wishes of the local people, the relationship between local authority size and configuration, and the functions which the authorities are expected to perform.

2.3 Although many boundary anomalies were removed through these attempts at reform, many remained, as did a large number of small authorities. The prospect of post-war reconstruction led to questions about the adequacy of local government for the expected tasks. A White Paper in 1945 (Cmd 6579) maintained that local government should be adjusted and not recast.

2.4 The first Commission to be set up to review boundaries (rather than consider the mechanisms for review) was the Local Government Boundary Commission (the Trustram Eve Commission, 1945-49). A precursor to subsequent bodies, it consisted of commissioners and staff, and could appoint assistant commissioners. Its powers were wide, except that the London County Council and Middlesex were excluded and restrictions remained on certain actions affecting boroughs.

2.5 Ministers did not have powers over the Commission's recommendations; it was an executive body able to make Orders. In the event, however, no Orders were made because the Commission decided that local government structure needed to be overhauled in the light of authorities' functions. Its proposals for a recast mixture of one and two tier local government, including the redrawing of many district boundaries, proved too ambitious, and the Commission was dissolved. The earlier
arrangements for taking boundary changes through a special Parliamentary procedure were reactivated until agreement could be reached on a further attempt at reform.

2.6 After consideration of the functions and finance of local government, a Local Government Commission (the Hancock Commission 1961-64) was set up to review the organisation of local government on an area basis. The largest conurbations (outside London, for which a Royal Commission, the Herbert Commission 1957-60, was appointed) were designated Special Review Areas in which the Commission had wide powers to recommend the pattern of local government it felt appropriate. For the remainder of England outside the metropolitan areas, it could review counties and county boroughs. The county councils reviewed their districts.

2.7 In the event, the procedures of the Commission were complicated, and relatively little progress was made. The possibility of re-running the Commission's investigations at public inquiries into its recommendations and the subsequent overturning of its proposals by the Minister (as occurred in the case of the proposed merger of Rutland and Leicestershire) highlighted the problems of maintaining a balance between the remit of an independent Commission and the policies of the government of the day.

2.8 The Royal Commission on Local Government in England (the Redcliffe-Maud Commission 1966-69) carried out a far-reaching review of local government outside London, making radical suggestions for change. These were not unanimous - there was a dissenting report - and the recommendations were never implemented, partly because a change of government brought different policies to bear on the future of the shire counties.

2.9 The Local Government Act 1972 recast the whole local government system in England, outside London, and made provision for the establishment of this Commission. As a Commission-designate in 1971 and then as a Commission in 1972, we were given a broader remit on boundary matters, encompassing the whole of England, than had been given to any previous Commission. Our 21 years' work is outlined in Section 3 of this report.
Section 3

THE COMMISSION'S WORK, 1971-92

Introduction

3.1 The Local Government Act 1972 (relevant extracts are at Annex C) charged the Commission with reviewing the boundaries of Greater London, the London boroughs, the counties and districts (metropolitan and non-metropolitan), and their electoral arrangements, and to make proposals for changes to them in the interests of “effective and convenient local government.” The Commission could also make proposals in respect of reviews of parishes carried out by district councils.

3.2 The Commission was given a duty, under the Act, to review at periodic intervals all counties in England, all metropolitan districts and all London boroughs. It had a separate duty to review, also at intervals, the electoral arrangements for all counties, districts and London boroughs.

3.3 It was empowered to undertake ad hoc electoral and ad hoc boundary reviews of districts and it had to consider requests for these from local authorities, as well as recommendations from district councils arising out of their own parish reviews.

3.4 In considering suggestions put to it, as well as in producing or modifying its own draft proposals, the Commission had to take account of guidelines issued by the Secretary of State. Having decided on its final proposals, it was charged with reporting to the Secretary of State, to whom fell the final decision to accept them, with or without modification, to reject them, or to direct the Commission to carry out a further review, but not to substitute changes on his own initiative.

3.5 From the beginning, we saw ourselves as having a responsibility to ensure as wide consultation as possible at each stage with all those affected by, or interested in, any of its reviews. This procedural objective has always pervaded our work and is explored in more detail in section 5 of this report.

The Commission-designate

3.6 The Commission-designate was in existence from November 1971 until November 1972, when it formally became the Local Government Boundary Commission for England appointed under Section 46 of the Local Government Act 1972. Its primary, and very demanding, task was
to create a new pattern of districts by November 1972, in order to allow the newly-elected authorities to come into existence on 1 April 1974.

3.7 In its Report No. 1, the Commission recommended a nation-wide pattern of new and often larger districts, within the proposed non-metropolitan counties. It had first published draft proposals, and then taken full account of the views of local authorities and members of the public. Nearly all the existing local authorities and 2500 other organisations and individuals sent in their views.

3.8 The Commission-designate fashioned its priorities within guidelines given by Government, which were contained in Department of the Environment Circular 58/71. In particular, it had to preserve the identity of towns but also existing boundaries in creating new districts, and to have regard to the general objectives of local government reorganisation; and to take account of the wishes of the local inhabitants, the pattern of community life, and the effective operation of local government services. Thus, the concept of effective and convenient local government has been with the Commission since its inception. Much of our work has been concerned with its interpretation.

3.9 Foreshadowing the Commission’s evolving consultation procedures, the guidelines required that there should be the fullest possible consultation with local authorities and other interested parties after the publication of draft proposals.

3.10 The Commission recommended that 296 new districts should be created, about 15% of the then existing number of urban and rural district councils and boroughs. The preferred range of district population was 75,000-100,000. However, some much bigger cities and towns, many of them former county boroughs, were designated as districts, while local geography sometimes required much smaller districts; fourteen of those proposed having populations of below 40,000. Where possible, existing boundaries were retained. Boundary changes, to deal with anomalies, were seen as a necessary process which would follow on the creation of the new authorities in April 1974.

Initial Programme 1974-78

3.11 The Commission’s initial programme after its formal establishment in 1972 was largely determined by priorities set by the Secretary of State for the Environment. It reported on Names of Non Metropolitan Districts (Report No 2); Successor Parishes - Constitution and Names (Report No 3); Successor Parishes - Resumed Reviews (Report No 5); and Successor Parishes - reviews of late applications (Report No 8). Report No 6 (its Future Programme of Work) identified the review of electoral arrangements (then expected to last for four years) as the leading priority, which inevitably limited the scope for priority boundary reviews, at least up to 1978.
3.12 In practice, the reviews of successor parishes formed a considerable proportion of the Commission's early workload. Section 1(8) of and Part V of Schedule 1 to the 1972 Act had provided for the constitution of successor parishes. Indeed, the term 'successor parish' was itself coined by the Commission in its Report No 3, its first on the issue, in recognition of the fact that such parishes would effectively be the successors as local authorities, albeit with more limited powers and duties, of those urban districts or municipal boroughs from which they were to be formed.

3.13 Our guidelines called essentially for such areas to be considered to consist of small towns within the relevant authorities' areas, distinctly identifiable both in physical and community terms, whose populations did not generally exceed a 10,000-20,000 range or amount to more than one-fifth of that of the new district. The purpose of this provision was to ensure that such settlements within the new non-metropolitan districts or metropolitan boroughs would have the opportunity to retain a parish status similar to that for which the Act had already provided in the case of parishes in rural districts.

3.14 The Commission entertained applications almost until the date of reorganisation, April 1974, after which Section 48 of the Act came into effect as the proper means for the creation of a parish in the context of a district review.

3.15 The opportunity to establish a parish, albeit with more limited statutory powers than its predecessor authority, was taken up keenly in many areas where the creation of larger districts, to administer areas including those of former urban districts or municipal boroughs, would otherwise have left a gap between long-established feelings of civic pride and the new administrative arrangements. The Commission recommended the creation of some 300 such parishes before 1 April 1974, all but 24 in the non-metropolitan counties because the metropolitan counties consisted mostly of continuous urban areas.

3.16 These changes, leaving the new parishes as a third tier, but with rather fewer powers than their predecessors, gave rise initially to some divided loyalties and feelings of potential rivalry between authorities. However, they did not unduly hamper the development of administration in the new districts, as the authorities' powers and the relationship between them had been reasonably clearly defined in the Act, and there was a strong imperative to make the new system work efficiently.

3.17 In general, these newly-created parishes have functioned well over the years, and were no more affected than other parishes by changes arising from subsequent parish reviews. Although inevitably time-consuming, our reviews of successor parishes had painted in some of the detail on the broad local government canvas created by the structural changes of the 1972 Act.
The first round of mandatory electoral reviews 1974-81

3.18 The 1972 Act required the Commission to launch an initial programme of mandatory electoral reviews, following the 1973 local elections to the new authorities. A key requirement was to report in time for the next due elections; and local authorities' readiness to participate in the consultation was viewed as a prerequisite. The Commission proposed to start with the non-metropolitan districts, aiming to complete as many as possible in time for the May 1976 elections, and with the non-metropolitan counties, in time for the May 1977 elections. All remaining non-metropolitan districts, together with the metropolitan districts and London boroughs, would be reviewed in time for the 1978 and 1979 elections, priority being given to those districts with the greatest electoral anomalies. There were 332 districts and 45 counties to be reviewed.

3.19 This was an exceptionally demanding programme. It took up most of the Commission's time in the early years, and it was explicitly accepted that administrative boundary reviews would have to take second place in other than exceptional circumstances, and that discretionary reviews could not be undertaken until after 1978.

3.20 From the beginning, importance was placed on proper consultation, which might include local meetings held by specially-appointed Assistant Commissioners. Progress was dependent on the co-operation of the other parties, and in particular on that of the local authorities. Indeed, a recurrent theme in the Commission's activities has been the potential conflict between the desirability of maintaining progress and achieving targets on the one hand, and the demands by consultees for additional consultation time on the other.

3.21 Progress with the programme of electoral reviews, though patchy in places and halted by the Enfield case (paragraphs 3.30-3.31 below) was impressive, particularly as so much new ground had to be broken and procedures created. Report No 141, Initial Electoral Reviews: Progress Report, demonstrated that the Commission had established the early precedents of thorough consultation and was aware of the importance of establishing its credentials as an advisory body of value both to local and to central government. It had placed particular emphasis on the primacy of public consultation; the acceptance and consideration of all forms of representation, from whatever source, whether corporate or individual; and a readiness to consider each case on its individual merits within certain broad principles. It had developed its electoral review procedures, and established consultation with political parties as an appropriate practice while preserving the Commission's impartiality.

Initial parish reviews 1978-84

3.22 In Department of the Environment Circular 121/77, the Secretary of State envisaged that the Commission would complete its initial parish
review programme over a six-year period up to 1984. It was expected that the programme would be staged: progress would be dependent on the flow of reports, the complexity of individual cases, the extent to which authorities kept to the guidelines, and the need for modifications or for the Commission to carry out its own reviews.

3.23 Our procedures and programmes were set out in our Report No. 286, Parish Boundary Reviews: Procedures and Programmes. We had found that local authorities' understanding and application of the guidelines varied greatly. Particular difficulties were whether to recommend change when this would put parishes at loggerheads, especially where there had been a deep tradition of civil and ecclesiastical parishes, and whether a newly-created parish could become an unnecessary tier of local government, for example in the more urban areas.

3.24 On this latter point, the Commission was sometimes faced with applications for parish status from quite sizeable towns, exceeding either in numbers or in proportion of a district's population the respective guidelines of 20,000 or one-fifth which had been felt appropriate at the time of reorganisation when provision for successor parishes was being considered.

