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1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Ealing's boundary with the London Borough of Hounslow; and for the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham's boundaries with the London Boroughs of Ealing, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames.

2. We have considered, but decided against proposing, radical change such as the realignment of Ealing's southern and eastern boundaries along the M4 Motorway and the Brentford-Willesden Junction railway line. However, we are recommending that the Old Oak Common railway sidings be united in Hammersmith and Fulham, and that a residential area in Norwood Green be united in Ealing. In addition, we are making several proposals to remove minor anomalies, for example where properties are divided by boundaries. Our report explains how we arrived at our proposals.

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

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

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

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

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

7. We took the opportunity in our Report No 550, "People and Places" (April 1988), to explain in some detail the approach we take to our work and the factors which we take into consideration when conducting reviews, including the guidelines given to us by the Secretary of State (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

8. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which the Commission had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as it makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.
9. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since London government reorganisation in 1965 and to offer our thoughts on the issues which have been raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We therefore published a general report in May 1992, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs" (Report No. 627), which discusses a number of the wider London issues which have arisen during the course of this review.

THE USE OF ROADS AS BOUNDARIES IN URBAN AREAS

10. In the course of our review of boundaries in Greater London, we have found no general consensus among local authorities over the relative merits of side and centre-of-road alignments. On occasions, this has led authorities to accept the principle of a draft proposal we have made, but to oppose the precise alignment; this report contains a number of examples. We have therefore felt it appropriate to set out our general views on the use of roads as boundaries in urban areas.

11. Some authorities favour centre-of-road alignments, on the grounds that these facilitate access to side roads which adjoin the proposed new boundary, and reduce the need for each authority's service vehicles to travel through the other's area. They are also said to facilitate the exercise of planning and other controls where, for example, buildings overhang the highway, or building works extend into it.

12. Other authorities prefer side-of-road (back edge of pavement) alignments. They take the view that such alignments facilitate traffic management and highway maintenance, reducing the need for liaison and agency agreements between authorities over highway matters. In the context of this review, Hammersmith and Fulham specified a preference for side-of-road alignments.

13. In general, we support the view that centre-of-road alignments are preferable where there is a need for local authorities to provide day-to-day services to properties on both
sides of a road - for example, in residential areas. In addition to reducing the need for service vehicles to travel outside each authority's area, such alignments also facilitate any necessary liaison between residents and their own local authority over street works, and planning and other controls. We take the view that each case must be considered on its merits, having regard to the nature and geography of the area in question, any particular issues that are drawn to our attention, and to the preferences of the local authorities concerned.

THE BOUNDARIES COVERED BY THIS REPORT

14. This report concerns Ealing's boundary with Hounslow, and Hammersmith and Fulham's boundaries with Ealing, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames. Our final proposals for Ealing's boundaries with Harrow and Brent, and that part of its boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham at the northern end of Old Oak Lane, have already been submitted to you (Reports No. 610 and 651). Ealing's remaining boundary, with Hillingdon, and Hammersmith and Fulham's remaining boundaries, with Kensington and Chelsea and Wandsworth, are being considered separately.

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

15. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow. We also received representations from four interested organisations and four members of the public. The British Railways Board also commented on the boundary between Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, in response to our draft proposals for Brent.

OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM

16. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published a further consultation letter in connection with this review. This announced our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, and was published on 9 March 1992. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. We arranged the publication of
a notice advertising our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the local authorities were requested to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 11 May 1992.

17. We received a total of 19 representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decisions. They included comments from all the affected local authorities. The remainder were from local councillors, residents and organisations. We also received two petitions, containing a total of 31 signatures.

18. Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow suggested only minor change to their common boundaries. However, we received a number of representations recommending radical change to the boundaries between these three authorities. Our conclusions in respect of these suggestions for radical change are set out in the following paragraphs (19-41), prior to our final proposals for changes to individual boundaries.

SUGGESTIONS FOR RADICAL CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

The M4 Motorway, the A4 Great West Road and Contiguous Communities

19. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, the Ealing Social Democratic Party suggested an extensive realignment of the Ealing/Hounslow boundary, to follow a combination of the M4 Motorway, from the River Crane to Gunnersbury Park; the BR Brentford-Willesden Junction railway line at Gunnersbury; and the London Underground District Line, between Gunnersbury and Stamford Brook.

20. The Social Democratic Party commented that such a realignment would produce a clearer and more easily identifiable boundary. First, it would resolve the current division of communities at Norwood Green, Boston Manor, Gunnersbury and Bedford Park. Secondly, by uniting Gunnersbury Park in Ealing, it would reflect
the importance of the Park as a facility for residents of South Ealing and Acton, and the importance of Lionel Road as the main access from Ealing to the M4 Motorway. Thirdly, it would unite the Southall W3 and W5 postal districts, and open land between Norwood Green and the M4, in Ealing.

21. The Ealing Acton, Ealing North and Ealing Southall Conservative Associations (hereafter referred to as the Ealing Conservatives) suggested that the boundary between Ealing and Hounslow should be realigned to follow the M4, from Boston Manor Park to Heston Road in Norwood Green. The Norwood Green Residents' Association also suggested a realignment to the M4, between the River Brent/Grand Union Canal and Heston Road.

