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1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried
out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Merton
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 Merton 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. Merton 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 16 March 1976 the Merton Borough Council submitted their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 21 wards, each returning 2 or 3 members to form a council of 58.

5. We studied the Borough Council's draft scheme and noted that, in terms of equality of representation, it provided an even standard of representation throughout the borough.

6. The Borough Council's submission included a copy of an alternative scheme suggested by a local political party. This scheme referred also to a scheme drawn up by the Chief Executive. At our request a copy was sent to us. We studied these alternative schemes together with the additional comments which had been sent direct to us. We considered that the Council had insufficient regard to local ties when preparing their draft scheme and we decided that a satisfactory basis for the future electoral arrangements for the borough, in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines, would be achieved by adopting the wards suggested by the local political association for the Merton, Wimbledon constituency area and the wards suggested by the Chief Executive of the Council for the remainder of the borough. Our amendments reduced the size of council by one to 57 members. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

7. On 13 September 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Borough 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 19 November 1976.

8. Merton Borough Council informed us that they had no comment to make on
our draft proposals.

9. A local political association, not the one mentioned in paragraph 6,
objected to the reduction in the number of councillors we allocated to the
Merton, Wimbledon constituency area and to our proposed Lavender, Figge's
Marsh and Phipps Bridge wards. A councillor representing the existing
Mitcham North ward objected to our draft proposals and suggested an alternative
pattern of wards in place of our proposed Lavender, Figge's Marsh and
Graveney wards.

10. A residents association and a resident of our proposed Vale ward who supported
his case with the signatures of 44 electors, objected to the boundary
between our proposed Figge's Marsh and Vale wards and suggested that it should
be re-drawn along the Streatham-Mitcham railway line. They also suggested
that our proposed Vale ward should be renamed "Longthornton".

11. We received objections to our proposed Phipps Bridge and Ravensbury
wards from two ward committees of the local political association mentioned
in paragraph 9 above. One ward committee suggested that the boundary between
the 2 wards should be drawn along the Mitcham-Wimbledon railway line
throughout and the other suggested replacing our proposed two 3-member wards
by an alternative pattern of wards.

12. A councillor representing the existing Wimbledon West ward suggested
that the Drax Avenue area of our proposed Village ward should be transferred
to our proposed Raynes Park ward. This councillor was supported by the
other councillors representing the existing Wimbledon West ward and by councillors representing the existing Wimbledon North ward.

13. A residents association and councillors representing the existing West Barnes ward suggested that the Elm Walk area of our proposed Cannon Hill ward should be transferred to our proposed West Barnes ward.

14. In view of these comments on our draft proposals, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr B Marder, QC, was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

15. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting in Merton on 13 May 1977. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

16. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals, subject to amendments to our proposed Phipps Bridge/Ravensbury and Village/Raynes Park ward boundaries and giving the name Longthornton to our proposed Yale ward.

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

18. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.
19. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Merton Borough Council and will be available for 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)

4 August 1977
Sir Edmund Compton G.C.B. K.B.E.
Chairman,
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Dear Sir Edmund,

Review of Electoral Arrangements:
London Borough of Merton

1. I have to report that following my appointment by the Home Secretary as Assistant Commissioner for the purpose of assisting the Commission's review of electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Merton, I presided at a local meeting held at the Town Hall, Wimbledon Broadway on Friday 13 May 1977 to hear representations.

2. The meeting opened at 10 a.m. and concluded at 3.30 p.m. I enclose an attendance list showing that a total of 24 people attended. In addition, the Council's Chief Executive and members of his staff were in attendance and assisted generally when asked to do so in explaining plans and numerical analyses. After the meeting I made an unaccompanied inspection of those areas which I had been specifically asked to see.
These were two areas (a) around the Eastfields level crossing, including Grove Road, Oakleigh Way and Tamworth Lane, all in Mitcham; and (b) the West Barnes/Cannon Hill area, including Parkway and Southway, in the southwestern part of the Borough. My prior knowledge of the Borough was not detailed, but I have been generally familiar with the area for some years, and I spent some further time acquainting myself with other parts of the Borough which were referred to at the meeting.

3. There follows a summary of the issues emerging in the course of the present review, a report of the proceedings at the meeting, my conclusions and my recommendations to the Commission. I also attach a summary list of written representations to which I refer later in this report.

Background to the meeting

4. The London Borough of Merton has a present electorate of about 136,000 which is expected to increase slightly to about 138,000 by 1981. It is divided between two Parliamentary constituencies of which Wimbledon has generally been held by a Conservative whilst Mitcham and Morden has generally been held by Labour. The Borough ranges very widely in "character" and it would probably not be useful to attempt a thumbnail sketch, but I was conscious at the meeting of an indefinable sense of difference between the relatively more affluent western half of the Borough and the relatively more industrialised eastern half.
The present Council consists of 63 members including aldermen. Of that total, there are 33 Conservatives, 27 Labour and 3 Ratepayers, so that the Conservatives have an overall majority.

5. The current review began in June 1975 when the Commission invited the Borough Council to submit proposals. At an early stage it was agreed between the Borough Council and the Commission that a Council of 57 or 58 members would be appropriate, and a Council of this size appears to have commanded general acceptance, both prior to and at the local meeting.

