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INTRODUCTION

1. This is our final report on our review of the boundaries between the London Borough of Newham and the neighbouring boroughs of Redbridge, Greenwich, Tower Hamlets, Hackney and Waltham Forest. We are recommending a number of minor changes to these boundaries, to reflect local affinities and to tidy up anomalies; for example, where properties are divided between two separate authorities. In particular, we are recommending that the Aldersbrook Estate and Wanstead Flats should be united in Redbridge. We considered a suggestion by LB Waltham Forest that Stratford New Town should be transferred to its area, but we concluded that the evidence available to us did not justify such a major change. We have already reported to you on our final recommendations for the boundary between Newham and LB Barking & Dagenham (Report No. 660).

2. This report explains how we have arrived at our conclusions, following public consultation on our initial draft proposals for changes, and on our subsequent further draft proposals for several areas. Our recommendations are summarised in Annex B.

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

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

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

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

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

7. As with our previous London borough reports, we have thought it appropriate to note some general considerations which have been raised by our examination of these boundaries.

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

9. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which it had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as it
makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.

10. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since local government in the capital was reorganised in 1965, and to offer our thoughts on the issues raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We have therefore published a general report, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs" (Report No. 627), which discusses the wider issues which have arisen during our review of London.

11. Our view remains that this review is not the right occasion for an reappraisal of the extent of London or the pattern of London boroughs, which would inevitably raise questions about the nature and structure of London government. However, we have seen it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which have arisen and which may need to be considered in any more fundamental review of London in the future. Our review of Newham has touched on the following such issues: the redevelopment of the Docklands area (paragraph 12 below); the influence of major new roads (the A406, paragraphs 21 and 23); and the relationship between local communities and local government boundaries (at the Aldersbrook Estate, paragraph 29; at Wanstead Flats, paragraph 33; and in the areas between and in the vicinity of Stratford, Leytonstone/ Leyton, and Forest Gate, paragraphs 43, 47 and 51).

DOCKLANDS

12. We noted the central position occupied by the area known as London Docklands in the Boroughs of Newham, Tower Hamlets, Southwark and Greenwich, and considered whether to pursue the concept of a Docklands Borough. However, we recognised that although some of the Boroughs' planning responsibilities had been affected by the activities of the London Docklands Development Corporation, this body would be wound up once its task was completed. Local authorities in the area still played a major role in providing services, and it was envisaged that they would resume their full role on the dissolution of the LDDC. It was clear to us that the area would be subject to more change in the future, and we concluded that it would be premature to propose changes to the pattern of local government in Docklands.
THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

13. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Newham, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets, Greenwich, Hackney and Waltham Forest. In addition we received 31 individual representations from members of the public and interested bodies.

OUR DRAFT AND FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM

14. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published two further consultation letters in connection with this review. The first, relating to Newham's boundaries with Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Hackney and Tower Hamlets announced our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, and was published on 29 January 1990. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. Newham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Hackney and Tower Hamlets were asked to publish a notice advertising our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, they were requested to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 26 March 1990.

15. We received a total of 96 individual representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decisions. They included comments from Newham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Hackney Tower Hamlets, and Mr James Arbuthnot MP. The remainder were from local residents.

16. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposals in respect of Newham's boundaries with Redbridge and Waltham Forest, was issued on 30 April 1991, and received similar publicity. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Comments were invited by 25 June 1991.

17. In response to our further draft proposals, we received 31 individual responses: from Newham, Redbridge, and Waltham Forest; from a local councillor; and from local residents.
OUR PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN NEWHAM AND GREENWICH

18. We received no suggestions in respect of this boundary, which follows the River Thames; a readily identifiable natural feature and a clear barrier between communities. We consider the present boundary to be satisfactory and accordingly recommend no changes.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN NEWHAM AND REDBRIDGE

(a) ROMFORD ROAD/LITTLE ILFORD (THE A406)

Our draft proposal

19. Both local authorities commented on the boundary between the Ilford Golf Course and a point just to the north of where the Woodgrange Park/Barking railway line and the LUL District Line pass under the (then recently-completed) South Woodford to Barking Relief Road, the A406. Newham accepted that the Golf Course looks to Ilford and should therefore remain in Redbridge. However, it believed that the River Roding was a major barrier in this area and suggested that the boundary should be realigned along the Manor Park/Ilford railway line and should then follow the river to the south. Redbridge preferred that the boundary south of the railway line should be realigned to the centre-line of the A406, which it considered to be the most significant barrier in this area.

