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

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

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

3. Enfield Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they
submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 10 March 1976 Enfield Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 35 wards each returning 2 councillors to form a council of 70 members.

5. The Borough Council's submission included copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We considered this together with comments which had been sent to us direct. These included alternative and different schemes submitted by three local political parties; proposals for six new wards in the Bush Hill Park area submitted by a ratepayers' association; a suggestion by a local federation, with the support of another ratepayers' association, that the existing scheme of wards should be retained; a further suggestion by two local residents that the existing thirty wards should each return one councillor; objections to proposed changes to the present Ponders End ward from a residents' association and three local residents; and general objections to the draft scheme from the minority Group of the Council.

6. We studied the Council's draft scheme together with the alternative schemes. We considered that the scheme for 66 councillors submitted by one of the political parties offered the best standard of representation for the borough and decided to adopt it as the basis for our draft proposals.

7. We adjusted the boundaries between the proposed Southgate Green and Palmers Green wards and the proposed Grange and Highfield wards in order to improve the balance of representation between the wards concerned. After consulting the Ordnance Survey we made a number of minor alterations to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

8. On 11 November 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft
9. Enfield Borough Council objected to our draft proposals on the grounds that the proposed council was not large enough, that natural boundaries had not been used and that community ties had been broken. They asked us to adopt the draft scheme for 70 members which they had originally submitted or, if this were unacceptable, to adopt their draft scheme with modifications.

10. We received letters from the minority Group of the Council, three constituency political parties, a local political association, and the local political party whose alternative scheme we had adopted as the basis for our draft proposals, all accepting our draft proposals in principle but proposing modifications. One of the other political parties which had submitted an alternative scheme wrote accepting some proposed wards but criticising others. The ratepayers' association from the Bush Hill Park area informed us that they objected to our draft proposals. The two residents who had suggested a council of 30 members reaffirmed that suggestion. The residents' association and two individuals who had earlier objected to proposed changes in the Ponders End area reiterated their objections. Another resident objected to the proposed boundary between the Willow and Southbury wards.

11. In view of these comments we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr L J Slocombe was appointed an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Enfield on 30 and 31 May 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.
13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and of his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended a council of 66 members with minor modifications to 24 of the 33 wards in our draft proposals, mainly designed to improve boundaries.

14. 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 of the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted and we modified our draft proposals in accordance with those recommendations. We then formulated our final proposals.

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

**PUBLICATION**

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

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N Digney (Secretary)

30 June 1977
Sir.

Review of Electoral Arrangements
London Borough of Enfield

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 11th March 1977, I have the honour to submit the following report.

1 Date of Meeting:
A local meeting was held at the Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield on Monday and Tuesday the 30th and 31st May 1977. The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. on the first day and at 1500 hours I adjourned till the following day. The meeting was resumed on the second day at 10.00 a.m. and concluded at 15.00 hours. On Wednesday 1st June 1977 from 9-30 a.m. until midday I made an inspection of certain areas and boundaries. Full details of the inspection are contained in paragraph 26 of this report.

2 Attendance
The signed attendance sheets have been forwarded to the Commission. All those who spoke or participated in the proceedings are shown below.

Mr Wilfrid D Day, Chief Executive and Town Clerk for the Council of the London Borough of Enfield and Councillor A J Young, Leader of that Council.

Mr R Pert, Elections officer for the Enfield Branch of the National Front.


Mr Bryan Davies, M.P. (Enfield North) and

Mr Ted Graham, M.P. (Edmonton)

Mr L C Harrison – local resident

Mr E. C Pain – Secretary/Agent of the Edmonton Constituency Labour Party

Mr Reg Downs – Secretary and Agent of the Enfield North Constituency Labour Party

Mrs C M Powney – Secretary of the Southgate Labour Party

Mr J W V Atwood on behalf of the Edmonton Conservative and Unionist Association.

The Bush Hill Park Ratepayers Association were unable to be represented at the meeting but had sent me a statement which they had intended to make.

Ponders End Residents Association – Mr P H Delow, Hon Secretary

Mr F J W Welfare – resident in Ponders End ward and also for the Association

Mr W A Thomas – a resident and a spokesman also for the Ponders End Residents Association
Mr F P Bell - Chairman of the Federation of Enfield Residents and Allied Associations.

Mr W D Hyde - a resident and on behalf of his colleague Mr A R Oakden (unable to be present)

Dr L Eric L Ridge - Chairman of the Liberal Central Committee, London Borough of Enfield.

Each speaker had the opportunity of commenting on what had been said by others in addition to making their own views known. Not many availed themselves of this right of reply but some did as will be seen later in the report.

The Commission's draft proposals.

The Borough Council's draft scheme was submitted to the Commission on the 10th March 1976 and provided for a council of 70 members elected from 55 wards. The Borough Council also forwarded a letter from the Conservative Associations Liaison Committee supporting a scheme for 70 councillors - 2 per ward - but making a number of suggestions as to altered ward boundaries. The Commission also received direct a number of representations, schemes and suggestions from other political parties, Residents Associations and other individuals. In assessing the Council's draft scheme the Commission were of the opinion that the forecast of growth of electorate was somewhat high bearing in mind past trends which showed a steady (though small) decline. However as the Liberal and Labour Parties had used somewhat similar figures the Commission were content, for the moment, to use the figures provided for the purpose of their draft proposals. The Commission were disturbed at the amount of opposition which had been shown to the Council's draft scheme and had received some criticism of the way the scheme had been produced. Additionally, they noted that the three other major schemes submitted presented a more even standard of representation than the Council and the Liberals scheme gave the best standard of equality. The Commission therefore used the Liberal scheme as a basis for their own proposals. When the figures were examined a number of inaccuracies came to light and as a result the Commission decided to realign the boundary between Southgate Green and Palmers Green wards and also that between Grange and Highfield wards in order to obtain a better balance between those wards. Some minor boundary modifications, which had been recommended by the Ordnance Survey in the interests of technically better boundaries, were also adopted. All the other comments and schemes submitted to them were not adopted by the Commission for various reasons. The Commission's draft proposals which were published on the 11th November 1976 thus provided for a council of 66 members elected from 33 wards.

Comments on the draft proposals.

When the Commission's draft proposals were published they were advertised locally. A number of comments were received. I mention those comments here in summary form but deal with them all fully in later parts of this report.
(a) Enfield Borough Council - Council say again that a Borough of the size of Enfield should have 70 members, Commission's scheme for 66 members is unacceptable. A long list of specific criticisms was submitted concerning matters of good boundaries and community of interest and they want their scheme reconsidered. If this does not meet the criterion on equality then amendments (20 out of 35 wards) are suggested to bring the position into balance.

(b) Labour Party Council Group. The Chief Executive had been asked to examine and report on the Commission's draft proposals and this he had done as instructed. The Labour Group are prepared to accept the draft proposals with the possible modifications as shown in the report - 26 out of 33 wards affected.

(c) Constituency Labour Parties. The three Labour Parties go along with the Council Group (b above) but with a various batch of further amendments affecting the three constituences. Many of these are fairly minor but there are quite extensive changes in three wards in the west, namely Trent, Merryhills and Oakwood.

(d) Liberal Central Committee - accept the position as set out in (b) above but with further amendments affecting nine of the wards.

(e) Edmonton Conservative and Unionist Association. Accept that there should be a 66 member Council elected from 33 wards but make a substantial number of amendments to the draft proposals which affect all but five of the 33 wards. Also suggest three changes of names of wards.

(f) Enfield Branch of National Front - give a qualified welcome to some of the proposed wards, criticise others, think 66 is too many for the Council and ask that their own scheme for 60 members be re-considered.

(g) Bush Hill Park Ratepayers Association - object to the draft proposals, think 66 councillors to be too many, suggest existing wards be retained with some boundary adjustments. Six wards are affected directly but others would also be affected.

(h) Mr W D Hyde and Mr J R Oakden - say existing 30 wards should be retained but each ward should return one councillor only, making a council of 30.

(i) Ponders End Residents Association - object to splitting up the existing ward and make a number of suggestions as to how the ward should be dealt with.

(j) Mr L C Harrison - objects to splitting up of Ponders End ward and in particular to placing Northfield Road and Southfield Road in the proposed Jubilee ward.

(k) Mr W A Thomas - similar views about Ponders End ward as the Residents Association.

(l) Mr H S A MacNair - objects to draft proposals which place a number of roads around Churchbury Lane in proposed Southbury ward instead of in Willow ward.

Cases advanced at the meeting.

The following paragraphs 6 to 25 deal with the cases advanced at the meeting in support of, or against, the Commission's draft proposals and the many variations of those proposals and alternative schemes, and amendments to those schemes. The report is not in any way a verbatim note of every word that was said.
but is, I hope, a fair and balanced summary of the principal points made by the speakers. In my report I have linked in where necessary the points made in correspondence by the speakers. There were a number of plans and documents handed in, the gist of whose contents I include in the following paragraphs or in my consideration of the cases.

My assessment of the weight of arguments advanced at the meeting is contained in paragraphs 27 to 43 below.

National Front - Enfield Branch.

Mr R Pert, Elections officer presented the case for the Enfield Branch of the National Front. The Branch had forwarded a detailed statement of their views to both the Commission and the Borough Council as long ago as the 23rd February 1976. This report or statement reviewed the position generally, expressed the view that with the abolition of aldermen a council of 60 members should be sufficient and indeed preferable to 70 and made a detailed criticism of a number of the ward boundaries. The Branch also forwarded a scheme and map indicating the boundaries for a council of 60 members elected from 30 wards. He was disappointed that the Commission had not agreed and had not given reasons why 66 members were necessary. The Branch had then made formal representations on the 29th December 1976 in which they gave "qualified" support to the draft proposals but still could not understand why 66 had been chosen as the right number. He was also in the difficulty of not knowing the various forecasts and electoral ratios, and did not like wide variations. The qualified support applied to a number of the wards but others he criticised on various grounds, mainly of boundaries. The Branch were of the opinion that their proposed scheme and map showed an adequate and proper representation of 60 councillors from 30 wards and he wanted this considered. There was no need in his view for the elected councillors to exceed the present number and he thought that democracy would be properly served with the 60 councillors. He was in support of more delegation to officers as an aid to efficiency and did not see this as a derogation of democracy if policy was clearly defined and rested firmly with the elected members.

London Borough of Enfield Council.

Mr W D Day, Chief Executive and Town Clerk presented the case for the Borough Council. He indicated the various plans and lists displayed in the room for the information of all concerned. He dealt first with the matter of the calculation of the electorate and said that this could be done on the polling district method or the individual house count method. The earlier calculations had to be revised because of inaccuracies arising when the boundaries had been transferred from diagrammatic street plans to Ordnance Sheets. The individual count method had been used. More would be said later about this.

Mr Day then gave a historical, geographic and social review of the London Borough
of Enfield and the main features were illustrated on a coloured plan (handed in). The object of this review was to acquaint me with the nature of the area, its varying development, its mix, its problems and its potentialities for further industrial growth. The transport facilities to, from, and through the Borough was good and the new M.25 would be a great help. Of the total of 97110 housing stock about 20% was local authority, 61% privately owned, about 15% rented unfurnished and 3% rented furnished. I noted all this information with interest. Mr Day then handed in a paper, together with supporting tables and graph which dealt with the basis and method of calculating the population and electorate in future years up to 1981, which had been prepared by Mr M F Jewell, Group Planning Officer. This paper is of such importance and significance, affecting as it does every single scheme and the many modifications, that I deal with it in a separate paragraph later on and explain the principal conclusions in the paper and its impact on the various schemes. Linked with this was a statement (handed in) showing the principal public sector developments in various wards. Private development is also covered in the paper above referred to. At this stage Mr Day formally withdrew the Council's original scheme, asked that the revised scheme should be considered and indicated that he would later be submitting a few further amendments to that scheme so as to achieve even greater electoral equality.

He went on to deal with the Council's case in three sections - size of council, councillors per ward and boundaries and areas of wards.

Size of Council. This matter had first been considered by the Borough Council in 1972 when the Local Government Bill was before Parliament. There was nothing in the Act itself as to size. The Council had said, inter alia, "the number of councillors for London Boroughs be increased to a minimum of 70" - (minute handed in). When the London Boroughs Association were asking for views which led to the Commission issuing guide-lines, the Borough Council (March 1975) had agreed with the range of 50 - 70 members and further said "that in the case of the London Borough of Enfield the size should be 70" (minute handed in).

At the time the draft scheme was being prepared by the Council certain local associations had been consulted and the views can be summarized briefly - some local associations of residents and ratepayers said 60 plus co-opted members on Committees, the Labour parties said 60, Liberals said 66, one local association said possibly 70. The Borough Council set their face firmly against co-option as a means of raising the numbers and came out for a council of 70.