3.25 Some examples of such applications which it recommended, and the Secretary of State subsequently accepted, in terms of population were Lichfield (27,000), Newark (25,000), Workington (28,000) and Yeovil (26,380); whilst Goole (32%), Congleton (29%) and Penzance (37%) exemplified those exceeding one-fifth of a district's population. Whilst towns in these categories fell within accepted guidelines in other respects, it often became apparent from local representations that such places cherished an individuality which only parish status could aptly express, as distinct from the inevitably wider and more strategic focus of a new and larger district.

3.26 The Commission, for its part, required evidence of thorough testing of local opinion and a balanced assessment of the outcome, without imposing rigid requirements as to the means by which the wishes of the people were to be established. Where appropriate, it undertook its own reviews.

Principal area boundary reviews

3.27 Procedures for these ad hoc but sometimes quite major reviews were set out in Report No. 287. As with the later mandatory programmes, the guidance given to the Commission in DOE Circular 33/78 (paragraph 14 of and Annex B to which are at Annex D below) stressed that only in very exceptional circumstances, such as to give effect to agreed changes, should it be prepared to recommend the abolition of a non-metropolitan district or other principal authority. Otherwise, it should consider
suggestions for alterations to those boundaries, taking account of the factors set out in that paragraph and Annex, and subject to the provisions of the 1972 Act.

3.28 Ad hoc principal area boundary reviews became an important and variegated part of our work. The option of reviewing individual authorities' boundaries at their request, outside the mandatory programmes, injected an additional element of flexibility. There were many differing reasons for such requests, though they often came down to common underlying and interconnected factors such as the desirability of incorporating recent development within the area of an authority which might be effectively providing most of its municipal services, or the identification of clearly-defined boundaries to take account of geographical anomalies which either had not been dealt with at the time of reorganisation or had arisen since.

3.29 The size of these reviews has varied greatly. Some, however, have been very substantial, including Chesterfield (Report No. 517), Oxford (Report No. 536) and Gloucester/Cheltenham (Report No. 547), and have often required the consideration of a multiplicity of issues to deal satisfactorily with the physical and demographic relationship of the authority being reviewed to the adjacent authorities.

The Enfield case

3.30 In November 1977, litigation was initiated by the London Borough of Enfield, on the grounds that they considered a council of 70 councillors to be necessary. The Commission had opted, in reporting to the Home Secretary, for a council size of 66 as recommended in the Assistant Commissioner's report to it. In November 1979, the Commission's appeal was allowed by the House of Lords. Previously, in the Court of Appeal, Lord Denning had said that:

"there are the words at the beginning of Section 47 [of the Local Government Act 1972]... ‘changes appearing to the Commission desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government.....’ These words seem to me to be overriding words which the Commission must apply in the whole of their consideration."

3.31 This was the first judicial test of the way in which the Commission sought to exercise its statutory powers and duties, and something of a landmark in its history. Although the successful appeal enabled the Commission to proceed with its programme without any overhaul of its procedures or philosophy, the litigation had considerably delayed its work. Nonetheless we had, by July 1980, made initial reports to the Home Secretary on the electoral arrangements for the London boroughs, and metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts. In addition, reports on the electoral arrangements for 23 non-metropolitan counties had been
submitted by the end of 1980, although not all the metropolitan county electoral reviews had been completed.

**Mandatory Non-Metropolitan County Boundary Reviews 1983-91**

3.32 In March 1983, the Commission produced a general report, No. 443, summarising its work to date, and looking towards the mandatory programme of reviews of both metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties and districts, and of Greater London and its boroughs, which Ministers had initiated. The report indicated that, following the initial programme of electoral reviews, the Commission had also agreed to undertake second electoral reviews in a few cases where clear need had been shown, although it was disinclined to propose changes too quickly, in order to allow time for the new arrangements to settle down.

3.33 Our report observed that there had been some 75 requests for principal area boundary reviews, 23 of which had been completed, 8 refused, and one withdrawn, leaving a further 43 in hand. We continued to insist that authorities provided a clear picture of the changes required, a justification of the changes in terms of effective and convenient local government, and proof that local views had been fully canvassed. These points applied with at least equal force to parish reviews, which we had found often generated much strong public feeling, as demonstrated by the volume of written representations.

3.34 The Commission believed that the conduct of its mandatory review of the non-metropolitan counties between 1984 and 1989 would be largely determined by the guidance which the Department of the Environment was prepared to give to supplement the principles laid down by Section 60 of the 1972 Act. We had also identified much concern among local authorities about whether these reviews would consider fundamental change or consist simply of tidying up anomalies.

3.35 In DOE Circular 12/84, the Secretary of State issued guidance which indicated that radical change to a non-metropolitan county as a result of a review should be proposed only in exceptional circumstances where it was clear that existing arrangements had clearly failed to provide effective and convenient local government. Conversion from non-metropolitan to metropolitan status was later removed as a possible option by the Local Government Act 1985. In proposing boundary changes, the Commission was expected to concentrate on reflecting the effects of demographic change and of development since the 1972 reorganisation. Otherwise, its freedom of action was generally preserved.

3.36 The non-metropolitan county review programme opened in July 1985, the shire counties being divided for practical purposes into three blocks. The Commission’s procedures provided for full public consultation to satisfy the requirements of Section 60 of the 1972 Act. In each case, it
allowed seven months for preparation and submission of proposals by local authorities and interested persons. It would then announce its draft proposals or an interim decision to make no proposals, at that stage allowing a period of at least six weeks for any responses to that announcement. The final stage would be a report on its final proposals to the Secretary of State, when there would be a further opportunity of no less than six weeks for representations to be made to him before a decision was reached.

3.37 This basic procedural structure was retained throughout the Commission's remaining period of office. Although it proved to be durable and generally acceptable, a disadvantage was that reviews could be quite protracted, particularly if further draft proposals had to be consulted upon. We were still prepared to hold local meetings, though only for the purpose of gathering further information which could not have been obtained in any other way.

3.38 While many of the reviews proceeded relatively smoothly and to a reasonable schedule, the Commission was in some cases confronted by the need to strike a very carefully considered balance, as requested in DOE Circular 12/84, between the wishes of the local inhabitants and the other primary factors to be taken into account; the effective operation of local government and the pattern of community life. In some cases, there emerged campaigns by local groups seeking the restoration of pre-1974 authorities in the shape of former counties such as Rutland, Cumberland and Westmorland, or the abolition of new counties such as Avon, Cleveland and Humberside, created in 1974 by the amalgamation of parts of former counties and of county boroughs.

3.39 The Humberside reviews took place between 1985 and 1991 and were a major task. Our original report (No. 563) was issued in September 1988. We were then working under the constraint against proposing the abolition or creation of a principal local authority save in exceptional circumstances. At that stage, no more satisfactory alternative pattern of county boundaries had been identified which would be both consistent with the guidelines and avoid profound disturbance to the pattern of local government over a very wide area. We therefore made no proposal for radical change to the County of Humberside.

3.40 In March 1989, the Secretary of State directed us to conduct a further review of Humberside. He gave us guidance about the options he wished us to examine on the basis of a radical proposal of dissolving the present County of Humberside, and in doing so he lifted the constraint referred to above. To assist our deliberations, we commissioned a study of the potential costs and benefits of the various options for structural change from Arup Associates, and a social survey of local views by Research Surveys of Great Britain. When this review had been completed, we recommended in July 1991 (Report No. 604) that the area south of the Humber and east of the Trent should be combined with Lincolnshire,
leaving a smaller county of Humberside to the north of the Humber. Throughout the whole of the review, we had been impressed by the deep rooted, intense loyalties expressed by many local people towards their 'traditional' counties; and we return to this issue in paragraphs 6.7 - 6.9 of this report.

3.41 On a smaller scale, in the case of Newmarket, there was a generally hostile response to the Commission's proposal to transfer the town and its environs to Cambridgeshire (which largely encloses it). This response persuaded us to recommend, in Report No. 608 published in September 1991, minor boundary changes only, to widen the 'neck' between Newmarket and the rest of Suffolk.

3.42 One of our earlier county reviews was the Isle of Wight, where it appeared to us in that case that the universality of the two-tier structure imposed on shire counties by the 1972 Act represented a straitjacket. We expressed the view in our final report that, had it been within our terms of reference to do so, we would have been minded to recommend a single unitary authority for the whole Island. It remains to be seen whether this was a case in which "coming events cast their shadows before."

3.43 In completing its programme of shire county reviews, the Commission tackled 40 individual reviews; the last, Nottinghamshire, Report No. 609, being submitted to the Secretary of State in November 1991. The basic theme had inevitably been estate management and sensible change to unite communities and remove anomalies, major structural changes having been effectively ruled out by the guidance under which the Commission worked. The depth of attachment to the 'traditional' counties, which was a feature of these reviews, would in any event have provoked fierce resistance to any proposals for major changes to them.

The Rushmoor/Hart case

3.44 In the midst of these reviews, the Commission had to re-examine its procedures in responding to a judicial review sought by Hart District Council of its final proposals for the Rushmoor/Hart district boundary, contained in its Report No. 515.

3.45 The District Council had sought a declaration from the Court inter alia that the Commission had been in breach of the rules of natural justice, and of the consultation procedure under Section 60 of the 1972 Act. They also contended that it had mis-directed itself in its reading of DOE Circular 33/78 where this refers to the 'wishes of the local inhabitants' and to 'expected development'.

3.46 The judgement in the High Court, where the case was heard on 8 December 1987, endorsed the Commission's approach. The judge found that the Commission's final report had been proper, adequate, and
intelligible, and that it had dealt with the substantial points and principal arguments advanced. He also considered that the Courts should be particularly reluctant to be drawn into the field of boundary change, drawing attention to the right of those discontented with the Commission’s proposals to make representations to the Secretary of State during the six weeks’ minimum period before he took his final decision.

Mandatory London and Metropolitan area reviews 1987-92

3.47 The Commission was directed by Ministers (Annex E) to postpone its programme of mandatory reviews of the London boroughs and the metropolitan districts until 1 April 1987. This was to take account of the abolition of the Greater London Council and metropolitan county councils on 1 April 1986. The revised target date for completion was 31 March 1992 but was later extended to 31 October 1992. Programmes of reviews for London and each metropolitan area were launched respectively in April and October 1987.

3.48 Guidelines for the review of London and the metropolitan districts were contained in DOE Circular 20/86. They emphasised that the Commission should take special care in considering the outer boundaries of London and the metropolitan areas, but the criteria defining effective and convenient local government set out in DOE Circular 33/78 were still considered to be valid. It was suggested that, in the interests of stability, ‘the Commission may wish to consider the merging of existing local government areas, rather than any more widespread redrawing of boundaries, in any area where they form the view that major changes are called for.’

3.49 The Secretary of State also took the view that proposals for more radical changes, such as the abolition or creation of a principal area, would be appropriate only where the Commission considered that present arrangements clearly failed to provide effective and convenient local government. In the event, this proved to be a very high hurdle.

3.50 The Commission carried out a total of 36 administrative boundary reviews of the 32 London Boroughs and the City of London. Its first report, on the London Borough of Barnet, was submitted to the Secretary of State in January 1991 and its last, on the electoral consequences of its administrative boundary proposals for the London Borough of Brent, was submitted in October 1992. It had identified two broad categories for particular attention. Firstly, there were apparent *prima facie* anomalies, such as the division of the new community of Thamesmead between two boroughs (Greenwich and Bexley) and the division of London (Heathrow) Airport between two London boroughs (Hillingdon and Hounslow) and a shire district (Spelthorne, in Surrey). Secondly, there were places subjected to a popular demand for change, notably the call for the partition of Brent and, later, for the transfer of Streatham from Lambeth to Wandsworth.
3.51 The Commission had published its initial impressions of the London review in 'People and Places' (Report No. 550, April 1988), and published its first draft proposals in July 1988. It was clearly impossible to tackle the whole of London simultaneously, so resources were spread across London and not concentrated on particular sectors, as this enabled the expertise which the Secretariat had gained in the mandatory reviews of the shire counties to be applied immediately to London.