20. We agreed that, while the river is a major feature further to the south, the A406 represented a more significant barrier in this area and would provide a tangible and well defined boundary. We therefore adopted Redbridge's suggestion as our draft proposal, realigning the boundary westwards along a stretch of the Woodgrange Park/Barking railway line, northwards along the A406 (the western edge, as this appeared to offer a clearer line), and then along the Manor Park/Ilford railway line to rejoin the present boundary at Alders Brook.

Our final proposal

21. While Redbridge supported our draft proposal, Newham objected, taking the view that the River Roding would be a more suitable
boundary from the Manor Park/Ilford railway line southwards to its
boundary with Barking & Dagenham. The Council pointed out that this
stretch of the A406 was raised on an embankment and that access to
the area between this and the river was only possible from Newham,
and noted that we had proposed that the Newham/Barking & Dagenham
boundary to the south of the LUL District Line should be realigned
to the river. It also drew our attention to its role as agent for
the Department of Transport in maintaining the A406, arguing that
it would be sensible for the road to be located within the borough.

22. Mr James Arbuthnot MP supported our draft proposal. A member
of the public opposed it, taking the view that it would transfer
to Redbridge areas which are only accessible from Newham. He
favoured the use of the River Roding as the eastern boundary of the
borough, from the River Thames in the south to the northern
boundary with Redbridge.

23. Having considered these representations, we were not convinced
that the River Roding would provide a suitable boundary in this
area. The fact that the A406 runs along an embankment reinforces
our view that it represents a major physical barrier. It appears
that the narrow strip of land between the embankment and the river
would be relatively inaccessible irrespective of the location of
the boundary. Our original draft proposal for the Newham/Barking
& Dagenham boundary south of the LUL District Line realigned it to
the River Roding. However, in the light of evidence that the River
was not a major barrier in this area and that our proposal would
split a business community, we subsequently proposed that this
boundary should be realigned to the western edge of the A406.

24. We have reconsidered our draft proposal in the light of
Newham's role as agent for the Department of Transport. It appears
sensible that the road should for the most part remain in the area
of the authority responsible for maintaining it. In principle, the
use of the A406 would create a robust and durable boundary in this
area. Aligning this boundary to the eastern side of the road or to
related ground features would not call into question the current
maintenance arrangements; moreover, in our view, none of the
evidence before us suggests that such an alignment would be any
less satisfactory, in terms of effective and convenient local
government, than an alignment to the western side.
25. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, with a modification to align the boundary to the eastern side of the road or to appropriate ground features nearby. Our Report (No.660) on our review of the borough of Barking & Dagenham recommends that the Newham/Barking & Dagenham boundary should also be realigned to the eastern side of the A406.

(b) ALDERSBROOK ESTATE, THE CITY OF LONDON CEMETERY AND WANSTEAD FLATS

26. Newham suggested that the southern part of Wanstead Flats (the area bounded by Dames Road, Sidney Road, Woodford Road, Capel Road and Aldersbrook Road) should be transferred to its area, by realigning the boundary to run between Aldersbrook Road (at St Margaret's Road) and the Dames Road/Cann Hall Road junction. Redbridge suggested that the City of London Cemetery, the eastern part of Wanstead Flats, and the Aldersbrook Estate should be united in its area, to facilitate operation of environmental and trading controls. Nine members of the public supported this suggestion, drawing attention to the self-sufficient nature of the Estate and to what they considered to be the resulting sense of community.