Mr Day here produced a schedule showing the known position of all the London Boroughs in relation to size of Council. The particular matters which Mr Day regarded as important in supporting the request for a Council of 70 were: - Enfield had an area of over 20,000 acres, was the sixth largest in area and eighth largest in population of the 32 London Boroughs, the area was unique
in its mix of properties, industries and open space, it had the complete range of functions of an outer London Borough, plus a wide amount of agency work for the C.I.C. Thames Water Board and Department of the Environment. In particular the Borough had a heavy educational responsibility at primary, secondary and further education levels. He handed in statements showing the Committee structure, time table of meetings and education structure. The Council appointed 185 members to 05 outside bodies and councillors had their normal constituency duties. There was a normal 6 week cycle of meetings, a fair amount of delegation to members and officers and there could well be more work if managing bodies are set up for the primary schools. As an example he quoted the fact that over the past 12 weeks there had been 62 committee meetings, averaging 11 members and 166 hours of work. On top of all this were Chairmen's briefing, deputations, panels etc. Reducing the size of the Council would not automatically mean less expense as the remaining members would still have the work load to get through. Members expenses were at a modest level.

Members per ward. Happily there was no dispute about 2 members per ward, except Messrs Hyde and Oakden who thought one was enough. He quoted the view of the previous Commissioner in 1963 who favoured small wards.

Boundaries of wards. Mr Day here set about the Commission's draft scheme in a vigorous and critical way, and compared it unfavourably with the Council's own revised scheme. He premised his remarks by referring to the report he had been asked to prepare on possible ways of improving the Commission's scheme but this in no way meant the Council was in favour of the scheme. The report had been "not agreed" by the Council (January 1977). After saying the Commission's scheme was not acceptable to the Council because of the size proposed, the failure to meet criteria and some complex boundaries, Mr Day then listed points on a number of wards. Here I should explain that when he uses the word "plusage" he means a divergence exceeding 300 either over or under the average ward electorate.

Angel Road - plusage and bad northern boundary.
Craig Park - includes Edmonton Green area which looks to St Peters.
Ponders End - either Hertford Road or railway should be used as boundary.
Enfield Wash - plusage - 4 roads in northern area look to Enfield Lock.
Southbury - plusage - mixture of communities and bisected by Great Cambridge Road and Southbury Road.
St Marks - large plusage.
Raglan - plusage - joins areas together with no common interests.
Village - awkward shape - 2 miles long, communities mixed.
Latymer - northern boundary should follow Salmons Brook, Hyde estate divided.
Huxley - peculiar shape - parts could be moved north or south.
Weir Hall - large plusage and an awkward unnatural boundary. Same with Bowes.
Palmer Green - plusage - Westminster Drive area should be in Southgate Green.

Highfield - large plusage - area of Green Lanes looks to Winchmore Hill, not Hedge Lane area.

Winchmore Hill - Shrubbery Gardens area should go to Highfield, Bourne Hill to Grovelands.

Orange - area south of Green Dragon Lane should go to Winchmore Hill, roads in N.E corner look to Windmill Hill and area in N.W to Merryhills.

Worcesters - no connection between Meyer Green Estate and Caple Estate and no communication with Clay Hill area.

Chase - area south of Lavender Hill looks to Ridgeway area.

Merryhills - unsatisfactory shape, covers areas with no community of interest, no polling facilities in Chaseville Park Road and Oakwood Crescent, which should go into Oakwood.

Trent - The natural boundary is Bramley Road and Cat Hill and should go into Oakwood.

Grovelands - plusage, joins areas without community of interest, should be split, look to Southgate for shopping.

Southgate Green - part should go into Arnos, Stub north of Aldermans Hill should go into Palmers Green.

Mr Day then compared the various schemes against the standards of "plusage" and asserted that the Council's scheme was best. He then handed in a revised scheme and lists which would show a very favourable position of equality of representation, and urged that it should be adopted.

I refer in detail to this revised scheme later on in this report.

**Labour Group on Borough Council.**

Councillor L J D Warren, the Leader of the Labour Group on the Borough Council put the case for the Group, which consisted of 28 members out of 60 elected councillors. There were, in his view two criteria to be considered - the matter of community of interests and the number of councillors required to discharge the functions in an effective and efficient manner. He had heard the factual description of the area and it was fairly clear that most of the artizan dwellings were in the eastern part of the Borough and there was also a north/south division. The term "community of interest" was capable of wide interpretation but he took it to mean groups of people who identify with a particular class of society. The Council's scheme perpetuated the disintegration of areas and, he said, fragmented marginal and labour party areas. There were 25 ward boundary changes in the Council's scheme and he could not follow the reasoning behind many of those changes, and mentioned Ponders End as a typical illustration. He and his colleagues considered the Council's scheme had been designed on a political basis, he did not like the way the scheme had been
rushed through and argued that it had not been the subject of reasoned discussion. He considered the Commission had tackled the job in a proper way and welcomed the further improvements which would result if the modifications set out in the Chief Executive's report (and perhaps some others) were adopted. He had urged the Council to adopt such report but the proposal had been voted down. On the question of the size of Council he did not agree that it had always been the policy to have 70 councillors. The Labour Party would have been happy with 60 but they had to look at the position afresh when the Commission's guidelines and criteria were examined. There is absolutely no need for 70 members, 66 is perfectly adequate, there is no real burden of work on members, some members like to have lots of committee work and perhaps some of the work and size of committees is because of the wish to keep committee membership politically balanced.

He did not like the Council's scheme either in its earlier or revised versions because, amongst other things, it provided for 70 councillors which was too many. He, and his Group, would be happy to accept the Commission's draft proposals as amended by the Chief Executive's report and any further amendments which might be suggested to improve boundaries or electoral ratios. He asked for these views to be considered and urged that the Council's scheme be rejected.

Mr Bryan Davies, M.P. (Enfield North).

Mr Davies said he was going to deal with matters on a broad-brush approach and not immerse himself in detailed arguments about individual boundaries which would be fully developed by others. Changes in local government had their effect on his Parliamentary role and he was concerned to try to secure equity of representation in the context of the local community. Certainly the local authority case should be carefully considered and carry some weight but we had here a scheme on which agreement had not been possible. He represented the Labour Party in Parliament but he represented and worked for all his constituents. He was of the view, from the representations made to him, that the Council's scheme was a majority party view which took little account of the great body of opinion. The scheme had met with total opposition from the Labour and Liberal parties and many local associations. The scheme had met with a critical press and he drew my attention to an article on the matter in the Enfield Gazette - issue of 8th January 1976 - headed "Yours in haste" Mr Davies used the expression, "gerrymandering". He recognized the inadequacies of the Council's scheme, said no one else had suggested 70 members, pointed to the strongly expressed views of the Ponders End residents about the Boundary Ditch, and asked that the Commission's draft proposals as amended should be adopted.

Mr L C Harrison

Mr Harrison spoke as a resident in Southfield Road at present in the Ponders End ward. He grouped his observations in 2 sections - general considerations and then Ponders End. He had lived in the area for over 40 years, coming here in 1933,
and worked in Tottenham. He was totally opposed to the Council's scheme for 70 councillors, opposed to the Commission's scheme and its variants for 66 councillors, disagreed that there had been any general acceptance of the figure of 70 and said 60 members were perfectly adequate. Nothing he had heard indicated that 70 councillors were needed. A Council of 60 was sufficient as they laid down overall policy and if the Committees needed strengthening then the way to do it was by co-option. He much favoured co-option as it gave a chance for experienced people to serve, say, on a single committee without a full commitment as a councillor. This would be to the benefit of the community, provide a stability for the electorate and keep the council at 60 with relatively few changes of existing wards. He pointed out that Members of Parliament had large electorates but managed alright.

Turning now to the Ponders End ward he said this was a historic area with good natural boundaries, the Boundary ditch was a long established boundary, there was shopping in the High Street and all community and social facilities and there was only limited access across the railway. The proposals of the Commission would split up the ward into three parts and link up disparate areas. He would really like to see the present ward retained intact if at all possible and he urged me to try to do this and particularly asked me to look at the possibilities for Northfield and Southfield Roads.

Edmonton Constituency Labour Party.

Mr E C Pain, Secretary/Agent spoke for this Party. He said that originally they had been in favour of a Council of 60 members but for the reasons which had been mentioned by Councillor Warren they now considered that 66 was the right number. He and his Party were wholly opposed to the Council's scheme, both original and amended, 70 councillors was too many and the Council's scheme made a lot of amendments which cut up communities. As examples of this he referred to St Alphege ward where a council estate was cut in half at Cuckoo Hall Lane and Hottingham Road and community facilities severed. The same sort of thing applied in Pymmes ward where the Ryde estate - Deansgate area - was broken up, to the detriment of the tenants associations. He also mentioned the division between Craig Park and Angel Road which placed Aberdeen Road and Angel Place on the wrong side of the North Circular Road from the polling station. Apart from thinking that 66 was the right number, Mr Pain said that he supported the Commission's proposals because they were an independent non-political body and the same principles applied to the modifications in the Chief Executive's report. The Commission's scheme, as further modified in the Chief Executive's report, and by his (Mr Pain's) additional improvements listed in his letter of the 18th January 1977 was the best possible scheme to meet all criteria and he asked me to recommend accordingly. In conclusion he pointed out that the projected populations had been based on forecasts supplied by the local authority.
Enfield North Constituency Labour Party.
Mr Reg Downes, Secretary and Agent spoke for this Party. He and his Party were completely opposed to all the Council's schemes, original, revised, and amended. Even the final scheme split up communities and he illustrated this by referring to one or two instances. In Enfield Wash ward, the boundaries were ill-defined and in the area around Eastfield Road the community had been split. In Ponders End ward the Boundary Ditch had not been used as the southern boundary. In Willow ward the roads around Sketty Road (part of the Willow Estate) should properly be included, in Southbury ward, and he did not like the ill-defined northern boundary. He was prepared, for the general reasons advanced by Mr Pain, to support the Commission's basic proposals as further modified on the lines of the Chief Executive's report and the Party's further amendments as listed in his letter of the 19th January 1977. He asked me to reject the Council's scheme and to recommend for approval his Party's proposals.

Southgate Labour Party.
Mrs C M Downey, Secretary, spoke for this Party. She said the Party were opposed to the Council's Scheme both on the grounds of the size of the Council and on a number of boundaries. She and her Party had expressed general acceptance of the Commission's proposals (as amended in Chief Executive's report) and put forward a number of further amendments to assist in retaining community ties. She illustrated this by referring to Arnos and Bowes wards and then Oakwood, Trent and Merryhills. In the Council's Arnos ward the area included property on both sides of Arnos Park which was a barrier. She thought the better boundary between Arnos and Southgate wards was Bowes Road - the east-west axis. The amendments proposed by her would secure the preservation of communities each with their own community facilities. In the Oakwood ward the boundary was unsatisfactory and split a unit in Southgate around Green Road and Addison Avenue and would affect the community hall. The amendments she had asked for in Oakwood affected other wards and this was why some changes had to be made in Trent and Merryhills wards. The Southgate Labour Party therefore asked for the Council's scheme to be rejected and the Party's proposals adopted.

Councillor A J Young.
Councillor Young spoke as Leader of the Borough Council and of the majority Party. He first confirmed his approval, as Leader, of the further amendments to the Council's proposals which had been submitted by Mr Day. He did so, not in any arbitrary way but because of getting a better equality of electorate in a scheme approved by the Borough Council for 70 members. So far as he was concerned the Borough Council had consistently maintained the view that 70 was the proper number of councillors and that there was a real need for that number. He rebutted any criticisms that the scheme had been rushed through or had been in any way improperly dealt with. There had been an item on the Committee agenda and the
draft scheme was the only scheme before the Committee. Having firmly fixed on the figure of 70 the subsequent amendments had been made to achieve better electoral equality. So far as the Council work was concerned the committee procedure and structure was kept under review, his experience showed a volume of work which required 70 members, who also had their constituency duties. Public participation procedures did mean further important work for members. He sincerely believed that the Council's scheme was the best that could be devised, it made as few alterations as possible, it met all the criteria of the Commission and he strongly recommended it to me for acceptance.

The Association were unable to be represented but had sent me a precis of what they would have said had they been there. I summarize their views as follows and have of course all the earlier correspondence. They first deal with some of the views expressed in the Chief Executive's report and say:-

(a) They do not accept that there is support for a Council of 70, elected from 35 wards. In fact no one supports the Council.
(b) Agree with comments that proposed Village ward is an odd shape.
(c) Proposed boundaries of Ponders End ward ignore existing community interests.
(d) Proposed Raglan ward is not acceptable because area to south east of the Great Cambridge Road does not naturally belong with that on the western side - the road, viaduct and King George's Field represent a large physical boundary.
(e) This area (d) above should be in Latymer ward and not Raglan ward.
(f) North west boundary of Raglan ward could be extended to Bush Hill Road, the New River and Park Avenue as far as Faversham Avenue.
(g) The name of Bush Hill Park should be used instead of Raglan because it has been a recognized name since the 18th century, is the name of the Station and Hotel, was used when housing estates were built between the wars and when the Association was formed in 1936, is a recognized postal address, and gives name to two existing wards.
(h) Raglan has no local significance except for a primary school and a couple of bungalows.

