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

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having
carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the
London Borough of Sutton, 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 Sutton Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to 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. Sutton 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 23 February 1976, Sutton Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 24 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 56 members.

5. The Borough Council's submission included copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We noted that the Borough Council had adopted many of the suggestions which they had received and had incorporated them in their draft scheme. We reviewed all the suggestions that had been made together with comments which had been sent direct to us by three local political associations.

6. We studied the draft scheme and noted that, with the exception of the Belmont ward which appeared to be under-represented by 1980, it would provide a basis of representation in compliance with the rules of the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines. We doubted, however, whether the electorate of the Belmont ward would increase as much as the Borough Council had forecast and we concluded that no modification was necessary to deal with the under-representation.

7. We studied the comments on the draft scheme and considered that there were local ties which should be taken into account in formulating suitable proposals for the Woodcote area of the borough. We therefore proposed replacing the Borough Council's two member Woodcote ward by single member Clockhouse and Woodcote wards. The boundaries of the Clockhouse ward had been suggested by a local political association.
8. After consulting the Ordnance Survey, we made minor alterations to some ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground.

9. Subject to the modifications referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, we adopted the Borough Council's draft scheme as the basis of our draft proposals. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

10. On 18 May 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 scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 30 July 1976.

11. Sutton Borough Council informed us that they supported our draft proposals other than those for two single-member Clockhouse and Woodcote wards.

12. We received objections to our draft proposals from a local political association who re-submitted an alternative scheme and from another local political association who suggested a different pattern of warding arrangements in place of our proposed Wandle Valley, Wrythe Green, Carshalton Central and Wallington North wards. A local political party re-submitted an alternative scheme for the area of the Sutton Carshalton parliamentary constituency.
13. We received specific support for our proposed Clockhouse and Woodcote wards from the two local political associations referred to in paragraph 12 above and from a local Ratepayers and Residents' Association.

14. 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 C W G T Kirk OBE was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

15. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Sutton on 28 October 1976. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

16. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and of his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to a modification in the boundary between the Wellington South, Clockhouse, and Woodcote wards. This involved an estimated 49 electors and was designed to take account of the line of a proposed motorway.

17. We considered our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We concluded that the amendment recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. Subject to this modification, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals.

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

PUBLICATION

19. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1973,
a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Sutton 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 comments.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)
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On 14th September 1976 the Secretary of State, in pursuance of Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, appointed me to be an assistant commissioner to hold a local inquiry or carry out any consultation or investigation with respect to the review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Sutton.

In response to an invitation from the Commission in a letter dated 10th June 1975, the Sutton Borough Council on the 23rd February 1976 submitted a draft scheme for the division of this London Borough into 24 wards returning a total of 56 Councillors. This scheme was duly advertised.

By a letter dated 18th May 1976 the Commission announced their draft proposals for 25 wards returning a total of 56 Councillors which, except for the division of one proposed ward into two wards, were in effect the Council's scheme with small adjustments to secure technically better boundaries, but the electorate of the other 23 wards remained unaffected. The Commission's proposals were duly advertised. Appendix 1 shows these proposals.

Representations were made by various bodies and persons, some about a draft scheme published by the Council in October 1975 for 24 wards returning 57 Councillors and others about the scheme submitted to the Commission by the Council in February 1976 and also about the Commission's draft proposals. Representations about the Council's schemes were made by:

1. The Local Government Committee of the London Borough of Sutton Labour Party, who objected to the Council's scheme and submitted their own scheme providing for 26 wards and 58 Councillors.

2. The Sutton, Cheam and Worcester Park Liberal Association, who objected to the Council's forecast of the electorate in 1981 and to the proposals for some of the wards.

3. The Sutton, Cheam and Worcester Park Conservative Association, who suggested adjustments to wards.

4. The Sutton, Carshalton Constituency Labour Party, who proposed an alternative scheme for the Sutton, Carshalton constituency which apart from the Woodcote wards is the same as that proposed by the Sutton Labour Party. (see paragraph (1))
The Carshalton and Wallington Conservative Association who suggested alternatives in some of the wards.

The Clockhouse Farm Estate Residents' Association who proposed a separate Clockhouse Ward.

Councillor J.L. Isard for the Wallington North Ward Residents' Association about proposals for the existing Wallington North Ward.

The Reverend A. Beddall about the area east of the River Wandle.

Mr. C.D. Parry arguing the use of the River Wandle as a ward boundary.

The Wallington Branch of the Communist Party who objected to the disregard of natural community boundaries by the scheme.

The Wallington North and District Residents' Association objecting to the proposal to divide the existing Wallington North ward into three areas and pressing for the River Wandle to be used as a ward boundary.

Councillor H. Doolley who supported the Wallington North and District Residents' Association.

The Commission received the following direct representations by:

The Sutton, Cheam and Worcester Park Liberal Association and the Carshalton and Wallington Liberal Association who jointly proposed a scheme for 23 wards and 53 Councillors with an alternative arrangement for two of the suggested wards which would produce a council of 51 members (see also sub-paragraph (2) ). Appendix 2 shows the proposal to 53 Councillors.

The Local Government Committee of the London Borough of Sutton Labour Party whose submission is identical with that referred to in sub-paragraph (1). Appendix 3 shows these proposals.

I visited the Borough on the 13th October 1976 for a general inspection of the areas to which the various representations related.

An informal meeting was held at the Sutton London Borough Council's Civic Offices on Thursday 28th October 1976. It began at 10-30 a.m., adjourned for lunch from 1-0 p.m. - 2-0 p.m. and ended at 5-05 p.m. In addition to myself, 37 persons were present during the morning session but some of them did not return for the afternoon session. Their names appear in Appendix 4. The points on which representations were made were fully discussed; and the discussion on each is summarised in the following paragraphs. The ward numbers used are those in the Commission's proposals.

FORECAST OF 1961 ELECTORATE

It was agreed that this should be discussed first, although the original size of the discrepancy suggested by the Liberal Association had later been reduced to about 500.
Mr. T.M.H. Scott, the Council's Chief Executive said that
the Council's forecast of the 1981 electorate had been
prepared in collaboration between the Planning Officer
and the Electoral Registration Officer and had been based on:

(1) the best projection of the housing stock;
(2) the known electorate for 1976;
(3) known development - actually started and proposed -
   according to planning permissions given;
(4) expected further dwellings to be occupied by 1981;
(5) the known trends of the occupation rate in the Borough.

He pointed out that the only real challenge to the Council's
forecast would be on the ground of the economic recession.
However, even if that did reduce the rate of building, there
were cushions in the Commission's proposals which allowed for
a reduction in the electorate without vitiating them. He
then dealt with four areas of large-scale development, viz:

(1) the Belmont Hospital site in Belmont Ward (7) By 1981,
   35% of the total electorate expected from this
development would be there.

(11) The Waterworks and Chalk Pits sites in Sutton East
    Ward (9) which would be 80% complete by 1981. Since
    the scheme was prepared planning permission had been
    given for private development known as Intercroft
    which it was expected would be completed by 1980.

(iii) Roundshaw in Beddington South Ward (25). This had
    already started and ought to be 80% completed by 1981, if
    not indeed finished by then.

(iv) Hackbridge (Savage Farm) site in Wandle Valley Ward (15).
    This would be 80% completed by 1981.

Even if these percentages of development were not attained,
the affected wards would still be viable as shown by the
following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total Electorate per Councillor in 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Development 35% complete 3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If none complete 2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton East</td>
<td>Development 80% complete 2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 100% Intercroft 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development 40% complete 2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 100% Intercroft 2233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington</td>
<td>Development 100% complete 2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Development 80% complete 2717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandle Valley</td>
<td>40% 2308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He doubted whether the recession would affect Sutton to any extent because:

(a) all London Boroughs were housing stress areas and the Greater London strategic plan could well provide for more housing in Sutton for Greater London

(b) of a confidential Department of the Environment document "Higher density housing in suburbs proposed to prevent waste of land" which was published in The Times on 6th September 1976 and the report in The Guardian on 18th September 1976 on "Policy switch aims to halt City decay".

(c) of the representations by the Greater London Council for retention and development of population and employment in Greater London;

(d) of the report of the Standing Conference on Planning for the South-East (Supporting more industry in Greater London, with the outer London Boroughs having an important part to play in relieving housing pressure in minor London;

which all tended to show that the Council's forecast was reasonable.

Mr. Geoffrey Thomas, M.B.E. (Liberal) made the following points:

1. He thought the reversal of policy described by Mr. Scott would have little practical effect in Sutton by 1981.

2. If it did occur in that time, its first effects would be in central London rather than in the suburbs.

3. Major services were required for the Belmont site, which would delay development.

4. Major services were required on the Hackbridge site including the diversion of a primary road, as well as schools, community centres, children's homes. The result could be that the cost could be more than the re-development of a Central London site e.g. the Surrey Dock and cease Hackbridge to be deferred.

5. The very high density proposed for the Waterworks site might be reduced.

6. Past experience of severe restriction on new housing increased the occupancy rate in urban areas.

7. He agreed the discrepancy between the Council's forecast and the Liberal Association's forecast was only about 500 electors.

