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PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames 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 Richmond upon Thames Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Greater London Council, the London Boroughs Association, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.

3. Richmond upon Thames 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 27 February 1976 Richmond upon Thames Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 19 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 52 members.

5. The Borough Council’s submission included copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We reviewed all the suggestions which had been made together with comments which had been sent directly to us. These included alternative schemes, one submitted by a local political association, the other by a political party. In addition we received comments and objections relating to the proposed Kew, Mortlake, Central Twickenham, East Twickenham, Heathfield and Whitton wards.

6. We studied the Council’s draft scheme and noted that it would provide a satisfactory basis of representation in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines. We noted that the alternative schemes submitted for our consideration likewise appeared to provide a fairly acceptable standard of representation but that they presented no clear advantages over the Council’s draft scheme. Accordingly we decided to adopt the draft scheme as the basis for our draft proposals.

7. We decided to adjust the proposed boundary between the Central Twickenham and West Twickenham wards in order to achieve a better standard of representation. We concluded, however, that we could not accept any of the suggestions made to us for other changes because of the extent to which they impaired the standard of representation. After consulting the Ordnance Survey we made a number of
minor alterations to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

8. On 15 June 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations 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 20 August 1976.

9. Richmond upon Thames Borough Council raised no objection to the draft proposals but pointed out a small error in the boundary between the proposed Barnes and Palewell wards. We received representations against the draft proposals from the local political association which had previously submitted alternative proposals to us and from several organisations and private individuals who objected to the proposals for a number of wards.

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

11. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at the Municipal Offices, Twickenham on 6 January 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

12. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and of his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft
proposals should be confirmed, subject to boundary modifications between the proposed Kew and Mortlake wards, the proposed Hampton Nursery, Hampton and Hampton Hill wards and the proposed Central Twickenham and East Twickenham wards. The changes were proposed on community grounds and also, in the case of the second proposal, to give Hampton Nursery ward additional electorate to provide a sounder basis for the first election in 1978. The Assistant Commissioner also adopted the corrected boundary line between the proposed Barnes and Palewell wards.

13. 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 changes recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted and, subject to these modifications, we decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

14. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the map.
15. 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 Richmond upon Thames Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without the map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.
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28 April 1977
In accordance with the instructions contained in the Commission's letter of the 15th November 1976, I conducted a Local Meeting as Assistant Commissioner at the Municipal Offices, Twickenham, on Thursday 6th January, 1977 to hear and discuss representations with regard to the future electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.

1. ATTENDANCES

I attach as Appendix "A" a list showing the names and addresses of the persons who attended the meeting and the interests they represented.

2. COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

The Commission's draft proposals for the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames, set out in the Commission's letter to the Council of 15th June 1976, proposed 19 wards returning 52 Councillors (14 wards each returning 3 Councillors and 5 wards each returning 2 Councillors).

In considering and formulating the draft proposals the Commission had before it:

(a) The draft scheme submitted by the London Borough Council which suggested 19 wards returning 52 Councillors (14 wards each returning 3 Councillors and 5 wards returning two Councillors).

(b) Alternative schemes submitted by the Richmond Labour Party and the Twickenham Labour Party (each for the Borough wards in the respective Parliamentary constituencies they represented). These presented an overall scheme for 22 wards returning 52 Councillors (12 wards returning 3 Councillors, 6 wards returning 2 Councillors and 4 wards returning 1 Councillor).

(c) Alternative schemes submitted by the Richmond and Barnes Liberals (Schemes A and B with preference for Scheme A) and the Twickenham Liberal Association (each for Borough wards in the respective Parliamentary constituencies they represented) - the Richmond and Barnes Liberals Scheme A and the Twickenham Liberal scheme together presented an overall scheme for the Borough of 20 wards returning 52 Councillors (12 wards returning 3 Councillors and 8 wards returning 2 Councillors), whilst the Richmond and Barnes Liberals Scheme B and the Twickenham Liberal scheme together presented an overall scheme for 19 wards returning 52 Councillors (14 wards returning 3 Councillors and 5 wards returning 2 Councillors).