22. A member of the public suggested that the boundary between Hounslow and Ealing should follow the M4 between the River Crane and Gunnersbury Park. He also suggested that Old Oak Common, East Acton, Bedford Park and Chiswick should be transferred to Hammersmith and Fulham, by realigning Hammersmith and Fulham's boundaries with Ealing and Hounslow to follow Kew Road and the BR Brentford-Willesden Junction railway line.

23. Another member of the public suggested transferring Brentford and Gunnersbury from Hounslow to Ealing, by realigning the boundary to follow a combination of the M4 and the River Brent. He also suggested transferring Old Oak Common, East Acton, Bedford Park and Chiswick to Hammersmith and Fulham, by realigning Hammersmith and Fulham's boundaries with Hounslow and Ealing to follow the District Line between the River Thames and South Acton, and the BR Brentford-Willesden Junction railway line between South Acton and Willesden Junction. The transfer of Chiswick from Hounslow to Hammersmith and Fulham was also advocated by two other members of the public.

24. We considered that, before we could reach any initial conclusions on the existing pattern of boundaries in this area of West London, we would need to seek the views of Hounslow and Ealing on the suggestions for radical change to their common boundaries, particularly with regard to the suitability of the M4 as a possible boundary. We therefore asked Hounslow and Ealing
for their views on whether a realignment of the boundary to the motorway would produce a more identifiable boundary, and better reflect existing patterns of community at Norwood Green, Boston Manor, Gunnersbury and Bedford Park.

Summary of further submissions

25. In response to our enquiry, Hounslow expressed the view that the suggestions submitted by the Ealing Social Democratic Party and the two members of the public were outside the scope of the present review and would, if implemented, be likely to prejudice the continued existence of Hounslow as a separate authority. The Council commented that the adoption of the M4 as the boundary would also sever existing community ties between North Hyde and Heston; create difficulties in planning control over Osterley Park; divide Boston Manor Park; and disrupt existing patterns of community and service provision at Gunnersbury, Brentford, North Chiswick and Bedford Park.

26. In commenting on the existing pattern of community at Boston Manor and Gunnersbury, Hounslow suggested that a case could be made for a realignment of the boundary to follow the Piccadilly Line, between Boston Manor and Acton Town. Similarly, in commenting on the pattern of community at Bedford Park, the Council suggested that a case could be made for uniting the Bedford Park Conservation Areas in Hounslow. However, in both instances, Hounslow emphasised that it was not actually recommending radical change.

27. Ealing commented that it could see no justification for change to the Hounslow/Ealing boundary at Gunnersbury Park, but indicated that it would not oppose a realignment of the Hounslow/Ealing boundary to follow the M4 through Osterley Park. Although the Council had no formal view on the differing proposals for Bedford Park, it did consider that any draft proposal to unite Bedford Park in Ealing should encompass only the area to the north of Bath Road.
Our initial conclusions

28. In the light of the views expressed by Hounslow and Ealing, we arrived at a number of conclusions on the suggestions for radical change.

29. In general terms, we concluded that the pattern of local authority boundaries in this part of West London was less than ideal. In particular, it took little account of the barrier effect of the M4/A4, or the proximity of the River Thames to the M4 at Brentford. We acknowledged that more rational boundaries in this area could be achieved only by radical change; more limited, intermediate change would not be sufficient. However, it seemed to us that the present review was not the appropriate occasion for radical restructuring, which should be considered only in the context of a comprehensive reappraisal of the pattern of unitary authorities within London as a whole.

30. More specifically, we agreed with Hounslow that a realignment of the boundary to follow the M4 at North Hyde would sever existing community ties. At Osterley Park, the existing boundary between Hounslow and Ealing appeared to us to be reasonably well defined. A realignment of the boundary to follow the M4 in this area would divide the Park, and would not, in our view, bring any clear benefits in terms of effective and convenient local government.

31. We accepted that the existing Ealing/Hounslow boundary at Boston Manor, Brentford, Gunnersbury, Chiswick and Bedford Park contained a number of obvious anomalies. In particular, it appeared to divide communities at Boston Manor and Gunnersbury Park. We were also aware that the existing Hounslow/Ealing boundary divided the two Conservation Areas covering Bedford Park.

32. We concluded that these particular anomalies could only properly be resolved by radical restructuring. Anything less would, in our view, bring its own difficulties; for example, a realignment of the Ealing/Hounslow boundary to follow the M4/A4 at Brentford and Gunnersbury would further reduce the already
narrow link between Chiswick and the rest of Hounslow, and would not in itself resolve the boundary anomaly in the Bedford Park area.

33. We considered that major change would be required if satisfactory boundaries, adequately reflecting the pattern of communities, were to be produced at Bedford Park. However, no representations supporting such major change had been received from either Hounslow or Ealing, or from any local bodies or residents of Bedford Park. In addition, as indicated in paragraph 29 above, we do not regard this review as the appropriate occasion for proposing radical change to the pattern of London borough boundaries.

34. Accordingly, we decided to issue an interim decision to propose no major change to the present boundaries between Hammersmith and Fulham, Ealing and Hounslow.

The response to our interim decision and our final conclusions

35. Neither Ealing nor Hammersmith and Fulham commented on the major boundary issues which we had identified in our draft proposals letter. Hounslow welcomed our interim decision not to propose major change at Bedford Park. However, a member of the public and a local organisation suggested radical change to the existing pattern of boundaries at Osterley Park and Chiswick respectively.