8. The 1981 figures for Belmont were too high.
(9) He felt unable to accept the criterion of electors per Councillor on which the Council's scheme was based. The existing average for the whole of London was 24,000 and for the outer London Boroughs 2500; and it was on this basis that the Liberal Association's scheme had been prepared.

(10) The Greater London Council's demographic projection in 1974 showed 125,000/126,000 as the electorate for Sutton London Borough in 1981.

(Note—There were 4 projections for the 1981 population which averaged 161,225. Experience shows the electorate of the Borough to be 78.5% of the population; so a forecast 1981 electorate of about 126,500 can be deduced from these projections.)

10. The Sutton Carshalton Labour Party also asked for the Council's forecast to be reconsidered.

11. Mr Scott replied:

(1) There was no difficulty in connecting the Belmont development to a new sewer which had been laid through the centre of Sutton.

(2) The Greater London Council had shown their intention to press on with the Hackbridge development and the off-site sewer would be laid in time for it.

(3) The Water Company would provide the sewer to the Waterworks site before it was sold to the Council.

(4) The occupancy rate for 1980/81 had been taken at 1.9 but it could be higher.

(5) The Greater London Council's demographic projection had been a statistical exercise only based on births and deaths and the fertility rate and took no account of immigration. No London Borough had accepted it as other than that.

12. Conclusion. After considering the Liberal Association's written representations and that was said at the meeting, I conclude that for the purpose of the present exercise the Council's forecast of the 1981 electorate may safely be accepted.

ST. HILIER NORTH (13), ST. HILIER SOUTH (14), WANDLE VALLEY (15), GREEN CHORY (16), WALLINGTON NORTH (20) AND CARSALTON CENTRAL (18)WARDS.

13. The next matter to be discussed was perhaps the most important before the meeting. Representations against the Council's scheme and the Commission's proposals were made by the Conservative Association, the Labour Party and the Liberal Association. All of them objected to the inclusion of part of the St. Hildre Estate west of the River Wandle, in the Wandle Valley Ward (15) and wanted the River to be the ward boundary. They also wanted the area known as Hackbridge to be in one ward. Their consequential solutions differed, however. Proposals that the River Wandle should be the ward boundary had also been made by Mr. C.D. Perry, Councillor J. Icard, Councillor H. Dooley and the Wallington North Ward Resident's Association.

14. Councillor David Howard (for the Sutton, Carshalton Conservative Association)

(1) accepted that basically electoral parity was needed among the wards. The Commission's decision to form a Clockhouse ward with a total of 1767 electors in 1981 seemed to indicate a move from strict parity.
There was a strong feeling in the Hackbridge area (Weddle Valley, Dwythe Green and Wallington North) about the River Weddle which, with very few crossing points, effectively divided the community on the east side of the Weddle from the community on the west. The residents strongly felt they were really quite separate communities, and therefore separate wards should be formed encompassing the area between the Weddle, the railway line and London Road. Submissions were made before and after the Council's February proposals that Ward 15 (Weddle Valley) was completely unsuitable as a ward. The community in Ward 20 (Wallington North) south of the railway line and east side of Weddle should form part of Weddle Valley Ward. There was no objection on the question of members. A suggestion has been submitted that a new ward be formed, called 'Hackbridge'. The original proposals were based on electoral parity, but the plan had been withdrawn when the Commission's recommendations on Clockhouse (which was very substantially below average) were received. The ward they were now proposing was only marginally lower than the average electorate. It included a small area across the Weddle, created by the original Hack Bridge, (the area to the north of Nightingale Road) in which there was a community interest with the main Hackbridge area.

(3) In the area north of the Sutton/Hackbridge/Mitcham Junction railway line, a realignment of boundaries between Wards 15 and 16 (Dwythe Green and Weddle Valley) was proposed by going up the Weddle and moving Ward 16 effectually northwards. Ward 15, proposed as the new Hackbridge Ward (instead of Weddle Valley Ward), would now be to the east of the River Weddle and extend southwards following the Weddle from Carshalton Park. Residents south of the railway on the east side of the main road located to the north of the community centre rather than the south: the residents regarded themselves more as part of Hackbridge than of Wallington. The forecast electorate for Hackbridge in 1981 was 4,100 for two Councillors.

In Carshalton Central (Ward 18) it was felt the northern boundary should go beyond the railway line, up Nightingale Road, so that Carshalton Central could take in the Carshalton College of Further Education. People from north of the railway line located to Carshalton Village as their main shopping area, and they regarded themselves as part of traditional Carshalton. Submissions from local residents suggested Ward 18 (Carshalton Central) by taking pieces of Dwythe Green (Ward 16) and Wallington North (Ward 20). The Westcroft Sports Centre in Wallington North could be entered only from Carshalton and the local community regarded it as being part of Carshalton Central.

The Council's projection of the electorate was accepted and on this basis his Association's proposal was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Electorate per Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hackbridge</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwythe Green</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton</td>
<td>7,3740</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington North</td>
<td>5,209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This meant one more Councillor for Dwythe Green leading to a Council of 57 members instead of the 56 proposed by the Council and the Association.
15. Mr. Stanley V. Davies, Secretary of the Sutton Carshalton Constituency Labour Party, presented a written memorandum in which his Party made the following points:

(1) the Commission's proposals broke community links in many instances;
(2) too few ward boundaries followed natural lines;
(3) the proposals for Wandle Valley ward were totally unreasonable because community context and natural boundaries were ignored e.g. the St. Helier Council estate was split;
(4) the area between the Sutton-Hackbridge railway and Croydon Road - Acre Lane should be in the same ward as the area north of the railway;
(5) the area between Croydon Road - Acre Lane and Stafford Road should be in one ward;
(6) Green Artythe Lane should be the boundary between two wards as the northern part of Carshalton had two main roads running through it and most of the housing was on the Artythe Lane side;
(7) the railways made weak boundaries because roads run under them and the cut-off was too sudden.

16. Miss Iris Foulings (Local Government Committee of Borough Labour Party) supported Mr. Davies and said Croydon Road was the natural southern boundary of Wandle Valley ward. The River Wandle was the natural western boundary of this ward from the north to the point where it met the Croydon Road.

17. Mr. G. Thorp (Liberal) said the three parties agreed that the River Wandle and the Croydon Road were major boundaries. The Liberal Association had included the development around Baddington Lane Halt in their proposed Hackbridge ward to give the required number of councillors. It would be wrong to break up the St. Helier Estate which should be retained as a single community divided into two wards. The South-eastern part of St. Helier South ward was not part of St. Helier Estate; the north-east part of the Wandle Valley ward was part of that estate.

18. Councillor Howard, (Conservative) said that the Liberal Association's opinion the east-west railway was an absolutely crucial boundary between Wallington North and Wallington South wards. There were only three railway crossings for a considerable stretch. The Liberal plan had only two crossings. Feeling was not so strong about the railway from Sutton - Hackbridge.

19. Mr. Scott replied that:

(1) The three submissions had been over-influenced by the decision of the Commission to create a separate single-member ward for Clockhouse because of community interest; and all three proposals had therefore been based on the community of interest argument rather than equality of representation. Equality of representation was the factor which took priority over others, although community of interest and natural boundaries had to be taken into account. These proposals created divergences in equality of representation. The Conservative Association's proposals created the Hackbridge or Wandle Valley ward with 2,138 councillors, which was low, and Artythe Green...
with 1,930 electors per Councillor, which was very low.
Mr. Scott calculated that the Labour Party's proposals were based on the following projections for 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton N-E</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton N-W</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton East</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington North</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington Central</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helier South</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He calculated the Liberal Party's proposals to be based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton Village</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wrythe</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington Town</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallington North)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackbridge (Wrythe Green)</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helier South</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helier North</td>
<td>7,122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The Council's proposal was to some extent designed to get the numbers of electors right, but they did not feel the River Wandle was a real barrier as was claimed. The road over Goat Bridge provided convenient through access over the Wandle, connecting the two parts of the proposed ward. Although the bit to the west was naturally thought of as part of St. Helier, it was not a dissimilar type of development from the development to the east of the Wandle where there was quite a bit of Council development. The Council did not attach as much merit to keeping the Greater London Council St. Helier Estate together as many people would. The Council did not like the idea of Council estates being for every purpose disassociated with the rest of the Borough and preferred the idea of Council Estates being integrated with the rest of the Borough. Part of the St. Helier Estate was no longer owned by the Greater London Council; part had passed into the ownership of the Borough Council. Both the Greater London Council and the Council were letting houses to the tenants of this estate. The break-up of the St. Helier Estate as an entity had not progressed a long way but it was on the way. The tenants of the Greater London
Council and the Borough Council regarded themselves as a community of tenants as distinct from other inhabitants; they had a common landlord and community of interest in that respect. The arguments in favour of Wandle Valley were based on similarity of development. The hook-up between the corner of St. Helier and the Hackbridge area took into account Council developments proposed for the sewage farm site, the land east of London Road and the Hackbridge/Mitcham Junction railway line. This would be a Council development, some possibly for sale, provided by the Greater London Council alone or with the London Borough of Sutton and Merton. East of the railway was not proposed for housing development; it was part of the Metropolitan green wedge.

