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

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

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

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

4. On 26 February 1976 the Hammersmith Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 21 wards, each returning 2 or 3 members to form a council of 50.

5. The Council's submission included copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We noted that in a number of instances the Borough Council had not felt able to adopt the suggestions put to them. We reviewed all these suggestions during our examination of the Council's draft scheme together with additional comments which had been sent direct to us by local interests.

6. We studied the draft scheme and noted that, in terms of equality of representation, only the proposed Starch Green and Brook Green wards appeared to give cause for concern.

7. We studied the comments on the draft scheme. It appeared to us that insufficient regard might have been given to local ties in the northern area of the borough. We accepted that there was a case for replacing the Council's 3-member Starch Green, Grove, Brook Green and Broadway wards by the six 2-member Starch Green, Grove, Brook Green, Broadway, Ravenscourt and Addison wards suggested by a local political association. In adopting this re-arrangement, which effectively resolved the inequalities in the electorates of the proposed Starch Green and Brook Green wards, we also made an adjustment to the boundary between Grove and Broadway wards so that it ran along the Glenthorne Road instead of the railway.

8. Subject to the modifications referred to in paragraph 7 above, and to some minor alterations recommended by the Ordnance Survey in the interests of better boundaries, we decided that the Borough Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements for the Borough in
compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

9. On 26 July 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter and to those who had commented on the draft scheme. The Council were asked to make our draft proposals and the accompanying map which defined the ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 4 October 1976.

10. Hammersmith borough Council objected to our draft proposals and requested the re-instatement of the Starch Green, Brook Green, Grove and Broadway wards in the draft scheme. The Council also suggested that the North End, Halford and Sandford wards in our draft proposals should be renamed "Avonmore", "Walham" and "Sands End" respectively.

11. Three local political associations gave qualified support to our draft proposals as a compromise scheme, but reaffirmed an earlier preference for a uniform system of 2-member wards throughout the borough. One additionally suggested alterations in the boundary between our proposed Sullivan and Sandford wards that would affect two estates. It was also suggested that the Halford, Town and Sandford wards in our draft proposals should be renamed "Walham Green", "Parsons Green" and "Sands End" respectively.

12. We received a petition from the residents of an estate asking for changes of boundary between our proposed Sullivan and Sandford wards to include the whole estate in one ward. This suggestion was similar to that made by the local political association referred to in paragraph 11 above.

13. A resident in Grove ward requested a boundary change in our proposed Grove and Ravenscourt wards to maintain the local community intact.
14. In view of these comments on our draft proposals, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr L.J Slocombe was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

15. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting in Hammersmith on 11 January 1977. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

16. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals subject to changes in three ward names: viz, North End ward should be renamed "Avonmore", Halford ward should be renamed "Walham" and Sandford ward should be renamed "Sands End".

17. We considered our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We concluded that the recommendations put forward by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.

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

PUBLICATION

19. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Hammersmith
Borough Council and will be available for inspection at the Council's main offices.
Copies of this report without the map are being sent to those who received the
consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

W DIGNLEY (Secretary)

10 March 1977
The Secretary
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
Room 123,
20, Albert Embankment,
London SE1 7 TJ

Sir,

Review of Electoral Arrangements
London Borough of Hammersmith

In accordance with my appointment by the Secretary of State as an Assistant Commissioner and pursuant to the instructions contained in your letter of the 6th December 1976, I have the honour to submit the following report.

1 Date of Meeting

A local meeting was held at the Town Hall, King Street, Hammersmith on Tuesday 11th January 1977 commencing at 10.00 a.m. and concluding at 1700 hours, On Wednesday 12th January 1977 from 9.30 a.m. until 12 noon I made an inspection of certain areas and boundaries. Full details of the inspection are contained in paragraph 12 of this report.

2 Attendance

The signed attendance sheet has been forwarded to the Commission. All those who spoke or participated in the proceedings are shown below.

Mr R A C Hooper Members Services Officer, assisted by Mr D O'Brien, Electoral Registration Assistant and Mr R D Jennings, Assistant Research Officer (Planning) on behalf of the London Borough of Hammersmith.

Councillors K G F B Howe, John Putnam and W C Smith on behalf of Fulham Conservative Association.

Mr Christopher Radmore (Chairman) and Mr Christopher Thorne on behalf of Hammersmith North Conservative Association.

Mr Peter Henegan - local resident.

Councillor L Hillard and Mrs J McMahon on behalf of Fulham Labour Party.

Councillor Simon Knott on behalf of Hammersmith North and Fulham Liberal Parties.

Councillors F Ing and A Breeze on behalf of Hammersmith North Labour Party.

Mr Peter Phillips - local resident.

Mr Daniel H Harris of Hammersmith North Labour Party who spoke concerning Grove Ward.

Each speaker had the opportunity of commenting on what had been said by others in addition to making their own views known. Not everyone availed themselves of the right of reply but most did.

3 The Commission's draft proposals

The Commission's draft scheme was based to some extent on the Borough Council's
draft scheme. The scheme submitted by the Borough Council provided for a Council of 50 members, elected from 21 wards comprising 8 3-member wards in the north of the Borough (Hammersmith North Constituency) and 13 2-member wards in the South (the Hammersmith, Fulham Constituency). Both the Council's and Commission's schemes, and all the others to be mentioned later made use of the constituency boundaries. Although overall there would be a slight imbalance in 1980 (24 : 23.40 and 26 : 26.61) if the population forecasts are achieved, the Commission took no action on this point as the distribution had been agreed by the parties and the boundary was a good one. In the Council's draft scheme only two of the wards proposed were co-terminous with existing wards, namely Avonmore and Sherbrooke. In examining the Council's draft scheme the Commission noted that in terms of ward entitlements there were two wards which gave persistent cause for concern - Starch Green and Brook Green. Before the draft scheme was submitted there had been provisional proposals which had been modified in response to comments about the use of Shepherds Bush Road as the eastern boundary of Grove Ward and the railway line had been substituted. Although this caused other modifications, the basic structure of 3-member wards in Hammersmith North was carried through to the draft scheme.

Before this there had been prepared by the Officers and the Electoral Review Sub-Committee a couple of schemes providing for 2-member wards throughout the whole Borough. When the minority parties realized that the Council's formal draft scheme was for 3-member wards in Hammersmith North they submitted certain counter-proposals to the Commission which can be summarized as follows:—

Hammersmith North Conservative Association forwarded the 2-member ward scheme as originally devised which showed a different pattern of wards in both constituencies.

Fulham Conservative Association and Hammersmith North and Fulham Liberal Associations forwarded copies of a modified version of the 2-member ward scheme and so far as Hammersmith Fulham was concerned this became the Council's draft scheme. Mr Knott had also suggested 3 further small variations and I deal with these in later paragraphs.

All I need say here about the two (officers) schemes is that the main difference was in respect of the four most northerly wards. In the original scheme the railway line formed the boundary between the College Park and Old Oak ward and the Wormholt and White City wards whereas in the modified scheme Westway became the boundary with consequential adjustments. It is only for the sake of completeness that I mention the two schemes as the subsequent discussions and arguments centred mainly around the second (i.e modified) scheme. Both these two schemes were in fact numerically superior to the draft scheme submitted by the Council.

The Commission in considering the Council's draft scheme were concerned about
the generously represented Starch Green Ward (2.65/2.53) and the under-represented Brook Green ward (3.67/3.50). Figures are for 1975 and 1980, respectively. In seeking to improve these wards the Commission had two options. First to adopt the Council's provisional proposals but this meant that Shepherds Bush Road (rather than the railway line running parallel to it) would be the boundary between the Grove and Brook Green wards. They noted that the railway line formed the boundary in all other schemes and the Council had been obliged in the light of comments to modify their proposals and use the railway line. Second the Commission could substitute a pattern of 2-member wards for that part of the Hammersmith North area covered by the Council's 3-member Starch Green, Grove, Brook Green and Broadway wards. In noting that both the original and modified versions of the officers scheme produced a satisfactory set of entitlements, they preferred the boundaries proposed in the original version. Therefore the Commission's draft proposals provided for the 13 two-member wards in the Fulham area, four 3-member wards in the extreme north of the Hammersmith area, and six 2-member wards for the remainder of the Hammersmith area. This was a replacement of the Council's 3-member wards of Starch Green, Grove, Brook Green and Broadway by six 2-member wards of Starch Green, Ravenscourt, Grove, Addison, Brook Green and Broadway as proposed in the officers original scheme but with Glenthorne Road dividing the Grove/Broadway wards instead of the east-west railway line.