36. The member of the public resubmitted his suggestion for a realignment of Ealing's southern boundary along the M4 and the River Brent, and for a realignment of its eastern boundary along the District Line and the BR Brentford-Willesden Junction railway line, between the River Thames and Willesden Junction. He argued that the M4 provided an effective barrier to north/south movement at Osterley Park.

37. The Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives considered that Chiswick was similar in character to adjacent areas of Hammersmith, and was linked by its location and by patterns of community life to inner London, rather than to Hounslow and outer
38. We also received a representation from the Bedford Park Society. Although the Society offered no view on whether the Bedford Park Conservation Area should be united in one authority, it did object to Ealing's earlier suggestion that Bath Road would provide a suitable boundary in this area. In addition, a local resident suggested that the areas of Bedford Park and Stamford Brook located east of Turnham Green Terrace should be transferred from Hounslow to Hammersmith and Fulham.

39. In reviewing our interim decision, we gave careful consideration to all these suggestions. We saw no reason to alter our initial view that the existing boundary appeared to be reasonably well defined to the north of the M4 at Osterley Park. We acknowledged that, further east, the M4 and A4 were significant physical features which in some areas might be said to delimit communities. However, we felt that a realignment of boundaries to these roads could not properly be considered in isolation from a wider review of the pattern of local authorities in Greater London. In view of this, and in the absence of local authority support for a realignment to the motorway, we have reaffirmed our initial conclusion that major change at Osterley Park, Brentford or Gunnersbury would be inappropriate at this time.

Other suggestions for radical change

40. We reached the same conclusion on the other radical suggestions submitted in response to our draft proposals letter. Although we saw some merit in the argument that Chiswick had greater affinities of interest with areas of inner London to the east than with Hounslow, we considered that the realignment suggested by the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives would constitute radical restructuring. Equally, we concluded that the scale of change necessary to unite the Bedford Park Conservation Area...
Areas in one authority, and to reflect adequately the wider pattern of community links in Bedford Park and surrounding areas, was outside the scope of this review. It was also clear to us that there appeared to be relatively little interest in radical change or dissatisfaction with the present, rather complex, pattern of local government boundaries in the area. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our interim decision to make no proposals for radical change to the present boundaries between Hounslow, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham.

41. While we concluded that radical change would be inappropriate in the context of this review, we felt there were several areas where the boundaries were unsatisfactory, and where some limited change was necessary in order to rectify anomalies and reflect communities of interest. Our proposals for change were published in our draft proposals letter of 9 March 1992.

EALING'S BOUNDARY WITH HOUNSLOW

a) North Hyde and Norwood Green

Draft Proposal

42. Ealing and Hounslow suggested that the boundary in this area should be realigned to the rear curtilages of properties on the east side of Jessop Avenue and Kingsbridge Road; the east side of the road in Craneswater Park and Crosslands Avenue; and the rear curtilages of properties on the south side of Norwood Road, Boundary Close, The Lawn and St Mary's Avenue. The Councils argued that these realignments would produce a clearer and more durable boundary, reflect the existing patterns of community and land ownership and take account of possible future development in the area of Jessop Avenue.

43. The Ealing Conservatives commented that they would support any reasonable proposal to unite the community of Norwood Green, and that they supported that part of the Councils' suggested realignment between the Grand Union Canal and Craneswater Park. However, as an extension of their suggestion to realign the
boundary along the M4, from Boston Manor Park to Heston Road, the Conservatives suggested that, between Craneswater Park and the motorway, the boundary should be realigned to the rear curtilages of properties on the south side of Heston Road, Norwood Road and Alleyn Park.

44. As mentioned in paragraph 21 above, the Norwood Green Residents' Association suggested a realignment along the M4 between the River Brent and Heston Road. It commented that, as a result of the construction of the M4, an area of Hounslow at the northern end of Osterley Lane had become isolated between the existing boundary and the motorway.

45. We agreed that the existing boundary was poorly defined; it passes arbitrarily between the residential areas of Norwood Green and North Hyde, dividing roads and properties, and it does not appear to reflect community patterns. We also agreed that the realignment suggested by Hounslow and Ealing would resolve these anomalies and provide a clearly defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt the Councils' suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

46. Ealing and Hounslow supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

b) The Aviaries Lake, Long Wood and Wyncote Farm, Osterley Park

Draft Proposal

47. Ealing and Hounslow suggested a realignment along the centre of The Aviaries Lake and then along the north side of the M4 to the Grand Union Canal, thereby transferring an area of land to the east of Windmill Lane to Ealing. The suggestion was submitted on the grounds that the land in question is part-owned by Ealing, and is accessible only from that Borough.
48. The existing boundary is poorly defined in this area, passing arbitrarily through the lake and adjacent land. We agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the area north of the M4, between the lake and the Grand Union Canal, in the authority from which access is obtained. We therefore decided to adopt the Councils' suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

49. Ealing and Hounslow supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

c) Open Land South of M4 at Elthorne Park

Draft Proposal

50. The construction of the M4 has produced a narrow salient of open land, situated south of the motorway at Elthorne Park, which is located in Ealing but has no access from that Borough. Ealing suggested a realignment along the north side of the M4 in order to transfer the salient to Hounslow. The suggestion was supported by Hounslow.