6. In response to the Commission's invitation, the Borough Council submitted a draft scheme in March 1976, for a council of 58 members in 21 wards each of 2 or 3 members. A large number of objections were made to the Council's draft scheme, including representations from the Labour Party's Local Government Committee, who had prepared an alternative draft scheme in February 1976. That scheme is for 58 councillors in 20 wards. It also became known to the Commission that the Council's Chief Executive had prepared a draft scheme which the Council had rejected. The Commission asked to see that scheme and a copy was supplied. It provides for 58 councillors in 20 wards. After consideration of these alternatives and the representations made, the Commission published its own draft proposals, for a Council of 57 members in 20 wards.
These proposals followed broadly the suggestions of the Chief Executive in the Mitcham and Morden area and those of the Labour Party in the Wimbledon area. As a result of the representations made after the Commission's draft proposals were published, the Commission decided to call a local meeting.

7. In opening the meeting, I indicated the issues which appeared likely to arise, but I made it clear that I was not proposing to limit discussion in any way to those issues. In the event, the meeting was wholly occupied by those matters foreshadowed in correspondence, and these were fairly limited. As indicated earlier there was no disagreement as to the size of the Council, and there were in effect four points in the Borough where ward boundaries were disputed. In addition, the name of one proposed wards was questioned.

Representations at the meeting

8. After opening the meeting and outlining its purpose and the issues which appeared to arise, I heard the following representations which I have presented in summary form. I first invited comments relating to the Figge's Marsh/Vale wards.
9. Councillor F H Meakings (whose name does not appear on the attendance list but who is a member for Mitcham North Ward) strongly objected to what he called the "cutting-up" of North Mitcham which the Commission's proposals for Graveney, Figge's Marsh and Vale Wards represented. He called the proposed Figge's Marsh ward "ridiculous" and relied on the Commission's own guidelines for boundaries, pointing out that the long-established boundary provided by the North - South railway was abandoned. In his view the objective should be to retain North Mitcham as near as possible intact. His proposal is indicated in a letter dated 10 November 1976.

10. Mr L.W.B. Augarde is Secretary of the Labour Party's Local Government Committee. He expressed some sympathy with the point of view of Cllr. Meakings, and explained that in his Committee's proposals the proposed Gorringe Park ward had been an attempt to retain North Mitcham intact. That had been rejected by the Commission for reasons which he understood and accepted. The proposals of the Commission were reasonable in avoiding so far as possible the severance of communities whilst maintaining parity of representation between wards.

The area further South in Polling district JD
is part of a different community which would in turn be severed by Cllr. Meakings' proposals. He was aware of strong representations from this area that they should not be lumped in with North Mitcham.

In fact no adverse consequences would follow from the Commission's proposals to add part of Polling district M to the proposed Figge's Marsh ward. The railway is not a real barrier; there is a wide level crossing at Eastfields Road which is extensively used.

Whilst generally content with the ward names proposed, he thought that, provided the proposed boundaries were maintained, Vale ward would be more aptly named Longthornton.

11. Ald. J.E. Smith, representing Mitcham Conservative Association, acknowledged the difficulty of presenting alternatives because of the ripple effects.

The Conservative proposals, endorsed by the Council had been rejected for reasons which were not made clear. It could hardly be for the purpose of retaining local ties, in the light of the curious proposal to disregard the clear and old-established boundary of the railway line in the Eastfields Road area. This would give rise to practical difficulties, especially on election days owing to serious rush-hour congestion at the level crossing. He felt greatly concerned that
people living on the E. side of the railway would feel out off from the community to which they belonged, by being added to the Figge's Marsh ward.


In answer to me, Mr. Norris said that the Association covered all the existing Mitcham Central Ward and had a paid-up membership of about 6,000 at present, including about 600 on the new Eastfields Estate. (This latter figure was later doubted - B.M.) He felt that these people had links with the Association, but he accepted that there was considerable movement to and fro across the railway, and the people on the E. side of the railway used shops and other facilities on the other side. He thought the railway had been more of a natural boundary between communities in the past.

13. Cllr. D.J. Hempstead (Labour) is a member for Mitcham West but lives in the present Mitcham North ward. He challenged the points made by Cllr. Meakings and Ald. Smith. The use of railway lines as boundaries had been discussed at earlier inquiries; it could not always be right to use them in a borough so criss-crossed by railways. The old Graveney ward revived by the
Commission's proposals is bisected by a railway and has been for years without ill effect. The Streatham/Mitcham line is in fact crossed by a footbridge at Sandy Lane, by the level crossing at Eastfields Road, by another footbridge at Gaston Road, leading directly to the main shopping area around the Fair Green, and by a bridge carrying a major road at Commonside East (Beehive Bridge). Cllr. Hempstead felt that residents in the Eastfields estate had closer links with Mitcham North than with the rest of the present Mitcham Central ward - residents in the Longthornton area tended to gravitate northward to Streatham. He agreed that the proposed Vale ward would be better named Longthornton.

14. Cllr. H.R. Veal (Labour) referred to lengthy discussions in a Council sub-committee, in which there were at least two agreed objectives, firstly to aim for as many councillors as the Commission could be persuaded to accept, and secondly to arrange for 20 wards, of which 10 would be in each constituency. Mitcham and Morden would have a bigger 1981 electorate than Wimbledon. I think this is not factually correct - B.M. Councillor Meakings proposal would reduce the former's representation. Cllr. Veal said that no plan would be ideal, but the Commission's proposals were as reasonable as could be expected.
15. **Ald. Smith** commented that there has not been unanimity in the sub-committee as to the number of wards.