(d) Representations from the Richmond and Barnes Liberals Kew Ward Group, objecting to the proposal in the Council's draft scheme to transfer from the existing Kew Ward into the proposed Mortlake Ward the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road, affecting some 800 electors.
Representations from Mrs. A. M. Jeffries of 61 Marksbury Avenue, with a petition signed by approximately 100 residents, also objecting to the proposal in the Council's draft scheme that the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road should be transferred from the existing Kew Ward and included in the proposed Mortlake Ward.

Representations from a number of residents in East Twickenham Ward suggesting an alteration to the boundary between the proposed East Twickenham Ward and the proposed Central Twickenham Ward on the grounds of community identity.

Representations from the Rivermeads Residents Association asking that the Rivermeads Estate (to the west of Hospital Bridge Road and bounded by Chertsey Road and Staines Road) - at present in the existing Hampton Hill Ward, but in the Council's draft scheme placed in Heathfield Ward - should be included in the proposed West Twickenham Ward.

Representations from Whitton Ward Conservatives expressing the opinion that the proposal contained in the Council's draft scheme to include in the proposed Whitton Ward the triangular area south of the Chertsey Road and comprising Gladstone Avenue, Denehurst Gardens and Rosecroft Gardens was unsatisfactory, and suggesting instead the addition to Whitton Ward of the area north of Chertsey Road in the vicinity of Rugby Road and Whitton Road, adjacent to the Twickenham Rugby Union Ground.

The Commission noted that the Council's draft scheme provided generally an acceptable standard of equality of representation (as indeed did the alternative schemes submitted by both the Labour and the Liberal organisations). Having regard to the representations received, it seemed inevitable that there would have to be a Local Meeting to discuss the alternative proposals and the Commission decided to adopt the Council's draft scheme but were particularly concerned as to the proposals for Kew Ward, Mortlake Ward and Nursery Ward, and the West Twickenham Ward/Central Twickenham Ward boundary.

Finally, the Boundary Commission in making their draft proposals re-aligned the boundary between West Twickenham Ward and Central Twickenham Ward so that it followed the Strawberry Hill to Twickenham railway line (this had the effect of transferring some 485 electors from West Twickenham Ward thus achieving a better standard of representation for that Ward). The Commission also decided to adopt a small number of minor modifications recommended by Ordnance Survey in the interests of technically better boundaries.

3. OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS received before Local Meeting:

- From the Chief Executive and Town Clerk of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames stating that the Council raised no objection to the draft proposals of the Boundary Commission. (The Chief Executive also pointed out an error made in the draft scheme as to the boundary between Barnes Ward and Palewell Ward at the southeast corner of Barnes Common. The line should have been the existing boundary line between existing wards. The Chief Executive asked that this correction should be made in the final ward scheme.)

(See Recommendation (d) in Paragraph 6)
- From the Richmond and Barnes Liberals objecting to the draft proposals and reiterating the Association's views as outlined earlier in February 1976.

- From the Twickenham Liberal Association objecting to the draft proposals and maintaining the views expressed in their previous submission in February 1976.

- From Richmond Town Ward Liberals of the Richmond and Barnes Liberals supporting the views and objections submitted by the Richmond and Barnes Liberals and particularly putting forward a suggestion for an alternative boundary line between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward.

- From Mr. Roger J. Lewis, of 22 Norman Avenue, Twickenham, on behalf of residents in the East Twickenham Ward restating their original objections and suggestions as to the boundary between East Twickenham Ward and Central Twickenham Ward and objecting particularly to the inclusion in East Twickenham Ward of Cavendish House in Chertsey Road, Cole Park Gardens, certain houses in Cole Park Road, part of Hill View Road and certain houses in London Road, these properties being west of the River Crane which the objectors felt ought to be the physical boundary of the Ward.

- From Whitton Ward Conservatives reiterating the views expressed previously in January 1976 and objecting to the triangular area, comprising the houses in Gladstone Avenue, Denehurst Gardens and Rosecroft Gardens, south of the Chertsey Road, being included in Whitton Ward, it being submitted that Chertsey Road was a natural Ward boundary and that it would be most inconvenient and hazardous if the electors in this area were compelled to cross this Road to proceed to a polling station; and also suggesting an alternative area to be added into Whitton Ward, namely the area to the north of the Chertsey Road around Whitton Road and Rugby Road and the Twickenham Rugby Union Ground.