3.52 The Commission published its broader conclusions from the London review, covering matters such as the outer London boundary, the number and pattern of London boroughs, and new communities, in its Report No. 627, 'The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs' (May 1992).

3.53 This overview confirmed that our review had led to generally small scale changes to the boundaries of the London boroughs. This was the first comprehensive review of boundaries since the historic establishment of local authority areas in the nineteenth century. Subsequent changes, even including the creation of Greater London in 1965, had generally been based on the amalgamation of former authorities. Wherever possible, we made proposals to replace defaced boundaries with ones tied to significant geographical features. We proposed to unite some divided communities and to secure the more effective delivery of local government services. However, we had found a general resistance to change, particularly at the intermediate level but also even on a fairly small scale, and we withdrew various proposals to alter boundaries which were vigorously opposed by many members of the public. We proposed more extensive change in only a few cases; for example to unite the new development of Thamesmead in one authority, Greenwich, in Report No. 622; the Becontree Estate in Barking and Dagenham, in Report No. 660; and the St Margaret’s area in Richmond, in Report No. 652.

3.54 In the course of the London review, we received representations on, and ourselves noted, wider boundary issues. Some people wished to revert to former local authorities, feeling alienated from or having little confidence in their present ones. There seemed little rationale for the pattern of boroughs in some areas. Some identifiable communities were split by boundaries, although the residents generally did not seek to be united in one authority and, indeed, frequently preferred the status quo to proposed change.

3.55 Two particular issues which arose in several reviews of individual boroughs were the outer boundary of London, which in some places runs well into rural areas and in others cuts through continuous suburbs, and the relation of the central area of London to the pattern of boroughs and the City of London. We decided that there were considerable anomalies in the boundaries, especially the outer London boundary in South West London around Kingston. However, we considered that this review could
not be the occasion to recommend sweeping changes, which we recognised might have implications for the future of several local authorities. Sometimes it seemed to us that there was no halfway house between major structural reform, outside our remit, and the correction of minor anomalies.

3.56 The Commission adopted a broadly similar approach to its reviews of the six metropolitan county areas in England. The reviews of Greater Manchester, Tyne and Wear, and West Yorkshire were all completed in June 1992; the review of South Yorkshire in August 1992; that of Merseyside in September 1992; and that of the West Midlands in October 1992. In total, 38 metropolitan administrative boundary reviews were undertaken, covering the 36 metropolitan districts. As in the case of London, the programme was accelerated through 1991 and 1992.

3.57 Our reviews of the metropolitan county areas followed a similar pattern to those of London. We found that there was a general expectation of little change, especially among most of the local authorities involved. We noted many detailed boundary anomalies, both in the internal boundaries of the metropolitan districts and in their boundaries with the surrounding shire counties which had frequently become overlaid by development. There were again pressures for secession from some existing authorities, often to revert to some version of a former authority. In particular, there were campaigns by people in Southport for Southport (a former county borough) to be split from Sefton in Merseyside and to be transferred to Lancashire, and by people in Sutton Coldfield for independence from Birmingham.

3.58 We recognised at the outset that the metropolitan areas varied considerably in the distribution and density of their population and the network of communities and topography; and our proposals took full account of these local differences. While Tyne and Wear is a compact, densely populated county, there are large areas of open land within the West and South Yorkshire metropolitan areas. The West Midlands contains a very heavy concentration of population to the north and west of the metropolitan area, in Birmingham and the Black Country, but also Coventry to the east as an almost detached - and historic - city. Greater Manchester and Merseyside have a much more significant common boundary, in terms of population, than do South and West Yorkshire or, indeed, West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester. More generally, the patterns of settlement in the metropolitan areas around the major urban hubs vary greatly, and particular places often attract historic loyalties which were brought to our attention during our reviews.

3.59 It is not surprising that the Royal Commission on Local Government in England had suggested a different number of metropolitan areas, with often different boundaries, than Parliament eventually approved. In most cases, historic boundaries and areas have remained, with the former authorities having been amalgamated to form the metropolitan districts.
3.60 Perhaps inevitably, we found that the boundary issues to be addressed varied considerably between the areas. We adopted a consistent initial approach to the reviews, examining each area's pattern of development and boundaries and considering all representations on wider issues in each area. At the same time, we considered the many representations received suggesting minor changes to the boundaries.

3.61 The West Midlands revealed boundary problems at all scales, from the minor to the basic pattern of local authorities. At the minor scale, many boundaries had become defaced through changes affecting the built-up area. This was particularly noticeable in the Black Country, which had been undergoing extensive physical change. At the other end of the scale, residents in Sutton Coldfield, campaigning for the Town to leave Birmingham, pointed to a sense of remoteness from Birmingham, which is the largest metropolitan district in England with just over 1 million inhabitants. Other issues included the appropriate authority within which the National Exhibition Centre and Birmingham International Airport should be located, and the outer boundary of the metropolitan area, which in places runs through continuous development, but elsewhere takes in large tracts of green belt.

3.62 We decided to consider the West Midlands in three blocks. First, the boundaries of Coventry, where we proposed some relatively minor changes such as unifying the Airport in the City. Secondly, the central authorities of Birmingham and Solihull, where we found particular difficulty with the relationship between the boundary and the continuous built-up area. We decided not to suggest major change to the boundary between Birmingham and Solihull, but we proposed, in Report No. 629, the transfer of built-up parts of Bromsgrove, notably Rubery, Rednal and the Frankley Estate, into the City of Birmingham where the boundary cut through development. Although we had much sympathy with the feelings of local identity expressed by residents in Sutton Coldfield, we concluded, in our Report No. 678, that this review was not the right occasion to be considering major change to the pattern of authorities. The third area was the Black Country, where many small-scale boundary changes were required to remove anomalies. We recognised the opportunities to define the conurbation more clearly that might be presented by the orbital roads being planned, but considered that this would be premature. We therefore proposed only minor changes to the outer boundary.

3.63 In Tyne and Wear, perhaps the most self-contained metropolitan area, most of the issues involved matters of detail, particularly where boundaries ran through the built-up area or split communities. Even here, the outer boundary exhibited some problems and wider issues were raised. Some respondents wished to recreate former patterns, for example the abolition of the metropolitan authorities and a return to Northumberland and County Durham. The pattern of communities in the southern part of the area had been affected by the development of Washington New Town, which had become a new community somewhat separate from
Sunderland and Gateshead. In the north of the area, we were made aware of deep and highly localised affinities between communities such as Wide Open and Hazlerigg, and their present local authorities. We decided to concentrate in this review on minor change, considering that we could not justify the costs and disturbance that radical change might entail. We published all five Tyne and Wear reports, Nos. 640, 643, 644, 645 and 646, in June 1992.

3.64 The review of Greater Manchester generated fewer large-scale issues, as we did not think it appropriate to reopen the issue of the extent of the metropolitan county area which had been vigorously fought over in the period leading up to the 1974 reorganisation. Many of the issues concerned the removal of specific boundary anomalies, particularly where boundaries had become defaced by changes in land use. In general, there was a strong preference among local people for their communities, such as North Ashton or Tontine, not to be moved to another authority, a feeling which we respected. As in the West Midlands and Tyne and Wear, an issue was the desirability of uniting the region's main airport in one authority, in line with our general policy on airports, in order to simplify the provision of local authority services and accountability.

3.65 Merseyside presented us with several problems. There was a vigorous campaign to "return" Southport to Lancashire, and we investigated the likely effects on both Sefton Metropolitan Borough and Lancashire County Councils before concluding, in Report No. 664, that proposing such a transfer could not be contained within the remit of our review. In addition, we found both a considerable number of boundary anomalies, and some public desire for change affecting the boundaries of Knowsley. This led us initially to consider major change, the effect of which would have been to call into question the future of Knowsley as a local authority. A spirited defence of Knowsley by its residents and council led us to the conclusion that only minor change was appropriate in this review.

3.66 The two Yorkshire metropolitan areas, South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire, contained strong, generally free-standing districts and also some deep local loyalties to smaller communities within them. In several places, such as Oakenshaw, where we initially considered the use of motorways as good boundaries, we received evidence about the strength and affinities of communities on either side which led us to propose less extensive changes. As the districts were generally less built-up than their equivalents in the other metropolitan county areas, the outer boundary was less of an issue, although there were some places where urban communities were outside the boundary and others where the boundary enclosed tracts of moorland. We decided that we should not seek major change in this review and again concentrated on useful minor improvements.
3.67 The Commission completed its London and metropolitan area review programme in October 1992. The only unfinished business, to be handed over at dissolution to the new Local Government Commission, was a number of further electoral and other non-mandatory reviews. In effect, the Commission had traversed the entire country at county, borough and district level.

Summary

3.68 Over a period of 21 years, the Commission has formulated administrative boundary proposals for all English non-metropolitan districts, and for the electoral arrangements of all districts and counties. It has completed one cycle of each of the mandatory administrative reviews which it was required to undertake - of the shire counties, of Greater London and the London Boroughs, and of the Metropolitan Districts and County areas. In addition, it has considered reviews of parishes for over two thirds of the country and has carried out a number of non-mandatory reviews of principal areas (districts) as well as specific electoral reviews.

3.69 These varied and multifarious reviews have helped achieve the Commission's objective of good estate management, of keeping the boundary and electoral fabric of England in good repair. The detail is set out in all our final reports, which are listed and categorised at Annex B. In sections 4, 5 and 6 below, we draw some conclusions from our 21 years' experience.
Section 4

THE COMMISSION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 This section deals with how the Commission has seen itself and the local government environment within which it has operated over the past 21 years.

The Commission's independence

4.2 In our view, the Commission's activities, during a period of perhaps unprecedented change in English local government and in citizens' perceptions of their local authorities, have vindicated the concept of a body set up on a continuing and impartial basis. Although the Chairman and Members are appointed by Ministers, they form a Commission which is as independent of central government as it is of local government or other influences. Local authorities and other parties may not always like our recommendations and sometimes they ask for more consultation time, but, despite the delicacy of much of the ground on which we have trodden, our integrity has almost invariably been accepted.

4.3 The Commission has repeatedly been able to cut through a mass of material, weigh disparate factors and then produce a balanced report. Over 21 years, this approach has enabled us to absorb many fluctuations in the various factors making up effective and convenient local government and in the broader local government environment. Any attempt to reduce the exercise of judgement, as distinct from accumulating facts on which judgement is based, in favour of the application of numerical techniques would be dangerously illusory. Our experience, that boundary decisions are an art and not a science, has been supported in recent years by in-house professional expertise and studies funded by the Commission. We believe that, over the past 21 years, we have refined our approach so as to make our conclusions more perceptive and more clearly focused on the essentials.

Programmes and priorities

4.4 As Section 3 shows, the Commission has always been a multi-task body, identifying and concentrating resources on various priorities. Breadth of remit and shifts in priorities have been, at least on reflection, a positive advantage. We have been able to take a broader view and cross-fertilise our experience, particularly of administrative boundary and electoral reviews respectively. Indeed, our task has been to bring together the
4.5 The speed of our progress has in practice often been dictated by resources, specific priorities such as the first round of electoral reviews, and the need to respond to pressures for fuller consultation. We deal with these procedural aspects more fully in section 5.