The Commission also decided that the Council's "Avonmore" ward should be re-named "North End" ward as suggested by the Fulham Conservative Association.

Comments on the draft proposals.

The Commission's draft proposals were advertised locally and comments invited. A number of comments were received. I mention these comments here in summary form but deal with them all fully in that part of my report dealing with the cases advanced at the meeting.

(a) Hammersmith Borough Council. Did not accept the Commission's draft proposals in respect of the six 2-member wards in Hammersmith North area and wished to substitute four 3-member wards in that area. Wanted the following name changes: North End - to be renamed Avonmore, Halford to be renamed Walham, Sandford to be renamed Sands End.

(b) Hammersmith North Conservative Association. Wished for consideration to be given to the twelve 2-member ward scheme for Hammersmith North but would accept as a compromise the Commission's draft proposals for this area.

(c) Fulham Conservative Association. Accept, subject to one alteration, the Commission's draft proposals for the Fulham area, and support a 2-member ward scheme for Hammersmith North area. As a second preference would accept Commission's proposals for this latter area. Suggested alterations in the boundary between Sandford and Sullivan wards affecting the Peterborough Estate and the Townmead estate. They ask for some name changes of wards: Maintain
support for North End (not Avonmore). Town to be re-named Parsons Green, Sandford to be re-named Sands End, Halford to be re-named Walham Green.

(d) Hammersmith North and Fulham Liberal Associations. Would prefer a uniform 2-member scheme for the whole Borough, suggest 3 minor amendments of boundaries affecting Broadway, Wormholt, White City, Coningham and Ravenscourt wards. If uniformity is not possible would support Commission's draft proposals.

(e) Peterborough Estate Residents. Asked for changes of boundary between Sandford and Sullivan wards to include whole estate in one ward. (This is on same lines as Fulham Conservative Association but residents do not comment on Townmead Estate).

(f) Mr P R W Hensman - a resident in Grove ward asked for changes in boundaries between Grove and Ravenscourt wards so as to preserve community ties.

Order of Proceedings.

It became clear to me on studying the papers that there were four main matters for discussion. I therefore decided to deal with the various issues in the following order :-

(a) names of wards
(b) Sandford/Sullivan ward boundaries
(c) Grove/Ravenscroft ward boundaries
(d) The Hammersmith North wards

In addition at the conclusion of these matters I would ask the Council to give some general statement on the likelihood of the population forecasts being achieved.

Cases advanced at meeting.

The following paragraphs 7 to 10 deal with the cases advanced at the meeting in support of, or against, the Commission's draft proposals. The report is not in any way a verbatim note of every word that was said but is, I hope, a fair summary of the principal points made by the various speakers, both initially and in reply. Additionally Mr Hooper handed in a general statement covering the Council's approach to the preparation of the various schemes. As this covered ground dealt with by a number of speakers there is no need for me to repeat it, especially as all present had a copy. My assessment of the weight of arguments advanced at the meeting is contained in paragraphs 14 to 17 below.

Names of Wards

(a) Mr Hooper for the Borough Council stated their case about the various alterations suggested in correspondence and some further ones suggested at the meeting.

North End area was probably historic and generally took its name from the main road - North End Road - running north to south through the ward. But for nearly three quarters of its length it runs through four other wards - Gibbs Green, Normand, Halford and Eel Brook. The prominent street market is not in North End
ward. Avonmore is the present name of the ward and has been since 1965 and is unchanged in the new proposals. Any change would be confusing and unnecessary.

Halford Whilst because of proposed boundary changes there is a case for a name change the Council prefer Walham rather than Walham Green.

Town The proposed ward forms part of the present Town and Parsons Green wards. The Council do not agree with a change to Parsons Green as the Green is not in the ward. "Town" is derived from the association with the early settlement of Fulham Town and the area has had the name Town since 1965. Parsons Green would only be appropriate if the ward boundary were altered.

Sandford There is now agreement that this ward be named Sands End.

Starch Green So far as the suggestion that Starch Green ward should be re-named Wendell Park was concerned he agreed that Wendell Park was larger than Starch Green but saw no case for a change.

White City/Shepherd's Bush He saw no merit in calling this ward either Shepherd's Bush or White City as one or the other would feel excluded. For psychological reasons the composite name was preferred.

(b) Mr. Howe and Mr. Putnam put the case, arguments and reply to the naming proposals on behalf of the Fulham Conservative Association. The main case was the submission of a learned and well researched document dealing with the history, areas and celebrities of the Manor of Fulham from AD 691. The burden of the paper was that the historic communities and settlements should be remembered by attaching appropriate ward names to those areas. Brief details as to each are as follows:

Parsons Green - a historic area of green, flanked by some fine buildings and this name would be much more appropriate than "Town". There would be no confusion as the new ward would include part of the present Parsons Green ward. If necessary the boundary could be altered to include the Green.

Walham Green The name first appeared in 1695 in the Court Rolls of Fulham Manor and as such has had a colourful and distinguished history since then. Hence the name of the proposed Halford ward should be known as Walham Green and not Walham as suggested by the Council.

Sandford This area was formerly (1813) known as Sandy End and the Association welcomed the agreed change of Sandford to Sands End.

North End There was a record of the name of North End from 1583 and was a well known village in the 18th and 19th centuries. The Association were pleased that the Commission had agreed the change of name from Avonmore. The Avonmore School was only a small infants school of no dominance in the area. Mr Putnam - a councillor for the ward - did not favour the other suggestions of "Olympia" or "Barons Court", and could not understand why the Council were sticking to the name of Avonmore.

(c) Mr. Radmore as Chairman of the Hammersmith North Conservative Association
wanted the name of Starch Green ward altered to Wendell Park on the grounds that Starch Green was just a tiny triangle of land whilst Wendell Park was much larger, much more central to the ward, and there was a school there. Hence the ward would be more identifiable to the electors. He also considered that White City and Shepherds Bush ward should be known as Shepherds Bush as the area was widely known as such and it was a simpler designation.

(d) Mr L Hilliard spoke on behalf of the Fulham Labour Party.
- Sandford - supports Council's proposal to re-name this Sands End.
- Halford - supports the new name proposed of Walham.
- North End - said that the ancient Settlement of North End has not existed within living memory, that the descriptive name of Avonmore should be restored, the Avonmore ward, which is unaltered in the proposals, has been so named since 1963 and any change would serve no purpose and be confusing. If one had to invent a new name "Olympia" would be more descriptive that North End although he was not proposing this - only resisting North End.
- Town He disagreed with the arguments of changing the name of this ward to Parsons Green. Historically there had been a Town ward for a very long time. The new ward comprised a large part of the existing Town ward, re-naming would be confusing to electors who did not associate their area with Parsons Green, no part of which was in the ward. The railway station of that name was on the edge of the ward and was no integral part of it. He objected to a suggestion that the ward boundary should be altered to include Parsons Green merely for the purpose of giving the ward that name. The only history that was relevant was fairly recent local government history and not the ancient history he had just listened to.

(e) Mr Knott for the Liberal Associations made the following comments.
- Town He agreed this ward should not be re-named Parsons Green. There had been a Town ward since 1900 and any change would be confusing to electors. He objected on the same lines as Mr Hilliard that ward boundaries should not be changed to accomodate a change of name.
- Halford He supports the change of name to Walham which was an original Fulham ward since 1900.
- North End He did not really like either North End or Avonmore and would have preferred Barons Court which had been the name in that area from 1900 - 1964.
- Starch Green This had been the name since 1900 and he said the Labour Party had an affection for it and saw no reason for change.
- White City/Shepherds Bush For his part he preferred simply White City.

The Sandford/Sullivan wards
There were two linked proposals here for changes in the Commission's draft proposals. At the north end the Fulham Conservative Association and the Peterborough Estate residents had suggested changes, and in the south the
Conservatives had a further change to propose. To set the scene I describe the proposals in broad outline and deal with the arithmetic of the electorate later in the report when forming my conclusions on the alterations.