16. **Mr. F. Hedden** for Glebe Court Residents Association, said that the Association represented 90-95% of the 264 properties comprising Glebe Court. They had objected strongly to the Council's proposals as they did not wish to be separated from the rest of the Mitcham South community to which they had always belonged. They therefore welcomed the Commission's proposals, which left Glebe Court in the proposed Phipps Bridge ward where they properly belonged.

(At this point it was agreed to pass on to consideration of the West Barnes/Cannon Hill area).

17. **Mr. S. Morton** for Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents Association, referred to the letter of 17th November 1976 setting out the Association's views. They had served the area nearly 50 years and would be very sorry to see the Elm Walk area transferred to the adjoining ward. Their view was shared by the neighbouring Cannon Hill Residents Association. Mr. Morton agreed in answer to my questions that he could not foresee any practical difficulties as a result of the proposed boundary, but he felt that no justification had been put forward for the change.
18. **Mr. D.C. Goodacre** for Cannon Hill Residents Association, wholly supported Mr. Morton. He did not think it a matter of great moment, but he could see no point in the change.

19. **Mr Augarde** pointed out that these two wards were virtually on target in the Commission's proposals, but would be somewhat off-balance if the Residents' Association's wishes were observed. But the Labour Party were not strongly opposed to an adjustment to meet those wishes.

20. **Cllr. R.L. Mackenzie** supported Mr. Morton and spoke of the strong sense of community in West Barnes. (The meeting then passed on to consider the boundary between Phipps Bridge and Ravensbury wards).

Mrs. Rowe spoke of two distinct communities, differing in character, with London Road forming a clear natural boundary between them. These were lumped together in the Commission's proposed Phipps Bridge ward. She referred also to practical difficulties in administration caused by carrying the proposed Ravensbury ward N. of the River Wandle. The proposals made in the letter of 17 November 1976 remedied these anomalies by retaining existing ties.

22. Mr F. Hedden (see para. 16 above) spoke also in his capacity as Chairman of Phipps Bridge Community Association. He commented that the two communities referred to by Mrs. Rowe had been united for years in the Mitcham South ward. Mr. Hedden also raised a question concerning the Phipps Bridge Community Centre. This was in Haslemere Avenue, and would be in Colliers Wood ward on the basis of the Commission's proposals. He suggested the boundary could be adjusted to keep the Centre in Phipps Bridge ward without electoral effect.

23. Ald. Smith (see para. 11 above) supported Mrs. Rowe, he said the existing Mitcham South ward was a very bad one; this review gave an opportunity to improve the situation, and the Commission's proposals singularly failed to do this.
He identified 3 distinct communities, viz. (a) the Mitcham Park area S.E. of London Rd; (b) the Phipps Bridge area, comprising large Council estates of the mid-60s; and (c) older communities such as Glebe Court, which were not readily identified geographically. The Conservative proposals sought to retain these identities whilst using natural boundaries as far as possible.

Furthermore, the salient bounded by Church Road, London Road and Baron Walk was very undesirable, producing a further carve-up of a community.

Ald. Smith concluded by expressing firm belief in a reasonably balanced Council with a strong opposition—he considered the Commission's proposals would not produce that.

24. Cllr. Hempstead disagreed with suggestion that the Commission's proposals would result in an unbalanced Council. As for the so-called salient, this was largely older development forming part of old Mitcham. It could be claimed that it was wrong to put that area in the Phipps Bridge ward. The argument based on social affinity could be used either way.

25. Ald. Smith at my request sought to explain further his last comment (see para. 23 above). He said that if
elections proceed on the basis of the Commission's proposals then on present trends the minority party would be decimated, but this would be less so if the alternative proposals were adopted. I was unable to ascertain more precisely why this should be the case.

26. Mr. Augarde for the Labour Party, did not accept Ald. Smith's thesis. He had studied canvass returns and other data and took the view that the Commission's proposals would produce a reasonable balance of representation. He criticised the Conservative proposals as tending to draw blue circles around Conservative enclaves for obvious party advantage. Further, it was desirable to retain 3-member wards where possible, but the Conservatives propose more smaller wards returning 1 or 2 councillors, again for their political advantage.

27. Mr. Christopher Smith, Vice-Chairman of the Mitcham and Morden Conservative Association, accepted that the proposals embodied in the letter of 17 November 1976 varied considerably from the Commission's numerical guidelines, but he urged the Commission to revert to the original Conservative proposals endorsed as the Council's draft scheme. I asked for clarification on this point, and was assured by Mr. Smith that he was authorised on behalf of the Conservative Association to invite the Commission to consider the Council's draft scheme and not the amendments contained in the letter of 17 November 1976.
Mr Smith then submitted, apparently as a proposition of law, that the Commission's proposals failed to comply with the statutory requirements, and he referred specifically to the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 11, paras. 3(2) and 3(3). He said there were many instances where numerical parity was not as near as may be, and many instances where local ties were broken. By way of examples, he cited (a) the failure to use St.Helier Avenue throughout as the boundary between St. Helier and Ravensbury Wards; (b) discarding the River Wandle as the boundary between Ravensbury and Phipps Bridge wards; (c) part of polling district J North of Haslemere Avenue transferred into Colliers Wood ward; and (d) the area E of the Streatham - Mitcham railway transferred into Figge's Marsh ward.