51. We agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the salient to be removed, and that Ealing's suggestion would produce a logical and durable boundary in this area. We therefore decided to adopt Ealing's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

52. Ealing and Hounslow supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
d) Durston House Playing Field, Windmill Road and Swyncombe Avenue

Draft Proposal

53. Ealing and Hounslow suggested a realignment to unite Durston House playing field and Swyncombe Avenue in Hounslow, and to transfer properties on the west side of Windmill Road to that Borough. The Ealing Conservatives agreed that Swyncombe Avenue and the playing field should be united in Hounslow, but opposed the transfer of the properties on the west side of Windmill Road, on the grounds that they were an integral part of Little Ealing.

54. The Conservatives submitted two alternative suggestions in this area. First, they suggested that the boundary should be realigned along the rear curtilages of properties on the north side of Swyncombe Avenue and, between the Ride and Swyncombe Avenue, the west side of Windmill Road. Secondly, as an extension of their suggestion to realign the boundary along the M4, they suggested a wider realignment along the southern curtilages of properties in Swyncombe Avenue and the northern perimeter of Boston Manor Park, to meet the north side of the M4. The Conservatives considered that this latter suggestion would unite Boston Manor in Ealing.

55. We agreed that the present division of Swyncombe Avenue and Durston House Playing Field was not conducive to effective and convenient local government, and that they should be united in Hounslow. We also agreed with the Ealing Conservatives that properties fronting the west side of Windmill Lane, between the Ride and Swyncombe Avenue, appeared to be more closely linked to Ealing than Hounslow. However, the Conservatives' wider suggestion, affecting Boston Manor, would have followed a stretch of the M4 which is partly elevated, and is therefore unsuitable as a boundary. We received no other representations in support of major change at Boston Manor, and concluded that such change could not be justified.

56. In order to rectify anomalies in the existing boundary, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal the Ealing Conservative
Associations' first suggestion, for a realignment to the rear curtilages of properties on the north side of Swyncombe Avenue and the west side of Windmill Road.

Final proposal

57. Our draft proposal was opposed by Ealing, the Ealing Southall Conservative Association and by four members of the public. Hounslow indicated that it did not oppose our draft proposal.

58. Both Ealing and the Ealing Southall Conservative Association argued that Boston Manor should be united in one authority. The Association resubmitted the alternative suggestion previously submitted by the Ealing Conservatives, for a realignment along the rear curtilages of properties on the south side of Swyncombe Avenue, the north side of Boston Manor Park and the north side of the M4, to meet the existing boundary at the River Brent/Grand Union Canal. It considered that such a realignment would unite Boston Manor in Ealing, and reflect the location of the W5 postal district boundary to the south of Swyncombe Avenue.

59. We reconsidered the case for uniting Boston Manor in Ealing in the light of the response to our draft proposal. We accepted that the existing Hounslow/Ealing boundary divides an area of continuous urban development at Boston Manor, while a number of significant features (including the M4 and the River Brent) appeared to create a clear break in the pattern of development. However, no residents of Boston Manor had written to us supporting the proposal to unite their community in Ealing, and we felt unable to conclude, on the evidence available, that the realignment suggested by the Ealing Southall Conservative Association would result in benefits in terms of effective and convenient local government.

60. On a more localised level, Ealing commented that our draft proposal would divide Durston House Playing Field from Durston House School, which would remain in Ealing. The Council therefore suggested uniting the playing field and Swyncombe Avenue in its authority. The Ealing Southall Conservative Association agreed that Swyncombe Avenue had close community ties with Ealing, and
a resident pointed out that her family looked to Ealing for shopping, health care, employment, education and library services.

61. We acknowledged that our draft proposal to unite Swyncombe Avenue in Hounslow had been strongly opposed by some local residents. However, the existing boundary is ill-defined and defaced, and we remained of the view that it would be beneficial, in terms of effective and convenient local government, to unite Swyncombe Avenue in a single authority. By far the greater part of Swyncombe Avenue is currently in Hounslow, and we considered that, on balance, it would be appropriate to unite the road in that authority.

62. We agreed that Ealing's suggestion would unite Durston House School's playing field with the school, in Ealing. However, we observed that Durston House School is an independent school, and is therefore not controlled by the local authority. In addition, the school's representatives had not commented on our draft proposal. Accordingly, we reaffirmed our initial view that the playing field should be united in Hounslow.

63. No objections were received to that part of our draft proposal affecting properties on the western side of Windmill Road.

64. We concluded that our draft proposal for Swyncombe Avenue, Durston House playing field and Windmill Road would create a clear, well-defined boundary, and was in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.

e) Clayponds Estate

Draft Proposal

65. The existing boundary is defaced, dividing the Clayponds Estate and a playing field to the east of South Ealing Road. Ealing and Hounslow suggested uniting the estate in Hounslow, by realigning the boundary to the west side of South Ealing Road and
the south side of Occupation Lane. The suggestion was submitted on the grounds that the Clayponds area shared a community of interest with Hounslow. The Ealing Conservatives supported the Councils' suggested realignment.

66. The majority of the Clayponds Estate lies within Hounslow, and we agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite it in that authority. We considered that the Councils' suggestion would achieve this and provide a clearly defined boundary. Accordingly, we decided to adopt their suggestion as our draft proposal for this area.

Final Proposal

67. Our draft proposal was supported by Ealing and Hounslow. However, it was opposed by two residents of the Clayponds Estate, who wished to remain within Ealing as tenants of that authority. We observed that the large majority of properties on the estate were owned by Hounslow. In view of this, and given the local authorities' support for our draft proposal, we have decided to confirm it as final.

f) Clayponds Hospital

Draft Proposal

68. Ealing and Hounslow both suggested a realignment to the southern curtilage of Clayponds Hospital, in order to unite it in Ealing. The Ealing Conservative Associations supported the Councils' suggestion.