(3) The Council did not see as much of a community of interest with Carshalton Village as has been suggested for the piece of Wrythe Green Ward between Nightingale Road and the railway line (Sutton/Carshalton/Hackbridge Line). This was included in the Commission's Wrythe Green Ward because their community of interest was with Wrythe Green itself. Public Buildings did not have any validity as an argument, as they served the whole of the Borough and were not significant as local community of interest. There was a shopping centre at Wrythe Green with quite strong evidence of community of interest. Some shopping centres had a catchment area wider than the local community and Carshalton High Street was one of them. The local community shopping centre was round Wrythe Green itself. It was accepted that there were good roads going through the railway line, but it was a firm divider.

(4) It was accepted as perhaps reasonable that the little piece of the Borough lying between the River Wandle on the south, the railway on the north and west, and London Road on the east (the Conservative Hackbridge Ward north of the railway) had a certain community of interest. It was not agreed that the roads to the south of that bit of the River Wandle which the parties had put into the Carshalton Village Ward had community of interest to the North. That had more community of interest with the Wallington North Ward into which the Council had put it, particularly since Westcroft Road (where the Sports Centre was) had recently been stopped in the middle and made into two cul-de-sacs. There was road access to the Sports Centre only from Carshalton High Street, and access only by foot from the other direction. The Sports Centre had been provided for the whole Borough. However, the Council would not really object to the southern boundary following the line of the Wandle where it ran eastwards even though it was south of the railway, provided it did not throw out the numbers factor.

(5) In the Liberal proposal for the Hackbridge Ward, they brought their boundary of Hackbridge Ward down to a little tongue at Westcroft Road, Acre Lane and Croydon Road. The Council contended there was no community
of interest at all between that corner and the main part of that ward to the north. The Council agreed very much with Councillor Edward's argument that the other railway line was an impenetrable boundary and should be used as the southern boundary of Wallingford North Ward.

COUNCILLOR PHILLIP PASSMORE, Member of the Greater London Council
For the Ealing Carshalton Constituency and member of the Labour Party representing St. Helier Ward said:

(1) The Greater London Council did not in fact sell houses to their tenants.

(2) The St. Helier Estate, as asserted by both the Liberal and Labour parties, was a very closely knit community; it was served by one residents' association; the children in the three wards making up this area went almost exclusively to two primary schools on the estate and few other children went there; there were parent/teacher associations from those schools; they did not have a feeling being with people from east of the river; there was a clinic and a branch library on the estate and people in that part of the estate which it was proposed to transfer to a ward common with the east side of the river did look towards the centre of the estate rather than east of the river.

CLOCKHOUSE (23) and DECDON (22) WARDS

Alderman A. G. TAYLOR, (Conservative) Alderman of the Borough Council said the Council had accepted the very real problems of the apparent remoteness of Clockhouse and could well understand why the Commission had decided to propose a one-member ward for Clockhouse; but they had produced a ward of 1,835 electors of which only 1,400 actually lived on the Clockhouse estate; and they had therefore found the other 435 electors from what were called the small-holdings, and these small-holdings were in remote from Clockhouse as the rest of the Borough - Beckenham, Carshalton South. On the map it looked as though Clockhouse and the small-holdings were contiguous, but there were the same communication problems between Clockhouse and the small-holdings as there were between Clockhouse and the rest of the Borough. A quarter of the electorate in that ward were going to be in precisely the same situation as Clockhouse regarded itself at the present time. The Council's view was that Clockhouse should be included in a two-member ward which would produce each nearer parity of electors per councillor, and it was up to the political parties whatever they might be to produce one candidate at least who had the interests of Clockhouse at heart. The way that the Boundary Commission had done it was not the way to do it. This was a political matter that should be resolved very much by the political parties who were putting candidates in the field. In those circumstances the Council believed that Clockhouse should be joined to the other single-member ward, Beckenham, to produce a two-member ward which would then have a combined electorate of 4,268 in 1981.

NO PARAGRAPHS.
Mr. Power Broker, Chairman of the Clockhouse Farm Estate Residents' Association said that the Residents' Association agreed with the Commission's proposal that Clockhouse should be represented as a single-member ward. Clockhouse had a natural affinity with Eadestoe and the children went to London Borough of Crayford schools. It was geographically isolated from Dutton and had no direct link either with Eadestoe. It had a local identity.

It is known that the 1939's then across was from Woodhamton in the Urban District of Eadestoe and Dutton. All major groups had emphasized the community interest and there was no greater case than Clockhouse for reinforcing community identity and interest. The small-holdings were not remote from Clockhouse, and there was identification. Some small-holdings were part of the Residents' Association.

As far as the interests were concerned, allaying Clockhouse with Eadestoe would not help in any way; Eadestoe was just as remote from the rest of the Borough. The route of the proposed L23 motorway, if it were extended, would entirely disprove Clockhouse from the rest of the Borough by creating cylindrical barriers. The paper submitted earlier by Mr. Stanley Davies opposed the combination of Clockhouse and Eadestoe.

Mr. Brook reminded that the suggested route of the L23 from Dutton through Bunting House in a north-south direction, on a line parallel with Woodhamton Lane but south of it, cutting across Eadestoe Road, going through the built-up area and coming out into Beddington South. It was not known then it would be built, if at all. It was not in a programme and there was a conflict of opinion on whether it should be extended. The centre line of the road had been settled but the side road order and the rest of the procedures had not yet been made. Ministry of Transport engineers had said that if the motorway were built they would, as part of the same exercise, make up an old road which existed only as a country track running from Clockhouse up to a crossroad called Oak Cross Road (Green Lane). It was part of the plan for the L23, and for the first time there would be a motor road connecting Clockhouse with the rest of the Borough direct.

Mrs. Smith (Liberal) the Greater London Council member for Dutton and Eadestoe said that the Department of the Environment were inviting the Greater London Council to take part in a working party on that would happen to the L23 if anything, and it would be about a year before the working party would report.

Mr. Power added that Clockhouse had had an adverse record of Councillor representation. The Residents' Association had, contrary to other local groups, taken to a representative sample of 1 in 10 of households in the district, including the small-holdings. One of the items on the questionnaire was, would the residents agree to any proposal for a Councillor to serve solely Clockhouse, and they had received a unanimous 'Yes' to this question.
COUNCILLOR ERNIE SMITH (Conservative) Eddington South Ward, recognized that Mr. Marker wished to retain the community identity and interests of Glochhouse, but this would still be maintained by the Council's plan because it did not affect the community. He pointed out that Alderman Taylor was very valid in his argument that the small-holders were a very valid one. The small-holders were 22% of the electorate, and there was evidence that they were not closely associated with Glochhouse. They had to go through Croydon to get to Glochhouse from the London Borough of Sutton at the present which was a primary consideration. Further examination showed to make a mathematical parity of representation, as the electorate would only just be in excess of 1,000. The combined electorate for Glochhouse and Eddington would give 9.13 per Councillor. There was a possibility of a Councillor being absent through prolonged illness, work, or for other reasons. With at least two Councillors they could fall back on the other representative for that area, which they could not do if there were only one Councillor. A separate ward would also tend to make it even more isolated from the Borough instead of part of it. Glochhouse should be integrated with the rest of the Borough.

MISS TOMLIN (Labour) agreed that there were no proposals from the Labour Party but they did support representation of Glochhouse by a single member. From personal experience when representing the Council on the Community Association of Glochhouse, to get there by public transport one had to go via Croydon. It was true, as the Chairman of the Residents' Association said, that they did have their interests towards another Borough. It was not going to alter the direction of that interest by having one member to represent the area, but it had always been her impression that the people did feel that they were not part of the London Borough of Sutton and even though they had Councillors in that area that officially represented them, the Councillors were cut off and were not really interested in Glochhouse. It was a mixed area, private and council; it was not an area like Streatham which was just Council housing. There was such community spirit that if one were going to absorb them into the London Borough of Sutton, they would feel very much that if they were represented by a single member they were part of Sutton and did get their feelings put forward on the Council, and were not just a little area cut off from us in all other ways and forgotten about.

COUNCILLOR MRS. EVELYN MACK, Leader of the Labour Group on the Borough Council. If it be only a one-member ward, you might have the member falling very ill for some time. But from an analysis of attendance at Council Meetings over the last few years, taken over all, attendance ran at the rate of about 50%. Extra second point was to reinforce the view about the isolation of Glochhouse. For years there had been a very strong feeling in the area that they would like to become part of Croydon, but the Labour Group over the last years had been attacked by people wanting to remain in Sutton.
although they felt isolated from that was going on in Sutton centre and from their Councillors, and they felt that having their own Councillor visiting that particular area might give them a better service. They felt that the links with Sutton were very poor indeed but wanted to belong to Sutton.

30. [DR. RUTLAND] said the Liberals had in their original submission recommended the separation of Cleckheaton and the small-holdings. Historically, the area was included in the Cleckheaton Urban District when Cleckheaton and Boston joined together in 1922, when nothing had been built on the area except the small-holdings; and Cleckheaton was an afterthought built in 1935. [HERMAN FOWLER] introduced the idea of putting up a suitable candidate. If the two areas were joined together, with only two parties represented, the Councillors would rely on the 2,642 electors in Udderscroft rather than the Cleckheaton side. He supported the submission's recommendation of a separate councillor ward.