I pointed out to Mr. Smith that, of his four examples, the first three were features common to both the Commission's proposals and the alternative favoured by the Conservatives. Mr. Smith agreed this was so, but he maintained that the Commission had taken account only of numerical convenience and had not paid sufficient regard to local ties. I indicated that his submission was noted and that the Commission would no doubt take legal advice on it.
30. Mr Augarde wished to point out that Lavender Ward in the Commission’s proposals appeared over-represented on 1975 figures (1.49 entitlement) and nearly exactly right by 1981 (1.96). However, a substantial part of the expected growth in this area was already taking place, so that the 1978 electorate would be considerably larger than the 1975 figures indicated.

31. In addition to the representations which I have summarised above, I have considered all the written representations to the Commission, including the letter from Cllr. Eugene Byrne, concerning the boundary between Village and Raynes Park wards, which was not discussed at the meeting.

Conclusions

32. As I have indicated earlier, there is no controversy as to the appropriate size of Council, 57 or 58 members being generally regarded as acceptable. In providing for division into wards, an infinite variety of solutions is of course theoretically possible, but in practical terms the choice for Merton seems to me to lie between the draft scheme supported by the majority party and proposed by the Borough Council and the Commission’s own proposals.
33. In numerical terms, the Council's scheme is far from satisfactory in securing parity of representation between wards as near as may be, nor does it appear to pay sufficient regard to the preservation of local ites in that it creates or perpetuates a number of deep and presumably divisive salients. Examples are to be found at Mitcham, between Mitcham Common and Longthornton wards, and between Lavender/Bond and Phipps Bridge wards; and in Wimbledon, between South Park and Priory wards, and between South Park and St Marys, where the opportunity to use the obvious main railway line as a boundary has been ignored. It may be that these reasons prompted the Commission to reject the Council's scheme at an earlier stage.

34. In the light of these manifest disadvantages of the Council's scheme, it appears to me that the determining issues must be whether the criticisms made of the Commission's proposals are of substance; if so, whether the Commission's proposals can and should be amended to meet them, or indeed whether the Commission's proposals are so far defective and unsatisfactory that they should be discarded in favour of the alternative Council scheme.
35. It will be convenient first to summarise my conclusions regarding the specific points of criticism of the Commission's proposals, as follows:

(a) Figge's Marsh/Vale wards. I do not think the railway line is an effective barrier between distinct communities in this area. Of course it presents a convenient means of drawing a boundary, but the boundary as drawn by the Commission is understandable on the ground. I conclude that the inclusion of this area E of the railway in Figge's Marsh ward will have no adverse consequences in relation to local ties and is much to be preferred to the numerical disparity caused by any of the alternative suggested.

(b) Vale ward. There is general agreement that this area would be better named Longthornton, and I conclude that this is a reasonable amendment to the Commission's proposals.

(c) West Barnes/Cannon Hill wards. I have sympathy for the views expressed by the residents associations, but the consequence of the amendments proposed to the Commission's scheme would be to make West Barnes ward under-represented substantially both on the present electorate and the 1981 projection. Very sound reasons are needed to justify this
disparity, and I can find none. The area in question seems to have as much affinity with Cannon Hill as with West Barnes, and as the Residents Associations in effect agreed, the only discernible consequence is likely to be the loss of a few members to one association and a corresponding gain to its friendly neighbour.

(d) **Phipps Bridge/Ravensbury wards.** The Commission's proposals were criticised, and amendments suggested, by the local Conservative representatives prior to the meeting (letters dated 23 October 1976 and 17 November 1976) and the criticisms and alternative proposals were pursued at the meeting (see paras 21 - 23 above). However, as reported in para. 27, the alternatives appeared at a later stage in the meeting to be withdrawn by the party. I have nevertheless considered them. So far as the amendment proposed in the letter of 23 October 1976 is concerned, there is little to choose between the Commission's proposals and the amendment in numerical terms. In the former case Ravensbury ward will be somewhat under-represented both currently and in 1981, whereas if the alternative were adopted, Phipps Bridge will be slightly under-represented on the 1976 electorate and rather more so by 1981. But all the figures are within or (in one instance) just outside the Commission's normal tolerance.
In terms of clear logical boundaries and the retention of local ties, the adjustment proposed in the letter of 23 October 1976 is in my view preferable to the Commission's proposals. The Wimbledon-Mitcham railway and Morden Road afford a clear and sensible boundary in this area, and although both sides of the railway are in the existing Mitcham South ward, the Commission's proposals would create an awkward salient which I think is unjustifiable by numerical requirements. I conclude therefore that the amendment represented in the letter of 23 October 1976 should be accepted.

On the other hand, the letter of 17 November 1976 suggests a radical re-shaping of the wards in this southern part of the Borough for which I can see no justification at all. Three wards would be involved, to produce a pattern which has no obvious geographical advantage over the Commission's proposals, and seem to be designed only for the purpose of using the River Wandle as a boundary. In my view the river, whatever other value it has, is unimportant in shaping local communities, and the cost of re-arrangement in terms of loss of parity between wards, is wholly unacceptable, besides requiring wards of 3, 2 and 1 members respectively.