- From Miss C. Livesey, 76 Gladstone Avenue, Twickenham, enclosing a petition signed by about 184 residents of Gladstone Avenue, Denehurst Gardens and Rosecroft Gardens objecting to the proposal to include these roads in Whitton Ward because it would incur extra hazards in crossing the busy Chertsey Road and the electors would have to travel a greater distance to record their votes.

- From Mr. D. A. Horne, 488 Staines Road, Twickenham, objecting to the proposals to place the Rivermeads Estate (dwellings west of Hospital Bridge Road and between Chertsey Road and Staines Road) in Heathfield Ward, stating that this Estate should more properly be included in West Twickenham Ward.

- From Mr. P. L. Cook, of 3 Adelaide Road, Richmond, opposing the proposed boundaries of the Wards in the Richmond Parliamentary Constituency and putting forward suggestions for amended boundaries and representation.
- From Mrs. Ann Jeffries enclosing a petition signed by about 260 local residents objecting to the proposal to include in Mortlake Ward the dwellings in the area, now in Kew Ward, bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road (and suggesting that in compensation of electoral numbers the area around Lion Gate Gardens might be included in Richmond Town Ward and taken out of Kew Ward).

- From Dr. J. L. Tonge, Chairman of the Kew Liberals, protesting against the transfer of the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road, from Kew Ward into Mortlake Ward.

- From Mr. H. S. P. Moses, of 7 Hamilton House, High Park Road, Kew, adding support to the objection against taking the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road, out of Kew Ward into Mortlake Ward and suggesting an alternative area near to Kew Ward which might be included in Richmond Town Ward.

- From Mrs. J. Dons, of 32 West Park Avenue, Kew, also objecting to the proposal to transfer the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road from the existing Kew Ward to the new Mortlake Ward.

- From Mr. T. J. Borman, of 26 Mays Road, Kew, objecting to the proposal to include the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road into the new Mortlake Ward.

- From Mr. A. Leeds, of 17 Atwood Avenue, objecting to the proposals to transfer his Avenue into Mortlake Ward.

- From Mr. J. Rowlands, of 27 Atwood Avenue, registering strong opposition to the proposal that his address should be transferred to Mortlake Ward.

The following representations were awaiting me on my arrival at the Municipal Offices, Twickenham and were received by me before the Local Meeting commenced:-

- From Mrs. B. J. Hales, of 59 Marksbury Avenue, protesting at the proposal to include that part of Marksbury Avenue into Mortlake Ward instead of Kew Ward.

- From Mr. A. A. Pickford, of 25 Atwood Avenue, Kew, strongly objecting to his address being included in Mortlake Ward, which he claimed was separated by a very busy main highway and commending the suggestion that properties in the vicinity of Lion Gate Gardens might be included in Richmond Town Ward, if it were necessary to achieve better numerical equality.

- From Moiss M. Pepper, of 5a Darrell Road, objecting to the proposal to transfer the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road into Mortlake Ward, Mortlake being remote from that area.

- From Mr. H. Brooke, of 1 Dynevor Road, Richmond, protesting against the proposal that the boundary between
Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward should be
the Sheen Road and George Street, which would have
the effect that his address would no longer be in
Richmond Town Ward but in Richmond Hill Ward.

4. SUBMISSIONS made at the Local Meeting

(1) Introduction

In making my preliminary introductions I outlined a suggested
method of proceeding with the business of the meeting and
intimated that after the meeting it was my intention to visit
various parts of the Borough and in particular those areas
referred to in our discussion affecting Ward boundary differences,
of difficulties in voting arrangements.

I then referred to the statutory rules to be observed in
carrying out electoral reviews which were set out in Schedule 11
of the Local Government Act 1972. I stated that as applied to
London Boroughs the primary rule required that the ratio of the
number of electors to the number of Councillors should be, as
nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the Borough, taking
account of any likely changes in the number or distribution of
the electorate in the succeeding five years (i.e. up to 1980).
As a secondary consideration the rules stated that regard should
be had to the desirability of fixing boundaries which would be
easily identifiable and also to any local ties which would be
broken by the fixing of any particular boundary. I emphasised
that the Boundary Commission were required to observe the rule
about equality of representation and to have regard to the other
rules.

I then informed the meeting of the various comments and
representations which had been received by me (these are listed
in paragraph 5).