31. [COUNCILLOR SMITH] replied that it should clearly be understood that having a single representative in Cleckheaton in no way ensured that he would be a resident of Cleckheaton. The political parties, at their peril, would ignore the voice from Cleckheaton for representation by local people, but it was not felt that this issue was connected with the issue of whether or not a community should be a resident in Cleckheaton. The small-holdings were more akin to Udderscroft, so if a line were drawn on a community basis, it would be north of the small-holdings and Cleckheaton would have only 1,400 electors, which would be quite ridiculous.

32. [DR. RUTLAND] replied that the small-holdings identified with Cleckheaton; the monthly newsletter was distributed to every small-holding along those roads.

33. [HERMAN TAYLOR] commented that the whole argument regarding Cleckheaton, ever since it had been included in the London Borough of Sutton, had been the inaccessibility of the area from the rest of the Borough and he did not minimise this; in fact, he accepted it. It was of very real importance and was a very real problem. He disagreed that the small-holdings were allied with Cleckheaton. They are not inaccessibility from any other part of the Borough or Cleckheaton and the problem still remained. If the Commission had found 1,800 electors within Cleckheaton, the case for having one ward would have been strong indeed. Their case was not strong if, to make the figures more or less right, they had brought in small-holdings to help their case. He did not believe this was valid; it was juggling of the figures which would leave Cleckheaton in the same remote situation. The small-holdings would have no real affinity with the Cleckheaton representative and would in effect, be unrepresented.
AUBREY PLS. BREDWELL (Labour) drew attention to the area between the railway from Sutton Station southwards to Epsom Station and the main road to the coast of it and put forward the following proposal:— This particular area should be transferred from South Sutton Ward (8) to Epsom Ward (7) making it a three Councillor ward and Sutton South Ward a two Councillor Ward. The reasons for this were:

(a) The boundary as drawn by the Commission would cut off the area south of the little branch road over the Southbridge (hence locally as the Finish Estate) from Epsom with which it has a close affinity.

(b) The number of electors involved in the 1961 forecast made it more logical for Epsom to be a three member ward and Sutton South a two member ward. She submitted a table illustrating this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>2,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>2,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She had assumed an increase of 2,800 in the two wards and appreciated it between the on the basis of her own local knowledge and had subdivided the current electorate in the strip as follows:

| Finish Estate | Brighton Road | Chisle Wick | Epsom Gore | Esher Heath | Esher | Esherbridge | Esherhythe | Farnham | Fetcham | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park | Fetcham Park |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Brighton Road | 135           | 16          | 16         | 8           | 9     | 98          | 31         | 12     | 41      | 52           | 52           | 52           | 52           | 52           | 52           | 52           |
| Chisle Wick   | Derrylands Ct, Ilmington Close | Groombridge Ct.  | Manfield Ct. | Merchants Close |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Esher Heath   | 324           | 324         | 324        | 324         | 324   | 324         | 324        | 324     | 324     | 324          | 324          | 324          | 324          | 324          | 324          | 324          |
| Esher         | 77            | 77          | 77         | 77          | 77    | 77          | 77         | 77      | 77      | 77           | 77           | 77           | 77           | 77           | 77           | 77           |
| Esherbridge   | 591           | 591         | 591        | 591         | 591   | 591         | 591        | 591     | 591     | 591          | 591          | 591          | 591          | 591          | 591          | 591          |
| Fetcham Park  | 79            | 79          | 79         | 79          | 79    | 79          | 79         | 79      | 79      | 79           | 79           | 79           | 79           | 79           | 79           | 79           |
| TOTAL FOR STRIP | 2,792        | 2,792       | 2,792      | 2,792       | 2,792 | 2,792       | 2,792      | 2,792   | 2,792   | 2,792        | 2,792        | 2,792        | 2,792        | 2,792        | 2,792        | 2,792        |

(c) Dr. Scott's figures if no development on the Epsom site were completed in 1981 would reduce the electorate for 1980/81 by 1,000 which would then bring her proposed figures from 7,555 to 6,555 but this would still make a viable 3 Councillor ward. Also at the very northern end of the added strip was an area described as car park but it had been named for further housing development. Although nothing like the size of Epsom, it would increase the numbers in the Epsom Ward.
Sfco had no particular points on area north of Sfco Estate which was linked to the area west of the railway by two roads. Apart from that, the community interest in the north of the strip had allegiance to Central Sutton rather than to South Sutton. The Sfco Estate was a war-time pro-fab estate demolished to become a housing estate which was developed had very considerable links with Balmont. Proposals were put forward to the Council from the Balmont and South Cheam Residents' Association as to how the estate should be integrated into Balmont.

Local churches supported campaigns to integrate new residents on the Sfco Estate with Balmont; the primary schooling for children from that estate was at Avenue Road School in Balmont; family allowances were drawn from the Post Office in Balmont Village and the clinic facilities were there. A park area at the corner southern and near Balmont Station had recently been opened by the Borough Council and called "Balmont Park" and the Council had sought the support of the Balmont and South Cheam residents as well as those from the Sfco Estate for the care of the park.

The Council had divided the Borough into areas for social services purposes with area terms, and had determined that the area to the west of the main road in the definitive area for its No. 1 town list the road has been taken as the boundary rather than the railway.

For proposal had the support of the Balmont and South Cheam Residents' Association and the Sfco Residents' Association.

35. MR. THOMAS (Liberal) said his Association presented a totally different solution but it met Macnamara's requirement that Sfco should be regarded as part of Balmont. He had taken two polling districts out of the existing wards and with them South Sutton and two other districts and called them Balmont; and had divided east and west very roughly along the line of the Balmont Hospital area. His proposal recognized the high density area of development taking place to the South of Sutton Station and separated it from the area more properly Balmont. It definitely incorporated some other elements of Balmont which were truly Balmont; areas around the Haraden and the other hospitals to the east of the Brighton Road, Downs Road and Leas Road had always been part of Balmont. He accepted the argument that a lot of community and other work had been done to bring Sfco into Balmont and his project did this. It had not been mentioned that the Easthills Carew Residents' Association did not think of itself as Balmont but regarded itself as part of Sutton. The boundary of the existing Balmont and Sutton South East (which left the Sfco Estate in Balmont) was preferable and the two words should be divided horizontally rather than vertically.
On Mrs. Browne's suggestion, the danger would be that if the road were used as the main boundary it could be extending a strip of 'no man's land' between the main road and the railway. Other parties had recently campaigned to have a pedestrian crossing on that road. They feared that area could become a no-man's-land unless the Balmont site was developed. A lot of London Borough people would be happy with it; and there was a danger of grouping all of its people together into what could turn into a large housing area surrounded by privately owned property. He personally thought the Balmont people would appreciate being assimilated into the Sutton side rather than being grouped into one large area of Council properties surrounded by an area of private residences.

Contrary to all expectations, the residents of Frankland Estate were not using Balmont Village as a focal point. Shops in the shopping area were closing and they were not getting any substantial increase in business from Frankland. Most of the primary school children from Frankland went to school in Avenue Road; the rest of the children moved north into Sutton for their education. On Dr. Thomas's point, it would be true that there was one road east of the Brighton Road, (District Road) that would regard itself as Balmont, but that in the only point east of the railway that would regard itself as truly Balmont. He accepted that Eningahm Gardens felt part of Sutton because the socio feelers existed about Eningahm Gardens, he believed the Frankland Estate had the socio affinity. Even the southern end of the Borough in that area, the flow was entirely north/south.

The Council considered there was a difference of about 300 in the electorate between Ealing's figures and those given by Dr. Browne. Some of it might be because she had added an increase of 700 in South Sutton to take account of the development taking place in that ward. This did the job twice because the Council had made allowance for that already in their figures. Dr. Browne said that for Sutton South there would be an electorate of 5,723 leaving out the strip and Balmont, including the strip, 8,955. The Council would put 7,959 against Balmont and 5,863 in Sutton South. That Mrs. Browne was doing in transferring the three members to Balmont and reducing Sutton South to six members was to overshoot the development which would take place (95% by 1981) with the result following continuously after that. The Council saw the Commissioners's proposals as such were acceptable because they still allowed in the next review, when the development was complete in Balmont, for a 3 member ward there with an electorate of 7,883. Eningahm Gardens regarded itself as part of Sutton and not part of Balmont; there was just as many community of interest ties in the Sutton direction to the north and in the Sutton South direction to the east and the railway itself was crossed at very few points. The divisions for social services offices were not necessarily good electoral areas; they would not necessarily relate to each other.
39. MRS. JEAN WILLLAMS, Member of the Balfron and South Cheam Residents' Association, said that a number of shopping surveys she had conducted showed that the Shanklin Estate and people going over from Downs Road did use Balfron for shopping because it was much nearer than Sutton.

40. MRS. MAHER (Chairman of the Sutton South-coast Ward Labour Party) said that Ewell Hill Gardens looked to Sutton Town Centre because this area was totally different, consisting mainly of people going out to work and with a very small child population. The Shanklin Estate had a high population of children and clearly people. She supported Mrs. Bronson.