(i) THE ALDERSBROOK ESTATE

Our draft proposal

27. We took the view that this estate is a homogeneous community which is divided by the present boundary. We decided to issue a draft proposal that the part of the Estate now in Newham should be transferred to Redbridge, to unite it in a single borough (Redbridge) and thereby improve the provision of services. The proposed boundary followed the eastern curtilage of Wanstead Park Avenue and the western curtilage of Aldersbrook Road.

Our final proposal

28. Our draft proposal was supported by Redbridge, Mr James Arbuthnot MP, and 73 members of the public. We also received two petitions (37 signatures) in favour of the proposed change. However, Newham believed that the Aldersbrook Estate was isolated from all the surrounding boroughs by open space (and particularly from Redbridge by the A406), and that the Manor Park shopping
centre (in Newham) was the community focus for the eastern half of
the Estate. The Council suggested that the Estate should be united
in Newham and that the part already in the Borough should not be
transferred to Redbridge. A member of the public also suggested
that the Estate should be united in Newham, on the grounds that the
socio-economic mix of the borough would be widened by the addition
of the professional people who, he believed, lived in this
relatively affluent area.

29. Having considered these representations, we concluded that the
volume of support for our draft proposal indicated that our view
of the local community of interest was correct, and that the
residents of the Aldersbrook Estate look to Redbridge, in which the
larger part of the Estate is already located, for local services
and facilities. While there may be some basis for the view that the
area is isolated from Redbridge, local residents appear to consider
themselves to be more isolated from Newham. We note the view that
the Estate should be united in Newham for socio-economic reasons,
but this would appear to be contrary to the wishes of many local
residents and, in any case, we do not consider that boundaries
should be altered solely in order to influence the social
composition of boroughs. We have therefore decided to confirm as
final our proposal to unite the Aldersbrook Estate in Redbridge.

(ii) THE CITY OF LONDON CEMETERY AND WANSTEAD FLATS

Our interim decision

30. Although we considered Redbridge's view that it would be in
the interests of effective and convenient local government to
transfer the City of London Cemetery to Redbridge and to unite
Wanstead Flats in its area, we noted that both facilities are
administered by the Corporation of London (and are maintained on
its behalf by the Epping Forest Conservators). As there appeared
to be no reason to conclude that this arrangement was
unsatisfactory, we reached an interim decision to propose no change
to the boundary in this respect.

Our further draft proposal

31. In response to our interim decision, Newham reiterated its
suggestion that the southern part of Wanstead Flats should be
united in its area, for historical reasons. The Council also opposed the suggestion that the City of London Cemetery should be transferred to Redbridge. It pointed out that it has considerable experience and expertise in dealing with the environmental problems associated with crematoria, and that the Cemetery grounds form a valuable addition to Newham's limited stock of public open space.

32. The present boundary across Wanstead Flats is poorly defined. In view of this, and our conclusion (in our Report No 648 on our review of the other boundaries of Redbridge) that the Redbridge/Waltham Forest boundary should be realigned to the western edge of the Flats, we reconsidered our interim decision not to propose any change to the Redbridge/Newham boundary across the Flats.

33. We concluded that there was merit in Redbridge's contention (reiterated in the context of the Redbridge/Waltham Forest boundary review) that uniting the Flats in one borough would facilitate the enforcement of environmental and trading controls. However, we concluded that there was insufficient evidence to justify the transfer of the City of London Cemetery from Newham to Redbridge, but that it would be sensible to unite the Flats in Redbridge, in which they are, for the most part, currently situated.

34. Accordingly, we adopted as a further draft proposal an alignment which follows the southern perimeter of the Flats before turning north along Forest Drive and the rear curtilages of properties in Wanstead Park Avenue to join the existing boundary at the north-west corner of the City of London Cemetery, thereby uniting Wanstead Flats in Redbridge.

Our final proposal

35. Redbridge supported our further draft proposal, but pointed out that it did not include the small area of Wanstead Flats to the east of Forest Drive. The Council reiterated its view that the Flats should be united in a single local authority area. A member of the public also supported our proposal and drew attention to this area, which he feared might be considered for development.