In relation to the number of councillors they maintain their view that 60 is sufficient and these should be elected from the existing 30 wards with minor boundary adjustments. Economy would be achieved and they have heard no justification for a figure of 66 or 70. They hope the Commission will look favourably on local interests and help to maintain interest at grass roots level.

Edmonton Conservative and Unionist Association.
Mr J W V Attwood spoke for the Association. He said that the Association is in agreement with the Commission that the Council should comprise 66 members elected
from 33 wards. He accepted the Commission's judgement in this matter and had no doubt that the work of the Council could quite properly be done with 66 members - it was after all only a reduction of about 5% from the present size. Nevertheless the Association considered that a number of the wards and some of the ward boundaries needlessly divided existing communities, especially in the Edmonton area and adjoining parts.

Their aim was to preserve as much as possible of natural communities. It had taken some time for the people to get used to the changes made in 1963 and too drastic changes would be confusing. He mentioned the comments of the Vicar of St Matthew in the Enfield Gazette about the splitting up of Ponders End ward into 3 parts. Their proposals would meet this criticism. Before turning to individual wards Mr Attwood said their overall aims in preparing their scheme were to locate existing communities within one ward, to make most effective use of man-made and natural boundaries, to preserve as many of the features of the existing ward structure as was possible and to keep within the bounds of electoral equality. The result was that changes were suggested in all but 5 of the Commission's proposed wards. There were also 3 altered names suggested - Church Street (Latymer), Pymmes (St Marks) and Bush Hill Park (Southbury). Some of the detailed points as to ward changes are listed below:

Angel Road - changes give better equality with Craig Park.
Arnos - retains as much of existing ward within its natural boundaries.
Bow - allows retention of natural boundaries and avoids isolating Westminster Drive area.
Bullsmoor - includes roads whose community is with Turkey Street rather than Hoe Lane.
Bush Hill Park - retains present ward and historic boundary, centres on Main Avenue and the Park.
Chase - uses existing boundary along Lavender Hill and includes some Hilly Fields roads.
Church Street - retains most of existing ward and keeps conservation area in one ward.
Grange - area south of Green Dragon Lane excluded, the Lane is better natural boundary.
Green Street - more effective use made of natural boundaries in west and south.
Highfield - includes area south of Green Dragon Lane and excludes area south of Connaught Gardens.
Hoe Lane - better use of southern boundaries.
Huxley - keeps together communities in New Park ward and excludes part of Pymmes Estate east of Haselbury Road.
Jubilee - retains historic boundaries and communities.
Merryhills - retains area east of Ridgeway.
Oakwood - 2 roads near Oakwood Park included.
Palmer's Green - uses Pymmes Brook as boundary.
Ponders End - includes area between High Road and railway.
Pymmes - includes whole of Pymmes Estate within its natural community and boundaries.
Raglan - encloses present Bush Hill South ward (with some exceptions) in community area.
St Alphege and St Peters - adjustments to balance electorates.
Southgate Green - retains much in Arnos ward of existing electors.
ton - changes in areas around Churchbury Lane and culs-de-sac.
Village - more compact and better boundaries.
Weir Hall - prevents ward straggling across two major trunk roads.
Willow - Myddleton Avenue and roads north to Worcesters ward.
In conclusion Mr Attwood said the Association's proposals were a recognizable improvement for the whole of the Borough, met the tests of equality and he asked that they should be approved.

17 Ponders End Residents Association.
Mr F H Delow - Hon. Secretary, presented the case for the Association. He reminded me of the detailed expression of their views in letters of the 24th February 1976 and 4th January 1977. The Association were primarily concerned with the Ponders End ward and wanted to do everything possible to secure the maintenance of the existing ward boundaries and perhaps extend the western boundary from the railway to the Great Cambridge Road. The Commission's draft proposals would dismember the ward and place parts of it in three wards - Southbury, Jubilee and Ponders End and would not use the historic and well-known Boundary Ditch for the Southern boundary. The Association had been in existence for 44 years, had about 550 members and were very active in local and community affairs. If the Commission's proposals were implemented only the Church and Post Office would remain in the ward - all other community buildings would be elsewhere. Mr Delow hoped that the Boundary Ditch could be fixed as the southern boundary and that this should continue westwards to include the Northfield and Southfield areas in Ponders End. The area he would also like to see in the ward was the piece between the railway and the Great Cambridge Road, so as to include the Lincoln Way area. This had a community of interest with Ponders End. He was aware that changes had to be made and he put forward the suggestion that the northern boundary of the ward could be along Nags Head Road and Lea Valley Road instead of The Ride and Durants Road. The whole area had a much higher proportion of dwellings in the ward than other districts and they were predominantly of the artisan type. The Association had considered 60 members to be sufficient but if they had to choose they would
prefer 66 to the 70 proposed by the Council. He urged that I should give close
and special care to the matter of the Ponders End ward.

Mr F J W Welfare spoke both as a resident of long standing and as a member of the
Ponders End Residents Association. He explained that Ponders End started off as a
little village and parish in Middlesex and then became a ward in the former
Enfield UDC - probably in 1894. In 1963 when the three Boroughs were combined to
form the present Borough he had attended the Inquiry and the Inspector had
supported his objection and Ponders End remained a separate ward. He said the
ward was unique, fully equipped with all community buildings including 3 Churches
and other places of worship. He fully supported what Mr Delow had said about
extending the ward towards the Great Cambridge Road and his other proposals.

Mr Welfare would hate to see the ward broken up as this would make the
Association less effective and break up the Community. Whilst he realised that
some changes may be inevitable he very much hoped that some better boundaries
could be found for Ponders End and he urged me to try hard to do this.

Mr W A Thomas spoke as a resident in Lincoln Road. His views had been previously
expressed in correspondence and the burden of his argument was a plea against the
dismemberment of Ponders End ward. He himself lived in the area between the railway
line and the Great Cambridge Road which Mr Delow had suggested should be transferred
to Ponders End ward. This area was generally considered to be part of Ponders End
and the Association had something around 50 members from that area and they were
not members of the Bush Hill Park Residents Association. Mr Thomas also worked as
well as lived in the area. He said the Association had been most active in dealing
with residents problems and illustrated this by reference to action taken by the
Association concerning a nuisance from industrial premises (now gone from the
area). They had never been criticised for their actions in dealing with matters
which were technically out of the ward. He preferred a smaller Council and thought
60 was about right.

Federation of Enfield Residents and Allied Associations.

Mr F P Bell, Chairman, spoke for the Federation, which he said had 32 Associations,
representing some 20,000 residents in the Borough. He explained the make up of the
Federation and its constitution. In August 1975 the Federation had been asked by
the Council for comments on the proposed review and after discussion they expressed
the following views to the Council :-

(a) That, although Aldermen were to be abolished, the total number of councillors
should remain at 60 - 2 per ward.
(b) greater equality could be achieved by adjustments on boundaries of existing
wards.
(c) burden of committee work could be relieved by maximum use of co-option from
interested people.

The Federation was surprised when the Council published in January 1976 a
complete re-warding with 70 councillors from 35 wards. They knew this was a majority decision with both Labour and Liberal voting against. The Federation therefore discussed the matter again and unanimously decided to advise the Commission of their opposition to the scheme because:-
(i) it had been worked out by one political party and on a party vote.
(ii) the new 35 wards would not be equally divided over the 3 Parliamentary Constituencies.
(iii) differences between wards would be substantial.
(iv) people had got used to present warding.
(v) there is no need for 70 councillors.
(vi) greater use should be made of co-option. Two of their affiliated organizations had made separate representations (Bush Hill Park and Ponders End).

When the Commission's draft scheme for a Council of 66 elected from 33 wards was published the Federation thought that was the end of the road. But when they learned that the Council was again submitting their scheme and there was to be this local meeting the Federation had authorized Mr Bell to repeat their views. He said the present system of 60 councillors and 30 wards should be retained with minor boundary adjustments and that, to replace the 10 Aldermen, two or three co-opted members be appointed to each of the main committees. He supported the views expressed by the Bush Hill Park Residents Association and those of the Ponders End Residents Association. Finally he said he had been a little baffled by the immense amount of argument about smallish figures of differences in ward electorate.

Mr Ted Graham, M.P. (Edmonton).

Mr Graham said he was going to deal only with St Marks ward. He lived there - in First Avenue - and knew the area very well. He strongly supported the Commission's proposals, as amended by Labour Party, for this ward. The Commission had made the right decision in drawing the boundary along Lincoln Road and the Labour amendment excluding Lincoln Way and Lincoln Close was a good improvement. Any other boundary would, in his view, be wrong. The area was known as the Avenues, because of the names First, Second etc Avenue and very largely consisted of artisan housing. This was a real village and a classic illustration of two sides of the track. The ward as now proposed had a very close community of interest and everybody knew their neighbours and resorted to the same shops, library etc. He therefore asked for the Commission's scheme for 66 councillors with the Labour Party's amendments to be approved.

Mr H D Hyde spoke as a resident interested in local government in the Borough. He regretted that his colleague, Mr A R Oudgen, who had been his co-signatory in correspondence with the Commission, was unable to be present but he spoke for them both. Mr Hyde had had experience as a councillor with Enfield UDC and he said from what he had heard that the existing ward system worked well and saw no
reason for the major changes which had been discussed. Local government needed re-vitalizing, ratepayers were appalled at the number of councillors, there was little interest, too much time had been spent at this hearing on plans and figures, there were too many alterations and it was most sensible to leave things as they are. He said the political parties were jockeying for position as all the Aldermen were Conservatives whereas the elected members were almost equally balanced. The increased staff and salaries for management duties should mean a lesser role for councillors as well as a saving of expenditure with a smaller Council. The Committees were too large, the dead wood should be cut out and candidates could compete for the reduced number of seats available. He referred to Edmonton, Alberta, where a few years ago the Council consisted of a Mayor and 13 Councillors for a much bigger area.

In conclusion he summarized: keep wards as at present, one councillor for each ward, a Council of 30 is ample to run the Borough and there would be a saving of money.

Liberal Central Committee – Borough of Enfield.

Councillor Dr L Eric L Ridge, Chairman of the Committee presented the case for the Liberals. The Liberals accepted the scheme of a Council of 66, elected from 33 wards – 2 members each. What they aimed at was a fair and equitable system. They had looked at all the figures of population and electorate in the London Boroughs and the mathematics led to a figure between 63 and 66 as being appropriate for Enfield. Thus a figure of 66 Councillors for the Borough seemed about right. There would also be a right balance for the 3 GLC divisions. If the number of wards was right (33) then any other number would be difficult to divide equitably by 3. He, Dr Ridge, was most surprised by the suggestion that the Council should be larger – he was only on 2 main committees and had plenty of time for others but had not been appointed. The great problem was of finding suitable ward boundaries and at the same time getting the numbers right. Arguments had occurred about the use of one road or another and he accepted that there were many possible variations. He took the view that the real single community was the London Borough of Enfield where a corporate spirit was now growing. He did not think that electors were particularly concerned about which ward they were in so long as they were properly represented and could get hold of their local councillor. Dr Ridge was generally happy with the Commission's draft proposals, modified in the manner of the Chief Executive's report, but made some further suggestions affecting 9 wards which he considered as an improvement.

Replies and Closing Comments.

I summarize here the points made by way of reply and in the following paragraph the closing speech on behalf of the Borough Council.

(a) Mr P P Boll – very much hopes the Commission will take note of the views of the residents.
(b) Mr J W V Attwood - referred to the comments about St Marks ward and considered that the area (triangle) of roads south of Alberta Road, Trinity Avenue, Melbourne Way and Dinsdale Drive should more logically be included in Raglan ward.

(c) Mr Reg Downs - said he had no quarrel with the development figures which had been produced at the hearing but regretted that such figures were so late. The three Labour Parties had prepared their schemes on the basis of the population and electorate figures previously supplied by the Council. He hoped I would bear this in mind when considering their scheme.

(d) Mr E C Pain - referred to what Mr Attwood had said about ward names, especially Church Street. This was already divided by the Great Cambridge Road and there was a history of change in this area anyhow. He mentioned Mr Day's comments about the western wards "looking" east and west but this principle had not been extended to wards in the east. He also agreed with what Mr Downs had just said about the late arrival of the revised electorate figures.

Borough Council's Closing Comments.

Mr Day first commented on what had been said about electorate figures. He regretted that the figures were late but the exercise had been absolutely necessary. No growth was now postulated and the new figures had been prepared on a careful statistical basis. He said there had been 3 main criticisms of the Council's case and he dealt with them separately.

(a) Method of presentation. Certainly the Council's scheme was a majority decision and the decision had been taken late in an evening but there was nothing unusual in this. Following the Commission's first letter, local views had been obtained and then it became clear that there was disagreement about the size of the Council. The aim was to get a scheme before the Council and then to the Commission. He had advised the Council that all the details were not available but did not say that a decision could not be made. All subsequent amendments were to bring the scheme for 70 councillors nearer to absolute electoral equality.