41. MRS. RUTH SIM (Liberal) added that there were a number of members' associations on the other side of the road. The Shanklin residents did use Balfron but there was a return flow, as Balfron people used the shop on the Shanklin Estate and the children used the play areas.

42. MR. SCOTT commented on the Liberal proposal that whatever might have been the historical connection, the present affiliations the Council believed led to a north/south solution, rather than an east/west solution.

43. MR. RUSSEL agreed that the flow was north and south but that did not necessarily remove the Shanklin Estate's tie with Balfron. The Council were supporting an increased number of shops in Balfron which was a development area. The railway might be closed by 1980. She felt that the coexistent Commissioners should make a special visit to this area.

Conclusion of the Ward

The meeting then moved on to discuss the effect on the other wards of the scheme submitted to the Commission by the Sutton, Cheam and Worcester Park and the Carshalton and Wallington Liberal Associations and by the Local Government Committee of the London Borough of Sutton Labour Party. The Labour Party's representatives said they had already put forward the points which were most important for them; and for the rest, they were content to rely on their written representations. The meeting therefore proceeded to discuss the effect on the Commission's scheme of the Liberal's proposals; and a brief note of this discussion appears later. After a while there emerged a major point. The Council's scheme and the Commission's proposals both envisaged a Council of 56 members, while the Liberals proposed 53 members (they abandoned their alternative scheme for 51 members).

ALDERMAN TAYLOR (Conservative) said that the Council (consisting at the present time of 8 Aldermen and 51 Councillors— a total of 59 members) had unanimously decided that in the future 56 members were essential to carry the load of work so that, apart from the question of any particular part of the Liberals' scheme, he opposed it because it provided for 3 less members than were necessary in the opinion of the Council.
SR. C. THOMAS (Liberal) explained that the Liberals, in preparing their scheme, had striven to achieve an electoral parity among the wards; that they had aimed at an electorate for each ward of 2,500 per Councilor with a tolerance of 250 more or 150 less and that these factors accounted for many of the differences between their proposals and those of the Council and the Commission. The next paragraphs of this report accordingly deal mainly with particular wards where the Liberals felt the boundaries were wrongly drawn.

45.

NORTH CHEAM (3) AND SUTTON COUNTRY (4) WARDS

SR. THOMAS (Liberal) said that the group of streets in Sutton Country South next to Hamilton Avenue, had no community with Sutton Common and ought to be in North Cheam. To restore the electorate in Sutton Common they proposed that the railway instead of the Sutton by-pass should be used as a boundary. The northern boundary of North Cheam should follow the Maldon Road and Chatsworth Road.

THE LABOUR PARTY's scheme also moved the Hamilton Avenue area into North Cheam and put the whole of the area (instead of part as proposed by the Liberals) between the by-pass and the railway into Sutton Common.

SR. KIPPS (Conservative) commented that the Sutton by-pass must be the boundary. In his view it was more sensible to keep the Hamilton Avenue area in Sutton Common than to bring part of Risehill (10) into Sutton Common.

46.

ROSEHILL WARD (10). The Liberals, in consequence of their proposals for Sutton Common Ward and having regard to their view of the appropriate electorate for each ward, proposed a new ward called Risehill which took in part of Sutton East Ward (9). SR. Thomas admitted that it had been difficult to devise boundaries, which included an area north-west of the railway.

47.

COLUMBIA PARK SOUTH (2), NORTH CHEAM (3), CHEAM UPT (5), CHEAM SOUTH (6) AND SUTTON UPT (12)

SR. THOMAS criticised the Commission's proposals for Cheam Upt (5) and Cheam South (6) because in the Liberals' opinion the railway should be the boundary and not Cheam High Street. THE LABOUR PARTY's scheme also used the railway as the boundary. SR. THOMAS added that the other changes in these wards were designed to keep communities together and to provide an appropriate electorate for each ward. SR. SCOTT replied that if Columbia Park South followed the Council's scheme, Cheam would run from there to the south-eastern boundary of the Borough, but it had had to be divided somewhere.

There were about 700 electors between the High Street and the railway, so that imbalance would result from the use of the railway as a boundary. South of the High Street was a dormitory area; north of it was much less so.
The shopping centre in the High Street was the main attraction and drew people to it from both north and south. The Council thought it was a better boundary than the railway in this case. Mr. August (Conservative) supported Mr. Scott and criticised a proposal by the Liberals to include an area in Sutton East Ward (12) in their scheme ward as it was out of the by-areas which ought to be a ward boundary.

68.

EASTERN WARDS

Mr. Thomas considered that Stafford Road (E.271) was a more important barrier than the railway in the South Wimbledon North Ward (20) while Croydon Road should be the north boundary, and the Liberals scheme flowed from this, as well as from the proposals discussed in relation to the River Thames.

(p. 13-20)

Mr. Scott replied that the Council considered the railway to be more divisive than Stafford Road, and a more equal parity could be obtained if the railway were used. The people living north of the railway on both sides of Stafford Road came together in shops and businesses there. The people living south of the railway, while same would go to Stafford Road, mainly went to Ener Road or Wimbledon Green. Croydon Road on the northern boundary would cut through a community.

68. Shaw (Liberal) felt in reflection that the area around Pullingers Lane Station should be in Wimbledon North Ward (21).

SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER

49.

1931 Election (p. 7 - 12)

Having read the papers and listened to what was said at the meeting I propose the following to adopt the Greater London Council for 1931 as an issue of these proposals.

50.

The Alternative Scheme (p. 44 - 53)

(1) The Commission in formulating their proposals are bound by paragraph 3 of the 11th Schedule of the Local Government Act 1972, which in effect requires that the ratio of electors to councillors in 1931 (in this case) shall be so nearly as may be the same in every ward but, subject to that, regard shall be had up:

(a) easily identifiable boundaries and

(b) local ties.

Equality of representation in this area important than boundaries or ties.

(2) Sutton London Borough is largely a build-up area with many of its residents working in London. It is within my own knowledge that 50 years ago it consisted of quite separate villages and small towns, each with its own strong local ties.
The nature of the development since then (private and public housing, factories, offices, growth and change of old shopping centres and the establishment of new ones, with even recently and particularly in and around Sutton itself, the re-development by blocks of flats of the site of larger detached houses) has reinforced these ideas and led to the growth of new ones; and this process appears likely to continue. Generally speaking, it is difficult enough in most districts, working within the criteria of the Local Government Act 1972, to relate words exclusively to local ones. In this London Borough it is impossible; and a compromise has to be accepted. The problem is to find the best compromise.

(3) Four sets of proposals for the whole of the London Borough have been put forward by the Council's scheme, the Commission's draft proposal, the Labour Party's scheme and the Liberal Association's scheme. The first two are the same except that the Commission have divided the wards into ten wards.

(4) The Labour Party is preparing their scheme for 26 wards. Returning 55 Councillors appears to have placed rather more emphasis on local ties than do the Commission's proposals, but the result has been to produce wards, among which the ratio of electorate to Councillors is much more uneven than in the Commission's proposals. Moreover the total number of Councillors is on the high side.

(5) The Liberal Association appear to have concentrated on parity of representation among the wards, but although they have had regard to local ties and good boundaries and have corrected what they saw to be defects in the Commission's proposals, they have been unable to avoid in some instances cutting local ties and using more than the best boundaries in their Sutton-Golding wards. Their scheme provides for 55 Councillors. Alexandra Taylor assured the meeting that the Council had unanimously expressed the opinion that a minimum of 55 Councillors was necessary to do the Council's work. This assurance was not challenged at the meeting, and I feel I must attach considerable importance to it.

(6) Having carefully studied the written representations from the Labour Party and the Liberal Association, and listened to what was said at the meeting and comparing their schemes with the Commission's draft proposals, I consider that on the whole their proposals are a better compromise than either of the other two schemes. Accordingly I RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMISSION'S DRAFT PROPOSALS BE ADOPTED RATHER THAN EITHER THE LABOUR PARTY'S SCHEME OR THE LIBERAL ASSOCIATION'S SCHEME SHOULD BE USED AS THE BASIS AGAINST WHICH THE MORE DETAILED COUNCILS' PROPOSALS DISCUSSED IN THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.
Appendices 1 and 2 reveal a discrepancy in the forecast of the 1981 electorate for the Clockhouse ward. The Commission put the figure as 1767 but the Council's 1981 figure for the Liberal Associations' Clockhouse ward (which is much the same as the Commission's proposal) in 1976. After the meeting, I asked Chief Executive how this occurred. He explained that the Commission had made their own division of the electorate of the Council's Clockhouse ward. He had carefully checked the figures and, using the same criteria as for the other wards, the Council's as compared with the Commission's figures were:

1976 Electorate 1981 Electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clockhouse</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickcote</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>2461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>4268</td>
<td>4268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless the Commission have a special reason for their division of the electorate I would prefer to use the Council's figures.