36. Newham opposed our further draft proposal, suggesting that the division of the Flats had not led to any problems. The Council drew attention to the management responsibilities of the City of London
Corporation, and suggested that the role of other local authorities was very limited. However, it believed that Newham residents would be disadvantaged if they were obliged to contact another local authority (Redbridge) if environmental problems arose.

37. The Council considered that it would be better to maintain the status quo so that all those affected by activities on the Flats could turn to their own local authority if any problems arose. It also commented that the sports pitches and changing facilities near Capel Road were not used to any great extent by Redbridge residents, and requested that a small building in that area (containing changing rooms and two residential flats) which was split by the existing boundary, should be united in its area.

38. We concluded that the arguments submitted by Newham were not sufficient to persuade us to alter our view that Wanstead Flats should be united in Redbridge. While we recognise that the residents of the two flats mentioned by the Council may look to Manor Park and Forest Gate in Newham, we considered that the changing rooms in this building, by their nature, relate closely to the recreational facilities on Wanstead Flats, and that it would be inappropriate to place them in a different local authority area. If the two councils agree, there appears to be no reason why Newham could not continue to service the building.

39. The triangular area of land east of Forest Drive appeared to us to be relatively self-contained, as it is separated from the main part of the Flats by a major road. To transfer it to Redbridge would, in our view, create an undesirable salient.

40. Having considered all the evidence before us, we have decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN NEWHAM AND WALTHAM FOREST

(a) CROWNFIELD ROAD/CANN HALL ROAD

Our draft proposal

41. Newham suggested that an undefined stretch of the boundary should be realigned to Crownfield Road and Cann Hall Road. It considered that the present boundary is essentially arbitrary,
dividing individual properties and a cemetery and meandering through a primarily residential area (made up largely of terraced housing), and that minor change alone would not result in a rational or an easily identifiable boundary.

42. The suggested change would transfer some 3000 electors from Waltham Forest to Newham. Waltham Forest pointed out that more than 500 of these electors occupy properties which it owns. The Council suggested four minor realignments, to rectify anomalies and to ensure that Knighton Road, Vansittart Road, Sidney Road and Janson Road were each united within the same local authority area. We also received 22 individual representations concerning this area, of which 21 opposed Newham's proposal.

43. While we accepted that Newham's suggestion would create an identifiable boundary, we considered that there was no evidence of benefits, in terms of effective and convenient local government, sufficient to justify change on this scale. The shops and facilities in Crownfield Road would be divided if this suggestion were adopted, but they appeared to form a small community focus. While it is not easy to identify a good boundary in a densely populated area such as this, we concluded that, in general, the minor amendments suggested by Waltham Forest would be satisfactory in this respect.

44. However, the present boundary divides Sidney Road and Knighton Road between two boroughs. We therefore decided to realign the boundary to Sidney Road, Forest Road and Dames Road, to improve service provision and facilitate road maintenance. We also decided to adopt Waltham Forest's suggestions in respect of Vansittart Road and Odessa Road, and in the Janson Road and Crownfield Road areas, to rectify the anomaly of split properties, and to unite West Ham Cemetery and West Ham Jewish Cemetery in Newham by realigning the boundary to their northern curtilages. We therefore issued draft proposals to this effect.

**Our further draft proposal**

45. We received objections to our draft proposal from Newham, from 10 members of the public (of whom two suggested further boundary changes), and in the form of a petition containing 17 signatures. Redbridge supported our proposal, as did Mr James Arbuthnot MP.
46. Newham preferred its original suggestion, on the basis that the area between Cann Hall Road and the present boundary looked south to Forest Gate, and that local government services could therefore be provided more effectively from Newham. The Council believed that its suggestion offered a means to unite areas with a clear community of interest. It also considered that our proposals were flawed in detail. In its view, the residents of the area bounded by Forest Road, Dames Road and Woodford Road looked to Forest Gate (a view endorsed by two residents of Knighton Road); to reflect this, the boundary should follow Dames Road between Vansittart Road and Sidney Road and should then run north-eastwards across Wanstead Flats (the Council's reasons are noted in paragraphs 26 and 31 above). The Council also indicated that if the boundary was to follow Sidney Road and Janson Road, it would prefer a centre-of-road alignment.