(b) Number of Councillors. The Council's policy since 1972 was for 70 councillors and he considered that the majority (ruling) party was in the best position to know how many were required. Councillor Warren, a councillor of great experience, had personally felt that 60 would be enough but he would now accept 66. Councillor Warren had also said there was no real need for so many councillors on Governing Bodies but Mr Day disagreed with this. There was no disagreement that the majority party should have a majority on committees and this could better be achieved with a larger council. Most of the organizations had asked for 60 members and Messrs Hyde and Oakden for 30. Many local authorities had expressed their local preference for size within the agreed guide lines (50 - 70) and he thought very special weight should be given to that preference. If there were 70 councillors they would not be overworked and anything less would mean overwork. Dr Ridge was an enthusiast but many others may not have time available. The Council say firmly
that 70 was right.

(c) **Vand boundaries.** Mr Day then listed the various schemes in terms of divergence from the average and the result was that the Council's scheme was the best of all in relation to these figures. He then dealt with a number of the comments which had been made by others.

**Ponders End.** If changes could be made to use the Boundary Ditch as a boundary whilst not unbalancing the electorate he was prepared to try to fit it in.

**Arnos.** Mrs Powney was concerned about the splitting of the community by Arnos Park but that Park is not such a barrier as Telford Road (North Circular). The Council's scheme would meet her point about Oakwood.

**Labour Group.** All the criticisms which he listed in his earlier statement still applied.

**Liberals.** The criticisms were the same as above with additional comments about St Marks and Angel Road wards.

**Labour Party.** The point about splitting the Hyde Estate between Pymmes and Church Street wards could be met by including Hawthorn Road and Laburnum Road in Pymmes ward.

**Conservatives.** The earlier criticisms still applied to Enfield Wash and Grovelands ward. It was wrong to argue the case for Church Street on historic grounds and the conservation area would be retained in one ward. There was little community of interest in the north west of Pymmes ward with the remainder. That area should go to Huxley. In the Grange ward the area west of Worlds End Lane had a greater interest with Merryhills and the Old Park View area should go to Town or Merryhills.

**Inspections.**

Commencing at 9-30 a.m. and concluding at midday on Wednesday 1st June 1977 I made an accompanied visit to many parts of the Borough - a total of 29 miles were covered. Those who accompanied me were: Alderman W H Cook (Borough Council), Mr J P M Watson (Assistant Town Clerk), Mr B Stapley (Chief Executive and Town Clerks Department), Mr Day (Conservatives), Mr E C Pain and Mr R Downs (Labour), Mr F J W Welfare (Ponders End) and Mr F P Bell (Federation). Commencing from the Civic Centre, I proceeded northwards along Baker Street, then down Myddelton Avenue to Carterhatch Lane (crossing Great Cambridge Road), and saw developments in Larksfield Grove and Moorfield Road areas. From there up the Hertford Road and into Ordnance Road and saw three developments proceeding in Standard Road, Ferndale Road and Manly Dixon Drive. Returning to Carterhatch Lane I saw junctions at The Sunny Road, Sharon Road and Osborne Road and then into Green Street (development north of Durants Park). Back down Hertford Road to junctions of The Ride and Nags Head Road and thence westerly along Southbury Road to The Town and via London Road to Lincoln Road and a number of its junctions and thence down Hertford Road and Sandhurst Road. At this point I walked a short distance.
inspecting the Boundary Ditch and then went southwards down Charlton Road, Nightingale Road and Montague Road to Angel Road. Thence westwards, noting Aberdeen Road, Angel Place and to Silver Street (Klingers Site) and then northwards up Haselbury Road to Deansway and then southwards down the Great Cambridge Road to the Roundabout and along the North Circular Road, Bowes Road, Telford Road to High Road and Station Road. Circling back via Arnos Grove Station up Wilmer Way, Cannon Hill to Southgate Circus, down Winchmore Road and Eversley Park Road to see the Oakwood Crescent area and thence down Worlds End Lane and Bincote Road. From there I proceeded via Uplands Park Road to the Ridgeway – Ridge Crescent area – and returned along Lavender Hill back to the Civic Centre. This itinerary may sound confusing without the aid of a map but it meant that I saw many of the areas where boundaries were in dispute and where development was being carried out, and thus acquainted myself briefly with the area of the Borough.

Assessment of weight of Arguments.

Having heard all the arguments and expressions of view, carefully considered all that had been said, written and pointed out on maps, and finished my inspections, I am now almost ready to consider the various problems involved and to reach the necessary conclusions. Before doing so I think it would be helpful if I wrote a few paragraphs on general matters which I hope will better set the scene for what follows.

Primary considerations.

When considering matters affecting an electoral review at this hearing I am bound to observe the statutory requirements of the Local Government Act 1972. The primary requirement is in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 – that the ratio of number of electors to councillors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward. This is mandatory. The other considerations in paragraph 3(3) as to boundaries and local ties are subordinate to the primary rule. All this means that I shall have to examine electoral ratios very closely and keep them constantly at the fore-front of my mind. At this hearing, as at others, much evidence was given about community of interest and natural and other boundaries. These are all matters to which I have to have regard. The astonishing thing is that the evidence is so contradictory and different view points as to what constitutes "a community" are vigorously argued. To all those who may eventually be disappointed with my conclusions, may I say that the physical things like Churches, Schools, Shops, Community buildings etc do not cease to be used merely because a line is drawn on a map in one position or another.

On the question of the size of a Council I have a little more discretion. There are no statutory rules but agreed guide lines which allow me a little more flexibility.
Forecasts of Electorate.

When the various schemes had been sent to the Commission all of them had indicated a growth of electorate between 1976 and 1981 of the order of 4\%\%\%\%. The figures provided did not tally exactly but they were all around 8700 - 9300 (growth). The Commission thought these rather high but let the matter go for the time being pending this hearing. I too was very concerned with the accuracy of the forecasts, not only because of the trends in London Borough populations generally but also because I thought the elector/house ratio of 2.25 was very high. I therefore welcome the exercise which has been undertaken by the Borough Council to put the forecasts on a firmer basis, and one which I think is realistic. Nevertheless I share the concern expressed by people at the hearing that all the revised figures were not available until the hearing was well under way. It certainly meant that I had a whole new set of calculations to do. There is no value in saying more on this point but I do say it was right that the revised figures were produced and I congratulate the staff concerned for their efforts.

Having got these new figures it only remains to consider whether they have been produced on a proper basis. The answer to this is given in a paper prepared by Mr M F Jewell, Group Planning Officer, which was handed in by Mr Day. I read the paper with great care and with great interest. I always feel slightly inadequate in attempting to summarize a technical document and I will play safe by merely recording that I found no fault with the methodology or with the results.

Population forecasting and its application to electorates is always a tricky matter. I am satisfied that all necessary factors - house-building (public and private), household sizes, population trends and movements - had all been properly considered. I consequently accept the paper. All that remains is to record the total figures shown. Electorate 1976 - 200767 (factor 2.0674 per dwelling). Electorate 1981 - 199619 (factor 1.9892). These total figures have been allocated appropriately to the individual wards for the various schemes before me. When I refer in later paragraphs to figures it will be to the new figures.

Council's latest revisions.

As the latest revisions and amendments were handed in at the meeting by way of a plan and statement it would be as well if I briefly described it. The plan is very much on the lines of the earlier plan sent to the Commission and shows a number of areas (coloured yellow) which could be transferred to adjoining wards to achieve even closer electoral equality. In many cases the change involves only one side of a road or roads. I mention below the wards affected with the number of electors indicated :-

Arnos exclude 111 to Broomfield, 21 to Palmers Green, 227 to Old Southgate, 241 to Bowes.
Bowes - include 241 from Arnos.
Broomfield - include 111 from Arnos.
Bullsmoor - exclude 101 to Ordnance, 113 to Enfield Wash, 132 to Forty Hill.
Cambridge Road - include 225 from Green Street.
Chase - include 123 from Forty Hill,
Church Street - exclude 91 to Pymmes.
Enfield Wash - include 133 from Bullsmoor, exclude 770 to Green Street, include 310 from Ordnance.
Forty Hill - include 132 from Bullsmoor, exclude 123 to Chase.
Grange - exclude 369 to Firs Park, include 285 from London Road.
Firs Park - include 369 from Grange.
Green Street - include 770 from Enfield Wash, exclude 225 to Cambridge Road, exclude 307 to Ponders End.
Hedge Lane - include 238 from Tottenhall.
Jubilee - exclude 201 to St Peters.
Lincoln Road - exclude 99 to Willow and 308 to London Road.
London Road - exclude 285 to Grange, include 308 from Lincoln Road, exclude 198 to Willow and 84 to Ridgeway.
Merryhills - include 224 from Trent Park.
Oakwood - include 210 from Trent Park and 199 from Old Southgate.
Old Southgate - include 227 from Arnos, exclude 199 to Oakwood and 75 to Palmers Green.
Ordnance - include 101 from Bullsmoor, exclude 310 to Enfield Wash.
Palmers Green - include 75 from Old Southgate include 21 from Arnos.
Ponders End - include 307 from Green Street exclude 335 to St Alphege.
Pymmes - include 91 from Church Street.
Ridgeway - include 451 from Town and 224 from Trent Park.
St Alphege - include 335 from Ponders End.
St Peters - include 201 from Jubilee.
Tottenhall - exclude 238 to Hedge Lane.
Town - exclude 451 to Ridgeway, include 313 from Willow.
Trent Park - exclude 224 to Ridgeway, 304 to Merryhills and 210 to Oakwood.
Willow - exclude 313 to Town, include 198 from London Road and 99 from Lincoln Road.
I shall forward the plan and exact details of the suggested changes to the Commission.

Size of Council.
It must be obvious to everyone that I cannot proceed further with the consideration of the review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Enfield until I have made up my mind about what size the Council should be and I proceed firmly and speedily to grasp that nettle. Put in its simplest form the position is as follows: - The Borough Council want a Council of 70 members. All
other speakers objected to that figure on the grounds it was too many. The Labour Parties, the Liberals and the Edmonton Conservatives considered 66 (the Commission's number) to be the right figure. The National Front and the various Ratepayers and Residents Associations, the Federation and most of the individual speakers wanted a scheme for 60 Councillors, based where possible on the existing wards. Messrs Hyde and Oakden considered a Council of 30 members perfectly adequate. It is always difficult for an outsider to say what is the right size for a Council. No one expects me to spring like a genie from a bottle and produce an answer immediately. Nevertheless it is my duty to make a firm recommendation. I asked for, and received, details of the Council's committee structure, timetable of meetings and appointments on outside bodies. Mr Day in his statement gave figures of actual attendances over a period of 12 weeks. All these matters I noted and considered. Leaving aside the views of people who are not councillors, there was a complete conflict of evidence among those who are councillors. Councillor Young said 70 were needed, Councillor Warren said 66 could manage well and Councillor Dr Ridge really complained of not having enough work to do. Both the Members of Parliament supported a Council of 66. I thus find myself faced with a solid body of local opinion strongly against there being a Council of 70 members. Indeed the local ratepayers, through their representations, formed a solid chorus of objection to 70 members and also to 66. Mr Day referred also to the position of other London Boroughs in relation to size of Council and handed in a summary of the position as he knew it. From this summary and from my own knowledge I record the following. Of all the 32 London Boroughs the Commission have only made proposals for a Council of 70 in two cases - Croydon and Ealing - both larger than Enfield in electorate. There are 4 other Boroughs larger than Enfield in electorate and the size proposed by the Commission is: - Barnet (60) Bromley (60) Lambeth (64) and Wandsworth (61) - two inner and two outer London Boroughs. All the proposals that I have been considering (except Messrs Hyde and Oakden) are within the recommended range of 50 - 70 and above the recommended minimum of 2500 electors per Councillor. The Borough Council maintain that they have stuck to the figure of 70 since 1972. This I accept but attach no special weight to it. Neither do I accept the proposal that the choice of the Council should be of major significance. The whole object of these local meetings is to examine the position. I have given all proper weight to the Council's views and evidence but am quite firmly of the opinion that their proposals should not be approved. There is a solid weight of evidence against 70. I consider that the maximum figure in the guidelines should be used sparingly and I think it is too many for Enfield. I cannot believe that the Committee Structure cannot quickly be adapted to a Council of 66, which is only about a 5% reduction. My view is that 66 is the right number and this figure forms the basis of most of the other
schemes prepared by the political parties. I shall come later to the details of what particular scheme should be adopted. I now reject the Council's proposals for a Council of 70 members elected from 35 wards. In doing this I make it clear that I do so because of the decision I have made about the size of the Council and not on grounds of electoral equality. The Council's scheme cannot be faulted on an electoral ratio basis - in this respect it is almost perfect. The consequence of what I have said above is that all other schemes and proposals which do not provide for a Council of 66 are rejected. It would be discourteous if I just left it at that and I will say a few words about each, leaving Ponders End to the very last.