69. The greater part of the hospital site lies in Ealing, and the existing boundary divides a recently constructed extension to the hospital buildings. We therefore agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the entire hospital site to be united in Ealing, and decided to adopt the Councils' suggestion as our draft proposal.
Final Proposal

70. Our draft proposal was supported by Ealing and Hounslow. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

g) Pope’s Lane

Draft Proposal

71. Ealing and Hounslow suggested a minor realignment of the boundary to the south side of Pope’s Lane. The Ealing Conservatives supported the Councils' suggestion.

72. We considered that the existing boundary, which is ill-defined along Pope's Lane, was not conducive to effective highway maintenance. We therefore decided to adopt the realignment suggested by Ealing and Hounslow as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

73. Our draft proposal was supported by Ealing and Hounslow. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

h) Gunnersbury Lane and Acton Town Station

Draft Proposal

74. Ealing and Hounslow both suggested realigning the boundary to follow the south side of Gunnersbury Lane and the southwestern curtilage of Acton Town Underground Station, thereby uniting the station in Ealing. The Ealing Conservatives supported the Councils' suggested realignment.

75. We considered that the realignment suggested by Ealing and Hounslow would provide a clear boundary along Gunnersbury Lane and resolve the current anomalous division of Acton Town station.
We therefore decided to adopt the Councils' suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

76. Our draft proposal was supported by Ealing and Hounslow. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

INTERIM DECISIONS TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS

a) Junction Road

77. The Ealing Conservative Associations suggested a minor realignment to unite in Ealing a residential terrace on the west side of Junction Road.

78. Although the existing boundary runs through continuous development, it does not divide properties. The stretch of boundary between Windmill Road and Ealing Road is reasonably well-defined, as it follows the rear curtilages of properties in Whitestile Road. We doubted whether the minor realignment suggested by the Conservatives would result in any benefits in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposal.

79. Hounslow supported our interim decision. Ealing did not comment. We received no other representations, and have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

b) Windmill Road

80. The Ealing Conservatives advised us that they had received a number of representations from residents of a small group of houses on the west side of Windmill Road, adjacent to Darwin Road. The residents had suggested that the boundary should be realigned to the rear curtilages of properties on Windmill Road, so as to be coincident with the postal district boundary in this area.
81. We observed that postal districts are designed to facilitate postal operations, not to enhance effective and convenient local government. They do not necessarily reflect communities of interest. Accordingly, in the absence of any more substantial reason for change, we took an interim decision to make no proposals.

82. Hounslow supported our interim decision, and Ealing did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN EALING, HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM AND HOUNSLOW IN THE BEDFORD PARK AREA

83. As mentioned in paragraph 40 above, we concluded that the scale of change necessary to reflect the wider pattern of community links in Bedford Park and surrounding areas was outside the scope of this review. We therefore decided to consider the suggestions for minor change only in this area.

84. The pattern of local authority boundaries at Bedford Park is complex, and we were aware that even minor change could have an effect on three boroughs - Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow. We have therefore felt it appropriate to consider the boundaries between all three boroughs in the area between Acton Green and Goldhawk Road.

a) Woodstock Road

Draft Proposal

85. Ealing and Hounslow suggested that the boundary should be realigned to follow the eastern side of Woodstock Road, from its junction with Priory Avenue to its junction with Fielding Road. Noting that the Councils' suggestion would unite responsibility for road maintenance in one authority, we decided to adopt it as our draft proposal, subject to extending the side-of-road alignment along the entire length of Woodstock Road and providing
a clearer alignment at the junction between Woodstock Road and Priory Avenue.

Final Proposal

86. Our draft proposal was supported by Hounslow, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

b) Abinger Road

Draft Proposal

87. Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow submitted similar suggestions to align the boundary to the rear curtilages of properties in Abinger Road and to the rear curtilages of Nos 98-110 Woodstock Road. The Councils' suggestions differed only in minor detail at the southernmost point of the suggested realignment. The Hammersmith Labour Party submitted a suggestion identical to that of Hammersmith and Fulham.

88. The existing boundary divides properties in Abinger Road and Emlyn Road. We considered that the realignments suggested by either Council would produce a clearly defined and logical boundary which would complement our proposal for Woodstock Road (described in paragraphs 85-86 above). However, we considered Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion to be preferable to that submitted by Hounslow, in that it was tied more closely to ground detail at its southern extremity. We therefore decided to adopt Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion as our draft proposal for this area.

Final Proposal

89. Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported our draft proposal. Hounslow indicated that it had no objection. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
c) **Stamford Brook Road and Goldhawk Road**

Draft Proposal

90. Hounslow suggested realigning the boundary to the north side of Stamford Brook Road and the west side of Goldhawk Road, in order to unite the area between Stamford Brook Road and Goldhawk Road in Hounslow. Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith Labour Party suggested a smaller-scale realignment, to unite only Stamford Brook Common and properties in Stamford Brook Avenue in Hounslow.