I then invited a representative of the Council to make a
short general statement as to the relevant action taken by the
Council in the procedure for the review of electoral arrangements
under the Local Government Act 1972 and leading up to this Local
Meeting.

Councillor A. F. Arbour, a member of the Conservative Majority
Party on the Council and Chairman of the General Purposes Committee,
said that with Alderman K. I. Morell, the Leader of the Council,
and Mr. A. R. Wynne, Deputy Town Clerk (Administration), he would
speak at the meeting on behalf of the Council and in support of
the Boundary Commission's draft proposals which were based on
the Council's draft scheme.

He said that the Council were approached by the Local
Government Boundary Commission in June 1975 as to revised
warding arrangements and asked to prepare a draft scheme by
January 1976; to place such scheme on deposit for comment and
representation; and to submit the draft scheme then to the
Boundary Commission not later than the 27th February 1976. He
said that the Council appointed a sub-committee to put forward
to the Council a draft scheme for consideration and the
composition of that sub-committee included the leaders of all
parties on the Council. A scheme was prepared by November 1976,
although there were also minority proposals. The Council's
scheme was published in December 1975 with a view to
representations or comments thereon being submitted to the
Council before the scheme was submitted to the Commission in
February 1976. The Council had an opportunity in February 1976
again to consider the scheme with such comments as they received
and at that time the Council decided to adhere to their draft
scheme.
Then the Boundary Commission, in their letter to the Council of 15th June 1976, published draft proposals which were very similar indeed to the Council's draft scheme although made a modification of the boundary between Central Twickenham Ward and West Twickenham Ward and made also some minor alterations to boundaries as suggested by Ordnance Survey. When the draft proposals were published, the 20th August 1976 was fixed as the date by which any comments or representations of the draft proposals might be sent to the Boundary Commission. As a result of such comments and representations (and these had already been listed at the meeting) this public meeting had been convened.

Councillor Arbour said that in the meantime the Council had considered the slight amendments to the draft scheme made by the Boundary Commission in their draft proposals and were happy to support these amendments.

(2) Warding Arrangements Generally

I felt it appropriate at this stage to note that in the Council's draft scheme and in the Commission's draft proposals, and indeed in the Liberal Party alternative schemes, and the Labour Party alternative scheme, it was proposed that the number of Councillors to be elected in Richmond-upon-Thames should be 52. The Borough was divided into two Parliamentary constituency areas, namely, the Richmond constituency area with a 1975 electorate of 53100 and a projected 1980 electorate of 54281 (giving an entitlement of 21.63 Councillors and allocated 22 Councillors) and the Twickenham constituency area with a 1975 electorate of 72718 and a 1980 projected electorate of 76187 (giving an entitlement of 30.37 Councillors and allocated 30 Councillors). Although, in making new Borough Ward arrangements, the Council and the Commission were not bound to adhere to the Parliamentary constituency boundary, in this case the boundary between the two Parliamentary constituencies was the River Thames, a very effective boundary, and the River had been retained in all the schemes as a ward boundary.

In view of the comments and representations made, I felt that it would be better if the meeting proceeded first to deal with those wards in the Richmond and Barnes areas (comprising the Richmond Parliamentary constituency) and then to deal with the proposals for wards in the Twickenham area (being the area of the Twickenham constituency).

(3) Wards in the Richmond and Barnes parts of the Borough

Councillor Arbour said that his Council, in preparing the draft scheme (and this had been followed by the Boundary Commission in their draft proposals), had aimed to create wards which would cause the minimum of change from the existing ward arrangements but, at the same time, note had had to be taken of the requirements of Schedule II of the Local Government Act 1972 that in each ward the ratio of the number of electors to the number of Councillors should be, as nearly as may be, the same. In order to achieve this equality of representation, some alterations had had to be made to the ward boundaries in the North Sheen area and also in the dividing boundary between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward. Such boundaries as had been fixed were, however, easily identifiable and he submitted that there had been comparatively few representations against the Council's scheme. The Labour Party had put forward alternative proposals but had not submitted representations to the Boundary Commission against the draft proposals (although he noted that Councillor Lady Connor, was present at the meeting to speak on behalf of the Labour Party). The Liberal Party had
reiterated their proposals for an alternative scheme or schemes but he felt that it could be said that, so far as the Council were concerned, it was only the Liberal Party that was against the Council scheme and that represented some 13 members out of 63. He felt therefore that it could be said that the draft scheme was acceptable to some 50 out of 63 members. Surely this was an overwhelming majority of the Council and he felt that an overwhelming majority of the electorate of the Borough would also agree with the scheme as now proposed. Again, he emphasised that the Council's scheme and the Boundary Commission's proposals presented a scheme of minimum change.