The National Front - Enfield Branch.
The Branch proposed a scheme for 60 Councillors elected from 30 wards. The scheme showed a rather uneven electoral ratio and the figures were outside the Commission's tolerances in four wards and only just in in four others. The average electorate per councillor varied from 2520 to 3782 - a range of 1262. There was no close and substantial argument on ward boundaries. Scheme rejected.

Their proposals were overall for a Council of 60 based on existing wards with some minor changes. The Association were primarily concerned with six existing wards - Grange, Town, Bush Hill South, Bush Hill, Ponders End and Church Street. Looking at the figures at the present time they reveal a very unsatisfactory state of electoral equality with entitlements ranging from 0.97 (Town) to 2.41 (Bush Hill) - all for 2 councillors. These figures are on a 60 member Council. I projected these figures to a 66 member Council and they were equally unbalanced. The same applies when I did the exercise for 1981. The scheme cannot be adopted and is rejected. I also see no reason to change the proposed name Raglan to Bush Hill Park. There is no ward called precisely Bush Hill Park at the present time and the ward name of Raglan cannot possibly affect the postal address or the Hotel and Station names. I also note that whilst the Association's proposal was based on existing wards there were quite substantial changes introduced into their scheme.

Federation of Enfield Residents and Allied Associations.
The Federation did not submit a plan for warding but had pressed for a Council of 60 based on existing wards with some minor, but unspecified, boundary adjustments. All I can say here is that the existing scheme shows some quite substantial variations in electoral balance. There is a range between electors/councillor ratios of 1238 - lowest 2786, highest 4024. It may be convenient in this paragraph to deal with the matter of the use of co-opted members on Committees. This suggestion was made by the Federation as well as a number of Associations and individuals. The constitution and membership of committees is wholly a matter for the Borough Council and not for me. All I will say is that I
agree with Mr Day when he said this was not a factor which should be used in
determining the size of the Council at a hearing such as this.

Messrs Hyde and Oakden.

Mr Hyde wanted the existing wards with each ward returning one member, making a
Council of 30. The figures that I gave in paragraph 34 would apply except the
un-balances would be compounded because of the number of councillors being
halved. For example it would give a ward with a figure of 1355 above the average
and one with 1121 below the average - a range of 2476. This is completely
unacceptable. A Council of 30 members for a Borough of the size and importance of
Enfield is just not on so far as I am concerned. Mr Hyde invited me to be bold
and reject the Commission's guidelines of size. I do not mind being asked to be
bold but I do not intend to be stupid. I make no comments on the views he expressed
about councillors and I attach no weight to the argument about saving money by
having a very small Council.

Various Schemes for a Council of 66.

Having decided that I am going to recommend a Council of 66 members it only
remains now to decide which scheme is to be chosen. I shall proceed on the basis
of an old-fashioned tontine and eliminate the schemes one by one until there is
only one survivor. There are 5 schemes to be considered - the Commission's draft
proposals, the Edmonton Conservatives scheme, the Labour Group of Council scheme,
the Liberals scheme and the Labour Parties scheme - and I will deal with them in
that order. I spent a good deal of time in experimenting with the idea of taking
bits out of each scheme and constructing a new one. The more I got into this
exercise the less happy I felt. The various permutations and combinations are as
numerous as the days in the year and I finally decided that I would have to
recommend a single scheme as it stood.

The Commission's draft proposals.

When I worked out the Commission's proposals on the revised figures for 1976 and
1981 I found there was a fair and regular equality of electorate with only two
slight excesses in 1976 and 1981. Highfield ward was marginally above the
tolerance and St Marks slightly below in 1976. In 1981 St Marks was still below
the tolerance but less so and Weir Hall was above. I am not recommending these
proposals for approval as other schemes have improved some of the boundaries.
In the absence of those other schemes the Commission's draft proposals would have
been perfectly acceptable.

Edmonton Conservatives Scheme.

This scheme showed a major number of alterations from the Commission's draft
proposals - all but five of the 33 wards had been amended. There were also changes
of name in three wards. I examined this scheme in relation to the revised figures
of electorate in 1976 and 1981. The standard of representation in 1976 was fairly
even and only one ward - Southgate Green - was outside the Commission's accepted tolerances. In the other three schemes yet to be considered the representation for this ward was much better: Conservatives 1.76, Labour Group 1.91, Labour Parties 2.10, Liberals 1.91. In 1981 the standard of representation is less satisfactory and there are three wards outside the tolerances - Hoe Lane, Pyrmes and Southgate Green. The figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Labour Group</th>
<th>Labour Parties</th>
<th>Liberals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Lane</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrmes</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Green</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N/A - cannot be compared directly)

On the grounds of electoral equality I reject this scheme.

Labour Group on Council.

This scheme was based on the Commission's draft proposals to which had been included the various possible modifications set out in the report of the Chief Executive and Town Clerk. Both in 1976 and in 1981 the electoral ratios were all within the Commission's tolerances although there were some variations which were slightly larger than I would have liked. This scheme is a satisfactory one and could easily be recommended for acceptance. The reason I am not doing so is that I consider that some boundary amendments in other schemes are marginally better.

Liberal Central Committee.

This scheme was based on the Commission's draft proposals to which had been included the various possible modifications set out in the report of the Chief Executive and Town Clerk and further changes had been proposed affecting 9 wards. Both in 1976 and 1981 the electoral ratios were all within the Commission's tolerances although in 1976 there were a few wards where the variations were larger than I would have liked - St Marks in particular and this was repeated in 1981. As this scheme is one of the final pair that I am considering I did a special exercise of comparison with that of the Labour Parties scheme which I shall be examining in the following paragraph.

The figures that I examined related to the 2 schemes as a whole, then the 9 wards where the Liberals had made further suggestions. On the 33 wards in 1976 the Liberals scheme was slightly better in 15 wards and slightly worse in 16 wards with 2 about equal. In 1981 the figures were respectively 14 and 14 with 5 about equal. The position in the nine wards referred was about equal. Thus I am left with a difficult situation where either scheme would be satisfactory. I am however not recommending the scheme for approval as I think the Labour Parties scheme has the better boundaries and I say so in the next paragraph. The Liberals scheme is a very good one and I had the greatest difficulty in deciding what to do.

Labour Parties Scheme.

The standard of representation of this scheme is fairly even but the revised
figures show some variations in 1976 and in two cases in 1981 the figures are marginally outside the tolerances – Palmers Green and St Marks. Taken as a whole it shows a good pattern of representation. It will be recalled that both Mr Pain and Mr Downs made a particular point of saying that their scheme had been prepared on the basis of figures provided by the Council and I think they were slightly apprehensive that the revised figures might have put the balance out a little. They were quite right. The scheme which they presented to the Commission was wholly within the tolerances. It is possible to say that various figures which I have used are so close that the decision could have gone to the Liberals or to the Labour Group on the Council. To that I would say that I have chosen the Labour Parties’ scheme also on the basis of some boundaries. Particularly in Oakwood, Trent and Merryhills do I think the Labour Parties boundaries are very much better than the Liberals and to a lesser extent those at Arnos and Bowes. I am therefore going to recommend the Labour Parties scheme for acceptance but with one very slight amendment which will give a better boundary. I recommend that the boundary between Trent and Oakwood wards in the extreme south west of Trent should continue straight down the centre of Bramley Road and Cat Hill to the Borough boundary. This I think is preferable to the present line which runs southwesterly from Bramley Road behind Bramley Close and the north westerly side of Green Road. The change would only mean the transfer of seven electors from Trent to Oakwood.

Mr H S A MacNair.

Mr MacNair, who did not attend the hearing, had written to the Commission objecting to the Commission’s proposals which placed a small number of roads (including Churchbury Lane where he lives) in the proposed Southbury ward instead of in Willow ward. The scheme that I am recommending will meet his point, as indeed do many other schemes – the Liberals, the Labour Group and the Council’s finally revised scheme.

Ponders End ward.

My main decision has been taken. But I have examined in great detail the possibilities of meeting some of the matters raised by the Ponders End Residents Association, the Federation, Mr L C Harrison, Mr W A Thomas and Mr F J W Welfare. To the extent that they wanted a Council of 60 they have lost the day but I believe that the preservation, and possible extension, of Ponders End ward is their principal objective. I must say at once that it is quite impossible to preserve the ward as it now exists. The figures are quite hopeless. The only way to meet all the points made at the hearing would be to scrap the whole scheme and make a new one built round Ponders End. This is clearly out of the question so what I have done is to juggle with various areas and figures and to see whether anything can be done. Firstly the matter of the Boundary Ditch has been solved and this has been used as the southern boundary from the Borough boundary.
westwards all the way to the Hertford Road. All the open part of the ditch is the boundary and part of it where it is culverted near Woodcote Close. The next suggestion was to include in the ward not only the area between Hertford Road and the Railway line (which is in the present ward) and includes Northfield and Southfield Road, but also the piece between the railway line and the Great Cambridge Road - the Lincoln Way area. As a help to assist me it was suggested that a piece in the north (The Ride/Durants Road) could go into Green Street ward and Nags Head Road and Lea Valley Road as far as the railway line on the east should form the northern boundary of Ponders End ward. The Council supplied me with figures for these areas. I am not pursuing one other suggestion concerning a boundary along Cuckoohall Lane as this would mean the Boundary Ditch would cease to be a boundary. For the sake of brevity I will give each of the areas a short name - the area between the Railway line and the Great Cambridge Road I will call Lincoln Way, the area between the Hertford Road and the railway line I will call Northfields, and the area between The Ride and Durants Lane I will call Nags Head. The electorate figures are: — Lincoln Way 242, Northfields 2026 and Nags Head 585. There is quite clearly no point in considering the transfer of the Lincoln Way area to Ponders End unless also the Northfields area is transferred but the contrary is possible - I could transfer Northfields and not touch Lincoln Way.

So if the two areas were transferred from Southbury ward it would mean a loss of 2268 electors from that ward and a gain of the same number by Ponders End. Electorate would then be Southbury 4607 Ponders End 8050. Leaving these figures in suspense for the moment I now turn to Nags Head. If this area was removed from Ponders End it would logically go into Green Street ward unless it was parcelled out elsewhere. A transfer of 585 from Ponders End would give the following result: — Ponders End 5197 and Green Street 6278. This taken on its own is not too bad but Ponders End would not give up Nags Head without something in return and here we come to the milk in the coconut. Ponders End, less Nags Head plus Northfields and Lincoln Way would give 7475 which is far too high and leave Southbury at 4607 which is far too low. The detachment of Lincoln Way (242) would be insignificant. My conclusion is that I cannot make the figures work and I have to reject all the proposals outlined above. The last matter I have to deal with was a request by Mr L C Harrison that I should look at Northfields Road and Southfields Road. This I have done and recommend no change because if these two roads alone were transferred to Ponders End it would mean an awkward stub end of the ward. Finally I may say that I do not think the Ponders End Residents Association will be seriously affected in their work. They already have members outside the ward (vide Mr Thomas) and I am sure they will get briskly on with recruiting when the final decision is made.
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Recommendations.
I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals for a Council of 66 members elected from 33 wards be approved subject to the modifications listed in the report of the Chief Executive and Town Clerk, as further amended by the three Labour Parties and subject to the additional small modification suggested by me in paragraph 41 of this report.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant.