91. We agreed that the existing boundary was unsatisfactory, in that it was ill-defined and divided properties. It appeared to us that Stamford Brook Road, and in particular Goldhawk Road, were significant thoroughfares which would provide a clear and durable boundary in this area. Accordingly, we decided to adopt Hounslow's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

92. Our draft proposal was supported by Hounslow, but opposed by Hammersmith and Fulham, the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives and five members of the public. We also received two petitions, containing a total of 31 signatures, in opposition to our draft proposal.

93. Although Hammersmith and Fulham agreed that Stamford Brook Common should be united in Hounslow, it claimed that many local residents objected to our proposal to transfer properties in Stamford Brook Road and Goldhawk Road to that borough. The Council also believed that our draft proposal would not improve the standard of local services currently provided to this area, and could cause confusion by dividing Stamford Brook Road between two authorities.

94. Hammersmith and Fulham argued that our draft proposal would not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. As an alternative, it resubmitted its original suggestion for minor change, to unite in Hounslow a District
Health Authority property which fronts the eastern side of Stamford Brook Avenue. It also suggested that the petrol station at the junction of Stamford Brook Avenue and Goldhawk Road should be united in its authority.

95. The Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives commented that our draft proposal would divide the property holdings of Riverside District Health Authority between two local authorities. Some residents feared that our draft proposal would have a detrimental effect on the provision of local health services; they also argued that their community links were with Hammersmith and Fulham, rather than with Hounslow.

96. Although we remained of the view that our draft proposal would produce a clear and well-defined boundary, we nevertheless accepted that the anomalies in the existing boundary could be remedied by more limited change. From the evidence we had received, it also appeared to us that minor change would be more likely to reflect community ties and accord with the wishes of local residents.

97. Accordingly, we have decided to withdraw our draft proposal and adopt as our final proposal a series of minor realignments, to unite the petrol station, the District Health Authority property and Stamford Brook Common in Hounslow.

HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM'S BOUNDARY WITH RICHMOND UPON THAMES

98. The existing boundary between Hammersmith and Fulham and Richmond upon Thames is aligned to the centre of the River Thames. In the absence of any suggestions for change, we took an interim decision to make no proposals.

99. Richmond supported our interim decision. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.
100. The existing boundary divides Cedar House, in Chiswick Mall, and properties in Miller's Court. Hounslow suggested a realignment to the eastern curtilage of Swan House to unite Miller's Court and Cedar House in Hammersmith and Fulham.

101. Hammersmith and Fulham also suggested uniting Miller's Court in its area, but proposed that Cedar House be united in Hounslow, on the grounds that the building is similar in character to neighbouring properties in that authority. The Hammersmith Labour Party submitted an identical suggestion.

102. The larger part of Miller's Court lies in Hammersmith and Fulham, and we considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the development in that authority. We observed that both Councils' suggestions would achieve this. However, we agreed with Hammersmith and Fulham that Cedar House appeared to have a greater affinity with nearby properties in Hounslow. We therefore decided to adopt Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

103. Our draft proposal was supported by Hammersmith and Fulham and by the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM'S BOUNDARY WITH EALING

a) Warple Way, Valetta Road and Jeddo Road

Draft Proposal

104. The existing boundary is ill-defined in Warple Way, and divides Jeddo Road and several industrial and residential properties to the south of Valetta Road. Ealing suggested a minor realignment to the north side of Jeddo Road and to the south side of a footpath behind properties on the south side of Valetta Road. Hammersmith and Fulham also suggested a realignment along this footpath; in addition, it proposed realignments to the curtilages of industrial premises on the south side of Valetta Road and to the south side of Jeddo Road. The Hammersmith Labour Party submitted an identical suggestion.

105. We took the view that Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion would provide a clear boundary, and would also have the advantage of uniting the Lucas Electrical Engineering Works, and the works at the western end of Jeddo Road, in one authority. Ealing's suggestion would not have rectified the defaced boundary in these industrial areas. However, Ealing's suggestion to adopt a north side of road alignment for the eastern half of Jeddo Road would unite the whole road in Hammersmith and Fulham, whereas Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion for a south side of road alignment would perpetuate the division of the road between two boroughs.

106. We considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the industrial properties and Jeddo Road to be united in one authority. We therefore adopted as our draft proposal Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestions for Valetta Road and Warple Way, and Ealing's suggestion for a north side of road realignment along the eastern half of Jeddo Road.
Final Proposal

107. Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported our draft proposal. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm it as final.

b) The boundary between The Vale and Willesden Junction

108. We considered the boundary between The Vale and Willesden Junction in three sections: the area south of the London Underground Central Line; the area between the Central Line and the Grand Union Canal; and the area north of the Canal.

109. The existing boundary is ill-defined along Old Oak Road and Old Oak Common Lane. It meanders across Old Oak Common and divides adjoining British Rail property.

i) The boundary south of the London Underground Central Line

Maps 12 and 13

Draft Proposal

110. To the south of the Central Line, Ealing suggested realigning the boundary to the south side of The Vale, the west side of Old Oak Road and the east side of Old Oak Common Lane, between Western Circus and the Central Line. Hammersmith and Fulham, the Hammersmith Labour Party and the Ealing Conservatives supported Ealing's suggested realignment.

111. Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham also submitted slightly differing suggestions for minor change to the boundary where it passes through Claydon Garden and a cluster of properties to the south of Western Circus.

112. The Ealing Social Democratic Party suggested a radical realignment of the boundary in this area, along Braybrook Street, the western boundary of Wormwood Scrubs Prison, the south side of the A40 Westway, and the rear curtilages of properties on the
south side of Hilary Road. The purpose of this suggested realignment was to unite East Acton shopping centre in Ealing.