The changing role of local government

4.6 The Commission has been less concerned with the exact position that local government takes in the nation than with perceptions of it, which seem to have changed over the years; thus the need for the Commission to be very adaptable. When we started work, there seemed to be some certainties about the role of multi-purpose local authorities, and their optimal size. The situation is now much more fluid, partly as a result of legislation. One example is education, where the role of the local authority has changed profoundly and will continue to do so. Another is care in the community, where local authorities will gain an important function and with it the need to work even more closely with health authorities. Even more fundamental change has been signalled by such developments as the concept of the enabling authority, compulsory competitive tendering, and seismic upheavals in local government finance. These developments have been reflected not only in the individual citizen's but in our own perceptions of the role of local government and the consequences for boundary issues.

4.7 The very adaptability of local government in England, as proved by its rapid response to the major structural changes in 1974 and, in London and the metropolitan areas, in 1986, may present its own problems. The protean local authority, able to deal with ever increasing change and now in an environment where there are more and more indirect means of providing services to the citizen, may be more difficult to define in terms of its boundaries. We deal in section 6 with the apparently increasing distinction between areas as a source of historic pride and as units of local administration.

Council size

4.8 The Commission's electoral review remit has inevitably brought it up against issues of council size; that is, the number of elected members appropriate for particular local authorities. We have noted large variations in elector/councillor ratios not only, as might be expected, between metropolitan and rural shire districts, but between neighbouring authorities such as Brent (one councillor for every 2561 electors) and Westminster (one councillor for every 1829 electors). Such variations between adjacent authorities may complicate the development of electoral arrangements for new unitary authorities which are formed of two or more existing
authorities; and criteria on matters such as council size and the broad range of councillor/elector ratios might facilitate the restructuring process to be undertaken by the Local Government Commission.

4.9 We have been conscious of a wider feeling that there are too many rather than too few councillors, and we have always needed to be convinced that the number of elected members needs to be increased as the result of any electoral scheme which we commend to the Home Secretary. The most obvious and superficially attractive remedy for electoral imbalances tends to be one requiring an increase in council size, and we have to contend with this potential "ratchet effect" which has no clear justification.

4.10 We received little guidance on council size, and we have not seen it as our job to come to any definitive conclusion. In general, we have found it necessary to work within the existing parameters of size and organisation. There are virtues in both standardisation and the accommodation of local traditions. A crude standard, such as the number of electors per councillor, could be particularly inappropriate at both ends of the spectrum; in lightly populated rural areas, where the electorate is very scattered, and in inner urban areas where problems of multiple deprivation and dependence on council services may be at their maximum.

4.11 Although firmly committed to the concept of directly elected representative local government, we are not convinced that present arrangements and elector/councillor ratios are necessarily defensible in terms other than of tradition. We therefore welcomed the Government's consultation paper, issued in July 1991, on alternative patterns of local government organisation, and the recent Ministerial statement that some of these issues of local authority internal management merit further investigation. At a time when many of the old certainties in local government have been replaced by a new fluidity, the present internal arrangements should not be regarded as either immutable or inviolate.
Section 5:

PEOPLE AND PROCEDURES

5.1 This section deals with how the Commission has improved its procedures, with particular reference to the requirements of the Citizen’s Charter.

Our procedures

5.2 The Commission has always sought to conduct open, visible procedures which give all concerned, whether local authority, company, voluntary association or individual citizen, a full opportunity to be aware of its proposals and to contribute by means of comment and representation. Indeed the basic procedure, of going out to consultation with one proposal and relying largely on written representations, has remained unaltered; and the approach was vindicated by the judicial decisions in the Enfield and Rushmoor/Hart cases.

5.3 A basic approach of written consultation and representation has not, however, meant that the Commission has neglected meetings and debate. In its early days, it conducted a series of public meetings to discuss its proposals for the new ‘1974’ districts. It subsequently organised a number of local meetings where it felt that it had not received a reasonably full account of local people’s views in their written representations; a recent example is the review of Thamesmead (Greenwich/Bexley). Our usual practice was to appoint Assistant Commissioners to conduct such meetings on our behalf but, on occasions and especially in recent years, we have taken the meetings ourselves. We have always been conscious that such proceedings should be informal, and so give every opportunity to the local resident to make his or her case without the need for expert advocacy or excessive preparation.

5.4 The Commission has always had a commitment to processes which are democratic, accessible and even-handed; the even-handed approach between corporate bodies and individuals which is emphasised in the Citizen’s Charter as ‘fair and efficient treatment.’ In our work, the concerns of the ordinary member of the public should not be and have not been subordinated to those of local authorities or other corporate entities. Where proposals made by individual residents for boundary adjustments or electoral provisions have commended themselves to the Commission, we have incorporated them into our draft proposals. Similarly, Members have available to them all comments (except duplicated proforma letters; of which they see a selection) when considering their conclusions on a particular review.
5.5 We have always taken full account of the responses to our consultations; draft proposals are just that, not unratified final decisions, and there have been many occasions on which we have changed course in the light of public comment. This is, in our view, a reflection of strength and not of weakness as we have never laid claim to a monopoly of the truth.

**Timescales**

5.6 We have tried to reconcile allowing sufficient time for comment and not prolonging reviews. In general, there has been pressure for more, not less, consultation time. Our basic procedure, of going out with a draft proposal and, if necessary, issuing further or even additional further draft proposals, has been painstakingly thorough.

5.7 The inevitable disadvantage is that reviews can be very time-consuming. This is particularly so where a review is complex and consultees ask for more time to respond, or we have to issue further draft proposals with the complementary addition of consultation time. As a result, reviews can sometimes take several years to complete during which time information becomes obsolescent, the situation on the ground changes, or local activists’ enthusiasm is blunted.

5.8 We have thought about possible improvements which might combine the present openness and thoroughness with some acceleration. It might, for instance, sometimes be preferable in future to go out to consultation on two or three options simultaneously. This should make time-consuming rounds of further draft proposals less likely and enable arguments for and against various proposals to be considered simultaneously and not consecutively. The net might also be spread more widely by more local meetings, possibly a series in a particular review area hinging on a discussion of the various options, and by making more use of social surveys as a means of assessing public opinion.

**Visibility**

5.9 We were concerned about the visibility of the Commission to the individual citizen. Public awareness derives from publicity - advertising, formal letters and notices announcing the launch of reviews, and ‘general awareness’ publications which we have issued from time to time, such as ‘People and Places’, and our leaflets on the reviews of London, the metropolitan areas and district boundaries. We wanted our activities to be visible because everyone affected by our proposals should be aware of them and have the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process.

5.10 There is an inevitable difficulty because our reviews have not been part of daily life; they have been sporadic in terms of their impact on a particular area. The use of public notices has always been widespread,
but these are not alluring documents and not all those affected by our proposals appear to have seen them. We have therefore tried recently to improve our publicity particularly when we have launched our reviews. We also became conscious of the need to increase our outreach to ethnic and linguistic minorities, in consultation with local Councils for Racial Equality and Citizens' Advice Bureaux.

The Citizen's Charter

5.11 The Citizen's Charter, produced in summer 1991, encouraged us systematically to reconsider our procedures and processes. We felt that we had in many respects anticipated the Charter in our emphasis on open, democratic and even-handed procedures and in our anxiety to disseminate our proposals as widely as possible. We took the opportunity to conduct a thorough review of our internal as well as our external procedures, which the then Chairman reported to the Secretary of State for the Environment in October 1991. One particular initiative was to introduce a much more ‘user friendly’ and accessible style of final report, including a summary of our conclusions in the first few paragraphs and clearer mapping.

Information

5.12 In the absence of a statutory requirement to provide information, the Commission’s work has sometimes been limited by the unwillingness of participants to provide information or (more usually) to respond on time. We have often found that the true picture has been unveiled only late in the consultative process even when the information had already been available to the parties. In the last few years, we have tried to alleviate the problem by preliminary discussions with the authorities involved, based on a structured list of crucial questions and information requests.

5.13 We acknowledge the difficulties. Information gathering is time-consuming for hard-pressed authorities and other organisations. There has been a marked tendency for an authority which generally approves of our draft proposals to submit a limited response, and for an authority opposed to the proposals to put in a very strong case. If we are convinced by this case, and issue further draft proposals, the situation can be reversed. This is time-consuming and produces fragmentary information which is not readily comparable; and, quite often, reasoned justification for proposals is often not provided or is unverifiable.

5.14 Our experience suggests that there should, in future, be a more concerted and organised effort by any body such as ourselves to command the high ground of information, from the beginning of a review. This would entail a basic structure of key information requirements to which the participants would be asked to respond according to an agreed
methodology. This approach to information gathering, together with simultaneous consultation on various proposed options as suggested in paragraph 5.8 above, may be of particular interest to the new Local Government Commission.
Section 6

THE SEARCH FOR GOOD BOUNDARIES

6.1 In this section, we look back at our central task of recommending good and durable boundaries, and at the various influences upon our work.

The strands of effective and convenient local government

6.2 Over 21 years, the Commission has steered a carefully charted course, balancing and appraising the three component strands of effective and convenient local government, the importance and significance of which can vary from time to time. We were fortunate to have been given such a straightforward and intelligible remit, consisting of three clear elements - the wishes of the people, the pattern of community life and the effective provision of local government services. A more sophisticated and diffuse remit could have been a positive disadvantage.

6.3 We have always sought to interpret 'effective and convenient local government' flexibly and to adapt the relative importance of the three factors to each particular case. It seems to us that this concept has itself shifted over time, in response to changing perceptions of the role of local government on the part of the elector and service customer. In particular, there has been a recent tendency for community identity and the wishes of the people to figure more prominently in the submissions we have received than the assessment of proposals against size or operational yardsticks for the provision of local government services. This shift in emphasis influenced our own conclusions on the Humberside review (paragraphs 3.39-3.40 above).

Ministerial guidance

6.4 Ministerial guidance has been beneficial, indeed essential, in setting the general framework for the Commission's work and in ensuring that we were not expected to range too widely over the limitless pastures of local government pattern and structure. We have been able to concentrate our efforts where we have been able to recommend solid and positive proposals for boundary improvements.

6.5 Our work has essentially fallen into two waves. We were called upon to produce a new pattern of districts for introduction in 1974, after which we were tasked with filling in the detail of the new structure through
reviews of successor parishes, electoral reviews, and some principal area boundary reviews. Our remit was again expanded, in the 1980’s, when Ministers issued guidelines for conducting the programmes of mandatory shire county and then London and metropolitan area reviews in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972.

6.6 A general embargo on proposing the creation or abolition of principal authorities, lifted only in the case of Humberside, then proved restrictive. In some cases, we felt that major re-structuring was the only long-term solution, but, as we had been effectively deprived of this option, we were led to look at often unpopular intermediate change (moving a substantial number of people, without the underlying rationale of major structural change) or very small-scale boundary adjustments. Our guidance may have contributed, albeit indirectly, to the Commission's work being driven towards small-scale boundary change. We return to this in paragraphs 6.10-6.11 below.

Community loyalties

6.7 The Commission has been increasingly fascinated by the contrast between what local people see as their community and what, on more objective arguments, their community is. The classic example is the ‘suburban villager’, relating to a place lost to agriculture with the growth of a town in the early twentieth century, who commutes to the town centre and shops in superstores. A Department of the Environment Minister recently referred to this feeling as the English rural idyll.

6.8 The Commission had become increasingly aware, particularly during the Humberside review but also in other reviews, of the profound and almost visceral nature of some attachments to place. These can be felt at various levels from the county, through the town, to the village. A corollary seems to be that new local government formulations, whether at county or district level, can take many years to put down deep roots among local people whatever the quality of the services provided or the correctness of the administrative geography.