L J SLOCÔMBE
Assistant Commissioner

8th June 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. D. Day</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Enfield 814 Green Lanes N.21</td>
<td>L. B. of Enfield Enfield Southgate Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Kayney</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Enfield 276, Baker St, Enfield</td>
<td>L. B. of Enfield   Enfield North Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ainsley</td>
<td>6 St James Cottages N19  N.9</td>
<td>Edwardian Conservative Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. Thomas</td>
<td>274 Lincoln Road Enfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Kelson</td>
<td>345, Lincoln Road Enfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Bell</td>
<td>22 Burmah Close Enfield 363/362</td>
<td>F.E.R.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Harrison</td>
<td>19 Havelock Road Enfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Broad Home 205, Forst N.13</td>
<td>Self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Commons</td>
<td>3 River Ford, Enfield  53, Racecourse Rd, N.11</td>
<td>Edmorton Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Warren</td>
<td>72 Lower Bridge Grove N.9</td>
<td>Labour Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Kent</td>
<td>22 Red Park View. Enfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Canada Ave N.18</td>
<td>Enfield Branch National Front.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Ashton</td>
<td>195 Walworth Rd, SE17</td>
<td>G. London Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. J. Mason</td>
<td>125, Green Oakley Lane, N 21</td>
<td>Labour Group on the London Borough of Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Davary</td>
<td>5 Hansemore Road N21</td>
<td>Winchmore Hill Liberals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Collins</td>
<td>58 Brecon Rd, Enfield</td>
<td>Edmonton Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Robinson lbs</td>
<td>58 Brook Rd, Enfield</td>
<td>Southgate Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Hewitt</td>
<td>56 Harrow Drive, N.9</td>
<td>Observer for Liberal Central Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lamont</td>
<td>351 Church St, N.9</td>
<td>Public Observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lamont</td>
<td>29, Boreham Rd, N.8</td>
<td>Royal Hill Estate Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. Rogers</td>
<td>weekly herald</td>
<td>Edmonton Cons Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Ferrerl</td>
<td>8 Newport Lodge, Enfield</td>
<td>Edmonton Cons Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Ferrerl</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Enfield</td>
<td>EDMONTON CONS ASSOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lamont</td>
<td>37 Greenfield Close, N.8</td>
<td>EDMONTON CONS ASSOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lamont</td>
<td>30 Northumberland Gardens, N.9</td>
<td>EDMONTON CONS ASSOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lamont</td>
<td>79, Cecil Road, Enfield</td>
<td>EDMONTON CONS ASSOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The names and addresses are filled in.*
### Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. J. Jones</td>
<td>Mr. Hone J. Common</td>
<td>S. W. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Chamberlain</td>
<td>Enfield Herald, High Rd</td>
<td>Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. V. Flinn</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Enfield</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Jackson</td>
<td>Enfield Herald, High Rd</td>
<td>Assist Town Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF WARD</td>
<td>NO OF COUNCILLORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGEL ROAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLSMOOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIG PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFIELD LOCK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFIELD WASH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFIELD LOCK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVELANDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHFIELD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOE LANE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUXLEY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUBILEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATYMER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRYHILLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKWOOD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMERS GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PONDERS END</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAGLAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST ALPHEGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARKS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PETERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHURY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHGATE GREEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLAGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIR HALL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINCHMORE HILL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORCESTERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARNOS WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the western part of the roundabout between Oakleigh Road South and Bowes Road, thence southeastwards crossing said roundabout to and along Bowes Road and Bowes Road (North Circular Road) to Hardwicke Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 133 Bowes Road, thence eastwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 131-121 Bowes Road to the western boundary of No 119 Bowes Road, thence southwards along said western boundary and continuing southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 5 - 47 Livingstone Road and the western boundary of No 56 Elvendon Road to Elvendon Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 94 Brownlow Road, thence southwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 92 - 68 Brownlow Road, thence in a straight line to and southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 66- 60 Brownlow Road, thence in a straight line to and southwards along the rear boundaries of No 56 - 48 Brownlow Road to Goring Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 46 Brownlow Road, thence southwards to and along said boundary to the northern boundary of No 44 Brownlow Road, thence eastwards along said boundary to and southwards along the rear boundary of said property and the rear boundaries of Nos 42 and 40 Brownlow Road, to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards along said borough boundary and northwestwards and northeastwards along the western boundary of said borough to the point of commencement.
BOWES WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Arnos Ward, thence generally northwards along said ward boundary to Bowes Road (North Circular Road), thence eastwards along said road and North Circular Road to the roundabout at the junction of said road and Great Cambridge Road, thence southwards along Great Cambridge Road to the footpath and road known as Tile Kiln Lane, thence generally southwestwards along said footpath and road and continuing southwestwards along Tottenhall Road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 234 Tottenhall Road, thence southeastwards along said northeastern boundary to the rear boundary of No 15 Stewartsby Close, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary, the rear boundary of No 17 Stewartsby Close and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of the access road running along the northern boundary of No 12 Stewartsby Close and the rear boundaries of Nos 154 - 170 Pasteur Gardens and southwestwards and north westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 172 and 174 Pasteur Gardens to Tottenhall Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of Atlasta Lodge, thence southwards to and along said eastern boundary and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of said lodge, the rear boundaries of Nos 198 and 196 Tottenhall Road and continuing southwestwards along the northwestern boundaries of the Sports Ground and the Allotment Gardens and in prolongation thereof to the footpath leading from Tottenhall Road to the southwestern corner of the Sports Ground, thence southeastwards along said footpath and in prolongation thereof crossing the northern perimeter of the Boundary Playing Fields to the footpath in said playing fields running southwestwards to and southwards along the eastern boundary of The Lodge to Norfolk Avenue, thence southwestwards and southwards along said footpath to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.
WEIR HALL WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Bowes Ward, thence generally northwestwards, and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the roundabout at the junction of Great Cambridge Road and Sterling Way (North Circular Road), thence eastwards along said way to a point being the prolongation southwards of the western boundary of the properties Nos 287 - 321 Silver Street, thence northwards along said prolongation and western boundary to a point in Kendal Avenue opposite the northern boundary of afore mentioned property, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary and southwards along the eastern boundary of said property to the rear boundary of No 285 Silver Street, thence eastwards along said rear boundary to and southwards along the eastern boundary of said property to Silver Street, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said street to a point opposite the western boundary of No 217 Silver Street, thence northwards to and along said western boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 215 - 163 Silver Street, crossing Lopen Road in a straight line to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 161 - 145b Silver Street, crossing Haslebury Road to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 145a - 125 Silver Street crossing Buliver Road in a straight line to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 123 - 101 Silver Street crossing Sheldon Road in a straight line to and southeastwards along Nos 93 - 77 Silver Street crossing Warwick Road in a straight line to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 75 - 65 Silver Street to the road known as Sweet Briar Walk, thence southwards along said road to Silver Street, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said street to Victoria Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 61 Silver Street, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundaries and the rear boundaries of Nos 59 - 51 Silver Street and in prolongation thereof to the Theobalds Grove - Bruce Grove.
railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.

ANGEL ROAD WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Weir Hall Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to Silver Street North Circular Road, thence eastwards along said road and continuing southeastwards and northeastwards along Angel Road to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said borough boundary to and northwestwards and westwards along the southern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

SOUTHGATE GREEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Arnos Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said borough boundary to Crown Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to High Street, thence southwards and southeastwards along said street and continuing southeastwards along the road known as The Green and the road known as Cannon Hill to the road known as Alderman's Hill thence southeastwards along said and northwards road to Ulleswater Road, thence northeastwards/along said road to Conway Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Fox Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to Grovelands Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the road known as Alderman's Hill, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of Broomfield Park, thence southwestwards to and along said eastern boundary to Broomfield Lane, thence westwards along said lane to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 56 Broomfield Avenue, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 58 - 108 Broomfield Avenue to and southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of No 108 Broomfield Avenue to Broomfield Avenue, thence southwestwards along said
avenue and in prolongation thereof to Pymme's Brook, thence northeastwards along said brook to the Kings Cross Hertford railway line, thence south-westwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Bowes Ward, thence westwards along said ward boundary to and northwestwards along the northern boundary of Arnos Ward to the point of commencement.

PALMERS GREEN WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Bowes Ward meets the eastern boundary of Southgate Green Ward, thence generally northeastwards and northwestwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwestwards along Fox Lane to St George's Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the road known as Bourne Hill, thence southeastwards along said road Hoppers Road and Hedge Lane to New River, thence generally southwards along said river to a point opposite the southern boundary of Hazelwood Sports Ground, thence southeastwards to and along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of No 14 Connaught Gardens, to the road known as Connaught Gardens, thence southwestwards along said road to the northern boundary of Bowes Ward, thence southwestwards and westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

HIGHFIELD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Bowes Ward meets the eastern boundary of Palmers Green Ward, thence northeastwards and generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary to and northwestwards along the northern boundary of Palmers Green Ward to the road known as Green Lanes, thence northeastwards along said road to Ridge Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to New River, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said river to Firs Lane, thence generally southwards along said lane to a point opposite the access way leading from Firs Lane to the rear of
Nos 195 - 267 Hedge Lane, thence northeastwards and northeastwards and southeastwards along said access way and in prolongation thereof to the access way that leads from Tatem Recreation Ground to Hedge Lane, thence southwards along said access way to Hedge Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the northeastern corner of Bowes Ward, thence south-westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

HUXLEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Weir Hall Ward meets the eastern boundary of Highfield Ward, thence north-westwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to a point opposite the southern boundary of the playing fields north of Rayleigh Road, thence eastwards to and northeastwards and eastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of No 1 Kipling Terrace to the southeastern corner of said property, thence eastwards in a straight line to the northwestern corner of No 33 Victor Villas in Great Cambridge Road, thence eastwards along the northern boundary of said property, the southern boundaries of Nos 7 and 8 Perry Gardens, the southern boundaries of Nos 85 - 75 Deansway, Nos 55-41 Deansway, Nos 23-9 Deansway and continuing eastwards to and along the southern boundary of No 243 Haselbury Road to Haselbury Road, thence southwards along said road to Park Lane, thence eastwards, northwards and eastwards along said lane to and crossing Victoria Road in a straight line to the southwestern corner of No 96 Victoria Road, thence eastwards along the southern boundary of said property, the rear boundaries of Nos 2 - 16a Sunnyside Road South and the southern boundary of No 1a Sunnyside Road East to the south-eastern corner of said property, thence due east from said corner to the Theobalds Grove - Bruce Grove railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Weir Hall Ward,
thence northwestwards and westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

CRAIG PARK WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Angel Road Ward meets the eastern boundary of Huxley Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northeastwards along the Bruce Grove - Theobalds Grove railway line to Church Street, thence southeastwards along said street to the southwestern carriageway of the gyratory system known as The Green, thence southeastwards along said carriageway to the road known as The Broadway, thence southwestwards along said road to St George's Road, thence eastwards and southwards along said road to a point being in prolongation northwestwards of the northern boundary of the Baths situated south of St Georges Chambers, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and northern boundary and in prolongation thereof to Plevna Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Salmon's Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to Montague Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Salmon's Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to its junction with the eastern spur of Salmon's Brook, that flows adjacent to the eastern boundary of Eley's Estate, thence due eastwards from said junction through the Sewage Treatment Works to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said borough boundary to the northern boundary of Angel Road Ward, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

GROVELANDS WARD
Commencing at a point on the northern boundary of Southgate Green Ward where Crown Lane meets High Street, thence northwards along said street to and northeastwards across Southgate Circus in a straight line to Chase Road,
thence northwards and northwestwards along said road to a point opposite
the northern boundary of No 156 Chase Road, thence northeastwards to and
along said northern boundary to and southeasterly along the rear boundary
of said property to the northern boundary of the access way that runs
to the north and east of Nos 158 – 168 Chase Road, thence northeastwards
along said northern boundary to and southeasterly along the eastern
boundary of said access way and the rear boundaries of Nos 168 – 178
Chase Road to the southern boundary of Oakwood School Playing Fields,
thence generally eastwards and southeasterly along said boundary to the
southeastern corner of said playing fields, thence due eastwards from
said point to the Southgate - Cockfosters railway line, thence northwes-
twards along said railway to a point due westwards of the southwestern
corner of Oakwood Park, thence due eastwards to said point and generally
eastwards along the southern boundary of said park to and northeasterly
along the southern boundaries of Nos 2 and 1 Oakwood Park Cottages and
the rear boundaries of Nos 55 – 39 Willow Walk to the eastern boundary of
Nos 167 and 169 The Vale, thence southeasterly along said eastern boundary
and the eastern extremity of the road known as The Vale to the northern
boundary of Nos 34 and 36 The Glade, thence eastwards along said northern
boundary to the rear boundary of said properties, thence southeasterly
along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 32-2 The Glade
to the road known as Gladeside, thence southeasterly along said road to
the road known as The Glade, thence southeasterly along said road to
Winchmore Hill Road, thence northeasterly along said road to and south-
easterly along Church Hill to a point opposite the northwestern boundary
of Groveland Park, thence southeasterly to and along said boundary to
and southeasterly and southeasterly along the western boundary of
said park to the road known as The Bourne, thence southeasterly along
said road and the road known as Bourne Hill to the western boundary of
Palmers Green Ward, thence southeasterly and southeasterly along said
boundary to the northern boundary of Southgate Green Ward, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

WINCHMORE HILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Highfield Ward meets the northern boundary of Palmers Green Ward, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary to and northwestwards, northeastwards and northwetwards along the eastern boundary of Grovelands Ward to Houndsden Road, thence northeastwards along said road and Hadley Way to Green Dragon Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the Kings Cross - Hertford railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway line to Vicar's Moor Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the northwestern boundary of Highfield Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

VILLAGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Huxley Ward meets the eastern boundary of Highfield Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the road known as Bush Hill, thence northeastwards and northwards along said road and northwestwards along Carrs Lane to a point opposite the eastern boundary of Chase Lodge, thence northwards to and along said eastern boundary to the northeastern corner of said property, thence eastwards in a straight line to the southwestern corner of No 21 Uvedale Road, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along the rear boundary of said property and continuing northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 19 - 1a Uvedale Road to and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of the last mentioned property to Walsingham Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern
boundary of No 36 Walsingham Road, thence northeastwards to and along said
northern boundary to the rear boundary of No 26 Essex Road, thence north-
eastwards along said boundary and continuing northeastwards and south-
eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 24-4 Essex Road and the southern
boundary of Nos 1-24 Salisbury Court to London Road, thence southwards
along said road to Lincoln Road, thence eastwards along said road to
Chalkwell Park Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to a point
opposite the southern boundary of No 2 Chalkwell Park Avenue, thence
westwards to and along said boundary to and northwards along the rear
boundary of said property and northwards and northeastwards along the
western boundaries of Nos 4-12 Chalkwell Park Avenue to the northeastern
boundary of Lincoln Court, thence northwestwards along said northeastern
boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of Lincoln Court
to the western boundary of Roseneath Walk, thence northwards along said
western boundary to the southern boundary of the Holy Family of Nazareth
Convent, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and northwards
along the eastern boundary of said convent and continuing northwards
along the eastern boundary of the Tennis Courts to the northeastern corner
of said courts, thence due eastwards to the footpath leading from Adelaide
Cottages to Chalkwell Park Avenue, thence southeastwards along said
footpath to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 20 Chalkwell
Park Avenue, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary to the
western boundary of Chalkwell Park Avenue, thence northeastwards along
said western boundary to the southern boundary of No 22 Chalkwell Park
Avenue, thence westwards along said boundary to and northwards along the
rear boundary of said property and the rear boundaries of Nos 24-38
Chalkwell Park Avenue to the northern corner of the last mentioned
property, thence due eastwards from said corner to the Enfield Town -
Bruce Grove railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway line
to Lincoln Road, thence westwards along said road to Wellington Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 18 Wellington Road, thence southwestwards to and along said northern boundary and the southern boundary of the Cricket Ground to the rear boundary of No 22 Wellington Road, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 24 - 32 Wellington Road crossing Private Road and continuing southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 34a - 50a Wellington Road and in prolongation thereof to Saddler's Mill Stream, thence southeastwards along said stream to a point opposite the boundary of No 52 Wellington Road, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundary to the footpath joining Wellington Road to Athole Gardens, thence southwestwards along said footpath to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 54 Wellington Road, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 56 - 62 Wellington Road to the rear boundary of No 3 Queen Anne's Gardens, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 5 - 9 Queen Anne's Gardens to the footpath leading from Lingfield Close to the rear of Nos 13 - 24 Lingfield Close, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said footpath and continuing southwestwards in a straight line to the eastern most point of No 46 Village Road, thence generally southwestwards along the rear boundary of said property, the rear boundary of No 48 Village Road and the southeastern boundary of the property known as Trederwen (Home for Elderly Ladies) to the northeastern boundary of St Stephens Court, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said boundary and the southeastern boundary of said property to Park Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to the road known as Queen Anne's Grove, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 1 Queen Anne's Grove, thence northwestwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the
rear boundaries of Nos 3 - 93 Queen Anne's Grove and continuing southwestwards along the western boundary of the building on the western side of No 421 Bury Street West to Bury Street West, thence northwestwards along said street to Church Street, thence southwards along said street to a point opposite the access way to the rear of Nos 1 - 75 Blakesware Gardens, thence southeastwards to and along said access way to Little Bury Street, thence southwestwards along said street to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 2 Ramscroft Close, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundary, southeastwards and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 6 - 28 Ramscroft Close and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 27 and 25 Ramscroft Close and in prolongation thereof to Salmon's Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to Great Cambridge Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 44 Kipling Terrace, thence northwestwards to and along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 43 - 11 Kipling Terrace crossing the access road south of No 11 Kipling Terrace in a straight line to and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 10 - 1 Kipling Terrace to the northern boundary of Huxley Ward, thence generally westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

LATYMER WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Craig Park Ward meets the northern boundary of Huxley Ward, thence westwards, northwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of Village Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to Salmon's Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to a point due north of the northeastern corner of No 72 Tillotson Road, thence due southwards to said northeastern corner, thence southeastwards along the rear boundary of said property and the rear boundaries of Nos 70 - 62 Tillotson Road
to and southeastwards and southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 78 - 2 Stanley Road and southwards along the eastern boundary of No 107 Church Street to Church Street, thence southeastwards along said street to the western boundary of Craig Park Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

RAGLAN WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Latymer Ward meets the eastern boundary of Village Ward, thence generally northwestwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the Enfield Town - Bruce Grove railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway to Great Cambridge Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of No 248 Bury Street, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 246 - 188 Bury Street to a point opposite the western boundary of Nursery at the rear of Nos 170 - 166 Bury Street, thence southwards to and along said western boundary and the rear boundary of No 164 Bury Street to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the rear boundary of No 162 Bury Street, thence southwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 160 - 156 Bury Street to the footpath leading from Darley Road to Winchester Road, thence eastwards along said footpath and in prolongation thereof to Bury Street, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said street to the Theobalda's Grove - Bruce Grove railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Latymer Ward, thence northwesternly along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
JUBILEE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Craig Park Ward meets the eastern boundary of Raglan Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwestwards and northeastwards along the Bruce Grove - Theobalds Grove railway line to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 70 Woodstock Crescent, thence southeastwards to and along said northern boundary to Woodstock Crescent, thence northeastwards along said crescent to Woodpecker Close, thence southeastwards along said close to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 34 Mayfield Crescent, thence northwards to and along said rear boundary to and eastwards along the northern boundary of said property crossing Mayfield Crescent in a straight line to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 143 - 9 Elmcroft Avenue and the rear boundaries of Nos 19 - 1a Southfield Road to the rear boundary of No 479 Hertford Road, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 477 - 457 Hertford Road crossing Galliard Road in a straight line to and southwards along the eastern boundary of No 194 Galliard Road to the northern boundary of St Alphege Church (C of E), thence eastwards along said northern boundary to Hertford Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 25 Byron Terrace, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 24 - 1 Byron Terrace to the northern boundary of No 411 Hertford Road, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 409 and 407 Hertford Road crossing Bedford Road in a straight line to and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 405 - 367 Hertford Road crossing the access way in a straight line south of the last mentioned property to and southwestwards along the
rear boundaries of Nos 365 - 349 Hertford Road crossing King Edward’s
Road in a straight line to and southwestwards along the rear boundaries
of Nos 347 - 329 Hertford Road to Bridlington Road, thence westwards
along said road to the unnamed road west of St Clement’s Court, thence
southwestwards along said road to Ripon Road, thence eastwards along
said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 315 Hertford
Road, thence southwestwards to and along said rear boundary and the
rear boundaries of Nos 313 - 295 Hertford Road crossing Cleveland Road
in a straight line to and southwestwards along the rear boundaries
of Nos 293 - 277 Hertford Road to the northern boundary of the Cock
Tavern (PH), thence northwestwards along said boundary to and south-
westwards along the rear boundary of said public house crossing
Houndsfield Road in a straight line to and southwestwards along the
rear boundaries of Nos 267 - 259 Hertford Road to North Road, thence
southeastwards along said road crossing Hertford Road and continuing
southeastwards along Forest Road to a point opposite the rear boundary
of No 308 Hertford Road, thence southwestwards to and along said rear
boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 306 - 278 Hertford Road crossing
Lowden Road in a straight line to and southwestwards along the western
boundary of No 1 Lowden Road and Nos 262 - 238 Hertford Road crossing
Grosvenor Road in a straight line to and southwestwards along the
rear boundaries of Nos 236 - 196 Hertford Road to Rosemary Avenue, thence
eastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the rear boundary of
No 192 Hertford Road, thence southwards to and along said rear boundary
and continuing southwards along the eastern boundary of the parcel of
land situated south of No 192 Hertford Road and the eastern boundary of
St Edmund’s RC Primary School, to Bounces Road, thence southeastwards
along said road to Bounces Lane, thence southwards along said lane to
the rear boundary of No 17 Monmouth Road, thence westwards along said rear
boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 15 - 1 Monmouth Road to
and southwards along the eastern boundary of the last mentioned property
to Monmouth Road, thence westwards along said road to New Road, thence
southwestwards along said road to the northern boundary of Craig Park
Ward, thence northwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to
the point of commencement.

ST MARKS WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Raglan Ward meets
Lincoln Road, thence generally southeastwards along said road to the
Theobalds Grove - Bruce Grove railway line, thence southwestwards along
said railway line and continuing southwestwards and southwards along the
western boundary of Jubilee Ward to the eastern boundary of Raglan Ward,
thence northwestwards, northeastwards and northwestwards along said ward
boundary to the point of commencement.

ST PETERS WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Craig Park meets
the eastern boundary of Jubilee Ward, thence northeastwards along said
eastern boundary to the rear boundary of No 2 Grosvenor Road, thence
southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos
4 - 10 Grosvenor Road to the western boundary of No 12 Grosvenor Road,
thence southwards along said western boundary to the rear boundary of
said property, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary, the rear
boundaries of Nos 14 - 34 Grosvenor Road to and along the northern
boundary of No 85 Westminster Road crossing Westminster Road in a straight
line to and eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 46 - 72 Grosvenor
Road to Chester Road, thence southwards along said road to a point
opposite the rear boundary of No 74 Grosvenor Road, thence eastwards to
and along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 76 - 98
Grosvenor Road to St Peter's Road, thence northwards along said road to
Woodlands Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 2 Woodlands Road, thence southwestwards to and along said western boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence eastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 4 - 20 Woodlands Road crossing the open space east of said properties in a straight line to and along the southern boundary of the access way to the rear of Nos 22 and 24 Woodlands Road, eastwards and southwards along the rear boundary of No 26 Woodlands Road to and eastwards and southeasterwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 28 - 94 Woodlands Road to the eastern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwards along said boundary to and eastwards along the northern boundary of No 48 Devonshire Road to Devonshire Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 43 Devonshire Road, thence south-eastwards to and along said northern boundary to the western boundary of No 15 Brierley Avenue, thence northeasterwards along said western boundary the eastern end of Woodlands Road and the southeastern and eastern boundaries of No 113 Woodlands Road to the northern boundary of the access way to the rear of Nos 15 -1 Brierley Avenue, thence eastwards along said boundary and the northern boundary of No 270 Nightingale Road, crossing said road to and continuing eastwards along the northern boundary of No 235 Nightingale Road and in prolongation thereof to the eastern boundary of the access way to the rear of Nos 219 - 289 Nightingale Road, thence southwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 81 Goodwin Road, thence eastwards along said boundary to and generally southwards along the eastern boundary of said property to Goodwin Road thence southeasterwards along said road to the Enfield Lock - Angel Road railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to National Grid Reference TQ 3564693979, thence due eastwards to and southeastwards along Pickett's Lock Lane to the eastern bank of the River Lee Navigation south of Pickett's Lock, thence due eastwards crossing the William Girling
Reservoir to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards along said borough boundary to the northern boundary of Craig Park Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

ST ALPHEGE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of St Peters Ward meets the eastern boundary of Jubilee Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of No 479 Hertford Road, thence southeastwards along said northern boundary to Hertford Road, thence northwards along said road and High Street to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 1 High Street, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to Boundary Ditch, thence southeastwards along said ditch to a point opposite the southeastern corner of the Chemical Works on Riverside Estate, thence northwards to said corner, thence southeastwards along the southern boundary of Riverside Estate to its southeastern corner, thence due eastwards from said corner to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said borough boundary to the northern boundary of St Peters Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

OAKWOOD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Southgate Green Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said borough boundary to the road known as Cat Hill, thence eastwards along said road crossing the roundabout junction with Chase side and continuing northeastwards along Bramley Road to Chase Road, thence southeastwards along said road and southeastwards and southwards along the western boundary of Grovelands Ward to the northern boundary of Southgate Green Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
TRENT WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Oakwood Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said borough boundary to the road known as The Ridgeway thence southeastwards and eastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of parcel No 0061 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 28 - 2999 Edition of 1970, thence southwards to and along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundaries of parcels Nos 0044 0019 and 0004 and continuing southwards along the eastern boundaries of parcels Nos 0004 and 0075 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 28 - 2998 Edition of 1970 to and westwards along the southern boundary of the last mentioned parcel and continuing westwards along the southern boundary of parcel No 0075 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 26 - 2798 Edition of 1971 to the western boundary of parcel No 0035, thence southwards along said western boundary to Hadley Road, thence eastwards along said road to the road known as The Ridgeway, thence southeastwards along said road to the road known as Slades Hill, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said road southwestwards along Enfield Road and Bramley Road to and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of Oakwood Ward to the point of commencement.