Councillor David Williams, speaking on behalf of the Richmond and Barnes Liberals, then submitted their alternative schemes A and B for the wards in Richmond and Barnes. He referred to the representations made to the Boundary Commission in February 1976 which had been reiterated in their comments on the draft proposals submitted in August 1976.

At the outset, I said that I had noted that the Liberals had put forward two schemes, scheme A and scheme B, and I asked if they had now made up their mind which of the two alternative schemes they wished to pursue at this meeting.

Councillor Williams readily informed me that they wished to pursue scheme A, which they preferred. He said that this scheme attempted to draw ward boundaries on a genuine community basis. He felt that the boundaries in the Council's draft scheme were somewhat unsatisfactory and he wished to suggest some rather radical amendments.

First, he outlined a number of suggested changes to boundaries in and around the North Sheen area affecting Kew Ward, Richmond Town Ward, East Sheen Ward, Pelawell Ward and Mortlake Ward.

As to Kew Ward, the Liberals suggested that the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road should be included in Kew Ward (and not in Mortlake Ward as suggested in the Council's draft scheme and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals). They also suggested that an area bounded by Kew Road, Fitzwilliam Avenue, the rear of the southern part of Windoer Road, Sandycombe Road and Stanmore Road and Wyndham Road, should be taken out of Kew Ward and added into Richmond Town Ward.

As a large number of representations had been made as to the southern boundary of Kew Ward, it was decided to discuss this particular matter first.

Councillor L Worth, a Councillor representing Kew Ward, said that there were obvious difficulties as to the boundary of Kew Ward and he felt that Lower Richmond Road made a better boundary than, say, Atwood Avenue. He thought that to get the numbers right as to electorate in the two Wards it would be better to exclude some of the roads nearer to Kew Road. He felt that Stanmore Road and Wyndham Road made a rather indeterminate boundary and perhaps an equally good boundary could be found a little north, so placing roads in that area in Richmond Town Ward.

He noted that Kew Ward in the draft proposals had a 1980 projected electorate of 7400 (entitlement 2.95). If the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road were to be added back that would add some 793 electors, making a total of 8202 (entitlement 3.27). Mortlake
Ward would then be reduced from 755^ by this 793 making a 1980 projected electorate of 6761 and an entitlement of 2.69. The Liberals now suggested that some 666 electors should be added into Richmond Town Ward which, as at present drawn, had an electorate of 5259 with an entitlement of 2.10. The addition of 666 would give a figure of 5925 with an entitlement of 2.36.

Mrs. A. Jeffries, of 61 Marksbury Avenue, then asked that consideration be given to the petition which she had submitted to the Commission in August 1976 which urged that the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road should be added back into Kew Ward. If this area were to be placed in Mortlake Ward those streets would be isolated from the surrounding area. It would be a bit "tacked on" to Mortlake Ward but separated from it by a six-lane highway and two cemeteries, and adjacent streets geographically closer to Mortlake would be allowed to remain in Kew Ward. Finally, she said, it would break up the community and isolate those affected. The alternative plan suggested was that the properties northwards from Stanmore Road to Lion Gate Gardens should be added into Richmond Town Ward. She felt that this would affect some 400 electors who believed they were part of Richmond rather than Kew.

At this stage Mrs. S. Lloyd, of 28 Chiltern Road, Richmond, (which lies between Marksbury Avenue and North Road) said that this area should be included in Kew Ward, and she then referred to the roads nearer to Kew Road. She said she had lived in this area all her life and she felt that the people in Lion Gate Gardens looked more to Richmond, whilst the people who lived in Fitzwilliam Avenue felt they were in Kew. She thought that the ward boundary should divide these two Avenues.

Councillor David Williams then said that he thought a line should be found somewhere along Fitzwilliam Avenue and Gainsborough Road. It was agreed, however, that this was not a wholly satisfactory boundary line. (I later ascertained that if this area were added to the Richmond Town Ward it would affect some 333 electors.)