47. Having considered these representations, we were not persuaded that the case for major change was sufficiently strong to justify the disruption that would inevitably follow. While Stratford is the major centre nearest to the areas in question, many facilities are readily available in Leytonstone, not far to the north. However, we accepted that the residents of Sidney Road and Knighton Road appeared to have more affinity with Forest Gate in Newham than with Leytonstone, and that the Council's suggested realignment along Dames Road would reflect that community of interest. We therefore decided to adopt Newham's suggestion as our further draft proposal, although, for the reasons set out in paragraph 33 above, we did not endorse the Council's suggested boundary across Wanstead Flats.

Our final proposal

48. We received 21 responses to our further draft proposal in respect of Dames Road, of which ten (and a petition containing the signatures of 102 residents) were objections. LB Waltham Forest also suggested a radical change to the boundary west of the West Ham Cemetery. This suggestion is considered separately, in paragraphs 53-55 below.

49. Both Waltham Forest and a Waltham Forest councillor preferred our original draft proposal, stating that the residents of Sidney Road and Knighton Road use services provided by LB Waltham Forest. However, the councillor noted that residents tended to use shops
in Forest Gate and in Stratford, which are both in Newham. LB Newham and a local resident considered that the residents of these roads look southwards, to Forest Gate, although the Council believed that more radical change than our further draft proposal envisaged was needed to reflect local patterns of community life. The Council also reiterated its preference that the boundary should follow the centre-lines of roads rather than their sides.

50. We have considered the views expressed in these responses, several of which express concern about the effect of the proposed change on the arrangements for educating local children. In our view, such fears are misplaced; the Courts have recently ruled that local education authorities' admission policies should be based firstly on sibling links and secondly on the proximity of the child's home to the school, regardless of local authority boundaries, thereby reinforcing parental choice.

51. While we recognise that many local residents prefer the status quo, we have concluded that, given the proximity of Sidney Road and Knighton Road to Forest Gate, and the community links to that area identified in these and earlier representations, our further draft proposal is the most appropriate way to address the anomaly whereby these roads are split by the boundary. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

52. We have also considered the request by Newham for centre-of-road alignments between Burgess Road and Dames Road, in place of the side-of-road alignments which we had proposed. The Council argued that centre-line alignments would allow for maintenance agreements between authorities, with costs shared. However, our proposal for Dames Road continues an existing side-of-road alignment, and we have concluded that to adopt the Council's suggestion would create an awkward boundary in this area. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our further draft proposal in respect of Dames Road but, in view of the different situation between Janson Road and Burgess Road, to modify our draft proposal for this area by aligning the boundary to the centre-lines of the roads in question.

(b) STRATFORD NEW TOWN

53. Waltham Forest suggested that its boundary with Newham should
be realigned southwards along the Leyton/Stratford railway line, eastwards along the Liverpool Street/Southend railway line, and northwards along the western curtilages of Forest Gate Hospital and West Ham Cemetery, thereby transferring some 6000 electors, and the area known as Stratford New Town, from Newham to Waltham Forest. The Council believed that the area, which in its view focusses on the A11 road, had a strong affinity with Leyton and Leytonstone to the north, and that service provision would be improved by the suggested change. It also commented that the gain in terms of electors would compensate for the change we had proposed at Woodford Green, involving the transfer of more than 2000 electors from Waltham Forest to Redbridge (which we have now confirmed as final in our Report No. 648 on the boundaries of Redbridge).

54. Newham opposed this suggestion, pointing out that the area in question adjoins what it regarded as the main administrative, retail, commercial and transport centre and the main community focus in Newham, Stratford Town Centre, but was remote from comparable facilities in Waltham Forest.