6.9 We have frequently confronted this dilemma of reconciling emotional feelings for the past with the need for local authorities to be efficient working units with sensible boundaries. It seems that a rather pervasive but ill-defined distinction between traditional centres of loyalty and local government administrative areas is beginning to emerge. As we have suggested in paragraph 4.7 above, the protean ‘enabling authority’, which provides relatively few direct services, may loosen the link between the local administration and the sense of place; indeed the re-creation of some traditional counties with no administrative functions is being contemplated. We have nevertheless always regarded our task as proposing boundaries which reconcile feelings of community with efficient administration; thus we have seen local government as an organic, living entity and not as a ‘theme park’ telling interested citizens how things were done in the past.
The sensitivity of boundary work

6.10 The Commission has detected two themes. There is the narrow focus of many citizens' interest in how boundary proposals fit their particular street, or locality, rather than in dramatic structural changes, though there are some major exceptions, such as Brent, Humberside, Southport, Sutton Coldfield and Streatham, where there have been strong pressures for partition or secession. There seems also to be a general preference for the status quo, examples being responses to our proposals for changes to the Surrey/West Sussex, West Sussex/East Sussex and Surrey/Hampshire boundaries.

6.11 Concentration on very small issues may have been accentuated by three factors. First, Ministerial guidance has usually discouraged us from considering major structural change. Secondly, intermediate change is often deeply unpopular. This has not however discouraged the Commission from making proposals for such change when it deemed this to be justified, such as in uniting the new community of Thamesmead, currently divided between Bexley and Greenwich, in Greenwich (Report No. 622) or transferring Rubery and Rednal from Bromsgrove to Birmingham (Report No. 629). A third influence may have been the Commission's practice of going out to consultation on a single draft proposal, rather than a range of options, as this seems to induce a 'street-fighting' mentality in which objectors and counter-objectors concentrate their opposition narrowly on proposals for very minor change.

Town and country

6.12 Historically, the boundaries around towns have caused Commissions particular difficulties. The need to appreciate the differences between town and country, even though these are far less marked in England than in many continental countries, the importance of historic boundaries, and the political implications of change, make this a particularly complex issue. The time is rarely right to tackle it; during major re-structuring, speed dictates the use of existing boundaries. Service patterns and community identities subsequently consolidate and this leads to resistance to limited change and to a realisation that only radical solutions, for which there may then be no opportunity, can solve resultant problems. The result is a lack of positive action. Fairly recent examples are the Commission's reviews of the Oxford and Gloucester/Cheltenham areas, Reports Nos. 536 and 547 respectively.

6.13 An early concern related to the potential remoteness of rural areas. Such areas have been subject to many and severe changes in recent years, with significant numbers of communities losing most or all basic local facilities. The large, aggregated '1974' district can seem particularly remote from a small country village. We feel that part of the answer may be enhanced parishes set within a unitary authority framework, as suggested in the Department of the Environment consultation paper on local government structure issued in April 1991.
Development issues

6.14 The Commission has kept assiduously to the doctrine that it should not intervene in the development or planning process. We have recommended no change when to move a boundary might have been premature in this respect, or we have delayed a recommendation until the planning issue was resolved. The Commission has on occasion suspected that the future development of an area (such as a large industrial zone undergoing major regeneration) might better take place under one authority, but this has again sometimes brought us up against the constraints on recommending radical change.

Costs and benefits of change

6.15 Boundary changes are not cheap. Even a simple parish review imposes administrative costs on consultees as well as the Commission. The potential overall costs of major change, in terms of both transitional and running costs, may be millions of pounds, as we were able to show in Humberside as a result of the Arup Study (paragraph 3.40 above). In 1989, we commissioned a short feasibility study from Ecotec to see whether we should as a matter of course investigate the costs and benefits of our own activities further. Although we decided that there were limitations on the value of historical research of this kind, the study helped us become increasingly mindful of the cost and value-for-money implications of our work.

6.16 Benefits are less easily measured. Many depend on intangible factors and are related to the strength of local democracy and the depth of local feeling. Benefits must not be played down in comparison with the more quantifiable cost factors, and it is important that sufficient counterbalance is provided.

6.17 In some areas, the Commission has harboured a feeling that only major reform might produce the benefits to either services or community identity that would justify the considerable costs of change. This could be tested only in a fuller review such as the area reviews to be undertaken by the Local Government Commission.

A pro-active or reactive role?

6.18 The Commission's role has shifted, in line with the expectations of the country and of Ministers. Any expectations of radical change flowing from our recommendations have not been fulfilled. Yet, taken in combination, the Commission's reports contain a wide corpus of proposals for improving and updating administrative boundaries and electoral arrangements, the significance of which may have been underestimated because its impact has been diffused. We doubt whether certain authorities, such as Humberside and Lincolnshire, or Knowsley, or
Greenwich and Bexley, involved with some of our more ambitious proposals, would have regarded us as being unnecessarily defensive or over-cautious.
Section 7

REFLECTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

7.1 Our work has shown that an impartial and non-political body, to consider and make recommendations on local authority boundaries, is very important. Local government in modern Britain has been acclaimed for its honesty and democracy; it has been going through a period of profound change, and an independent mechanism for considering boundary changes is an important bastion.

7.2 We have anticipated the Citizen's Charter in our approach to consultation. We have always been conscious that the most important people are those who actually live in the places, particularly on or near the boundaries, we have been reviewing. We have taken particular care that local authorities and other corporate entities should not benefit from an 'inside track' unavailable to citizens at large and we have made our procedures as democratic and open as possible, through the issue and public advertising of our draft and further draft proposals.

7.3 We welcomed the guiding light of 'effective and convenient local government' as a very clear and comprehensive triple test of a boundary proposal; provision of effective services, community ties, and the wishes of the local people. Pinpointing the key issues has demanded the exercise of judgement and, frequently, intuition. Often, we have had to look beyond the clamour of pressure groups to reach the bedrock of local opinion beneath, and to identify the various layers of community loyalty which seem to be assuming increasing importance as a component of modern local government.

7.4 At the outset, we were involved in the big picture of local government reorganisation, in helping formulate the '1974' pattern of local government. In more recent years, however, we have not been expected, except in unusual circumstances, to propose the abolition or creation of a new principal local authority, a restriction which was however lifted in the case of our second review of Humberside much to the benefit of our considerations. On occasions, we have had to look at relatively minor change when a fundamental reconstruction might have been more appropriate.

7.5 Proposals for detailed boundary changes often unleash innate local conservatism and opposition even to very minor modifications; on the whole, people want to stay where they are. We have seen unrelenting
trench warfare in which small stretches of ground, proposed for transfer in our draft and then further draft proposals, are fought over by successive waves of objectors and counter-objectors. Our approach may often have teased out a good answer, but possibly one on an artificially small scale and after rather a long time. In the future, there may be a case for going out to consultation on two or three options, whether for structural or boundary change, rather than launching successive proposals. Equally, it is important to set the ground rules for information so that responses can be assessed on a consistent basis.

7.6 We return to our function of good estate management. Boundaries become out-of-date, as population shifts, new housing developments are built and the pattern of industry alters. It is bad practice, and poor democracy, for local authority boundaries to become obsolete and anachronistic. Thus there will be a continuing need to keep the fabric of English local government, its boundaries and electoral arrangements, in good repair.

October 1992

K F J ENNALS (CHAIRMAN)
G R PRENTICE
HELEN SARKANY
C W SMITH
K YOUNG
R D COMPTON (SECRETARY)
# ANNEX A

## COMMISSION CHAIRMEN, DEPUTY CHAIRMEN, MEMBERS AND SECRETARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Holders</th>
<th>Term of Office</th>
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<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>General reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Recommendations for new Districts in the non-Metropolitan Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Names of Non-Metropolitan Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Successor Parishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Successor Parishes (Resumed Review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Electoral Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Successor Parishes: Review of Late Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td>Enfield Judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286.</td>
<td>Parish Boundary Reviews: Procedures and Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td>Reviews of Principal Areas: Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413.</td>
<td>Report on Initial Reviews of Electoral Arrangements in Districts and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443.</td>
<td>A survey of the Commission’s work so far and their future programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550.</td>
<td>People and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688.</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bexley (Belvedere Ward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Broxbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Watford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Tamworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Southend-on-Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Tendring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Uttlesford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Rochford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Holderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>South Ribble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Corby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Yeovil (South Somerset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>North Wolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Thamesdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Congleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Fylde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Langbaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Epsom and Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Shrewsbury and Atcham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Wansdyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Northavon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Luton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Chorley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Fenland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>South Bedfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Harlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Chiltern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Boothferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Welwyn Hatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. Test Valley ...........................................October 1975
71. Gedling ...........................................October 1975
72. Berwick-upon-Tweed .............................October 1975
73. Broxtowe ...........................................October 1975
74. South Shropshire .................................October 1975
75. East Northamptonshire ..........................October 1975
76. Kettering ...........................................October 1975
77. Tynedale ...........................................October 1975
78. Wansbeck ...........................................October 1975
79. Tunbridge Wells .................................October 1975
80. City of Nottingham ...............................October 1975
81. Ashfield ...........................................October 1975
82. Ribble Valley ......................................October 1975
83. Kingswood ...........................................October 1975
84. Oswestry ...........................................October 1975
85. Woodspring ...........................................November 1975
86. Peterborough ......................................November 1975
87. Middlesbrough .....................................November 1975
88. Wyre ...........................................October 1975
89. Maldon ...........................................November 1975
90. Alnwick ...........................................October 1975
91. Blyth Valley ......................................October 1975
92. Burnley ...........................................October 1975
93. Kennet ...........................................October 1975
94. Woking ...........................................November 1975
95. Ellesmere Port ....................................November 1975
96. Gillingham ...........................................November 1975
97. Stockton-on-Tees .................................November 1975
98. Barrow-in-Furness ................................November 1975
99. Vale Royal ...........................................November 1975
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Cannock Chase</td>
<td>October 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>October 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>October 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Rushmoor</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>West Somerset</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Scunthorpe</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Taunton Deane</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Staffordshire Moorlands</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Dacorum</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>North Shropshire</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Hertsmere</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Tonbridge and Malling</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>Mendip</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Glanford</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>South Northamptonshire</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Mid Bedfordshire</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Castle Point</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>January 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Epping Forest</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>East Hertfordshire</td>
<td>May 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich</td>
<td>April 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>North Warwickshire</td>
<td>May 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Bridgnorth</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>South Wight</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Thanet</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
163. South Herefordshire .................................August 1976
164. Gloucester ...........................................August 1976
165. South Derbyshire .................................August 1976
166. City of York .........................................September 1976
167. Sedgemoor ..............................................October 1976
168. City of Hereford ......................................October 1976
169. Boston ..................................................October 1976
170. West Oxfordshire .....................................October 1976
171. City of Worcester ....................................October 1976
172. South Norfolk .........................................November 1976

173. North Hertfordshire ...............................November 1976
174. Craven ....................................................November 1976
175. West Derbyshire .......................................November 1976
176. Wear Valley .............................................November 1976
177. Melton .....................................................January 1977
178. Oadby and Wigston .................................January 1977
179. Bromsgrove .............................................March 1977
180. Nuneaton ...............................................December 1976
181. Sandwell ................................................December 1976
182. Scarborough ...........................................February 1977