113. For part of its length, the Ealing Social Democrats' suggestion followed a break in residential development formed by open land and prison property. However, we concluded that insufficient justification had been provided to warrant the adoption of such a radical realignment, which would in any case have produced an arbitrary boundary at Hilary Road.

114. We also concluded that neither of the minor realignments suggested by the Councils would provide clear or consistent boundaries, particularly as they failed to rectify the division of Claydon Garden and the properties south of Western Circus. We felt that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for both these areas to be united in one authority, namely Ealing. In order to achieve this and provide a clear, well-defined boundary, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment to the centre of the road in Old Oak Road and Old Oak Common Lane, between The Vale and Wormwood Scrubs.

Final Proposal

115. Our draft proposal was supported by Hammersmith and Fulham, the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives and by one local company. However, it was opposed by Ealing and by one member of the public. Ealing resubmitted its original suggestion for a realignment to the western curtilage of Old Oak Road and the eastern curtilage of Old Oak Common Lane, commenting that side-of-road alignments would facilitate highway maintenance.

116. We remained of the view that the existing boundary was unsatisfactory, and that a centre of road alignment would unite split properties and create a clear and rational boundary. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
ii) The boundary between the Central Line and the Grand Union Canal
Maps 13 and 14

Draft Proposal

117. The boundary between the Central Line and the Grand Union Canal divides open land at Wormwood Scrubs and British Rail land at Old Oak Common. Hammersmith and Fulham suggested uniting Wormwood Scrubs and the Old Oak Common railway sidings in its area, by realigning the boundary to the east side of Old Oak Common Lane. The Hammersmith Labour Party submitted an identical suggestion. The Ealing Conservatives suggested a realignment to the centre of Old Oak Common Lane.

118. Ealing opposed Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion, on the grounds that major boundary change at Old Oak Common should await the completion of the development of the area by British Rail. Ealing and the Ealing Social Democratic Party suggested only minor change, to unite open land at Wormwood Scrubs in Hammersmith and Fulham.

119. In the context of our review of Brent's boundaries, the British Railways Board had expressed a wish to see all its landholdings at Old Oak Common, Willesden and Wembley grouped together in the same local authority. This could only have been achieved by major restructuring, which we regarded as being outside the scope of this review. Nevertheless, we agreed that the present arbitrary division of British Rail land at Old Oak Common was not in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We considered that Hammersmith and Fulham's suggested alignment along the east side of Old Oak Common Lane would unite both the open space at Wormwood Scrubs and the railway land at Old Oak Common. We therefore decided to adopt the Council's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

120. Our draft proposal was supported by Hammersmith and Fulham, Brent and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives. Brent considered our proposed alignment to be clear and well-defined.
In addition, the Tree of Life Trustees' Committee supported our proposal on the grounds that it would transfer from Ealing to Hammersmith and Fulham a sports pavilion which the Committee leased from the latter authority. The Committee also argued that Old Oak Common was an integral part of Wormwood Scrubs, and that Old Oak Common Lane provided a distinctive physical boundary.

121. Our draft proposal was opposed by Ealing, which argued that the railway sidings at Old Oak Common should remain within the Ealing section of the Park Royal Regeneration Area. The Council stated that any major redevelopment of the railway land would generate additional traffic in Ealing, as the sole road access was via that Borough. It therefore suggested that the boundary should be realigned south from Willesden Junction station to the Grand Union Canal and east along the canal as far as Scrubs Lane, before returning to Old Oak Common Lane via the northern perimeter of Wormwood Scrubs. Such a realignment would unite the railway sidings and adjoining British Rail land in Ealing.

122. We gave careful consideration to the points raised by Ealing. However, we do not see any practical objection to extending Hammersmith and Fulham's share of the Park Royal area, as the current multi-agency and multi-borough approach to planning matters in the area appears to us to function effectively. In particular, we observed that Hammersmith and Fulham participates in the Park Royal Partnership, which provides a forum for the development of regeneration schemes in the area. (The boundary issues affecting Park Royal are addressed more fully in our Report No 651, which concerns the London Borough of Brent's boundaries with its adjoining authorities).

123. Although Ealing's suggested realignment would reflect the pattern of road access at Old Oak Common, it would also create a severely contorted boundary. In our view, our draft proposal would produce the most clear and logical boundary in this area.

124. In responding to our draft proposal, Ealing also suggested that Oaklands House and Victoria Terrace should remain in its authority, as they were largely isolated from Hammersmith and Fulham by railway land. We observed that Oaklands House, although
partly managed by a local housing association, was still used by British Rail as a staff hostel. Accordingly, we concluded that this property should be included in the transfer of railway land to Hammersmith and Fulham.

125. However, we agreed with Ealing that Victoria Terrace was likely to have closer links with Ealing than with Hammersmith and Fulham. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to a minor modification to retain Victoria Terrace in Ealing.

iii) The boundary to the north of the Grand Union Canal

Map 14

Draft Proposal

126. To the north of the Grand Union Canal, Ealing suggested a realignment to the west side of Old Oak sidings and the south side of Willesden Junction, in order to transfer Crewe Place, Stoke Place and properties on the east side of Old Oak Lane to its authority. Ealing considered that patterns of community and service delivery linked these roads more closely with its area than with Hammersmith and Fulham.