(a) The area in the north (Peterborough Estates). The proposal is to include an area to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road in the Sulivan ward. This would mean transferring the following addresses from the Sandford ward to the Sulivan ward:

1-35 (odd), 2-40 (even) Acofold Road, 2-38 (even) Bagleys Lane, 1-23 (odd)
2-64 (even) Bovingdon Road, 1-11 Cresford Road, 49 to 63a (odd) New Kings Road,
1-12 Peterborough Villas, 1-59 (odd) Sandilands Road, 1-97 (odd) Wandsworth Bridge Road. The total is about 539 electors as at 1975/76. This area is that covered in part by the Studdridge Street Conservation Area. The properties included in the list above are slightly more embracing than those listed in the petition from the Peterbrough Estates residents but the intention is clearly the same as the Fulham Conservatives.

(b) The area to the South (Townmead Estate). The proposal is to transfer an area between Stephendale Road, DeMorgan Road and Wandsworth Bridge Road from the Sullivan ward to Sandford ward — about 355 electors at 1975/76.

(c) Mr Howe and Mr Putnam presented the case for the Fulham Conservative Association. Mr Howe opened with a number of general observations supporting the advantages of a uniform 2-member scheme throughout the Borough, and particularizing the benefits for Fulham — good ward boundaries, compact and homogeneous areas, minor variations only in Councillor/electorate ratios and a close relationship between the two. The specific proposals only involved minor changes to an otherwise excellent scheme by the Commission. Whilst in general the Wandsworth Bridge Road formed a natural boundary between the areas concerned (a) and (b) above) the Townmead estate was more affected by a very busy junction — Carnwath Road/Townmead Road/Wandsworth Bridge. He gave details and a sketch map indicating the very high traffic count and the measures being taken to reduce the number of heavy vehicles entering the area. A further major road scheme is envisaged and the advantage would be to the residents concerned if they were all in Sandford ward, with whom they already have a greater affinity of interest. Hence the Association's proposal. So far as the northern proposal (a) above) was concerned the Peterborough Estate lies on both sides of Wandsworth Bridge Road where such road is a less emphatic division. All the estate is of similar architectural appearance and character and the residents share common interests and problems. This was a ground for putting them all in the same ward. The fact of similarity had been recognized by the extension of the Studdridge Street Conservation Area to include the part of the estate east of Wandsworth Bridge Road. The Council have also included the whole estate within a planning Directive. The Association were aware of the petition from the residents on similar lines to their views. They did not accept
the criticisms of their proposals which had been made by other speakers and in turn thought that too much emphasis had been given by others to polling places, crossing points etc., and could not accept the Sullivan ward was a "pivotal" ward, whatever that phrase meant.

(d) **Mr L Milliard** on behalf of the Fulham Labour Party strongly objected to the Conservative proposals, both on the grounds of general principle and on a number of detailed points. The guiding principles of the Commission had been carefully adhered to, community groupings and long associations respected wherever possible and he thought that the scheme for Fulham had been agreed by all concerned in the best interests of good will all round. He criticised the Conservative proposals by saying: (1) An area with a common style of architecture or developer is not an accepted criterion for re-warding an area (2) Wandsworth Bridge Road although a relevant boundary is not sacrosanct and the Conservatives argument could be just as readily used in reverse. Turning then to more detailed and specific points Mr Hilliard said (i) To take the Bagleys Lane/Bovingdon Road area out would worsen polling facilities in a difficult traffic area (ii) the area of the Peterborough Estate concerned has never been associated with the predecessors of Sullivan ward (iii) the estate as a whole has always been divided historically, socially, politically and electorally and it does not make sense to bring it together now (iv) The Townmead estate people already have to cross Wandsworth Bridge Road but to a nearby polling station in Hugon Road but a transfer would mean a much longer walk. (v) The estate has been included in Sullivan ward for the past 12 years and any change would be upsetting and confusing (vi) A transfer of either of the two estates would produce a worsened electoral ratio (vii) No figures should be considered for the speculative possibilities of the Gas Board land. He therefore strongly opposed the Conservatives proposals.

(e) **Mr S Knott** for the Liberal Associations was opposed to the Conservatives proposals primarily because he considered the Fulham scheme had been agreed by all the political parties and further amendments should not be raised. Also he thought that it was designed for the electoral advantage of the Conservatives. As in his view Sullivan ward was a "pivot" ward (who wins Sullivan wins the Council) there should be no change to the electoral advantage of one party. He was against fine tuning.

(f) **Mr R Hooper** for the Borough Council pointed out that the Commission's draft proposals for the Sandford and Sullivan wards have followed the original scheme of the Council. He then described the different areas and their boundaries - Townmead estate, 3 large blocks of Council flats and Peterborough Estate - a large number of smallish houses, privately owned and of similar architectural style. When preparing the schemes careful attention had been given to electorate figures. Whilst regarding Wandsworth Bridge Road as a natural boundary it was necessary to find a suitable area to balance up the figures and the Townmead
estate fulfilled all the right conditions. He did not wish to comment on the
various social arguments which had been advanced but made it clear that the only
effective increase from new development was the Sandford Manor area which would
produce about 200 electors for Sandford ward. No development was expected on the
Gas Board land before 1980.

The Grove/Ravenscourt Ward Boundaries. An objection had been submitted by Mr
P R W Hensman, a resident of the Grove ward, concerning the western boundary
of the Grove ward as shown in the Commission's draft proposals. Before recording
the details of his arguments and case I think it would clarify matters if I
explained the proposal in outline. In Mr Hensman's original objection he had
suggested Ravenscourt Road as a possible western boundary but he realized that
this might cut too heavily into the adjoining Ravenscourt ward. Accordingly he
had, as a second string, suggested Paddenswick Road as a good boundary. As I had
worked out the figures I told him that to use the Ravenscourt Road boundary would
create a gross imbalance of electorate between Grove and Ravenscourt wards. He
readily accepted the suggestion from me that he should base his case on the use
of Paddenswick Road and I considered the matter on that basis.

(a) The proposals can briefly be described as follows and I deal with the arithmetic
of electorates in my conclusions later on. The Commission's draft proposals show
the western boundary of Grove ward running northwards up Dalling Road from
Blenthorne Road, then about three-quarters way up, Dalling Road runs north-
easterly into Brackenbury Road and north up that road to the junction with
Goldhawk Road. Mr Hensman's proposal is to start the boundary at the same point
but to divert north westerly along Paddenswick Road (from its junction with
Dalling Road) to Goldhawk Road. I point out that Mr Hensman's proposal is
relevant only to the Commission's draft scheme as the area under discussion is
distributed in different ways in other schemes, except that in the Council's
draft scheme the whole of the area is in Grove ward.

(b) Mr Peter Hensman - a resident in Grove ward - objected to the Commission's draft
proposals so far as the western boundary was concerned and he put forward the
alternative which I have described in (a) above. The grounds of his objection
were (i) the top part of Dalling Road is not a natural boundary but a small
residential street (ii) that area, with 7 or 8 neighbour shops, school, church
and church hall forms a central focus for the local community which would be
split up by the Commission's proposals (iii) Paddenswick Road contains very little
residential accommodation and no neighbourhood shops. (iv) The top part of Dalling
Road is mainly a 30ft carriageway reducing to 20ft whereas Paddenswick Road is
mainly 40ft, and a busy bus route and much more heavily trafficked than Dalling
Road (v) the proposals of the Commission would cause problems in relation to
polling stations (vi) the relatively minor imbalances of electorate resulting
from the change are far less important than the preservation of readily
identifiable communities (vii) he did not really like Glenthorne Road as a southern boundary. He therefore pressed for his proposal to be adopted.

(c) Mr Hooper for the Borough Council outlined the three major sets of proposals there had been for the western boundary of Grove ward. He submitted that both the Council's original and revised schemes came nearer than the Commission's in meeting Mr Hensman's objection. The problem of polling places was not insuperable - the Godolphin and Latymer School would still be used and also Brackenbury School even if it were outside the ward. If the Commission decided to adopt the Council's revised scheme then Mr Hensman's proposal could be adopted without much difficulty. There were only 293 electors involved as between their revised scheme and Mr Hensmans.