55. We have received no representations suggesting that there are any problems with service provision in this area, nor any supporting Waltham Forest's views in any way. The fact that the area is close to Stratford Town Centre clearly indicates strong and established links with Newham, which appear to be reinforced by the predominance of municipal housing (a fact drawn to our attention by Newham). We note that the suggested change would increase the electorate of Waltham Forest and that this would balance, in part, the result of a boundary change elsewhere. The important point to take into account is that the changes we have proposed for Waltham Forest would not in our view have the overall effect of undermining its viability as a London Borough. Moreover as Waltham Forest has provided no evidence to support its assertion that the change would result in more efficient and cost-effective service provision, we have decided not to pursue the change it suggests.
Our draft proposal

56. Newham suggested that the boundary in this area, which runs along Temple Mill Lane, should be realigned to follow the railway north to the point where it is crossed by the proposed alignment of the A12 Hackney Wick to M11 Link Road. We noted that it is intended that the new road will follow the line of Temple Mill Lane between that point and the River Lee, and we agreed that the railway line and the proposed road alignment would provide a tangible and well defined boundary.

57. We therefore decided to adopt the Council's suggestion as our draft proposal, with a technical amendment to realign the boundary along the northern side of the Lane.

Our final proposal

58. Newham, Mr James Arbuthnot MP and one member of the public supported our draft proposal. Waltham Forest and three members of the public objected. Waltham Forest stated that the boundary should follow the curtilage of the proposed realignment of Temple Mill Lane; the northern curtilage of the Lane from Major Road westwards and then northwards to rejoin our proposed alignment at the Stratford railway line. The Council also suggested that the boundary should run westwards along the southern curtilage of the proposed M11 Link Road to the boundary with Hackney. It considered that these amendments would avoid dividing the Link Road between the two authorities. The Council also believed that aligning the boundary to Temple Mill Lane rather than to the railway line would be preferable because the land between them (some of which is owned by Waltham Forest) was the subject of discussions between the Council and British Rail; and because our draft proposal would divide the marshalling yard.

59. A member of the public opposed our draft proposal because it would transfer the M11 Link Road to Waltham Forest and threaten the existence of an animal sanctuary located between the railway line and Temple Mill Lane. In his view, the proposed boundary change would assist the implementation of road schemes favoured by Newham, which he opposed.
60. We concluded that although the alignment suggested by Waltham Forest might have merit in future, it would be premature to adopt this line before the link road has been constructed. We consider that our draft proposal would result in a more satisfactory boundary in this area, and we have therefore decided to confirm as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN NEWHAM AND HACKNEY

RIVER LEE

Our draft proposal

61. Newham suggested that the boundary should be realigned westwards from Temple Mill Lane to the River Lee and should then follow the centre line of the River southwards to the point where this boundary meets the Newham/Tower Hamlets boundary. This would transfer to Newham an area of land which is owned and managed by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority as a leisure/recreation facility. The Council pointed out that the present alignment is arbitrary and that most of the industrial area through which it runs is already in Newham (the rest is accessible only from that borough). It believed that semi-derelict and under-used land is adversely affecting neighbouring areas and that unification in one borough would assist planning and the provision of health, environment, and public protection services. Hackney objected, on the grounds that it needed to be able to manage both sides of the river, for conservation and leisure purposes.

62. We considered that in such a densely populated area, the river forms a clearly identifiable boundary, and that it is used as such to the north and south of this area. We decided to adopt Newham’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

Our final proposal

63. Both authorities supported our draft proposal, as did Mr James Arbuthnot MP. LB Newham suggested that the present boundary is an historical anomaly which needs to be corrected, while LB Hackney recognised that the area is physically separated from the rest of Hackney by the River Lee and agreed that it would be sensible to align the boundary to a clear natural feature. One member of the
public opposed our proposal, believing that LB Hackney was more sensitive to local needs than is LB Newham.