183. Crawley ................................................February 1977
184. Chichester ..............................................February 1977
185. Barking ..................................................February 1977
186. Stratford-on-Avon .....................................February 1977
187. West Devon .............................................February 1977
188. Purbeck ................................................March 1977
189. East Staffordshire ...................................March 1977
190. Broadland ..............................................March 1977
191. Macclesfield ..........................................November 1977
192. Newham ...............................................April 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>March 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Mid Devon</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>March 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>South Kesteven</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>South Hams</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Newcastle-under-Lyme</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>South Staffordshire</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>April 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>High Peak</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea (see also No. 4)</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>North Kesteven</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Richmond-upon-Thames</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Kingston-upon-Thames</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Tameside</td>
<td>July 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Gravesham</td>
<td>July 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td>July 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
223. Hackney .................................................... July 1977
224. Erewash ..................................................... July 1977
225. Westminster ................................................ July 1977
226. Brent ............................................................ July 1977
227. City of Durham ............................................... July 1977
228. Selby ............................................................. July 1977
229. Oldham ........................................................... July 1977
230. Camden .......................................................... August 1977
231. Basildon .......................................................... August 1977
232. Vale of White Horse .......................................... August 1977

233. Derby ............................................................. February 1977
234. Greenwich ....................................................... August 1977
235. Waltham Forest ................................................. August 1977
236. Mid Suffolk ...................................................... August 1977
237. Sefton .............................................................. August 1977
238. Chester ............................................................ August 1977
239. Penwith .......................................................... August 1977
240. Wyre Forest ...................................................... August 1977
241. Bexley ............................................................ August 1977
242. Wychavon ........................................................ August 1977

243. Cherwell ......................................................... August 1977
244. Tower Hamlets ................................................. August 1977
245. Bolsover ......................................................... November 1977
246. Solihull ........................................................... August 1977
247. Merton ............................................................. August 1977
248. Barnet ............................................................. August 1977
249. Wandsworth ..................................................... September 1977
251. Adur ............................................................... September 1977
252. Manchester ....................................................... September 1977
253. Teignbridge ...................................................... September 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>September 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>September 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>October 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>October 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>October 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>October 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>October 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Cotswold</td>
<td>November 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>November 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Amber Valley</td>
<td>November 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>November 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>November 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Allerdale</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>West Lindsey</td>
<td>December 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Copeland</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>North Cornwall</td>
<td>December 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Carrick</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Hove</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>February 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Kerrier</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>February 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>January 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>The Wrekin</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>August 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>September 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>September 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>November 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>September 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Torridge</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Weymouth and Portland</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>East Devon</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Shepway</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Worthing</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>November 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>November 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>December 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Harrogate</td>
<td>December 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>North Wiltshire</td>
<td>December 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>January 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>January 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>January 1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
317. Stockport.................................January 1979
319. Liverpool ..................................January 1979
320. Ryedale ....................................February 1979
321. Newbury ...................................March 1979
322. Rochdale ...................................April 1979
323. West Norfolk ...............................April 1979
324. Wigan ......................................March 1979
325. Stroud .....................................March 1979
326. Lewes ......................................March 1979

327. Wealden ....................................April 1979
328. Wirral ......................................April 1979
329. St Helens ..................................April 1979
330. Poole ......................................March 1979
331. Reading ....................................April 1979
332. Warwick ...................................May 1979
333. Wellingborough .........................May 1979
334. Cheltenham .................................May 1979
335. Leicester .................................May 1979
336. Dudley ....................................May 1979

337. Bradford ....................................June 1979
338. Portsmouth .................................May 1979
339. Exeter ......................................June 1979
340. Wolverhampton .............................June 1979
341. West Wiltshire .............................June 1979
342. North Bedfordshire ......................June 1979
343. Torbay .....................................June 1979
344. Kirklees ..................................July 1979
345. Sheffield .................................July 1979
346. Leeds .....................................August 1979
347. Salford ........................................ August 1979
348. Restormel ...................................... August 1979
349. Wakefield ..................................... September 1979
350. North Tyneside ................................ October 1979
351. Birmingham .................................. October 1979
352. East Lindsey ................................... September 1979
353. Bristol ....................................... September 1979
354. Hinckley and Bosworth ..................... October 1979
355. South Tyneside ................................ October 1979
356. Redditch ...................................... October 1979
357. Newcastle-upon-Tyne ........................ October 1979
358. Gateshead .................................... October 1979
359. Sunderland ................................... October 1979
360. Forest of Dean ................................. November 1979
361. Brighton ...................................... November 1979
362. Rother ........................................ November 1979
363. Slough ........................................ November 1979
364. North Devon .................................. November 1979
365. Suffolk Coastal ................................. November 1979
366. South Bucks .................................. December 1979
367. Waveney ....................................... December 1979
368. Tewkesbury ................................... February 1980
369. Arun ............................................ January 1980
370. Northumberland ............................... January 1980
371. Wycombe ...................................... January 1980
372. Charnwood ................................... February 1980
373. West Dorset ................................... February 1980
374. Mid Sussex .................................... February 1980
375. Caradon ....................................... March 1980
376. Windsor and Maidenhead .................... February 1980
377. North West Leicestershire ..................................................................................March 1980
378. Knowsley ........................................................................................................March 1980
382. Shropshire .........................................................................................................May 1980
383. Nottinghamshire ................................................................................................May 1980
384. Wimborne ...........................................................................................................June 1980
385. South Oxfordshire .............................................................................................June 1980
386. Staffordshire ......................................................................................................July 1980
387. Blaby ....................................................................................................................July 1980
388. Isle of Wight ........................................................................................................July 1980
389. East Cambridgeshire .........................................................................................July 1980
390. Hertfordshire ......................................................................................................July 1980
391. Cheshire .............................................................................................................August 1980
392. North Dorset ....................................................................................................August 1980
393. City of Manchester (second review) ...................................................................August 1980
394. Surrey ...............................................................................................................August 1980
395. Somerset .............................................................................................................September 1980
396. Lincolnshire ........................................................................................................September 1980
397. Hampshire ..........................................................................................................October 1980
398. Derbyshire .........................................................................................................October 1980
399. Lancashire .........................................................................................................November 1980
400. Cumbria .............................................................................................................October 1980
401. Essex ..................................................................................................................November 1980
402. Kent ...................................................................................................................November 1980
403. Northamptonshire .............................................................................................November 1980
405. Wiltshire ...........................................................................................................November 1980
406. Durham ..............................................................................................................December 1980
407. Humberside ........................................................................................................December 1980
408. Avon ..................................................................................................................December 1980
409. Warwickshire ....................................................................................................December 1980
410. Devon ................................................................................................................December 1980
417. East Sussex .......................................................................................................August 1981
419. West Midlands .................................................October 1981
424. Gloucestershire ............................................May 1982
427. Dorset ..........................................................June 1982
428. Oxfordshire ..................................................June 1982
429. Suffolk ........................................................June 1982
438. Buckinghamshire ...........................................December 1982
440. Hereford and Worcester .................................February 1983
441. Leicestershire ...............................................March 1983
452. Berkshire ......................................................July 1983
456. Cornwall ......................................................November 1983
460. Cambridgeshire .............................................December 1983
462. Bedfordshire ................................................January 1984
472. Norfolk ........................................................June 1984
473. West Sussex ..................................................June 1984
477. North Yorkshire ...........................................August 1984
479. Cleveland .....................................................September 1984
482. Greater Manchester ........................................September 1984
483. West Yorkshire .............................................October 1984
488. Merseyside ....................................................December 1984

3. Principal Area Boundary Reviews

32. Appleby/Frodingham Steelworks .................July 1975
(Glanford/Scunthorpe)
104. Slough (Berkshire/Buckinghamshire) ..........December 1975
145. Reading (Berkshire/Oxfordshire) ..............March 1976
250. River Test (Southampton/New Forest) ..........September 1977
379. Tamworth/Lichfield .................................March 1980
380. Thamesdown/North Wiltshire ....................April 1980
381. Manchester/Trafford ............................October 1980
404. West Lancashire/Wigan ..........................November 1980
412. Lincoln/North Kesteven ......................... April 1981
416. Sedgefield/Stockton-on-Tees .................. July 1981
418. Macclesfield/Vale Royal ......................... August 1981
420. Woodspring/Sedgemoor .......................... November 1981
422. East Hampshire/Havant ......................... February 1982
423. Allerdale/Carlisle ............................... February 1982
425. Crawley/Horsham/Mid Sussex ................... May 1982

430. Swale/Maidstone ............................... August 1982
431. Charnwood/North West Leicestershire ........ August 1982
432. Basildon/Castle Point ........................... August 1982
433. East Hertfordshire/Stevenage .................. September 1982
434. Taunton Deane/Sedgemoor ....................... September 1982
435. North Kesteven/West Lindsey .................. November 1982
437. Wansdyke/Woodspring/Mendip/Bristol ........ December 1982
439. Erewash/Amber Valley/Broxtowe ................ February 1983
442. Malvern Hills/Leominster/South Herefordshire/Wychavon/Wyre Forest .... March 1983
444. Preston/Ribble Valley ........................... June 1983

445. Worthing/Arun/Adur .............................. June 1983
446. Wychavon/Malvern Hills ........................ June 1983
447. Dacorum/Three Rivers ........................... June 1983
448. Arun/Chichester/Worthing ....................... June 1983
449. South Bedfordshire/Mid Bedfordshire ........ June 1983
450. Winchester/East Hampshire/
     Basingstoke and Deane/
     Test Valley/Eastleigh/Havant .................. August 1983
451. East Hertfordshire/Welwyn Hatfield ............ July 1983
453. Horsham/Mid Sussex ............................. July 1983
454. Boothferry/Beverley/Selby ...................... August 1983
455. Teignbridge/South Hams/Mid Devon ............. October 1983
457. Guildford/Surrey Heath/Woking/Elmbridge/Mole Valley/Waverley November 1983
459. Easington/Durham November 1983
461. West Oxfordshire/Cherwell December 1983
463. Newcastle-under-Lyme/Stoke-on-Trent April 1984
464. Braintree/Colchester/Chelmsford December 1983
465. Shepway/Canterbury December 1983
466. Rushcliffe/Newark/Nottingham/Charnwood/Melon/North West Leicestershire February 1984
467. South Hams/Plymouth March 1984
468. Medina/South Wight March 1984
471. North West Leicestershire/Hinckley and Bosworth July 1984
474. Suffolk Coastal/Ipswich July 1984
475. Durham/Sedgefield July 1984
481. South Ribble/Ribble Valley August 1984
484. South Shropshire/Shrewsbury and Atcham November 1984
489. South Oxfordshire/Vale of White Horse November 1984
490. North East Derbyshire/Bolsover January 1985
491. Castle Morpeth/Tynedale January 1985
494. Graveshams/Dartford/Sevenoaks April 1985
495. East Hertfordshire/Stevenage June 1985
496. Shrewsbury and Atcham/The Wrekin July 1985
497. Epping Forest/Brentwood June 1985
498. Uttlesford/Braintree June 1985
499. Chester-le-Street/Durham June 1985
501. Chorley/South Ribble July 1985
502. Tunbridge Wells/Maidstone August 1985
503. South Bucks/Chiltern/Wycombe July 1985
504. Dee Estuary (England/Wales) November 1985
505. Ribble Valley/Hyndburn/Burnley/Pendle October 1985
506. Dover/Canterbury/Shepway October 1985
507. Chiltern/Wycombe December 1985
509. Hinckley and Bosworth/Blaby .......................... November 1985
510. Gedling/Newark and Sherwood ......................... November 1985
511. Worcester/Malvern Hills/Wychavon ...................... November 1985
514. Eastleigh/Test Valley .................................. March 1986
515. Rushmoor/Hart ............................................ July 1986
516. North Shropshire/Shrewsbury and Atcham ............. August 1986
517. Chesterfield/North East Derbyshire ................. November 1986
518. Chester/Vale Royal ........................................ November 1986
521. Exeter/East Devon/Teignbridge ......................... December 1986
523. Leominster/South Herefordshire ....................... December 1986
524. Birmingham/Solihull ..................................... December 1986
525. North Dorset/Purbeck ................................. December 1986
526. Ashfield/Gedling ......................................... January 1987
531. Maldon/Braintree ........................................ December 1986
532. Blaby/Leicester/Oadby and Wigston .................... January 1987
536. Oxford/Cherwell/South Oxfordshire/.................. June 1987
   Vale of White Horse
537. Guildford/Mole Valley .................................. May 1987
547. Gloucester/Cheltenham/Cotswold/
   Stroud/Tewkesbury ......................................... March 1988
548. Unallocated
559. Epping Forest/Harlow .................................. June 1988
561. Oxford/Cherwell/South Oxfordshire/
   Vale of White Horse
   (Electoral Consequentials) .............................. August 1988
564. West Devon/Mid Devon/Torridge ......................... September 1988
570. South Bucks/Chiltern .................................... January 1989
581. Gloucester/Cheltenham/Cotswold/
   Stroud/Tewkesbury
   (Electoral Consequentials) ............................ February 1990
597. Gloucester/Cheltenham/Cotswold/
   Stroud/Tewkesbury
   (Final Electoral Consequentials) ..................... January 1991
619. Staffordshire Moorlands/Stafford ..................... October 1991
4. Parish Reviews