127. As part of its suggestion to unite all the railway land at Old Oak Common in its area, Hammersmith and Fulham suggested that the boundary should be realigned to follow the east side of Old Oak Lane. The Hammersmith Labour Party suggested an identical alignment.

128. We agreed with Ealing that the triangle of residential development to the east of Old Oak Lane was isolated from Hammersmith and Fulham by a broad swathe of railway land. In our view, it was likely that the residents of this area shared a community of interest with the area of Ealing to the west of Old Oak Lane, and we concluded that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for these properties to be transferred that authority. Accordingly, we decided to adopt Ealing's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to realigning the boundary to the curtilage of the warehouse in Old Oak Lane.
Final Proposal

129. Our draft proposal was supported by Hammersmith and Fulham and by the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives. Ealing considered our proposal to be too limited, and subsumed it within its own radical suggestion for this area, as outlined in paragraph 121 above.

130. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

131. Our final proposals will have limited electoral consequences for the local authorities affected by this review. The details of our proposals for changes in electoral arrangements are described in Annex B to this report.

CONCLUSIONS

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

PUBLICATION

133. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Hounslow and Richmond upon Thames, asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six
weeks from the date on which our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposals letter of 9 March 1992, and to those who made written representations to us.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NUMBER</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>TO:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
<td>Heston East Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B D</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heston East Ward</td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Grove Ward</td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Grove Ward</td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
<td>Spring Grove Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isleworth North Ward</td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isleworth North Ward</td>
<td>Dormers Wells Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elthorne Ward</td>
<td>Isleworth North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield Ward</td>
<td>Brentford Clifden Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brentford Clifden Ward</td>
<td>Northfield Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield Ward</td>
<td>Gunnersbury Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunnersbury Ward</td>
<td>Northfield Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunnersbury Ward</td>
<td>Ealing Common Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hounslow LB</td>
<td>Ealing LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunnersbury Ward</td>
<td>Ealing Common Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP NUMBER</td>
<td>AREA REF.</td>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>TO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Ealing LB Southfield Ward</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Southfield Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D F</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Starch Green Ward</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E G</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Starch Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J K</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Ravenscourt Ward</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Ravenscourt Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Ravenscourt Ward</td>
<td>Hounslow LB Chiswick Homefields Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A D</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Starch Green Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Vale Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>Ealing LB Vale Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Starch Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Wormholt Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Vale Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B D</td>
<td>Ealing LB Vale Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Wormholt Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ealing LB Victoria Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB Victoria Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ealing LB Victoria Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Victoria Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX C

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

**Ealing’s boundary with Hounslow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Realignment</th>
<th>Maps/Paras.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Green and North Hyde</td>
<td>Realignments to unite Barnes Avenue and Jessop Avenue in Hounslow; and to unite Norwood Road, Boundary Close, St. Mary’s Avenue and properties on the eastern sides of Craneswater Park and Crosslands Avenue in Ealing</td>
<td>Maps 1/2 Paras. 42-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aviaries Lake, Long Wood and Wyncote Farm</td>
<td>Realignment to centre of lake and to northern embankment of M4</td>
<td>Maps 3/4 Paras. 47-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Land south of M4 at Elthorne Park</td>
<td>Realignment to northern embankment of M4</td>
<td>Map 4 Paras. 50-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durston House Playing Field, Windmill Road and Swyncombe Avenue</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Swyncombe Avenue and Durston House Playing Field in Hounslow</td>
<td>Map 5 Paras. 53-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayponds Estate</td>
<td>Realignment to South Ealing Road and Occupation Lane</td>
<td>Map 6 Paras. 65-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayponds Hospital</td>
<td>Realignment to unite hospital in Ealing</td>
<td>Map 6 Paras. 68-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope’s Lane</td>
<td>Realignment to south side of Pope’s Lane</td>
<td>Map 7 Paras. 71-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnersbury Lane and Acton Town Station</td>
<td>Realignment to south side of Gunnersbury Lane and rear curtilage of station</td>
<td>Map 8 Paras. 74-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Boundaries between Ealing, Hounslow and Hammersmith and Fulham in the Bedford Park area

Woodstock Road
Realignment to eastern side of road
Map 9 Paras. 85-86

Abinger Road
Realignment to rear curtilages of properties on east side
Map 9 Paras. 87-89

Stamford Brook Road and Goldhawk Road
Realignments to unite Stamford Brook Common and Stamford Brook Avenue in Hounslow
Map 9 Paras. 90-97

Hammersmith and Fulham’s boundary with Hounslow
Cedar House and Miller’s Court
Realignment to unite Cedar House in Hounslow and Miller’s Court in Hammersmith and Fulham
Map 10 Paras. 100-103

Hammersmith and Fulham’s boundary with Ealing
Warple Way, Valetta Road and Jeddo Road
Realignment to eastern side of Warple Way; rear curtilages of properties in Valetta Road; and northern side of part of Jeddo Road
Map 11 Paras. 104-107

Between The Vale and Willesden Junction:

a) south of the Central Line
Realignment to centre of Old Oak Road and eastern side of Old Oak Common Lane
Map 13 Paras. 110-116

b) between the Central Line and the Grand Union Canal
Realignment to eastern side of Old Oak Common Lane and rear of properties in Victoria Terrace
Maps 13/14 Paras. 117-125

c) north of the Grand Union Canal
Realignment to perimeter of railway sidings
Map 14 Paras. 126-130