(e) Village/Raynes Park wards. A letter from Cllr. Byrne,
representing himself and other councillors in the existing Wimbledon West and North wards, suggested boundary re-alignments. Cllr. Bryne could not attend the meeting, but sent me a letter dated 12th May 1977. The matter was not discussed, but I have considered it. In numerical terms, there is little to choose between the Commission's proposals and the suggested amendment. According to the analysis supplied to me, if the latter were adopted, Raynes Park ward would be under-represented in 1976 and 1978 to an extent outside the usual tolerance, but the difference between that and the under-representation of Village ward in the Commission's proposals is very small indeed.

In terms of convenience and the retention of local ties, Cllr. Byrne's letter presents a good case for including this Drax Avenue area in the Raynes Park ward, and the case was not opposed or answered at the meeting. On balance, I think it should be accepted.

It will be seen from the foregoing that I have concluded firstly, that none of the objections taken to the Commission's proposals is so substantial or compelling as to justify their rejection; secondly, that in any event
the draft scheme put forward by the Borough Council would not offer a satisfactory alternative; and thirdly, that the Commission's proposals, whilst acceptable in general terms, can and should be amended in several relatively minor respects.

Recommendations

37. I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals, as set out in the letter dated 13 September 1976, with the accompanying memorandum, description of ward boundaries and map, should be adopted, subject only to the following modifications:

(1) Vale Ward - to be renamed Longthornton ward;

(2) Phipps Bridge/Ravensbury Wards. The boundary should be adjusted so as to be constituted by the Wimbledon to Mitcham Junction railway throughout; and

(3) Village/Raynes Park Wards. The boundary should be adjusted so as to include in Raynes Park ward the area between Beverley Avenue in the West and Drax Avenue in the East.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant.

(BERNARD MARDER Q.C.)
Assistant Commissioner.
LIST OF RESPONSES TO COMMISSION'S DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR MERTON

Letter dated 30 October 1976 from Longthornton and Tamworth Residents' Association objecting to the proposed ward name of Vale and suggesting Longthornton as an alternative.

Letter dated 10 November 1976 from Councillor F H Meakings objecting to the proposed Figge's Marsh/Gorringe Park ward.

Undated letter from Councillor Meakings setting out proposals for existing Mitcham North ward.

Letter dated 16 November 1976 from Mr J McKenna on behalf of the Conservative members in the existing Mitcham North and Mitcham Central wards, objecting to the failure of the Commission to make full use of the Streatham to Mitcham Junction railway line as a boundary in their draft proposals and suggesting the name 'Vale' as an alternative to Longthornton.

Letter dated 16 November 1976 from Mr B J Shenton objecting to Commission's draft proposals for the present Mitcham Central ward as contradictory, confusing and misleading. He presents a counter-proposal and also advocates the name of Longthornton.

Letter dated 18 November 1976 from Mitcham and Morden Conservative Association objecting to the Commission's hybrid draft proposals and advocating a mixture of 2 and 3 seat wards as a solution.


Letter dated 17 November 1976 from Mitcham South Conservative Association objecting to the Commission's proposals in respect of Phipps Bridge and Mitcham Park wards.

Letter, undated from Councillor E Byrne on behalf of the Wimbledon West ward and Wimbledon North ward councillors, suggesting amendments to the proposed Village ward and Raynes Park ward.

Letter dated 17 November 1976 from Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents' Association objecting to the draft proposals for the Raynes Park and West Barnes wards.

Letter dated 16 November 1976 from Councillor R L Mackenzie and others (West Barnes ward borough councillors), asking for further consideration of the proposed boundary line of the proposed West Barnes, Cannon Hill and Lower Morden wards.
LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS MEETING - 13th MAY 1977

ATTENDANCE SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Morton</td>
<td>R.P. &amp; W.B. Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A. Jones</td>
<td>Longthornton Res. Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Norris</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Smith</td>
<td>Mitcham &amp; Morden Cons. Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Patterson</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.W.B. Augarde</td>
<td>Secy. Local Govt. Committee (Lab. Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Franks</td>
<td>Councillor for West Barnes Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L. Mackenzie</td>
<td>Wimbledon Const. Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Russell Earnshaw</td>
<td>Glebe Court Residents Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Rosewell</td>
<td>Wimbledon Conservative Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Heddon</td>
<td>Merton/Wimbledon Cons. Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rintack</td>
<td>Mitcham Cons. Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Barnes</td>
<td>Cannon Hill Ward Res. Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ald. J.E. Smith</td>
<td>Councillor, Mitcham &amp; M. L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Goodacre</td>
<td>Councillor, Mitcham Morden L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan W. Goodacre</td>
<td>Cannon Hill Ward L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Hempstead</td>
<td>Mitcham &amp; Morden Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.B. Veal</td>
<td>Mitcham &amp; Morden Conservative Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Digney</td>
<td>Mitcham &amp; Morden Conservative Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Digney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McKenna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jane Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Kernick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF WARD</td>
<td>NO OF COUNCILLORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANNON HILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIERS WOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDONALD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNSFORD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGGE'S MARSH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVENEY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLSIDE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVENDER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGTHORNTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER MORDEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERTON PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIPPS BRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLLARDS HILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSBUY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYNES PARK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST HELIER</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLAGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST BARNES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON 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.

VILLAGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of the Borough meets the Southfields to Wimbledon railway, thence southeastwards and southwards along said railway to Gap Road, thence westwards along said road and continuing westwards along Leopold Road to Leopold Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Ricards Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Lake Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the road known as Church Hill, thence westwards along said road to St Mary's Road, thence northwards along said road to Highbury Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Belvedere Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to the road known as Belvedere Grove, thence southwestwards along said road, crossing Wimbledon Hill Road, and continuing southwestwards along the road known as Ridgway and Copse Hill to Drax Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 2a Drax Avenue, thence eastwards to and along said southern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence northwards along said rear boundary to the southern boundary of Wimbledon Hospital, thence westwards along said boundary to the western boundary of said hospital, thence northwards along said boundary to and eastwards along the northern boundary of said hospital to the southern boundary of Royal Wimbledon Golf Course, thence generally northwestwards and southwestwards along said southern boundary to the southwestern corner of said Golf Course, thence southwestwards in a straight line crossing Barham Road to the northeastern corner of No 54 Barham Road, thence southwestwards along the northern boundary of said property and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of Drax Playing Field and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards and northeastwards along the western and northern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

RAYNES PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Village Ward, thence generally eastwards along said ward boundary to Arterberry Road, thence southeastwards along said road crossing Worple Road and continuing southeastwards along Stanton Road to the northern most corner of No 21 Stanton Road, thence southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of said property and in prolongation thereof to the Wimbledon to New Malden railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to West Barnes Lane, thence generally southwards along said Lane to point opposite Pyl Brook, thence generally northwestwards to and along said brook, passing under the Kingston by Pass to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along said borough boundary to the
point of commencement.

HILLSIDE WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Raynes Park Ward meets the southern boundary of Village Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southern boundary to the Clapham Junction to Raynes Park railway, thence southwestwards along said railway, to the rear boundary of No 15 Wimbledon Bridge, thence generally westwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 17 to 25 Wimbledon Bridge to the northeastern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence southwestwards along said boundary and continuing southwestwards in a straight line across Wimbledon Bridge, to and along the northwestern boundary of No 22 Wimbledon Bridge to the southern boundary of said property, thence eastwards along said boundary, and the southern boundary of Nos 20 and 18 Wimbledon Bridge to the Clapham Junction to Raynes Park railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Raynes Park Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

DURNSFORD WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Village Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards and southwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of the Wandle Valley Sewage Disposal Works, thence southwestwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the River Wandle, thence southeastwards along said river to the Tooting to Wimbledon railway, thence westwards along said railway to a point opposite the western boundary of No 60 Cromwell Road, thence northwards to and along said boundary to said road, thence westwards along said road to Avondale Road, thence northwards along said road to Gap Road, thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of the Wimbledon (Gap Road) Cemetery, thence northwards to and northwards and
westwards along said western boundary and in prolongation thereof to the eastern boundary of Village Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

COLLIERS WOOD WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Durnsford Ward meets the northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough of Longley Road and London Road boundary to the junction thence eastwards to London Road, thence southwards along said road to the Tooting to Wimbledon railway, thence westwards along said railway and southwestwards along the dismantled railway to a point opposite the western boundary of the Chelsea College and City University Athletic Ground, thence southwards to and generally southwestwards along said boundary to Western Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 135 Western Road, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 4 Mount Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 6 to 84 Mount Road to the southern boundary of No 262 Church Road, thence westwards along said boundary to Church Road, thence southwards along said road to the accessway north of No 259 Church Road, thence southwestwards along said accessway and continuing along the northern boundary of the Phipp's Bridge Primary School to the path west of said school, thence southwards along said path to the path which crosses the Recreation Ground south of the Community Centre and Youth Club, thence southwestwards along said path and continuing southwestwards in a straight line to NG Ref TQ 2649169086, being a point in Phipp's Bridge Road, thence northwards along said road to NG reference TQ 2647169155, thence due westwards to the River Wandle (western arm) thence northeastwards along said River to Phipp's Bridge, thence northeastwards along said bridge to Phipp's Bridge Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the river known as The Pickle, thence northwestwards to and northwards along said river and continuing northwards along the River Wandle to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of Wandle Park, thence generally northeastwards and northwestwards along the southeastern and north-
eastern boundaries of said park to NG reference Tq 2668570624, thence north-
westwards in a straight line to Byngrove Road, thence generally southwestwards
along said road to the River Wandle, thence northwestwards along said river
and continuing northwestwards and northeastwards along the eastern boundary
of Durnsford Ward to the point of commencement.

TRINITY WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Village Ward meets the
southern boundary of Durnsford Ward, thence generally southeastwards
along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Colliers Wood Ward,
therefore southeastwards along said western boundary to South Road, thence
generally westwards along said road to Haydons Road, thence southwards along
said road to Quicks Road, thence westwards along said road to Merton Road,
therefore northwestwards along said road to the road known as Broadway,
therefore generally northwestwards along said road and continuing northwestwards
along Wimbledon Bridge to the eastern boundary of Hillside Ward, thence north-
estwards along said boundary and continuing northeastwards along the eastern
boundary of Village Ward to the point of commencement.