421. Havant .................................................. November 1981
426. Guildford ................................................. June 1982
436. Bolton .................................................. December 1982
458. Medina .................................................. November 1983
469. Malvern Hills .......................................... March 1984
476. Broxtowe ............................................... August 1984
478. Solihull .................................................. August 1984
480. Thanet ................................................... August 1984
485. Middlesbrough ......................................... December 1984
492. Aylesbury Vale ......................................... March 1985

493. Oldham .................................................. March 1985
512. Walsall .................................................. December 1985
513. Basingstoke and Deane ................................. December 1985
522. East Devon (Partial) ................................... December 1986
534. Birmingham .............................................. April 1987
541. East Devon ............................................... October 1987
549. Mid Sussex ............................................... September 1990
593. Torbay .................................................... April 1991
603. Cotswold ................................................ January 1992
626. South Oxfordshire (Partial) ......................... January 1992

631. Forest of Dean .......................................... March 1992
633. Wealden ................................................ March 1992
671. Rochford ................................................. August 1992
677. City of Worcester ...................................... August 1992
680. Northavon ............................................... August 1992
686. Forest of Dean (Electoral Consequential) .... September 1992

* Only those parish reviews launched by the Commission itself appear in the numbered series of the reports. The Commission also made recommendations on more than 200 parish reviews by district councils.
5. Further Electoral Reviews

470. Tamworth .................................................April 1984
486. Wiltshire ..................................................November 1984
487. Thamesdown .............................................November 1984
500. Taunton Deane ..........................................July 1985
508. Halton .....................................................October 1985
520. Kingswood ...............................................December 1986
527. Blyth Valley .............................................December 1986
528. South Ribble .............................................December 1986
529. Chelmsford ..............................................December 1986
530. Warrington ...............................................December 1986

543. South Staffordshire ....................................November 1987
544. South Somerset .........................................January 1988
560. Tonbridge and Malling .................................September 1988
567. Preston ..................................................October 1988
575. Colchester ................................................May 1989
576. Welwyn Hatfield .........................................June 1989
583. South Herefordshire ...................................May 1990
588. Burnley ..................................................May 1990
595. Langbaurgh-on-Tees .................................December 1990
613. Basingstoke and Deane ...............................October 1991

621. Purbeck ..................................................September 1992
681. Wiltshire ................................................September 1992
6. Mandatory Reviews of non-Metropolitan Counties, Metropolitan Districts and London Boroughs

519. Isle of Wight .................................................. October 1986
533. ILEA (Electoral Arrangements) ......................... March 1987
535. Cornwall and Devon ................................ April 1987
538. Oxfordshire .................................................. July 1987
539. Northamptonshire ........................................ August 1987
540. Lincolnshire .................................................. November 1987
542. Kent .......................................................... December 1987
545. Somerset ......................................................... January 1988
546. Cambridgeshire ............................................. March 1988
551. Cleveland ...................................................... May 1988

552. Lancashire ..................................................... June 1988
553. Northumberland ........................................... July 1988
554. Norfolk ........................................................ June 1988
555. Hertfordshire ............................................... June 1988
556. Wiltshire ......................................................... July 1988
557. Cumbria ........................................................ July 1988
558. Berkshire ......................................................... August 1988
562. Cheshire ......................................................... August 1988
563. Humberside ................................................... September 1988
565. Suffolk ........................................................ November 1988

566. Bedfordshire .................................................. November 1988
568. Avon ........................................................... November 1988
569. North Yorkshire ........................................... December 1988
571. Buckinghamshire ........................................ May 1989
572. Dorset ........................................................ April 1989
573. Shropshire ...................................................... February 1989
574. Gloucestershire .......................................... February 1989
577. Leicestershire ............................................... October 1989
578. Surrey ........................................................ January 1990
579. Warwickshire ................................................ January 1990
580. Hampshire ........................................... January 1990
582. Staffordshire ........................................... February 1990
584. Rochdale ........................................... January 1990
585. Doncaster ........................................... March 1990
586. Bradford ........................................... April 1990
587. Salford ........................................... May 1990
589. West Sussex ........................................... July 1990
590. Tameside ........................................... August 1990
591. Bolton ........................................... July 1990
592. Hereford and Worcester ................................. November 1990

594. Barnet ........................................... January 1991
596. Essex ........................................... February 1991
598. Bexley ........................................... January 1991
599. Derbyshire ........................................... February 1991
600. Wakefield ........................................... February 1991
601. Barnsley ........................................... February 1991
602. East Sussex ........................................... March 1991
604. Humberside (Further Review) .............................. July 1991
605. Trafford ........................................... July 1991
606. Leeds ........................................... September 1991

607. North Yorkshire (Further Review) ........................ August 1991
608. Suffolk (Newmarket) ................................ September 1991
610. Harrow ........................................... October 1991
611. Oldham ........................................... October 1991
612. Wirral ........................................... November 1991
614. Sheffield ........................................... September 1991
615. Croydon (Bromley/Outer London) ......................... November 1991
616. Stockport ........................................... November 1991
617. Manchester ........................................... January 1992
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Bromley (Bexley/Outer London)</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Greenwich (Thamesmead)</td>
<td>January 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Croydon (Lambeth)</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Birmingham (Bromsgrove)</td>
<td>February 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>March 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Salford (Further Review)</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Bromley (Lewisham)</td>
<td>May 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Greenwich (Mottingham)</td>
<td>May 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>May 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>May 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>May 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>August 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
655. Wigan .............................................. June 1992
656. Camden .......................................... June 1992
659. Kirklees ........................................... June 1992
660. Barking and Dagenham .......................... June 1992
661. Newham ............................................ June 1992
662. Ealing .............................................. August 1992
663. Hackney ............................................ July 1992
664. Sefton .............................................. July 1992
665. Heathrow ........................................... July 1992
666. Westminster ...................................... August 1992
667. Kingston ........................................... August 1992
668. Knowsley ......................................... July 1992
669. Wandsworth ....................................... August 1992
670. Rotherham ......................................... August 1992
672. Enfield .............................................. August 1992
673. Liverpool ............................................ September 1992
674. Nottinghamshire (Further Review) .............. September 1992
675. Kensington and Chelsea .......................... September 1992
676. Hillingdon ........................................... September 1992
678. Birmingham (Sutton Coldfield) ................. August 1992
679. Coventry (Electoral Consequentials) ......... August 1992
682. Solihull ............................................. August 1992
683. Birmingham (Bromsgrove) (Electoral Consequentials) ........ August 1992
684. East Sussex (Further Review) ..................... August 1992
685. Dudley/Sandwell/Walsall/Wolverhampton ....... September 1992
687. Brent (Electoral Consequentials) ............... October 1992
7. Other publications

Memorandum on Draft Proposals for New Districts in the English Non-metropolitan Counties proposed in the Local Government Bill

{Published by the Commission-designate in April 1972. The Commission came into existence in November 1972}

Leaflet No.1 LGBC: Review of the London Boroughs, Greater London and the City of London

July 1988

Leaflet No.2 LGBC: Changes to District Boundaries

July 1988

Leaflet No.3 LGBC: Review of the Metropolitan Counties and the Metropolitan Cities and Boroughs

November 1988

Response to the Government's Consultation Paper on the structure of Local Government

September 1991
47. (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3) below, the English Commission may in consequence of a review conducted by them or a district council under this Part of this Act make proposals to the Secretary of State for effecting changes appearing to the Commission desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government by any of the following means or any combination of those means (including the application of any of the following paragraphs to an area constituted or altered under any of those paragraphs):

(a) the alteration of a local government area;

(b) the constitution of a new local government area of any description outside Greater London by the amalgamation of two or more such areas of the like description or by the aggregation of parts of such areas of the like description or by the separation of part of such an area of the like description;

(c) the abolition of a principal area of any description outside Greater London and its distribution among other areas of the like description;

(d) the conversion of a metropolitan into a non-metropolitan county or of a non-metropolitan into a metropolitan county and in consequence thereof the conversion of a metropolitan into a non-metropolitan district or of a non-metropolitan into a metropolitan district within the county;

(e) the constitution of a new London borough by the amalgamation of two or more London boroughs or by the aggregation of parts of London boroughs or by the separation of part of a London borough;

(f) the abolition of a London borough and the distribution of its area among other London boroughs;

(g) the constitution of a new parish by--

(i) the establishment of any area which is not a parish or part of one as a parish; or
(ii) the aggregation of the whole or any part of any such area with one or more parishes or parts of parishes;

(h) the abolition of a parish with or without the distribution of its area among other parishes;

(i) a change of electoral arrangements for any local government area which is either consequential on any change in local government areas proposed under the foregoing paragraphs or is a change (hereafter in this Part of this Act referred to as a substantive change) which is independent of any change in local government areas so proposed.

(2) The English Commission shall not make any proposals to the Secretary of State under this section for a substantive change of electoral arrangements for a parish except in accordance with section 50(7) below.

(3) The English Commission shall not make any such proposals for the conversion of a metropolitan into a non-metropolitan county or of a non-metropolitan into a metropolitan county before the first review carried out by the Commission under section 48(1) below.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (1)(b) and (c) above metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties are areas of a like description and so are metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts.

Duty and power to review local government areas in England

48. (1) Subject to subsection (2) and section 49(5) below, it shall be the duty of the English Commission not less than ten or more than fifteen years after 1st April 1974 and thereafter at intervals of not less than ten or more than fifteen years from the submission of the last report of the Commission on the previous review under this subsection to review--

(a) all counties in England, all metropolitan districts and all London boroughs;

(b) the boundaries between Greater London and the counties adjoining it and between the City and the London boroughs adjoining it;

for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to all or any, or any part, of those areas or boundaries as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make, and the Commission shall, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

(2) The Secretary of State may by direction given to the English Commission vary the length of any interval specified in subsection (1)
above either as respects the whole review or as respects any particular case or class of case.

(3) At a time when the English Commission are not conducting a review under subsection (1) above, they may, subject to section 49(5) below, review all or any, or any part, of the areas mentioned in subsection (1)(a) above or of the boundaries mentioned in subsection (1)(b) above for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to them as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make, and the Commission shall, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

(4) If the English Commission receive a request from a local authority or parish meeting that the Commission should conduct a review under subsection (3) above with respect to any area or boundary in England in which the authority or meeting appear to the Commission to be interested, the Commission shall consider the request.