(d) Mr Radmore for the Hammersmith North Conservative Association supported Mr Hensman's proposal and for the same reasons. Additionally as a resident in Brackenbury Gardens he supported it as an individual and emphasized the community and shopping aspects.

(e) Mr Knott for the Liberals welcomed the fact that an individual - Mr Hensman - had taken the trouble to prepare sensible and useful proposals, on balance he supported the objection but felt that the key might be the electorate figures. However forecasts were often unreliable and there were many empty properties which if occupied could affect the figures.

(f) Mr Smith - a councillor for 24 years - had represented the Ravenscourt ward for 12 years and said he supported the Commission's draft proposals and disagreed with Mr Hensman. The Commission had, in effect, reverted to the old Ravenscourt ward and he saw no reason to change the proposals.

(g) Mr Harris of the Hammersmith North Labour Party spoke as a resident with a close knowledge of the area. He said the Commission's proposals would break long standing ties, affect the work of the Grove Neighbourhood Council and upset community links. He therefore supported Mr Hensman.

(h) Mr Phillips - a resident in Nasmyth Road in the Grove ward - supported Mr Hensman for all the reasons given by him. There was a good general community of interest, the Brackenbury School was a neighbourhood school and the centre of many social activities. He hoped the Commission could amend their scheme to accomodate the alteration.

The issues here can be briefly summarized. The Council's latest proposals are for eight 3-member wards in Hammersmith North. Of these four are the same as in the Commission's draft proposals. The other four are in substitution, for the six 2-member wards of the Commission. In addition there is for consideration the schemes for twelve 2-member wards proposed by the Conservatives and Liberals and a number of small variations to these schemes. Thus there is a complex group of alternatives to be considered. Once again I will defer the examination of
electedør figures until later. The following is a summary of the cases.

(a) Mr Hooper for the Borough Council reviewed the various schemes, commented on the objections which had been made by the various political groups and pressed for the Council's revised scheme for eight 3-member wards to be adopted for Hammersmith North. The proposals of the Council and the Commission diverged only in one substantial respect namely that the Commission propose six 2-member wards whereas the Council wanted four 2-member wards in their place. It was possible to argue that the Council had achieved a greater degree of uniformity because the whole of Hammersmith North would be covered by eight 3-member wards, although he conceded that uniformity for its own sake is of no particular advantage. What was important was that there should be as nearly as possible equal representation and good boundaries and regard to physical and community matters. He considered the Council's revised scheme met these requirements. He then went on to deal with the earlier schemes proposed by the officers and emphasized that none of these were specific recommendations but possibilities for consideration by the Electoral Review Sub-Committee.

The final decision was of course taken by the Council on the 7th January 1976 who did not accept the proposals of the Support Services Committee. This action set off the various objections.

Mr Hooper did not accept the Conservative and Liberal criticisms that the Council's scheme ignored natural boundaries and affinities and produced anomalies in terms of electorate. He gave figures for the various wards to show the Council's revised scheme was at least as satisfactory as any other and that close attention had been paid to most major physical boundaries. He was pleased to point out that the four most northerly wards were identical in the Council's schemes (both original and revised) and the Commission's draft proposals.

Mr Hooper rejected the argument that uniformity meant a 2-member system for the whole borough and referred to the Commission's guidance notes as not precluding a mix of 2-member and 3-member wards, which in fact the Commission had done.

(b) At the conclusion of Mr Hooper's statement I sought some guidance about the words used in the report of the Support Services Committee to the meeting of the Council on the 22nd January 1976. In particular I wanted to disentangle what part of the report was the views of officers and which parts were the substantive views of the elected members. I also wanted to question the relationship of the words "In terms of numbers of electors per councillor the Commission's scheme is clearly preferable".

Mr Jennings replied to this and explained which parts were the reports of officers and that members views came only after the Chairman of the Committee is recorded as speaking. The words quoted above related not to the "revised" scheme but to the original approved scheme of the Council. I noted this.

(c) Mr Hilliard on behalf of the Fulham Labour Party was unable to be present when
these matters were under discussion but handed in a statement which I summarize as follows. He supported the Commission's guidelines and believed these could produce a rational system of representation based where possible on the 1963 structure, which had then produced a nearly uniform system. With a Council reduced to 50 from 70 (including Aldermen) he had hoped it possible to meet the situation satisfactorily by twenty five 2-member wards. The schemes produced by the officers and approved by the Support Services Committee would have achieved that objective and he regretted that the Council had not accepted the proposals. Nevertheless in the light of present circumstances and because of the difficult problems of access and communication in the most northerly part of the Borough he, and the Fulham Labour Party, were prepared to accept the compromise proposals of the Commission. He felt this was a genuine attempt to solve the differences existing between the various parties in North Hammersmith. No differences of principle were present in the Fulham area and he agreed the proposals there.

(d) Mr Radmore on behalf of the Hammersmith North Conservative Association dealt with the matter on a number of separate issues:— against the 3-member system, for the 2-member ward system and for the Commission's draft proposals as a compromise. Included also were some detailed comments on boundaries. He objected to the 3-member ward scheme on the grounds that it failed to follow guidelines and was defective in respect of natural boundaries, local affinities, councillor/elector ratios, and polling districts. He regarded the impartial scheme of the officers as preferable to one motivated by politics and had hoped for complete uniformity throughout the Borough. Giving details he instanced (i) the busy Hammersmith Road dividing (in part) Broadway ward (ii) the splitting of Grove ward by the Metropolitan railway line through which there was only one link (iii) the linking in Wormholt ward of 2 disparate communities (iv) the linking in White City and Shepherds Bush ward of 2 communities of separate character and (v) the break in the line of boundary in Westway. He knew Westway was elevated here but still could not understand the "dog-leg" boundary. On what he had heard today he thought the proposal to transfer Becklow Gardens area defied logic and he preferred the east-west railway line as a southern boundary of Grove instead of Glenthorne Road which was unlikely to be altered in the foreseeable future.

In conclusion Mr Radmore said that 2-member wards made for greater identification between electors and councillors and he did not like large sprawling 3-member wards. However if the complete 2-member ward scheme was not agreed he would support the Commission's draft proposals as a fair alternative.

(e) Mr Smith referred to his 24 years service as a councillor for 3 wards at various times and as a party official and believed he had a good knowledge of electors requirements. Thus he supported Mr Radmore's general approach to a 2-member system. He speculated as to when an officer's report became a committee report and thought it difficult to draw a hard and fast line. He suggested that in this
matter there had been some political bias in sending the Council's scheme and its revised scheme to the Commission, and such schemes reflected party before public. With the reduction in the overall number of councillors it was even more important to ensure close associations between councillor and elector and this is best achieved by 2-member wards - can serve better in small packets. It had surprised him that a scheme agreed by 5 out of 6 political associations should have been thrown out by the Council. He commented particularly on both the carve up and extension of Broadway ward, and mentioned some village areas such as Brook Green which it was monstrous to move to Broadway ward. Nevertheless as an alternative he too would accept the Commission's draft proposals as a good substitute.

(f) Mr Putnam said there had been agreement between 5 of 6 political organizations and on behalf of the Fulham Conservatives he fully supported the arguments of the Hammersmith Conservatives as to the merits of an overall 2-member scheme. If this did not prove acceptable to the Commission then he would accept the compromise proposals as a very fair alternative.

(g) Mr Thorne as Vice-Chairman of the Hammersmith North Conservative Association said it was only the Hammersmith Labour Party who were against the 2-member ward scheme in Hammersmith. He associated himself with the views already expressed by the Conservatives.

(h) Before I record Mr Knott's observations it would be helpful if I summarized the effect of his 3 modifications to the 2-member scheme. He wanted:-(i) an area around Adelaide Road, Sawley Road and Galloway Road moved from Wormholt ward to White City ward. (ii) The Becklow Gardens estate to be moved from Coningham ward to Wormholt ward (iii) an area between Nigel Playfair Avenue, River Court Road the railway and the Thames to be moved from Ravenscourt ward to Broadway ward. All these were to improve the community links.