ABBEY WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Trinity Ward meets the
western boundary of Colliers Wood Ward, thence generally eastwards and south-
estwards along said western boundary and continuing along the western arm of
the River Wandle to the stream flowing northeastwards from the watercourse
situated north of Morden Hall, thence southwestwards along said stream to the
weir on said watercourse, thence westwards along said weir and continuing
westwards along the northern bank of said watercourse and in prolongation thereof
to Morden Road, thence northwards along said road to the Mitcham to Wimbledon
railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to Kingston Road, thence
northeastwards along said road to Russell Road, thence northwards along said
road to the southern boundary of Trinity Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

DUNDONALD WARD
Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Hillside Ward meets the southern boundary of Trinity Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Abbey Ward thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said western boundary and continuing southwestwards along Kingston Road to Mayfield Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of Nos 1 to 19 Spring House, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of the garages north of Nos 205a to 207 Kingston Road to Henfield Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Merton Hall Road, thence southwards along said road to the footpath south of Wimbledon Chase Middle School, thence southwestwards along said footpath and the footpath known as The Chase to the Wimbledon to Sutton railway, thence southwards along said railway to Kingston Road, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing along Bushey Road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 57 to 1 Gore Road thence northwards to and along said boundaries to the access road to the rear of Nos 57 to 69 Approach Road, thence southwestwards along said access road to Grand Drive, thence northwards along said drive, crossing Approach Road and continuing northwards along the access road to Raynes Park Station to the southeastern boundary of Raynes Park Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary and continuing northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of Hillside Ward to the point of commencement.

MERTON PARK WARD
Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Dundonald Ward meets the western boundary of Abbey Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said western boundary and continuing along Morden Road to London Road, thence south-
westwards along said road to a point due north of the western boundary of the
garage situated west of the Odeon Theatre in Aberconway Road, thence due south-
wards to and southwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said
garage, thence eastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 20
to 48 Bordesley Road, thence southwards along said boundaries and continuing
douthwards and southwestwards along the eastern boundary of the railway property
and in prolongation thereof to the Sutton to Wimbledon railway, thence north-
estwards along said railway to the southeastern boundary of Dundonald Ward,
thence northwards and northeastwards along said boundary to the point of
commencement.

CANNON HILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Dundonald Ward meets the
western boundary of Merton Park Ward, thence southeastwards along said western
boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the southern
boundary of No 1 Hillcross Avenue, thence southwestwards along said prolongation
and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundary of the properties on the
south side of Hillcross Avenue to the access way south of No 357 in said
avenue, thence northwestwards along said access way, crossing Hillcross Avenue
to the eastern boundary of No 2 Churston Drive, thence northwards along said
boundary and northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2-20 Churston
Drive, the northern boundary of the last mentioned property and crossing
Shaldon Drive to the eastern boundary of No 22 Churston Drive, thence north-
estwards along said boundary and continuing generally northwestwards along the
rear boundaries of Nos 24-36 Churston Drive, the northern boundary of the last
mentioned property and crossing Templecombe Way to the eastern boundary of
No 38 Churston Drive, thence northwards along said boundary and northwestwards
along the rear boundaries of Nos 38-52 Churston Drive, the northern boundary of
the last mentioned property, crossing Thurleston Avenue to the eastern boundary
of No 54 Churston Drive, thence northwestwards along said boundary and
continuing generally northwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 56-76
Churston Drive to the southern boundary of the Allotment Gardene, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 78 Churston Drive, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 351-361 Cannon Hill Lane to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said boundary to said lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of Raynes Park Playing Fields, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of Thornton Court to Grand Drive, thence northwestwards along said drive to the road known as Southway, thence southeastwards and northeasterwards along said road, to and northwestwards along the road known as Parkway to a point opposite the western boundary of Cannon Hill Common adjacent to the southern boundary of Noll Parkway thence generally northeasterwards and northwesterwards to and along said boundary and the western boundaries of Messines Playing Field and Prince Georges Playing Field to the southern boundary of Dundonald Ward, thence northeasterwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WEST BARNES WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Raynes Park Ward, thence generally southeastwards and northeasterwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Dundonald Ward, thence generally southwards along said western boundary, continuing generally southwards along the western boundary of Cannon Hill Ward and continuing southeasterwards along Grand Drive to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of the St Catherine's RC Secondary Girls' School, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to Pyl Brook thence northwesterwards along said brook to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Wandsworth Borough Council Sports Ground, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the access road to Battersea Cemetery, thence southwards along said access road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Crusaders Boys' Club south of Arthur Road, thence westwards to and along said boundary to the stream on the eastern boundary of
the Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Field, thence southeastwards along said stream to the western boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and generally northwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

LOWER MORDEN WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of West Barnes Ward, thence northwards and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the southwestern boundary of Cannon Hill Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the western boundary of Morden Park, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the southern most corner of the Scout Hall, thence southwards in a straight line to the northern most corner of the Peacock Farm Nursery, thence southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of said nursery to Lower Morden Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