The Commission have included in Clockhouse ward a group of houses along Dickcote Road and Bockmansterne Lane near the Wellington High School for Girls. There are 49 electors in these houses, which are now in the present Wellington South ward, and the number should be about the same in 1981. It would be very inconvenient for the electors to have to vote at the polling station for Clockhouse; and the expense of establishing a separate polling station for them in the girls' school would not be justified. The line of the proposed 123 motorway lies slightly to the east of Sandy Lane South, so if built these houses would be separated by it from the rest of Dickcote ward. If there is to be a separate ward for Clockhouse, it seems sensible that these houses should be in the new Wellington South ward. My proposal for the alteration of the boundary appears in Appendix 5. I realise that the boundary I have suggested is not as well defined as that proposed by the Commission but I consider that the interests of the electors concerned justify the acceptance of a less satisfactory boundary.

If my conclusions be accepted the respective electors for the three wards would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clockhouse</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickcote</td>
<td>2429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>6661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) In my opinion, where a quite isolated community exists, the Commission are justified in proposing a separate ward for it, even if its electors are markedly less in number than the average electorate for the wards generally.
Such a case would be quite exceptional. Having visited the Clockhouse estate and the smallholdings and seen the difficulty of communications described at the meeting, I am satisfied that the Commission's proposal for a separate ward is right. Because Clockhouse is entirely exceptional in this London Borough, it is clear to me that the establishment of a separate ward there (with the amendment I suggest in sub-paragraph (2)) with an electorate for Councillor of 1822 now and 1758 in 1861 (against averages of 2303 and 2416 respectively for the London Borough as a whole on the Commission's proposal) cannot be used as an argument for providing elsewhere in the London Borough wards with electorates markedly lower than the average. Accordingly I recommend that the Commission's proposal for the Locky and Clockhouse wards be approved, subject to the inclusion in the Wellingon South ward of the Town of Romford near the Wellingon School for Girls.

PARTICULAR CRITICISMS

(1) Criticisms were made that the Commission's proposals failed to observe local ties and used wrong boundaries in several instances. These are stated in the following sub-paragraphs and are summarized in the following paragraph.

(2) All the political parties objected to the inclusion in Wandle Valley ward as part of the St. Helier estate west of the River Wandle. Residents' Associations joined in this objection. Varying alternative wards for the north eastern part of the London Borough were made.

(3) Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations preferred to have a ward for the centre of Wellingon bounded on the north by Croydon Road and on the South by Stafford Road, although they differed about the eastern boundary which they accepted generally as the line proposed by the Commission. The Conservatives supported the Commission's proposal that the east-west railway should be a boundary.

(4) The Labour Party proposed that the boundary between Belmont and South Sutton wards should run along the main road and not the railway. The Conservatives opposed this change. The Liberal Associations' Scheme included in their Belmont Ward the southern part of the area between the road and the railway with the adjacent area west of the railway.

(5) Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations objected to the inclusion in Sutton Common ward of some streets south of Hamilton Avenue but made different suggestions for dealing with the consequences.

(6) Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations objected to Croydon High Street as the boundary between Croydon West and Croydon South wards and preferred the railway as a boundary; although the Liberal Associations proposed a different pattern of wards making no use of the Railway as a boundary at this point.
At the meeting requests were made that I visit the Borough again to examine these particular areas. I was impressed by the strength of feeling expressed by those putting forward the criticisms which by themselves appeared to have some validity (particularly that about the St. Helier estate), although of course I have to consider them against the picture for the Borough as a whole and the inevitable need to accept compromises if the object of the Local Government Act is to be achieved. Although my previous visit had covered these areas with others, I felt the need to see illustrated on the ground the points made by various speakers. Accordingly I made a further visit on the 16th November 1976 when I was accompanied by Alderman Taylor, and Councillors Slater, Eckard and Howard for the Conservative Party; Alderman Mrs. Brennan and Elton Fealin for the Labour Party; Mr. Thomas for the Liberal Association; and the Council's Chief Executive (Mr. Scott) and his Electoral Registration Assistant (Mr. Taylor). This visit was most helpful to me.

River Wandle; Crowdon Road; Stafford Road.

(1) The inclusion of part of the St. Helier Estate East of the River Wandle in Wandle Valley ward not unexpectedly attracted criticism. I noticed however that, although the need to preserve the integrity of St. Helier was strongly urged, the case for excluding this part of the estate from Wandle Valley seemed in the main to be argued by those concerned with Esherbridge east of the river. I am certainly of the opinion that it could be better, if it could reasonably be done, to use the river as the ward boundary at this point; and I do not think anyone at the meeting really disagreed. It could only be done, however, if wards in this part of the Borough satisfying the statutory criteria could be formed.

(2) The Council in their October 1975 scheme proposed to divide Esherbridge and St. Helier horizontally at Culver Road, but because of objections abandoned that suggestion and in February 1976 put forward the proposal which the Commission have adopted in their draft proposals. I spent some time trying to devise a satisfactory solution but failed to do so. I consulted the Chief Executive and I am satisfied that he and Mr. Taylor spent many hours at all stages examining many possibilities but all were seriously defective, leaving only the present less than perfect proposal to achieve the nearest to the practicable party of representation among the wards. All three parties put forward their solutions but for the reason given in paragraph 50 I feel unable to adopt either of the alternatives proposed by the Labour Party or the Liberal Association; while the Conservative Party's proposal means an extra Councillor, and an average representation per Councillor of 2283 (against 2303 for the Commission's proposals) and range from 26% to 19% which in my view is too uneven.
(3) The other main criticism in this area concerned the wish of the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations that Croydon Road/Acre Lane and Stafford Road should be used as ward boundaries, instead of the east-west railway. I paid particular attention to these roads and the development on both sides of them. I did not feel that the railway was so divisive of local ties as was suggested at the meeting as to justify the use of either of these roads instead; indeed it could be argued - and was - that the use of either road as a boundary would be more divisive than the use of the railway. Even if these roads were rather better boundaries than the railway the consequent reshuffle of the proposed wards could not in my opinion be justified.

(a) It seems to me that the Commission's proposals provide for this part of the Borough 6 wards which accord reasonably well with the criteria in the Local Government Act (vis: St. Helier North (13), St. Helier South (14), Crythe Green (16), Carshalton North (17), Carshalton Central (18) and Wallington North (20) and one less than perfect ward vis: Cackle Valley (15) and that any attempt to remove the area west of the River Cackle from Cackle Valley must produce a number of other wards which fall markedly short of those criteria. Therefore, while fully realizing that Cackle Valley ward is to some degree unsatisfactory, I feel compelled, in the absence of that I could regard as a more satisfactory alternative pattern of wards in this part of the Borough, to recommend that Wards 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 as shown in the Commission's draft proposals should remain unaltered.

Belmont and South Sutton Wards

(1) The Labour Party urged that the area in South Sutton ward between the railway and the main road should be transferred to Belmont Ward, while the Liberal Associations agreed that the southern part of this area known as the Shanklin Estate should be in Belmont. Both argued that the Commission's proposal favored local ties.

(2) As a result of my second visit and the discussion which took place on the site, the following points emerged:

(a) the Shanklin Estate was built by the Greater London Council and was completed two years ago. It is occupied by people from Greater London generally and only 17% to 20% lived in the prefabricated houses previously on the site;

(b) there is very little public housing in Belmont Ward;

(c) the Council are not proposing any positive action to expand the Belmont shopping area.
near Belmont Station. They have adopted a policy of refusing planning permission for change of use to any purpose other than shopping.

(3) I am satisfied from what I saw and heard that the Council are right in arguing that the natural flow of people in the area is generally north and south along the main road rather than across the railway, although elderly people do use the post office in the Belmont shopping centre. The northern part of the area (i.e. north of the narrow road to Belmont Hospital) clearly looks to Sutton. It seems to me to be doubtful that, as a considerable majority of the residents on the Shanklin estate have been in the London Borough for not much over two years, they could in that time have established local ties; particularly as the park at the southern end of the area is physical separation additional to that provided by the railway. Quite apart from these points, the alternative schemes put forward are subject to the same criticisms which I have made of them generally elsewhere in this report. Alderman Mrs. Brennan's figures which she put forward at the meeting appear to have included twice for development of the Belmont Hospital site, as the Council's figures had already allowed for this development.

(4) Accordingly, I am not satisfied that any change of the boundary between these two wards would be justified and recommend that the Commission's proposed boundary between the Belmont and Sutton South wards be accepted.

NORTH CHEAM AND SUTTON COMMON WARDS

56. (1) The Commission's boundary between these two wards was criticised because it put a group of streets south west of Hamilton Avenue into Sutton Common ward, whereas it was said the boundary should continue north-eastwards to the Borough boundary, thus leaving those streets in North Cheam ward. The consequential variation of the adjoining wards proposed by the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations necessitated the inclusion of areas south-east of the Sutton-by-pass in Sutton Common ward.

(2) During my visits, I found little difference in the type of development on either side of Hamilton Avenue. There is a small shopping centre in London Road on both sides of its junction with Hamilton Avenue, and the local school, clinic and library are a short distance north-eastwards of that junction.