64. We concluded that the River is the natural boundary in this area. All the evidence suggests that our draft proposal would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government in this area, and we have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN NEWHAM AND TOWER HAMLETS

RIVER LEE

Our draft proposal

65. As an extension of its suggestion for the Newham/Hackney boundary (paragraphs 61-64 above), Newham suggested that this boundary should be realigned to the centre-line of the River Lee; from the Newham/Hackney boundary southwards to the point where it rejoins the river between Waterworks River and City Mill River, and from the point north of the Northern Outfall Sewer where it again diverges from the river to the junction between the River Lee and the Bow Back River. The Council pointed out that the present boundary divides an industrial estate and stated that the area (which has limited access from Tower Hamlets) is as run-down as the riverside area to the north, and causes similar problems.

66. The present boundary is anomalous and we agreed that the River Lee forms a clearly identifiable feature. We decided to adopt Newham's suggestion as our draft proposal, to unite the industrial area in one borough, unite divided properties, and align the boundary to a firm natural feature.

Our final proposal

67. Both local authorities supported our draft proposal, and we have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

68. The electoral consequences of our proposals are outlined in Annex B to this report. Their effect on the standard of representation in the areas concerned is negligible.
CONCLUSION

69. We believe that our final proposals, which are summarised in Annex C to this report, are in the interests of effective and convenient local government, and we commend them to you.

PUBLICATION

70. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Newham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Hackney, Greenwich and Tower Hamlets, asking them to make available copies of this report for inspection at their main offices for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. We have arranged for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The notices will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing its recommendations, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date they were submitted to you.

71. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft and further draft proposals letters of 29 January 1990 and 30 April 1991, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed: K F J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
21 May 1992
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

NEWHAM LB

AFFECTING THE LONDON BOROUGHS OF REDBRIDGE, WALTHAM FOREST, HACKNEY AND TOWER HAMLETS

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing Boundary
Proposed Boundary
Other boundary divisions
Other Final Proposal Boundary

Produced by Ordnance Survey for the
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Little Ilford Ward</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Loxford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Loxford Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Little Ilford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Little Ilford Ward</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Loxford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Loxford Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Little Ilford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Forest Gate Ward</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Wanstead Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Manor Park Ward</td>
<td>Redbridge LB \ Wanstead Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cann Hall Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Forest Gate Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Forest Gate Ward</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cann Hall Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cann Hall Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cann Hall Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C E I</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cathall Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D F G H</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Cathall Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Waltham Forest LB \ Leyton Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney LB \ Kings Park Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D E F</td>
<td>Hackney LB \ Wick Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB \ Park Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ New Town Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB \ Park Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Stratford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LB \ Bow Ward</td>
<td>Newham LB \ Stratford Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX C**

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES**

**LB NEWHAM — BOUNDARIES WITH REDBRIDGE, WALTHAM FOREST, HACKNEY, TOWER HAMLETS, AND GREENWICH.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed Boundary Changes</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREENWICH</td>
<td>final proposal to make no change</td>
<td>para. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDBRIDGE</td>
<td>realignment to eastern side of A406</td>
<td>paras. 19-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Rd/Little Ilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersbrook Estate</td>
<td>realignment to unite the estate in Redbridge</td>
<td>paras. 27-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London Cemetery</td>
<td>remain in Newham</td>
<td>paras. 30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanstead Flats</td>
<td>realignment to unite Flats in Redbridge</td>
<td>paras. 30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTHAM FOREST</td>
<td>realignment along Dames Road, and centre lines of Janson Road and Burgess Road</td>
<td>paras. 41-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownfield Road/Cann Hall Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford New Town</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>paras. 53-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Hackney Wick - M11 Link Road</td>
<td>realignment to railway north to proposed alignment of A12 Hackney Wick to M11 Link Road</td>
<td>paras. 56-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACKNEY</td>
<td>realignment to River Lee</td>
<td>paras. 61-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER HAMLETS</td>
<td>realignment to River Lee</td>
<td>paras. 65-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>