(i) Mr Knott for the Liberal Associations commenced with a brisk attack on what he termed "blatant, crude and political manipulation" on the part of the Hammersmith North Labour Party. Outlining again the history of the Schemes he said that it was wrong that the 2-member scheme had been rejected by a party caucus, without consultations and contrary to normal practice. It was a classic ploy to try to put all the opposition in one ward so as to leave the field clear for the majority and this was happening here. He was particularly dubious about the growth figures for Broadway ward and considered the boundaries in the revised scheme completely wrong. In his opinion there were six natural communities in the area - Starch Green, Ravenscourt, Grove, Addison, Brook Green and Riverside. The 2-member scheme - improved by his amendments - would go a long way to keeping the communities together. For all these reasons he supported the 2-member scheme but as a compromise would accept the Commission's draft proposals as an alternative.
Mr F Ing spoke in his capacity of Chairman of the Support Services Committee which was the Committee dealing with the electoral review. He said he had been cast as the villain of the piece but this was completely untrue. There were politics on both sides. Much had been made of the point that 5 out of 6 of the political associations had agreed the 2-member scheme but this was basically a Fulham decision. Once it was clear that uniformity did not necessarily mean the same for the whole Borough, he was not prepared to divide North Hammersmith into 2-member wards as it was more suited to 3-member wards. The area divided up well into definite areas by reason of the existence of good natural boundaries of roads both north-south and east-west. Mr Ing then took me on a rapid verbal tour of those roads, North-South were Scrubs Lane, Wood Lane, Shepherds Bush Road, Old Oak Common Lane, Old Oak Road and Askew Road. East-West were Westway, Uxbridge Road, Goldhawk Road, Hammersmith Road, King Street, Talgarth Road and Great West Road.

Coming back to the arguments about 5 out of 6 in favour, he said the position so far as North Hammersmith was concerned was put in better perspective by saying that 2 minority parties were in favour of 2-member wards whereas the majority party was against it. He hotly denied that the party caucus had swooped down and altered the "agreed" scheme in an arbitrary way. The Party had carefully reviewed all wards, had masses of information before them and had tried to preserve as many of the old wards as possible. Close consideration had been given to boundaries and he argued that boundaries in the revised scheme were as good as any. He criticised some of the Commission's boundaries and in particular poured scorn on that between Addison and Brook Green wards - wiggling in and out of houses and streets.

Mr Breeze spoke for the Hammersmith North Labour Party and supported what Mr Ing had said both in respect of the detail and of the Labour Party's approach to the matter. They had tackled the warding in a serious and responsible way. They were the majority party and considered their views should be given careful attention. He could see no sense in Mr Knott's proposal to take Becklow Gardens estate out of its proper and natural place. Neither could he support the dividing up of the White City area. So far as Glenthorne Road was concerned it would be a long time, if ever, before this became a dual-carriage road as it was linked to other proposals for King Street. Hence King Street was a better southern boundary for Grove ward than Glenthorne Road. He had also other criticisms of the Commission's boundaries and referred, as Mr Ing did, to the Addison/Brook Green ward boundaries. In conclusion he said that the number of wards being reduced under the smaller Council scheme and considered the four 3-member ward Scheme was preferable to six 2-member wards.

Future Growth of Electorates

All the Schemes submitted and considered showed an estimated increase of electorate from 1975/76 to 1980 of 5568, - around 5%. I had previously examined the figures of electorate submitted by the Council and had also looked at the
Census figures from 1921 onwards. I had no doubt that, in common with many of the inner London boroughs, the population of Hammersmith was declining. The following figures speak for themselves:

**Population (Census)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28823</td>
<td>286451</td>
<td>241431</td>
<td>222124</td>
<td>184935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electorates (Council figures)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122256</td>
<td>119697</td>
<td>115869</td>
<td>111023</td>
<td>113050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of this I asked Mr Hooper to make a statement on the matter and this he did. He explained that the calculations of 1980 electorate had been made by adding the numbers of electors likely to be accommodated in new dwellings completed between 1975 and 1980 to the known 1975 electorate. This method appeared to be realistic in spite of the general decline over recent decades. However the Registrar-General's recent estimates had in fact shown an increase in population in Hammersmith between 1974 and 1975 (from 170,000 to 172,300). It was too early to say whether the change was a change of trend or a temporary fluctuation. Mr Hooper felt that if the decline is fairly evenly distributed the method used would still ensure relative parity between wards although the absolute numbers would be lower.

My view on electorate forecasts is that the projected figures are unlikely to be achieved by 1980.

**Inspections**

On the morning of Wednesday 12th January 1977 I made a tour of the area to examine disputed boundaries and proposed alterations to estates. On this tour I was accompanied by the following lady and gentlemen:

- Mr Hooper and Mr O'Brien (Borough Council)
- Mr Ing and Mr Breeze (Hammersmith North Labour Party)
- Mr Thorne and Mr Hennessey (Hammersmith North Conservative Association)
- Mr S J Knott (Hammersmith Liberal Association)

In addition for the visit to the Fulham area only were Mr Howe (Fulham Conservative Association) and Mrs McMahon (Fulham Labour Party). The places visited are listed below although not precisely in the order of route. Wandsworth Bridge Road at Wandsworth Bridge end, Townmead Road (and Estate), Stephendale Road, DeMorgan Road, Sandilands Road, Bagleys Lane, (Peterborough Estate), Wandsworth Bridge Road and its junction with New Kings Road, North End Road, Talgarth Road, (and some junctions), Hammersmith Road from Olympia to the Broadway, Shepherds Bush Common, Wood Lane, Westway, Galloway Road, Adelaide Road, Uxbridge Road, Becklow Gardens (Estate), Askew Road and Ashchurch Road junction, Goldhawk Road and its junctions with Railway, Brackenbury Road and Paddenswick.
Earlier in the day I made an unaccompanied visit to the area between Nigel Playfair Avenue and Rivercourt Road. Thus at the end of the tour I was satisfied that I had seen all the various roads and junctions forming boundaries in dispute and the various areas and estates for which alternative proposals had been made by the different objectors.

Assessment of weight of Arguments

Having heard all the arguments and expressions of view, carefully considered all that had been said and written and finished my inspections I am ready to consider the various problems and reach some conclusions and recommendations. I deal with the issues in the same order as I heard the cases.

Names of Wards

The issue of the names for some of the wards sparked off a lengthy and lively discussion as will be seen from the earlier paragraphs. Not only have I to consider those names which had been the subject of written representations but some others suggested at the hearing. Some perhaps more seriously than others. There was a great deal of delving into quite far distant history. Although no one actually said "all history is bunk" there was certainly an undertone to that effect. The view I take is a middle course between ancient and modern and a wish only to change names where this is really necessary. I do not think any bones will be broken whatever I decide but believe the recommendations I will make will command general, although not universal, approval.

So far as some of the names mentioned - Olympia, Barons Court etc - I reject these without further comment as being inappropriate or unnecessary. So far as the others are concerned my views are as follows:

Town

I see no reason for changing this name to Parsons Green. Still less do I think it proper to make a boundary change to facilitate the re-naming of the ward. The present ward name is well known and has some history. The majority of speakers were against change and I agree with them. I make no recommendation for change.

Starch Green. There was a suggestion, for the reasons before stated, that this ward should be re-named Wendell Park. This would have the effect of introducing a completely new name into the electoral system and the proposal had little general support. Starch Green as a ward has existed for a very long time and I am not prepared to make any change.

White City and Shepherds Bush. Either part of the name without the other would cause concern. Although a double-barrelled name, I do not see any advantage in a change and do not propose making one.

Halford. Happily there is complete agreement here and I shall make a formal recommendation that the name of the ward be changed to "Sands End".
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but there were different views as to whether this should be "Walham" or "Walham Green". I do not think this is a specially contentious or weighty point and I plump for "Walham". I will make a formal recommendation accordingly.

North End. I have left this to the last because it caused me the most thought. Frankly I am puzzled why the Commission used this name in place of "Avonmore", and can only assume it was because of the suggestion by the Fulham Conservative Association. The majority of speakers, including the Council, were against the change. It seems surprising to me that Avonmore ward which preserves its boundaries under the new proposals should have suffered a change of name. I do not agree with the change, there is no valid reason for it and I will make a recommendation that the name of "North End" be altered to "Avonmore".