(3) It does not seem to me that Hamilton Avenue is a strong division between local ties. The alternative schemes are open to the general objections I have already described and, in particular, that in the Sutton Common ward straddles the by-pass which in my opinion is a much greater barrier than Hamilton Avenue.
I therefore recommend that the North Cheam and Sutton wards proposed by the Commission be accepted.

CHEAM WEST AND CHEAM SOUTH WARDS

The criticism of these wards was that the boundary between them should be the railway and not the High Street. By itself, either would do as a boundary. From what I heard and saw I am not convinced that either of them operates very much as a divider of localities. From this it follows that the better boundary is the one which conduces to the best degree of parity in the electorate of the two wards; and this is undoubtedly the High Street. Therefore I recommend that the Commission's proposals for Cheam West and Cheam South be accepted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

I have not referred so far to some of the written representations made to the Council, but I have considered them. Some seem to have been met by the Council's February scheme. I took the others fully into account when considering the proceedings at the meeting and on my visits. In so far as any of them proposed amendments of wards other than those discussed in this report, I did not feel that they justified a departure from the Commission's draft proposals.

It will have been seen that I have recommended the adoption of the Commission's draft proposals except for a change in the boundary between Wallington South, Woodcote and Clockhouse Wards.

Finally, I would like first to pay tribute to the painstaking way in which the written representations were prepared and the helpful manner in which the various speakers explained them at the meeting; and second to record my gratitude to Mr. Scott and Mr. Taylor for so readily and promptly making available all the additional information for which I asked them.

22 NOVEMBER, 1976

[Signature]
### APPENDIX 1

**THE COMMISSION’S DRAFT PROPOSALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1976 Electorate</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total per Council</td>
<td>Total per Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park North</td>
<td>6934</td>
<td>2311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park South</td>
<td>4740</td>
<td>2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Cheam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>4945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sutton Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4722</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>4699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cheam West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4471</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cheam South</td>
<td></td>
<td>4726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4673</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>6095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sutton South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6805</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>7729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sutton East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5667</td>
<td>2833</td>
<td>6806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rosehill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4575</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sutton Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4558</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>5176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sutton West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>4509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>St. Helier North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7104</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>6996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St. Helier South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>4483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wandle Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3901</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>5834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brythe Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5449</td>
<td>2724</td>
<td>5383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carshalton North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5305</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>5380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carshalton Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5133</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>4941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Carshalton Beaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7157</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>6929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wallington North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6928</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>6939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Beddington North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wallington South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6612</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>7368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clockhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Woodcote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Beddington South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6389</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>7326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average electorate per Councillor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>2416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

56 128,988 135,306
### APPENDIX 2

**LIBERAL ASSOCIATION'S SHARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1976 Electorate</th>
<th>Liberal's Forecast</th>
<th>Council's Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chess</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7685</td>
<td>8050</td>
<td>2683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Chess</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7093</td>
<td>7050</td>
<td>2320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5558</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Worcester Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4475</td>
<td>4850</td>
<td>2425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Sutton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7339</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>West Sutton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>East Sutton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4829</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sutton Common</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5027</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>2575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Benhilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4441</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Beaches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4795</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>West Carshalton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5305</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>2675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>South St. Helier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4975</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>North St. Helier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7279</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Clockhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Carshalton on the Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carshalton Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>5450</td>
<td>2725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Wrythe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wallington Downs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7055</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wallington Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7783</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>2567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hackbridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Roundshaw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3889</td>
<td>4850</td>
<td>2425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Beddington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | 1976 Electorate 128,988 | average 2434      | 134,800 | average 2543 | 135,306 | average 2553 |
## APPENDIX 3

### Labour Party's Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of 1976 Electorate</th>
<th>1981 Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worcester Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Worcester Park North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Chesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chesh West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chesh South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sutton Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rosehill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sutton East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sutton South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sutton West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collingwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Helier North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Helier South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carshalton North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carshalton North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carshalton West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carshalton East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carshalton Beeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wallington North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wallington Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wallington South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beddington North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beddington South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woodcote North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woodcote South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128,988</td>
<td>2224</td>
<td>135,506</td>
<td>2333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 5

ALTERATION OF DESCRIPTION OF WALLINGTON SOUTH WARD IF HOUSES NEAR GIRLS' SCHOOL ARE INCLUDED IN IT.

1. Delete in Commission's description from "to Sandy Lane South" to end and substitute:

"... to Sandy Lane South, thence southwards and southwestwards along said Lane to Woodcoote Road, thence southeastwards along the said road to a point opposite the southern boundary fence of number 264 Woodcoote Road, and thence westwards along the said boundary fence and the southern boundary fence of the property known as Coogee to Woodmansterne Lane, thence northeastwards along the said Lane to the cart track shown as being immediately opposite the property known as Kamparo, thence westwards along the said track to the western boundary of plot 8443, thence northwesternwards along the boundary of the said plot to the western boundary of the Wallington High School for Girls', thence northwesternwards along the said boundary to the bridle way running from the said school generally westerly to the Telegraph Track, thence westwards along the said bridle way to the eastern boundary of Carshalton Beeches ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement".

2. This Amendment is illustrated on the annexed map.

3. No consequential amendments of the descriptions of the Woodcoote and Clockhouse wards are necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beddington North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington South</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton Beesleys</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton Central</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshalton North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheam South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheam West</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clockhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cheam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helier North</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helier South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Central</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Common</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton East</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton South</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton West</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington North</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandle Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Park North</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Park South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrythe Green</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON  DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

WORCESTER PARK NORTH WARD
Commencing at the point where Central Road meets the western boundary of the borough, thence generally northeastwards along said boundary and southeastwards along the northern boundary of the borough to NG reference TQ 2410566076, thence eastwards in a straight line to London Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Cheam Common Road, thence northwestwards along said road and Central Road to the point of commencement.

SUTTON COMMON WARD
Commencing at the point where Staines Avenue meets the southeastern boundary of Worcester Park North Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and continuing northeastwards and generally southeastwards along the northern boundary of the borough to the Morden to Sutton railway, thence continuing southeastwards along said railway to Reigate Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue and Oldfields Road to Pyl Brook, thence generally northwestwards along said brook to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of number 116 Hamilton Avenue, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary, crossing said avenue and continuing southwestwards along Brocks Drive to Gander Green Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane to Henley Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Staines Avenue, thence westwards and northwestwards along said avenue to the point of commencement.

ST HELIER NORTH WARD
Commencing at the point where Reigate Avenue meets the eastern boundary of Sutton Common Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of the borough, thence generally northeastwards and southeastwards along said
boundary and continuing southeastwards along the River Wandle to Middleton Road at Goat Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Green Wrythe Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to Thornton Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Wrythe Lane, thence northwards along said lane to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of number 1 The Market, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwestwards and generally westwards along the northern boundary of Rosehill Park East to the road known as Rose Hill, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of Rosehill Community Centre, thence westwards to and along said boundary to Reigate Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to the point of commencement.

WANDLE VALLEY WARD

Commencing at the point where Buckhurst Avenue meets Green Wrythe Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane and continuing northwards, northeastwards and northwestwards along the southeastern boundary of St Helier North Ward to the northern boundary of the borough, thence northeastwards and southeastwards, along said boundary to the Mitcham to Carshalton railway thence southwards and southwestwards along said railway to the River Wandle, thence generally northwestwards along said river to a point opposite the western boundary of the Engineering Works situated east of Mill Close, thence northwestwards to and along said boundary and northeastwards along said boundary and the northern boundary of said engineering works to a point opposite the River Wandle, thence northwestwards to and generally northwestwards along said river to a point due east of the access road south of number 143 Buckhurst Avenue, thence due west to said avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to the point of commencement.

WORCESTER PARK SOUTH WARD

Commencing at the point where London Road meets the western boundary of the borough, thence generally northwestwards, southwestwards and northwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Worcester Park North Ward, thence southeastwards along
sacd boundary to London Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

NORTH CHEAM WARD
Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Worcester Park North Ward meets the southern boundary of Sutton Common Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said southern boundary to Oldfields Road, thence southwestwards and southwards along said road and St Dunstan's Hill to Church Hill Road, thence generally northwestwards along said road to Senhouse Road, thence northwards and northwestwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Worcester Park North Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CHEAM WEST WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the borough meets the southeastern boundary of Worcester Park South Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the southern boundary of North Cheam Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary and southwards along St Dunstan's Hill to High Street, thence westwards along said street, Ewell Road and The Avenue to the western boundary of the borough, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SUTTON WEST WARD
Commencing at the point where the Sutton to Cheam railway meets the road known as Belmont Rise, thence northwards along said road, the eastern boundary of Cheam West Ward and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of North Cheam Ward to a point opposite the northern boundary of number 38 Oldfields Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary, continuing southeastwards along the rear boundaries of numbers 281 to 263 Collingwood Road, southeastwards in a straight line to and along the rear boundaries of numbers 261 to 123 Collingwood Road, thence northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of number 123 in said road
to said road, thence southeastwards along said road to the Morden to Sutton railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to NG reference TQ 2513264590, thence southeastwards in a straight line to and along St James Road to Grove Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the Morden to Sutton railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to a point opposite the eastern boundary of number 73 Grove Road, thence southwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the Sutton to Cheam railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

SUTTON CENTRAL WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Sutton West Ward meets the eastern boundary of said ward, thence generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the eastern boundary of North Cheam Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Sutton Common Ward to Stayton Road, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said road to the road known as Angel Hill, thence southwards and southeastwards along said road and High Street to the Sutton to Cheam railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

ROSEHILL WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Sutton Central Ward meets the eastern boundary of Sutton Common Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northeastwards and generally eastwards along the southern boundary of St Helier North Ward, to a point opposite the western boundary of St Helier Hospital, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and generally southeastwards along the rear boundary of said hospital and the rear boundaries of numbers 159 to 129 Westminster Road, thence southwards and southeastwards along the eastern boundary of Greenshaw High School to the rear boundaries of numbers 51 to 9 Duke of Edinburgh Road, thence generally southwards along said boundaries and eastwards along the southern boundary of number 9 in said road to
said road, thence southwards along said road and Surrey Grove and continuing
generally southwards along the path from said grove to Gassiot Way to a point
opposite the northern boundary of number 55 in said way, thence westwards to and
along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Allotment Garden, thence
southeastwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of number 31 Erakine
Road to said road, thence westwards along said road to Benhill Road, thence
northwestwards along said road and westwards along All Saints Road to the road
known as Angel Hill, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary
of Sutton Central Ward, thence westwards and northwestwards along said boundary
to the point of commencement.