(5) Subject to section 49(5) below, it shall be the duty of the English Commission to keep under review all non-metropolitan districts for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to any such districts as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make, and the Commission shall, unless to do so would in their opinion impede the proper discharge of their functions, consider any request made to them by any local authority or parish meeting appearing to the Commission to be interested in any such district that the Commission should make such proposals, and in either case the Commission shall, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

(6) In any case where the Secretary of State has made an order under section 1 of the New Towns Act 1965 designating any land as, or as an extension of, a new town and the area of the new town as so designated or so extended is not wholly comprised within one district, he shall, as soon as practicable after the order has become operative, send to the English Commission a notice stating that the order is in operation and specifying the districts within which that area is situated, and on receipt of such a notice it shall be the duty of the Commission, subject to section 49(5) below, to review the areas of those districts for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to them as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make, and the Commission shall, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

(7) Subject to section 49(5) below, the English Commission may at any time review the boundaries between the Inner Temple or the Middle Temple and the City or the City of Westminster for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals with respect to any such boundaries as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make and shall, unless to do so would in their opinion impede the proper
discharge of their functions, consider any request made with respect to any such boundaries by the Common Council, the Council of the City of Westminster, the Sub-Treasurer of the Inner Temple or the Under Treasurer of the Middle Temple, and in either case the Commission shall, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

(8) Subject to section 49(5) below, it shall be the duty of the council for each district in England to keep the whole of their district under review for the purpose of considering whether or not to make recommendations to the English Commission for such proposals with respect to the constitution of new parishes, the abolition of parishes or the alteration of parishes in their district as are authorised by section 47 above and what recommendations, if any, to make and the council shall, unless to do so would in their opinion impede the proper discharge of their functions under this Part of this Act, consider any request made with respect to any of those matters by any parish council or parish meeting appearing to the district council to be interested, and the district council shall from time to time report to the Commission accordingly.

(9) The English Commission shall consider any report made under subsection (8) above with respect to any district in England and, if they think fit, make the proposals recommended, either as submitted to them or with modifications, but if the Commission are of the opinion that the proposals recommended are not, as submitted or with modifications, apt for securing effective and convenient local government in that district or the district council have reported that they will not recommend the Commission to make proposals, the Commission may themselves review the whole or part of that district for the purpose of considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to it as are authorised by section 47 above and what proposals, if any, to make and may, if they think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.
Conduct of reviews

Procedure for reviews

60. (1) A Commission or district council proposing to conduct a review under the foregoing provisions of this Part of this Act shall take such steps as they think fit to secure that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of the proposal to conduct it and of any directions of the Secretary of State which are relevant to it.

(2) In conducting any such review a Commission or district council shall--

(a) consult--

(i) the council of any local government area affected by the review, and such other local authorities and public bodies as appear to them to be concerned;

(ii) any bodies representative of staff employed by local authorities who have asked the Commission or the council, as the case may be, to be consulted; and

(iii) such other persons as they think fit;

(b) take such steps as they think fit for securing that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of any draft proposals or recommendations, any draft of an order under section 50(4) or 57(4) above or any interim decision not to make proposals or recommendations or any such order and of the place or places where those proposals or recommendations or that order or decision can be inspected;

(c) in particular, deposit copies of those proposals or recommendations or that order or decision at the offices of any principal council whose area may be affected thereby and require any such council to keep the copies available for inspection at their offices for a period specified in the requirement; and

(d) take into consideration any representations made to them within that period.

(3) In considering any recommendations made by a district council in consequence of a review conducted by them under this Part of this Act a Commission may consult the council of any local government area affected by the review, such other local authorities and public bodies as appear to them to be concerned and such other persons as they think fit.
(4) Where a Commission propose to modify any proposals recommended by a district council as aforesaid or not to submit any such proposals, the Commission shall--

(a) take such steps as they think fit for securing that persons who may be interested in any modification or decision are informed of it and of the place or places where it can be inspected;

(b) deposit copies of any draft modifications or the decision at the offices of any principal council whose area may be affected thereby and require any such council to keep copies available for inspection at their offices for a period specified in the requirement; and

(c) take into consideration any representations which may be made to them with respect to any such modification or decision within that period.

(5) Where a Commission or a district council make a report, proposals or recommendations under this Part of this Act they shall--

(a) take such steps as they think fit for securing that persons who may be interested in the report, proposals or recommendations are informed of the report, proposals or recommendations and of the place or places where they can be inspected;

(b) in particular, deposit copies of the report, proposals or recommendations at the offices of any principal council whose area may be affected thereby and require any such council to keep the copies available for inspection at their offices until the expiration of six months after the making of an order giving effect, with or without modifications, to the proposals or recommendations or after a notification by the Commission that they have no proposals to put forward or, as the case may be, by the Secretary of State that he does not propose to give effect to the proposals of the Commission.

(6) Subject to subsections (1) to (5) above, the Secretary of State may make regulations prescribing the procedure by which a Commission or, as the case may be, a district council are to conduct a review under this Part of this Act or by which a Commission are to consider recommendations of a district council thereunder.

(7) Subject to those subsections and to any regulations made under subsection (6) above, the procedure of a Commission or a district council in conducting any such review and the procedure of the Commission in considering any such recommendations shall be such as they may determine.
RULES TO BE OBSERVED IN CONSIDERING ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

Counties

1.(1) This paragraph applies to the consideration by the Secretary of State or either of the Commissions of the electoral arrangements for elections of county councillors.

(2) Having regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the county likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration--

(a) the number of local government electors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral division of the county;

(b) every electoral division shall lie wholly within a single district;

(c) every ward of a parish or community having a parish or community council (whether separate or common) shall lie wholly within a single electoral division; and

(d) every parish or community which is not divided into parish or community wards shall lie wholly within a single electoral division.

(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (2) above, in considering the electoral arrangements referred to in sub-paragraph (1) above regard shall be had to--

(a) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable;

(b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary; and

(c) the boundaries of the wards of the districts in the county.

Greater London

2.(1) This paragraph applies to the consideration by the Secretary of State or the English Commission of the electoral arrangements for elections of councillors of the Greater London Council.

(2) The whole of the City and the Temples shall be included with part of the City of Westminster in the same electoral division and shall be treated for the purposes of this paragraph as forming part, and shall constitute a complete ward, of that London borough.
(3) Every other electoral division of Greater London shall lie wholly within a single London borough.

(4) Every parliamentary constituency wholly within a London borough shall constitute an electoral division.

(5) Where a London borough includes part of a constituency part of which is also included in another London borough or in a district outside Greater London, then, having regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of Greater London likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration--

(a) the number of local government electors in any one electoral division in the borough shall be, as nearly as may be, the same as the number of such electors in the other electoral divisions in the borough and, so far as the operation of the other provisions of this paragraph permits, the same as the average number of such electors in each electoral division of Greater London; and

(b) subject to paragraph (a) above, each electoral division in the borough shall consist of two or more complete wards of the borough.

(6) Subject to paragraphs (a) and (b) of sub-paragraph (5) above, in a case falling within that sub-paragraph, regard shall be had to--

(a) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary.

(7) For the purposes of sub-paragraph (5) above the average number of local government electors in each electoral division in Greater London on any date shall be taken to be a number obtained by dividing the aggregate number of local government electors registered on that date in the several registers of local government electors for Greater London by the number of electoral divisions in Greater London existing on that date.

**Districts and London boroughs**

3.(1) This paragraph applies to the consideration by the Secretary of State or either of the Commissions of the electoral arrangements for elections of councillors of a district or London borough.
(2) Having regard to any change in the number or distribution of the local
government electors of the district or borough likely to take place within
the period of five years immediately following the consideration--

(a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number
of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the
same in every ward of the district or borough;

(b) in a district every ward of a parish or community having a parish
or community council (whether separate or common) shall lie
wholly within a single ward of the district;

(c) in a district every parish or community which is not divided into
parish or community wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of
the district.

(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (2) above, in considering the electoral
arrangements referred to in sub-paragraph (1) above, regard shall be had to--

(a) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain
easily identifiable; and

(b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular
boundary.

Parishes and communities

4.(1) This paragraph applies to the consideration by the Secretary of
State, by either of the Commissions or by a district council of the electoral
arrangements for a parish or community having a parish or community
council (whether separate or common).

(2) In considering whether any such parish or community is to be divided
into parish or community wards, regard shall be had to the questions
whether--

(a) the number or distribution of the local government electors for the
parish or community is such as to make a single election of parish
or community councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and

(b) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish or community
should be separately represented on the parish or community
council.
(3) Where it is decided to divide any such parish or community into parish or community wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and in fixing the number of parish or community councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to—

(a) any change in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the parish or community which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

(b) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and

(c) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

(4) Where it is decided not to divide the parish or community into parish or community wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish or community regard shall be had to the number and distribution of the local government electors of the parish or community and any change in either which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish or community councillors.
Review criteria

CRITERIA WHICH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT IN CARRYING OUT REVIEWS — PARAGRAPH 14 OF AND ANNEX B TO DOE CIRCULAR 33/78

Paragraph 14:

The Commission are enjoined (47(1)) to make proposals for "effecting changes appearing to the Commission desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government". This will be a major consideration. In considering cases put to the Commission in support of requests that they should carry out reviews, therefore, they will have regard to whether or not an area or boundary accords with the wishes of the local inhabitants, reflects the pattern of community life, and is conducive to the effective operation of local government and associated services. Some factors to be taken into account in applying these criteria are given in Annex B to this circular.

If as a result they conclude that an area or boundary may be defective, they will consider whether it could be improved without interfering with the overall pattern of districts. Changes which seem likely to prejudice the continued existence of any existing district will, unless they could be scaled down, need to be considered in the light of paragraph 10 above; evidence of wholly exceptional circumstances will be required.

Annex B:

a. Pattern of community life.

Factors include:—

i. community of interest within an area, and sometimes a sense of separation from other areas, stemming from social, geographical, economic and cultural influences;
ii. size and shape of the areas of local government;
iii. development and expected development;
iv. means of communication and transport facilities; and
v. accessibility of administrative, shopping, business and employment centres, educational, social, recreational, cultural and religious facilities and professional and medical services.

b. Effective operation of local government and associated services.

Factors include:—

i. size and distribution of population;
ii. financial resources; and
iii. pattern of administration of local services, e.g., housing, social services, health, education, highways, and sewerage.
Secretary of State for the Environment's Direction of 8 May 1984

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

DIRECTIONS TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY
COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

1. The Secretary of State for the Environment, in exercise of his powers under section 49(5)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, hereby directs the English Commission not to undertake during a period commencing with the date of these directions and ending on 31 March 1987 any review of:

(1) any one or more of the following local government areas or parts of such areas namely:
   (a) metropolitan counties
   (b) metropolitan districts, and
   (c) London boroughs

and

(2) the boundaries between:
   (a) any metropolitan county and the counties adjoining it
   (b) Greater London and the counties adjoining it, and
   (c) the City of London and the London boroughs adjoining it

which the Commission have the duty or power to review under section 48 of the 1972 Act.

2. The Secretary of State for the Environment, in exercise of his powers under section 48(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, hereby directs the English Commission that the first interval mentioned in section 48(1) of the Act shall be varied so that the Commission shall conduct the first review there mentioned not less than ten or more than eighteen years after April 1, 1974.

PATRICK JENKIN
Secretary of State

Date: 8 May 1984