The Sandford/Sullivan Wards.

I have described the proposed changes in paragraph 8 of my report and need only refer to them in broad terms. Briefly it is a proposal to move an area at the north end of Wandsworth Bridge Road - the Peterborough Estate (part) from Sandford ward to Sullivan ward and an area at the south end of Wandsworth Bridge Road - the Townmead estate - from the Sullivan ward to the Sandford ward. The arguments are set out fully in my report paragraph 8. The change was proposed by, and supported by, the Fulham Conservative Association. It was opposed by the Fulham Labour Party and the Liberal Associations and not supported by the Borough Council, who had drawn up the scheme accepted by the Commission. A petition had been received from the Peterborough Estate residents asking for the transfer of the northern area but not of course mentioning the Townmead estate. The residents were not present to speak in support of the petition.

Before turning to consider the various arguments I set out the effect of such changes on the councillor/elector ratios. Both here and in all subsequent listing of figures I will use the very latest set of figures supplied to the Commission by the Borough Council at the end of October 1976. Thus there may be slight discrepancies between these figures and some of those produced by speakers at the hearing.

**Commission's draft proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4932</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4896</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5096</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9690</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>10028</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect of Modification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan (plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5103</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>5241</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Peterborough Estate minus (b) Townmead Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandford (plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4587</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4787</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) minus (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9690</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>10028</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be seen that in terms of individual ward entitlements this variant is only very slightly inferior to the Commission's draft proposals and then only really in Sullivan ward. If there were no other matters to consider I would probably reject it on the grounds that the variant did not produce a markedly better ratio. But I do reject it for other reasons as well. Firstly, I regard it as significant that of all the people signing the petition from the Peterborough Estate not a single person appeared before me to support the arguments about community of interest. Secondly I think the arguments about Wandsworth Bridge Road as a boundary can be used to support whatever it is wished to support.

Possibly the busiest junction is in the South but to me, who travelled the whole road I thought it all was a busy highway. Thirdly too much is made about traffic and crossings and it should be remembered that people only have to go to polling stations once a year at the most but use the busy roads every day. Fourthly I accept that there would be a worsening of polling arrangements in the northern part. Whilst saying this I do not attach too much weight to it (see thirdly above). Fifthly I am left with the impression that to help to justify on numerical grounds the transfer of the Peterborough Estate some counter-weight had to be found and this was the Townmead estate, who were to be removed from the Sandford ward which had been their ward since 1963. Finally I accept the point made by Mr Hilliard that the criteria for making a Conservation Area Order and a planning Directive are very different from those for settling electoral boundaries. I make no comment on the points made about the electoral advantage of the variant nor on whether Sullivan is a "pivot" ward. For all these reasons I reject the variant and make no recommendation to alter the Commission's draft proposals for these wards.

The Grove/Havencroft ward boundaries.

The proposal put by Mr Hensman and supported by some others is described fully in paragraph 9 of my report. Briefly it was to alter the western boundary of Grove ward by moving over westward along Paddenswick Road to Goldhawk Road instead of the Commission's line all the way up Dalling Road and via Brackenbury Road to Goldhawk Road. The proposal was supported by two local residents, the Conservative Association (and Mr Radmore personally) and the Liberal Association. Mr Smith opposed it. The Borough Council were fairly neutral as Mr Hensman's proposal was only relevant to the Commission's draft proposals. However if the Borough Council's proposals were accepted I felt that the Council could adopt Mr Hensman's variant without difficulty.
The figures for the electorate are as follows -

**Commission's draft proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4642</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9299</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paddenswick Road boundary variant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5427</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3872</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9299</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I had the opportunity of visiting this area and saw both Paddenswick Road, Dalling Road, the shops and the Brackenbury School. I agree with what was said about the relative importance and width of the two roads and have no doubt about the community interest. I would very much have liked to make some change here but consider that I am unable to do so because of the statutory requirements. Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972 regulates the matter. By paragraph 3(2)(a) the primary rule requires that the ratio of the number of electors to the number of councillors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the Borough taking into account likely changes in the electorate in the succeeding five years. A secondary consideration (Paragraph 3 (5) of the Schedule) about trying to avoid breaking local ties is subordinate to the main rule. Thus the Commission, and I, are required to observe the rule about equality of representation but only to "have regard" to the other rules. It will be seen from the figures given above that the Commission's draft proposals are very close to equality whereas the variant produces figures which by any stretch of imagination could not be said to be equal. I toyed with the idea of using the east–west railway line as a southern boundary instead of Glenthorne Road but this would make the position marginally worse. There is also no growth expected in the Ravenscourt ward so there is no chance of the imbalance between Grove and Ravenscourt wards (in the variant) improving in the future. With some regret I must reject the variant. The Commission's draft proposals must stand as drawn.

The Hammersmith North wards.

There are three main issues here to be settled. Should there be a scheme of twelve 2-member wards, a scheme of eight 3-member wards or a mix of 2-member and 3-member wards as proposed by the Commission. The arguments are fully set out in paragraph 10 of this report and I deal first with the twelve 2-member ward scheme. The proposals originated in schemes prepared by the officers
but so far as Hammersmith North was concerned never became the scheme approved
by the Borough Council. The 2-member proposals were sent to the Commission by
the Conservative and Liberal Associations and there were additionally some minor
variations and amendments within those schemes. During the hearing there were
some minor criticisms of some of the boundaries. I do not propose to deal with
these but to look at the basic principles involved and if I come out against
the complete twelve 2-member scheme then the details are no longer relevant. The
arguments for and against are fairly evenly balanced and it is a matter of
careful judgment. The most northerly part of the Borough poses some difficult
questions of access and boundaries. Whilst it is possible to produce 2-member
wards (and this has been done) with reasonable electorate ratios the shape and
boundaries are in some cases not as satisfactory as I would like. I have in mind
in particular the College Park and Wood Lane ward and the White City ward. I have
no doubt that had there been universal agreement on a complete 25 2-member ward
scheme for the whole Borough I could have swallowed my objections about shapes
and boundaries, but if that had happened there would have been no need for the
local meeting. Taking all matters into account I am of the opinion that the
Commission has made the right decision to produce a scheme of four 3-member
wards for the most northerly part of the Borough. It is a scheme that has a good
electorate ratio, fair boundaries, and the added virtue of being acceptable to the
Borough Council and, perhaps less enthusiastically to the minority parties. I
therefore reject the 2-member scheme as it relates to the four most northerly
wards and adopt the Commission’s draft proposals. There is no need for me to
comment on further details except to mention Mr Khott’s 3 amendments. He said
in connection with the Sandford/Sullivan ward boundaries that he did not like
fine tuning. No more do I. The remaining issue is between the Borough Council’s
revised alternative proposals and that of the Commission. The Commission’s draft
proposals are acceptable to the Conservative and Liberal Associations but are
opposed by the Borough Council and the Hammersmith North Labour Party.

The figures for the two schemes are as follows –

### Commission’s draft proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starch Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4388</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenacourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4642</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4728</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Council’s revised proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Cllrs</th>
<th>1975/76</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starch Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7111</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6729</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6761</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6093</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining these figures in terms of relativity we get the following result:

Commission's draft scheme. The average elector/councillor range runs from 1739 to 2400 (1975/76) and 2194 (1980). The average for the six wards is 2224 (1975/76) and 2323 (1980) compared with the average for the whole Borough of 2261 and 2372 respectively. The range of entitlements runs from 1.54 to 2.12 (1975/76) and 1.85 to 2.02 (1980).

Council's revised scheme. The average elector/councillor range runs from 2031 to 2370 (1975/76) and 2253 to 2414 (1980). The averages for the wards are of course the same as in the Commission's draft proposals, the range of entitlements (3 councillors in this case) runs from 2.69 to 3.15 (1975/76 and 2.85 to 3.05 (1980). It would require a judgement of Solomon to say which is the better set of figures. Certainly both of them closely conform to the requirements of equality. The range of variation is less in the Council's scheme. Both sets are equally satisfactory and it would be extremely hard to decide between the two schemes if I only had this point to consider. I now turn to another ground of discussion - the extent to which either scheme is better than the other in terms of the use of "natural" boundaries and the avoidance of divisions by busy main roads.