MERRYHILLS WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Oakwood Ward meets the southern boundary of Trent Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to a point opposite the western boundary of parcel No 5349 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 30-3196 Edition of 1969, thence southwards to and along said boundary to the southern boundary of said parcel, thence eastwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the rear boundary of No 61 Cotswold Way, thence southwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 63 - 67 Cotswold Way to the southernmost
point of the last mentioned property, thence southwards in a straight line to the northwestern corner of No 22 Glenbrook South, thence southwards along the western boundary of said property to the rear boundary of No 256 Lonsdale Drive, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary and eastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 258 - 286 Lonsdale Drive to the road known as Chiltern Dane, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 288 Lonsdale Drive, thence northeastwards to and along said rear boundary and northeastwards and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 290 - 302 Lonsdale Drive to World's End Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Eversley Park Road, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Winchmore Hill Ward, thence southwestwards along said ward boundary to and southwestwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along the northern boundary of Grovelands Ward to the eastern boundary of Oakwood Ward thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

GRANGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Merryhills Ward meets the southern boundary of Trent Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said southern boundary to and eastwards along Windmill Hill to the Hertford-Kings Cross railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to a point opposite southern boundary of No 17 Old Park Grove, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and the southern boundary of No 12 Old Park Grove to the rear boundary of said property, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 10 and 8 Old Park Grove to the rear boundary of No 115 Old Park Avenue, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of No 117 - 131 Old Park Avenue to the road known as Old Park Ridings, thence northeastwards along said road to Old Park Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to a point opposite the
northwestern boundary of the property known as Chase Lodge, thence north-
eastwards to and along said boundary to and southeastwards and north-
eastwards along the northern boundary of said property to the western 
boundary of Village Ward, thence generally southeastwards and southwest-
wards along said ward boundary and southwestwards along the northern 
boundary of Highfield Ward to the northern boundary of Winchmore Hill 
Ward, thence northwestwards, northwards and southwestwards along said 
ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Merryhills Ward, thence generally 
northwards along said boundary and westwards and northwards along the 
northeastern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

TOWN WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Grange Ward meets the 
eastern boundary of Trent Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern 
boundary to Bycullah Road, thence northeastwards along said road to 
Rowantree Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to Bycullah Road, 
thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said road to Byron Court, 
thence northeastwards along said court to the access way to the east of 
No 6 Byron Court, thence northwards along said access way to the rear 
boundary of No 10 Abbots Crescent, thence southeastwards along said rear 
boundary, the rear boundaries of Nos 8 - 2 Abbots Crescent and the southern 
boundary of No 61 Monks Road crossing said road in a straight line to and 
southeastwards along the northern boundary of No 30 and 28 Monks Road 
and the rear boundaries of Nos 14 - 2 Monks Close to the northeastern corner 
of the last mentioned property, thence due eastwards to the Kings Cross - 
Hertford railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway to the road 
known as Lavender Hill, thence eastwards along said road to the road known 
as Chase Side, thence southwards along said road to Laurel Bank Road, thence 
estwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern corner 
of St Michael's Hospital, thence southwards to said corner, thence eastwards
and southwestwards along the northern and eastern boundaries of said
hospital to the southern boundary of No 52 Armfield Road, thence
southeastwards along said southern boundary crossing Armfield Road in
a straight line to the southern boundary of No 43 Armfield Road, thence
southeastwards along said southern boundary and the northern boundary
of the Sports Ground to and southwestwards along the eastern boundary
of said Sports Ground to the rear boundary of No 12 Bell Road, thence
southeastwards along said rear boundary, the rear boundaries of
Nos 11–1 Bell Road and the northern boundary of Nos 234 and 236
Baker Street to Baker Street, thence southwards along said street and
Silver Street to Southbury Road, thence eastwards along said road to a
point in prolongation northwestwards of the Enfield Town – Bruce Grove
railway line, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and said
railway to the northern boundary of Village Ward, thence generally
southwestwards and westwards along said ward boundary to the eastern
boundary of Grange Ward, thence northwesterns and northeasterwards along
said ward boundary to and westwards along the northern boundary of
said ward to the point of commencement.

SOUTHBURY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of St Marks Ward meets
the eastern boundary of Village Ward, thence northwesterns along said
eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Town Ward to Southbury Road,
thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary
of No 18 Southbury Road, thence northwards to and along said western
boundary and in prolongation thereof to New River, thence northeasterwards
along said river to the footbridge and footpath between Tenniswood Road
and Ladysmith Road, thence southeasterns along said footbridge and
footpath to a point being the prolongation westwards of the northern
boundary of No 251 Ladysmith Road, thence eastwards along said prolongation
and northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property thence
southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of
Nos 249 - 217 Ladysmith Road to the footpath that leads from Ladysmith
Road to Donkey Lane, thence eastwards along said footpath and Donkey
Lane to a point being the prolongation westwards of the road known as
Cambridge Gardens, thence eastwards along said prolongation and said road
to Great Cambridge Road, thence southwards along said road to a point
opposite the northern boundary of Valour Works (Copper Wire), thence
eastwards to and along said northern boundary and the southern boundary
of Suffolks School Playing Fields to the rear boundary of No 38 Broadfield
Square, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and southwestwards
and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 37 - 12 Broadfield
Square and in prolongation thereof to the Theobalds Grove - Bruce Grove
railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to Southbury Road,
thence eastwards along said road to High Street, thence southwards along
said street to the northern boundary of St Alphege Ward, thence north-
estwards along said ward boundary and the northern boundary of Jubilee
Ward to the eastern boundary of St Mark's Ward, thence northeastwards along
said ward boundary to and northwestwards along the northern boundary of
said ward to the point of commencement.

WILLOW WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Southbury Ward
meets the eastern boundary of Town Ward, thence westwards and northwards
along said eastern boundary and continuing northeastwards along Baker
Street and northeastwards and eastwards along the road known as Forty
Hill to Russell Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point
opposite the northwestern boundary of No 8 Russell Road, thence north-
estowards to and along said boundary to the access way at the rear of
Nos 1 - 35 St George's Road, thence southeasterwards along said access way to the northwestern boundary of No 37 St George's Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeasterwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 39 - 47 St George's Road to the southeastern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the access way to the rear of Nos 49 - 61 St George's Road, thence southeasterwards along said access way to the northwestern boundary of No 63 St George's Road thence southwestwards along said boundary to the access way to the rear of Nos 72 - 92 Russell Road, thence southeasterwards along said access way to the western boundary of No 94 Russell Road, thence northeastwards southeasterwards and southwestwards along said boundary and the rear and eastern boundaries of said property to the rear boundary of Nos 96 and 98 Russell Road, thence eastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundary of Nos 100 and 102 Russell Road to and southwards along the eastern boundary of last mentioned property to Russell Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of the Sports Ground west of New River, thence southwards to and southwards, eastwards and southwards along said western boundary to Carterhatch Lane, thence southeasterwards along said lane to New River, thence southwards along said river to and continuing southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of Southbury Ward to the point of commencement.

PONDERS END WARD

Commencing at a point the northern boundary of St Alphege Ward meets the eastern boundary of Southbury Ward, thence northwards, westwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 72 Anglesey Road, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary, generally northeasterwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 74 - 78
Anglesey Road, eastwards along the southern boundary of the access way to the rear of Nos 58 - 42 Broadlands Avenue, the rear boundaries of Nos 52-35 Anglesey Road and Nos 7 - 11 Tenby Road to the rear boundary of No 16 Hertford Road, thence southwards along said rear boundary and southwards and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 14 - 2 Hertford Road to and northeastwards along the southern boundary of the last mentioned property to Hertford Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the road known as The Ride, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 143 The Ride, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 54 - 12 Bursland Road to the northern boundary of No 10 Bursland Road, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 8 - 2 Bursland Road to the rear boundary of No 94 Durants Road, thence southeastwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 96 - 114 Durants Road crossing Bursland Road in a straight line to the southern boundary of No 1 Bursland Road thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 - 53 Holmbridge Gardens and in continuation to the northwestern boundary of No 176 Durants Road, thence northeastwards along said boundary and southeastwards and southwestwards along the rear and southeastern boundaries of said property to the northern boundary of the access way to the rear of Nos 180 - 210 Durants Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary crossing Alexandra Road in a straight line to and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 98 - 2 King Edward's Road to Alma Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of The Alma (PH), thence eastwards to and along said boundary to and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of said property to Scotland Green Road North, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said road and
southeastwards along Duck Lees Lane to Aden Road, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said road crossing the roundabout junction and continuing southeastwards along Jeffreys Road to NG ref TQ 3649196242, thence due southwards to the western boundary of the Industrial Site situated on the eastern side of Jeffreys Road, thence southwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of said site, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of the British Waterways Depot to the southeastern corner of said depot, thence due eastwards from said corner to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said borough boundary to the northern boundary of St Alphege Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

CHASE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Trent Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards along said borough boundary to and southeastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to the eastern boundary of parcel no 5625 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TL 32-3300 Edition of 1971, thence southwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of parcel No 7007, thence eastwards, southwards and westwards along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of said parcel to the eastern boundary of parcel no 5900, thence southwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of parcel no 5900 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 32 - 3399 Edition of 1971 to Whitewebbs Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the track joining said road with Flash Lane, thence southwestwards to and along said track to Cuffley Brook, thence generally southeastwards along said brook to Turkey Brook, thence generally southwestwards along said brook to the road known as Clay Hill, thence southeastwards along said road to Browning Road,
thence southwestwards southwards and southeastwards along said road to
Lancaster Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the
eastern boundary of No 112 Lancaster Road, thence southwards to and south-
westwards along said eastern boundary continuing southwestwards along the
rear boundaries of Nos 2 - 64 and 66 Drake Street, to the southern boundary
the last mentioned property, thence westwards along said boundary to the
northern boundary of Town Ward, thence westwards, southeastwards and
westwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Trent Ward, thence
northwestwards along said ward boundary to and westwards, northwards and
northwestwards along the northern boundary of Trent Ward to the point of
commencement.

WORCESTERS WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Chase Ward meets the
northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said
borough boundary to Great Cambridge Road, thence southwards along said road
to the northern boundary of Southbury Ward, thence generally westwards
along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Willow Ward, thence
northeastwards along said boundary and northwestwards and southwestwards
along the northern and northwestern boundaries of said ward to the northern
boundary of Town Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along
said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Chase Ward, thence eastwards
along said boundary to and generally northwards along the eastern boundary
of said ward to the point of commencement.

HOE LANE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Southbury Ward meets
the eastern boundary of Worcesters Ward, thence northwards along said
eastern boundary to Turkey Brook, thence eastwards along said brook to a
point opposite the southern boundary of Nos 83 - 60 Auckland Close, thence southeastwards to and southeastwards and eastwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 56 Auckland Close, thence southwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 57 - 59 Auckland Close to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence eastwards along said southern boundary, the southern boundary of Auckland Close, the southern boundaries of Nos 51 and 43 Auckland Close, the southern boundary of Auckland Close, the southern boundary of No 35 Auckland Close and continuing eastwards along the northern boundary of the access road to the Garden of Remembrance to the Bruce Grove - Theobalds Grove railway line, thence northeastwards along said railway to Turkey Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Hertford Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Carterhatch Lane, thence westwards along said lane to the Theobalds Grove - Bruce Grove railway line, thence southwestwards along said railway to the northern boundary of Southbury Ward, thence westwards and northwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

GREEN STREET WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Ponders End Ward meets the eastern boundary of Southbury Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and northwards and generally eastwards along the eastern boundary of Hoe Lane Ward to Carterhatch Road, thence eastwards and southeastwards along said road to Brimsdown Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to Green Street, thence northeastwards along said street to Mollison Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to Millmarsh Lane, thence generally eastwards along said lane to its end, thence due eastwards from the end of said road to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and southwestwards along said borough boundary to the northern boundary of Ponders End Ward, thence
generally westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

ENFIELD WASH WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the northern boundary of Green Street Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of Hoe Lane Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and Hertford Road to Ordnance Road, thence eastwards along said road to Rotherfield Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 1 Rotherfield Road, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 3 - 49 Uckfield Road to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 88 Beaconsfield Road, thence southwards along said boundary to Beaconsfield Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 115 Beaconsfield Road, thence southwards to and along said boundary to Turkey Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to the Enfield Lock - Angel Road railway line, thence southwards along said railway to a point opposite the northern boundary of the GPO Works, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary and the southern boundaries of Nos 4 and 2 Lytton Avenue crossing Bilton Way in a straight line to and southeastwards along the northern boundary of the Government Training Centre to the southwestern boundary of the Depot, thence northwestwards along said boundary to and northeastwards along the northwestern boundary of the Depot and in prolongation thereof to Turkey Brook, thence southeastwards along said brook to the small River Lea or Lee, thence southeastwards along said river, crossing the River Lee Navigation to and eastwards along the Overflow Channel and in prolongation thereof.
to the western boundary of parcel No 2600 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan
TQ 36 - 3797 Edition of 1967, thence southwards along said boundary to
the southern boundary of said parcel, thence southeasterwards and north-
eastwards along said southern boundary and the eastern boundary of said
parcel to the southern boundary of parcel no 3900, thence southeastwards
along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough,
thence generally southeastwards along said borough boundary to the
point of commencement.

BULLSMOOR WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Hoe Lane Ward meets
the eastern boundary of Worcesters Ward, thence northwards along said
eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards
along said borough boundary to Hertford Road, thence southwestwards
along said road and the western boundary of Enfield Wash Ward to the
northern boundary of Hoe Lane Ward, thence generally westwards along
said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

ENFIELD LOCK WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Enfield Wash Ward
meets the eastern boundary of Bullsmoor Ward, thence northeastwards along
said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence
eastwards along said borough boundary to and generally southwards along
the eastern boundary of the Borough to the northern boundary of Enfield
Wash Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said northern boundary
to the point of commencement.