ST HELIER WARD
Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the northeastern boundary of Lower Morden Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said northeastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Cannon Hill Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the southwestern boundary of Merton Park Ward, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along the southwestern and southeastern boundaries of said ward to the southern boundary of Abbey Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary to the western channel of the River Wandle, thence southeastwards along said river to the unnamed road from Morden Hall, running through Morden Hall Park, thence eastwards along said unnamed road to the stream east of Morden Cottage, thence generally southwestwards along said stream to the River Wandle, thence southeastwards along said river (eastern channel) to Morden Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Morden Hall Road.
thence westwards along said road to St Helier Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 206 St Helier Avenue, thence westwards to and along said boundary to the eastern boundary of No 26 Chester Gardens, thence southwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of said property, thence westwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundaries of Nos 24-20 Chester Gardens to the western boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of No 18 Chester Gardens, thence westwards along said boundary to the western boundary of said property, thence northwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of No 16 Chester Gardens, thence westwards along said boundary, the southern boundary of No 131 Canterbury Road, and in prolongation thereof, crossing Canterbury Road to the southern boundary of Nos 152/154 Canterbury Road, thence westwards along said boundary to the western boundary of said properties, thence northwards along said boundary and the western boundary of Nos 148/150 Canterbury Road to the southern boundary of No 14 Combermere Road, thence westwards along said boundary and continuing westwards and southwestwards along the southern and southeastern boundaries of Nos 12-2 Combermere Road to the southwestern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to Combermere Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Farm Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 106A Farm Road, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the western boundary of No 55 Faversham Road, thence southwards along the western boundaries of Nos 55-27 Faversham Road continuing southwards to and along the western boundaries of Nos 23-1 Faversham Road to the southern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary and in prolongation thereof to Canterbury Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 206 Canterbury Road, thence westwards to and along said northern boundary to the
western boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said western boundary to the northern boundary of No 208 Canterbury Road, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 208 to 222 Canterbury Road, to the northern boundary of the Canterbury Primary School, thence westwards and southwestwards along the northern and northwestern boundaries of said school and continuing southwestwards along the northwestern boundary of Chaucer Middle School and southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of said school to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and generally northwestwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

RAVENSBURY WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of St Helier Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Abbey Ward, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the Wimbledon to Mitcham Junction railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to NG reference TQ 275868014, being a point opposite the northwestern boundary of the Industrial Estate, thence southwestwards to and along said northwestern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the River Wandle, thence generally southeastwards and southwestwards along said river to the southern boundary of the Borough thence northwestwards, southwestwards and generally northwestwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.
PHIPPS BRIDGE WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Ravensbury Ward, thence generally northwards and north-westwards along said eastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Abbey Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Colliers Wood Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to Western Road, thence southeastwards along said road and the road known as Upper Green West, crossing London Road and continuing southeastwards along the road known as Upper Green East to the road known as Commonsie East, thence southeastwards along said road to the Streatham to Mitcham Junction railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the road known as Commonsie West, thence southeastwards along said road to Croydon Road, thence southeastwards along said road to NG reference TQ 2841068065 thence due southwards to the Mitcham Junction to Hackbridge railway, thence southeastwards and southwards along said railway to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards and generally northwestwards along said Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

LAVENDER WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Phipps Bridge Ward meets the eastern boundary of Colliers Wood Ward, thence northwestwards, generally northwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary to London Road, thence southwards along said road to the northeastern boundary of Phipps Bridge Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

GRAVENEY WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Colliers Wood Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and generally southeastwards along said Borough boundary to the Streatham to Tooting railway thence westwards along said railway to Streatham Road,
thence southwestwards along said road to Gorringe Park Avenue, thence north-
westwards along said avenue to the eastern boundary of Lavender Ward, thence
northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards along the
eastern boundary of Colliers Wood Ward to the point of commencement.

FIGGE'S MARSH WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Phipps Bridge
Ward meets the eastern boundary of Lavender Ward, thence northwards along
said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Graveney Ward, thence
southeastwards and generally northeastwards along said boundary to the
northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said
Borough boundary to the Streatham to Mitcham Junction railway, thence
southwestwards along said railway to a point opposite the southwestern
boundary of No 6 Birch Walk, thence southeastwards to and along said
boundary and the western boundaries of Nos 5 to 1 Birch Walk and
continuing southeastwards along the western boundary of Nos 48-52 Oakleigh
Way to Oakleigh Way, thence southwestwards along said way to Grove Road,
thence southeastwards in a straight line to NG reference TQ 2883769308
being a point in Mulholland Close, thence northeastwards along said close
to Clay Avenue, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said avenue
to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 27 Hammond Avenue,
thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwest-
wards along the southeastern boundaries of Nos 29, 30 and 28 Hammond
Avenue and No 89 Tamworth Lane, crossing Tamworth Lane to the northwestern
boundary of the Playing Field, thence generally southwestwards along said
northwestern boundary to the southwestern boundary of said playing field,
thence southeastwards along said boundary to a point being the prolongation
northeastwards of the access road to the rear of the properties on the west
side of Brenley Close, thence southwestwards along said prolongation and
access road and in prolongation thereof to the southern carriageway of the
road known as Commonside East, thence northwestwards along said road and
continuing northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of Phipps Bridge Ward to the point of commencement.

LONGTHORNTON WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Figge's Marsh Ward meets the northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards generally eastwards and southwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of the playing field east of Pollards Hill High School, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of the Pollards Hill High School to the eastern boundary of No 1 Wide Way, thence northwards and southwestwards along the eastern and northwestern boundaries of said property to the road known as Wide Way thence northwestwards along said road to Manor Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the southern carriageway of the road known as Commonside East, thence northwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Figge's Marsh Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

POLLARDS HILL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Phipps Bridge Ward meets the southern boundary of Figge's Marsh Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary to the southern boundary of Longthornton Ward, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards and southwestwards along the eastern and southern boundary of the Borough to the eastern boundary of Phipps Bridge Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.