Commission's draft proposals.

In the following list I have used the comments contained in the report of the Support Services Committee to the Council on the 22nd September 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Major Roads Straddled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starch Green</td>
<td>Askew Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscourt</td>
<td>King Street, Great West Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>King Street, Great West Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>Shepherds Bush Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Green</td>
<td>Shepherds Bush Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council's revised scheme (report adapted by me)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Major Roads Straddled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starch Green</td>
<td>Askew Road, Goldhawk Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Glentham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Great West Road, Talgarth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Green</td>
<td>Fulham Palace Road (north)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again I am faced with a difficult choice on the basis of the details shown above. On balance I consider the Commission's draft proposals to be marginally better than the Council's scheme. I now reach my final conclusions on the merits of the two schemes. I consider that the Commission's draft proposals should be adopted in place of those of the Council for two main reasons. As I have said above there is little to choose between the schemes on the basis of figures and roads but there are, in my view, two defects in the Council scheme which lead me to reject it. Firstly, the use of Shepherds Bush Road as a boundary between Grove and Brook Green wards is a retrograde and unsuitable step. Earlier schemes have used the Metropolitan Railway line and this is a more positive barrier. I saw the very limited single access through it at Trussley Road and have no doubt
that this line is a better boundary than Shepherds Bush Road. Secondly I regard the Broadway ward as designed by the Council as an awkward, sprawling area linking up a number of disparate neighbourhoods. Also it suffers from the disadvantage of being divided east to west by the Great West Road and Talgarth Road and in part by Hammersmith Road. The whole ward seemed to me to have been made up from the remnants of other areas. Consequently I reject the Council's four 3-member ward scheme and support the Commission's draft proposals.
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19 Recommendation

I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals for the London Borough of Hammersmith be approved and adopted subject to the modification that the following ward names be altered:-

North End To be renamed Avonmore
Halford To be renamed Walham
Sandford To be renamed Sands End

I am, Sir
Your obedient Servant

L. J. Slocombe
Assistant Commissioner

20th January 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDISON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVONMORE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROADWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOK GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE PARK AND OLD OAK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLEHILL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONINGHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRABTREE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEL BROOK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBBS GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGRAVINE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMAND</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALACE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSCOURT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDS END</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERBROOKE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARCH GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULIVAN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALHAM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE CITY AND SHEPHERDS BUSH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORMHOLT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

COLLEGE PARK AND OLD OAK WARD

Commencing at a point where the metropolitan railway meets the eastern boundary of the Borough at Latimer Road Station, thence southwestwards following said railway to its junction with Wood Lane, thence northwards along said Lane to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the southeastern boundary of TA Centre, situated to the south of the White City Stadium thence southwestwards to and along said southeastern boundary, and northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of the said TA Centre to, and northeastwards along South Africa Road, to and northwestwards along White City Road to Westway, (A\40), thence westwards along Westway to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards, eastwards and southeastwards along the western, northern and eastern boundaries of the Borough to the point of commencement.

WHITE CITY AND SHEPHERDS BUSH WARD

Commencing at a point where the metropolitan railway crosses Goldhawk Road, thence northwards along said railway to Uxbridge Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 278 Uxbridge Road, thence northwards to and along said eastern boundary and the rear boundaries of properties Nos 2 to 56 Loftus Road, crossing Ellerslie Road and continuing northwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 58 to 96 Loftus Road, thence northwestwards along the northern boundary of No 96 Loftus Road crossing Loftus Road, and continuing northwestwards along the northern boundary of No 91 Loftus Road, and the
northeastern boundary of Loftus Road Football Ground to South Africa Road
thence southwestwards along the said road to Bloemfontein Road thence
northwestwards along the said road to the southern boundary of College
Park and Old Oak Ward, thence generally eastwards, southeastwards, and
northeastwards along the said southern boundary to the eastern boundary
of the Borough thence generally southwards along the said eastern
boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the road
known as Shepherds Bush Green thence southwestwards to and along
Shepherds Bush Green and continuing southwestwards along Goldhawk Road
to the point of commencement.

ADDISON WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of White City and
Shepherds Bush Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence
southeastwards along said eastern boundary to Addison Gardens, thence south-
westwards along said gardens to Richmond Way, thence southwards along said
way to Bolingbroke Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Blythe
Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Durnany Road, thence
southwestwards along said road to the northern carriageway of the road
known as Brook Green, thence northwestwards along said road to Shepherd's
Bush Road, thence southwestwards and westwards along said road to a point
opposite the northern boundary of the warehouse situated to the north of
North Croft School thence westwards to and along the said northern boundary
and continuing due west to the Metropolitan Railway thence north-
westwards along said railway to the southern boundary of White City and
Shepherds Bush Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point
of commencement.
BROOK GREEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Addison Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary to Hammersmith Road, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing southwestwards along the road known as Hammersmith Broadway to its junction with Beadon Road, thence northwards along Beadon Road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 3 Metropolitan Station Buildings, thence northeastwards to and along said western boundary and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of said property and Nos 4 and 2 said buildings to the Metropolitan Railway, thence northwards along said railway to the southern boundary of Addison Ward thence eastwards and generally northeastwards along the southern and southeastern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

AVONMORE WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Brook Green Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along the said Borough boundary to West Cromwell Road, thence southwestwards along said Road and Talgarth Road to and northwards along Gliddon Road and Edith Road to a point opposite the southern boundary of St Mary's Church, thence southwestwards to and along said southern boundary and northwards, eastwards and northwestwards along the western boundary of said Church to the southern boundary of Brook Green Ward, thence generally northeastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.
COMMENCING AT A POINT WHERE THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARY OF AVONMORE WARD MEETS THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE BOROUGH, THENCE GENERALLY SOUTHEASTWARDS ALONG THE SAID BOROUGH BOUNDARY TO LILLIE BRIDGE, THENCE SOUTHWESTWARDS ALONG LILLIE ROAD TO AND NORTHWESTWARDS ALONG NORTH END ROAD TO A POINT OPPOSITE THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE CLARENCE PUBLIC HOUSE, THENCE TO AND GENERALLY WESTWARDS ALONG SAID NORTHERN BOUNDARY AND THE REAR BOUNDARIES OF PROPERTIES Nos 146 TO 150 NORTH END ROAD AND Nos 1 TO 15 LANFREY PLACE, THENCE SOUTHWESTWARDS IN A STRAIGHT LINE TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF NO 2 CHALLONER CRESCENT, AND CONTINUING ALONG THE REAR BOUNDARIES OF PROPERTIES 2 AND 1 CHALLONER CRESCENT AND Nos 1 TO 41 PERHAM ROAD TO VEREKER ROAD, THENCE SOUTHEASTWARDS ALONG SAID ROAD TO MAY STREET, THENCE SOUTHWESTWARDS AND SOUTHEASTWARDS ALONG SAID STREET TO GREYHOUND ROAD, THENCE IN A SOUTHWESTERLY DIRECTION ALONG SAID ROAD TO A POINT OPPOSITE THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF PROPERTY No 183 GREYHOUND ROAD, THENCE NORTHWESTWARDS AND GENERALLY WESTWARDS TO AND ALONG THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF No 183 GREYHOUND ROAD AND THE REAR AND NORTHERN BOUNDARIES OF MARY MACARTHUR HOUSE FIELD ROAD TO FIELD ROAD, THENCE NORTHWESTWARDS ALONG THE SAID ROAD TO AND NORTHEASTWARDS ALONG, THE ACCESS ROAD SITUATED SOUTH OF HOLMAN HUNT HOUSE TO ITS END, THENCE NORTHWARDS, NORTHEASTWARDS AND NORTHWESTWARDS TO AND ALONG THE SOUTHERN AND REAR BOUNDARIES OF
Holman Hunt House to the southern boundary of Hammersmith Cemetery, thence eastwards and northwestwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of said Cemetery to Margravine Gardens, thence eastwards along Margravine Gardens, and northwards along Gliddon Road to the southern boundary of Avonmore Ward, thence generally eastwards along the southern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

WALHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Gibbs Green Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along the said Borough boundary to King's Road, thence southwestwards along said Road crossing Waterford Road and continuing southwestwards along New Kings Road to a point being the prolongation southeastwards of the northeastern boundary of Eel Brook Common, thence northwestwards to and along said northeastern boundary to a point opposite the junction of Tyrawley Road and Musgrave Crescent, thence northeastwards to and northwestwards along Musgrave Crescent to Moore Park Road thence westwards to and northwestwards along the path adjacent to the eastern boundary of Eel Brook Common playground to Effie Road, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along the said road to and northwestwards along Fulham Broadway and Jerdan Place to North-End Road, thence northwestwards along said Road to the southern boundary of Gibbs Green Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

SANDS END WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Walham Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along the said Borough boundary to a point being a prolongation southeastwards of the access road between Fulham Wharf and
Comley's Wharf, thence northwestwards to and along said prolongation and said access road to Townmead Road, thence northeastwards along said road to and northwestwards along De Morgan Road to Stephendale Road, thence southwestwards along said road to and northwestwards along Wandsworth Bridge Road to New Kings Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Walham Ward, thence northeastwards along the said boundary to the point of commencement.