SUTTON EAST WARD

Commencing at the point where the Carshalton to Cheam railway meets the eastern
boundary of Sutton Central Ward, thence northwestwards and northwards along said
boundary to the southern boundary of Rosehill Ward, thence northwards, eastwards
and southeastwards along said boundary and continuing southwards along Benhill
Road and St Barnabas Road to Carshalton Road, thence generally eastwards along
said road to King's Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the Carshalton
to Cheam railway, thence generally southwestwards along said railway to the
point of commencement.

ST HELEIER SOUTH WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Rosehill Ward meets the
southern boundary of St Helier North Ward, thence southeastwards and northeast-
wards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of Wandle Valley Ward,
thence southeastwards along said boundary and Green Wrythe Lane to Fellowes Road,
thence southwestwards along said road to Wrythe Lane, thence northwestwards along
said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of number 141 Wrythe Lane,
thence westwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwestwards and
northwestwards along the rear boundaries of numbers 1 to 75 and 79 to 83 Westminster
Road and the southern boundary of number 55 Whitby Road, continuing westwards across said road and along the southern boundary of number 46 Whitby Road and the rear boundaries of numbers 85 to 89 Westminster Road to the eastern boundary of Rosehill Ward, thence generally northwestwards and northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WRYTHE GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Helier South Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Wandle Valley Ward thence northeastwards and generally southeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the Mitcham to Cheam railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to West Street thence northwards along said street and northwestwards along Wrythe Lane to the southeastern boundary of St Helier South Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and northwestwards along the eastern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

CARSHALTON NORTH WARD

Commencing at the point where the Mitcham to Cheam railway meets the eastern boundary of Sutton East Ward, thence northwards, westwards and northwards along said boundary, eastwards and northwards along the eastern boundary of Rosehill Ward to the southwestern boundary of St Helier South Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary and continuing southeastwards and southwards along the southwestern boundary of Wrythe Green Ward to the Mitcham to Cheam railway, thence generally southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

CARSHALTON CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Sutton East Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Carshalton North Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southeastern boundary and the southeastern boundary of Wrythe Green Ward to the River Wandle, thence southwards and southwestwards along said river
to a point opposite the northern boundary of the recreation ground known as
The Grove, thence southeastwards to and generally eastwards along said boundary
and generally southeastwards along the eastern boundary of The Grove to Westcroft
Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Acre Lane, thence northeastwards
along said lane to Park Lane, thence southeastwards and southwards along said
lane to the Wallington to Sutton railway, thence westwards and northwestwards
along said railway to King's Lane, thence northwards, northeastwards and north-
wards along said lane to the point of commencement.

WALLINGTON NORTH WARD
Commencing at the point where the West Croydon to Sutton railway meets the eastern
boundary of Carshalton Central Ward, thence generally northwards along said
boundary, northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of Wrythe Green Ward
and northwards along the eastern boundary of Wandle Valley Ward to London Road,
thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary
of West Lodge, thence eastwards to and along said boundary and generally south-
wards along the eastern boundary of said property and in prolongation thereof to
the path from London Road to Church Road thence southeastwards along said path to
NG ref T2 2941965186, thence due southwards to and crossing Croydon Road and continuing
southwards along Rectory Lane and The Bridle Way to Bute Gardens, thence north-
eastwards along said gardens to Demesne Road, thence southwards along said road
to the West Croydon to Sutton railway, thence southwestwards along said railway
to the point of commencement.

BEDDINGTON NORTH WARD
Commencing at the point where the West Croydon to Sutton railway meets the eastern
boundary of Wallington North Ward, thence generally northwards and northwestwards
along said boundary and northwards along the eastern boundary of Wandle Valley
Ward to the northern boundary of the borough, thence generally northeastwards
along said boundary and generally southeastwards along the eastern boundary of the
borough to the West Croydon to Sutton railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

CHEAM SOUTH WARD
Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the borough meets the southern boundary of Cheam West Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Sutton West Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the road known as Belmont Rise to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary and northwestwards, northeastwards and northwestwards along the western boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

BELMONT WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the borough meets the eastern boundary of Cheam South Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Sutton West Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundaries of Sutton Central Ward and Sutton East Ward to the Sutton to Epsom Downs railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the borough, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SUTTON SOUTH WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the borough meets the eastern boundary of Belmont Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and generally eastwards along the southern boundary of Sutton East Ward to the western boundary of Carshalton Central Ward, thence southwards and southwestwards along Hillcroome Road to Mayfield Road, thence southwards along said road, southwards along the road known as The Ridgeway to and westwards along Chalkgrove Road to Langley Park Road, thence southwards along said road to the road known as Crossways thence eastwards and southeastwards along said road to Banstead Road South, thence southwestwards along said road, crossing Downs Road and continuing
southwestwards along the track across Banstead Downs northwest of Downview Hospital to the southern boundary of the borough thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CARSHALTON BEECHES WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the borough meets the eastern boundary of Sutton South Ward, thence northeastwards and generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Carshalton Central Ward, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said boundary to a point opposite the western boundary of number 96 Beddington Gardens, thence southwards to and along said boundary, the rear boundaries of numbers 100 to 118 in said gardens and the western boundary of the Stanley Park High School crossing Stanley Park Road and continuing southwards along Dalmeny Road to Brambledown Road, thence eastwards along said road to Boundary Road, thence generally southwards along said road and Telegraph Track to a point opposite the northern boundary of parcel number 3748 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 plan TQ 2862 edition of 1958, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Queen Mary's Hospital for Children, thence southwards along said boundary and generally southwestwards along the southern boundary of said hospital, the Riding Centre and the Biological Research Laboratories to Woodmansterne Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of number 18 Oakhurst Rise, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and the rear boundaries of numbers 17 to 10 Oakhurst Rise and numbers 21 to 37 Pine Walk to the western boundary of number 37 in said walk, thence southeastwards in a straight line to the northernmost corner of parcel number 0683 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 plan TQ 2761 edition of 1958, thence southwestwards along the northern boundary of said parcel, the northern boundary of parcel number 9183 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 plan TQ 2661 edition of 1958 and the northwestern boundary of parcel number 6966 and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of the borough, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
WALLINGTON SOUTH WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Carshalton Beeches Ward meets the southern boundary of Carshalton Central Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of Wallington North Ward to Demesne Road, thence southwards along said road to Stafford Road, thence eastwards along said road to Sandy Lane South, thence southwards and southwestwards along said lane to Woodcote Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 264 Woodcote Road, thence westwards to and along said boundary and the southern boundary of the property known as Coogee in Woodmansterne Lane and in prolongation thereof to Woodmansterne Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to the Cart Track situated to the west of the property known as Kamparo, thence westwards along said track to the western boundary of Parcel No 6443 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1/2500 plan TQ 2862 Edition 1956, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the western boundary of The Playing Field of Wallington High School for Girls to a point on the path to the south of the property known as Tween Trees, thence southwestwards along said path to Telegraph Track, thence northwards along said track to the eastern boundary of Carshalton Beeches Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BEDDINGTON SOUTH WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Wallington South Ward meets the southern boundary of Beddington North Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said boundary to NG reference TQ 312862955, thence westwards in a straight line to Foresters Drive at a point opposite Timberslip Drive, thence northwards along said Foresters Drive to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 57 in said drive, thence eastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 57 to 15 Foresters Drive, continuing northwestwards to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 13 to 1 in said drive to the road known as Waterer Rise, thence westwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Wallington South Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
WOODCOTE WARD
Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Wallington South Ward meets the western boundary of Beddington South Ward, thence southwards and generally eastwards along the western and southern boundary of Beddington South Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards and generally southwestwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of the Borough to Woodcote Road, thence northwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Wallington South Ward, thence northeastwards along said Ward boundary to the point of commencement.

CLOCKHOUSE WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southeastern boundary of Carshalton Beeches Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Wallington South Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Woodcote Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and northwestwards along said borough boundary to the point of commencement.