SULIVAN WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Sands End Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough in the River Thames, thence westwards following the said Borough boundary to a point due south of the junction of Carnwath Road and Broomhouse Lane, thence due north in a straight line to said junction and northwestwards along Broom house Lane to Hurlingham Road, thence northeastwards along the said road and northwestwards along Broomhouse Road to New Kings Road, thence generally northeastwards along said Road to and generally southwards along the western boundary of Sands End Ward to the point of commencement.

PALACE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Sulivan Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough in the River Thames, thence generally northwestwards along the said Borough boundary to a point due west of the southwestern corner of the property known as Eternit House, thence due east to said southwestern corner and continuing eastwards along the southern boundary of said property to Stevenage Road, thence southeastwards along the said road to and northeastwards along Inglethorpe Street
to Fulham Palace Road, thence southeasterwards along said Road and Fulham High Street to New Kings Road, thence northeasterwards along the said road to the railway at the junction with Hurlingham Road thence northeasterwards along the said railway, crossing Grimston Road to New Kings Road, thence northeasterwards along said road to the western boundary of Sullivan Ward, thence southeasterwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

TOWN WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Sullivan Ward meets the northern boundary of Palace Ward, thence generally southwestwards and northwesterwards along the northern boundary of Palace Ward to Fulham Road, thence northeasterwards along said road, to and northwesterwards along Munster Road to Bishops Road, thence northeasterwards along the said road to and southeasterwards along Kelvedon Road, crossing Fulham Road to Parsons Green Lane, thence southeasterwards along said Lane to the northern boundary of Sullivan Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

EEL BROOK WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Sands End Ward meets the western boundary of Walham Ward, thence generally southwestwards along the northern boundaries of Sands End Ward and Sullivan Ward to the eastern boundary of Town Ward, thence generally northwesterwards along said eastern boundary to Bishops Road, thence northeasterwards along said road to and northwesterwards along Goaters Alley, crossing Dawes Road, and continuing northwesterwards along Rylston Road to St Thomas's Way, thence northeasterwards along said way to a point opposite the western boundary of Brunswick Boys Club playground, thence northwesterwards and northeasterwards
to and along the western and northern boundaries of the playground and Boys Club to the path adjacent to the western end of Coomer Place, thence northwestwards along said path to and eastwards along Coomer Place to the western boundary of Walham Ward, thence generally southeastward along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

COLEHILL WARD

Commencing at a point being the junction of the northern and western boundaries of Town Ward, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along the western boundary of said Ward to and northwards along the northern boundary of Palace Ward, and continuing northwards along Fulham Palace Road to a point opposite the southern boundary of Fulham Recreation Ground, thence northeasterly along the southern boundary of No 44 Strode Road thence northerly along the rear boundaries of Nos 44 to 2 Strode Road, the northern boundary of No 325 Lillie Road to Munster Road, thence southeastwards along said Road to the point of commencement.

SHERBROOKE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Town Ward meets the western boundary of Eel Brook Ward, thence southwestwards along the northern boundary of Town Ward to and northwards along the eastern boundary of Colehill Ward to Lillie Road; thence northeasterly along the said road to and southeastwards along Rylston Road to the western boundary of Eel Brook Ward, and continuing southeastwards and southwestwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.
CRABTREE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Colehill Ward meets the northern boundary of Palace Ward thence generally southwestwards along said northern boundary to the western boundary of the Borough in the River Thames, thence generally northwestwards along the said Borough boundary to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of Chancellors Wharf, thence northeastwards to and along said southeastern boundary and the northwestern boundary of the Chemical Storage Depot to Chancellor's Road, thence northeastwards along said Road to Fulham Palace Road, thence southeastwards along said Road to the western boundary of Colehill Ward, and continuing southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

MARGRAVINE WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Sherbrooke Ward meets the northern boundary of Colehill Ward, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of Crabtree Ward to and northeastwards along Yeldham Road to the northwestern boundary of No 68 Margravine Gardens, thence northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 68 to 44 Margravine Gardens to the southern boundary of the District Line railway, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Gibbs Green Ward; thence generally southeastwards, southwestwards and again southeastwards along said western boundary to and westwards along Greyhound Road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 120 Greyhound Road, thence southeastwards to and along said western boundary, the eastern boundary of the transport depot, numbered 112 Greyhound Road and continuing southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 13 to 63 Tasso Road, the western boundary of Tasso Yard.
and No 6 Tasso Yard, and the western boundary of No 36 Humbolt Road to said Road, and continuing southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Sherbrooke Ward, thence southwestwards along the northern boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.

NORMAND WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Walham Ward meets the northern boundary of Eel Brook Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said northern boundary to and northwestwards and westwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of Sherbrooke Ward to the eastern boundary of Margravine Ward, thence northwestwards and eastwards along the eastern boundary of said Ward to the southern boundary of Gibbs Green Ward, thence generally north-eastwards and southeastwards along the said southern boundary to the western boundary of Walham Ward, thence southeastwards along the western boundary of the said Ward to the point of commencement.

BROADWAY WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Avonmore Ward meets the western boundary of Gibbs Green Ward, thence southwards and westwards along said western boundary to the northern boundary of Margravine Ward thence generally westwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of Crabtree Ward to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along said Borough boundary to a point being the prolongation southwards of Hammersmith Pier, thence northwards to and along said pier and continuing generally northwestwards along the path situated at the western edge of Furnival Gardens, thence crossing Great West Road to Nigel Playfair Avenue, thence northwards along
said avenue to King Street thence westwards along said street to Dalling Road, thence northwards along said road to Glenthorne Road, thence eastwards along said road to Hammersmith Grove thence southwards along said grove to a point opposite the northern boundary of the car park on the east side of said grove, thence eastwards to and generally eastwards along said northern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the Metropolitan Railway line, being the western boundary of Brook Green Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary and eastwards along the southern boundary of said ward to the western boundary of Avonmore Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

GROVE WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of White City and Shepherds Bush Ward meets the western boundary of Addison Ward thence southwards along said western boundary and continuing southwards along the western boundary of Brook Green Ward to the northern boundary of Broadway Ward thence westwards along said northern boundary to Dalling Road, thence northwards and northeastwards along said road to Brackenbury Road, thence northwards along said road to Goldhawk Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the point of commencement.

RAVENSCOURT WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Grove Ward meets the western boundary of Broadway Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the southwestern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards and northwards along said Borough boundary to the road known as Stamford Brook Gardens, thence northeastwards from said gardens to
Stamford Brook Road, thence continuing northeastwards along said road and Goldhawk Road to the western boundary of Grove Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

STARCH GREEN WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Ravenscourt Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said Borough boundary to Askew Road thence generally southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Ravenscourt Ward thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

CONINGHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of White City and Shepherds Bush Ward meets the northern boundary of Grove Ward, thence southwestwards along the said northern boundary and the northern boundary of Ravenscourt Ward to and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of Starch Green Ward to Uxbridge Road, thence eastwards along said road to the western boundary of White City and Shepherds Bush Ward, thence southeastwards and southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

WORMHOLT WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Coningham Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along the said Borough boundary to the southern boundary of College Park and Old Oak Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of White City and Shepherds Bush Ward, thence generally southeastwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the northern boundary of Coningham Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.