At this stage it is appropriate to bring into the record the various written representations submitted as to the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road being added back into Kew Ward, rather than be in the Mortlake Ward. (The letters are listed in paragraph 3 of this report.) The points made in these letters are that the people of this area have always identified themselves very strongly with Kew and wish to remain part of Kew Ward; that if this area were in Mortlake Ward they would be isolated from the rest of the Ward by the six-lane highway; that the area is part of the Ecclesiastical Parish of St. Philip which is an important part of Kew; and that they would no longer be in touch with the Kew Councillors whom they considered represented them.

Councillor Williams then went on to refer to Richmond Town Ward and first said that the Liberals felt that an area in North Sheen, bounded by Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue, the railway line north of Tangier Road, the west side of Sheen Court Road, Upper Richmond Road and Manor Road, was more properly an area which should have been included in Richmond Town Ward and not, as in the present scheme, partly in Mortlake Ward and partly in East Sheen Ward. This area comprised an electorate of some 1339 and the Liberals suggested that this would then bring the electorate for the Richmond Hill, Richmond Town and Kew group of Wards up to an entitlement for 9 Councillors, instead of 8 as in the draft scheme.
I had to comment that I was far from happy with this suggestion that this area comprising 1339 electors should be transferred into Richmond Town Ward for it appeared to me that this area was somewhat remote from Richmond Town and was probably better placed partly in Mortlake Ward and partly in East Sheen Ward. I asked Councillor Williams what was the real intention of the Liberals in this matter, for no doubt their proposal to move this area into Richmond Town Ward would have the effect of reducing Mortlake Ward, possibly down to an entitlement for 2 Councillors, to enable Richmond Town Ward (with some possible boundary adjustment between that Ward and Richmond Hill Ward) to be increased to an entitlement of 3 Councillors. It was also noted that there was a further proposal that Mortlake Ward should be reduced by 1791 to be added to the Barnes area to make two Wards, a Barnes Ward and a Barnes Common Ward.

Councillor Arbour then said that the Council were very much against this suggestion to move this area, comprising an electorate of 1339, into Richmond Town Ward. He said that he considered that this area was more properly in the Mortlake area and the East Sheen area and he stood by the Council's draft scheme in this matter. He wished to place on record that he believed Mortlake Ward should be of a size to entitle the Ward to 3 Councillors and he was very much against any change of that proposal.

Councillor Williams then referred to the boundary between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward. He said that under existing arrangements the boundary was along Sheen Road, Church Road and The Vineyard and down to the River, but the Council's draft scheme (and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals) had changed this boundary to Sheen Road and continuing that Road into George Street, and then along Water Lane to the River. Councillor Williams said that the Liberals felt that this line could not in any way be regarded as being the natural boundary between Richmond Town and Richmond Hill. The Liberals felt that this ward boundary should be along Sheen Road, Paradise Road, Ormond Road and then to Richmond Bridge. Councillor Williams said that, insofar as anywhere could be defined as the boundary between the Hill and the Town, it was here. Furthermore, he felt that the heart of the town centre should be wholly in Richmond Town Ward.

I then introduced the letter received that morning by me from Mr. Henry Brooke of 1 Dynevor Road, Richmond. In this letter Mr. Brooke said that he was Chairman of the Parents' Committee at the local Primary Junior School in The Vineyard where two of his children attended and that he was a member of the Richmond Society. He protested most strongly against the proposal to make a new boundary between the Town and Hill Wards down the middle of George Street. He said that this proposal ignored the pattern of community life in the area, that Richmond Hill Ward naturally pivoted around the Friars Stile Road shopping area and the Town Ward naturally pivoted around the main shopping streets in Richmond Town Centre. He felt that the ward boundary should be to the south of Dynevor Road for he felt that the people in Dynevor Road were directly involved with the political and planning issue concerned with the development of the Richmond Town Centre. His involvement with local government issues "up the Hill" was very slight by comparison.

I then had to point out to the meeting that the total electorate in Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward as proposed in the draft scheme and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals was 12988 (7729 in Richmond Hill Ward with an entitlement of 3.08, and 5259 in Richmond Town Ward with an entitlement of 2.10). This gave a total entitlement for these
two Wards which made up Richmond of 5.18 and even if, say, approximately 400 electors were added to that Richmond area from the Fitzwilliam Avenue, Gainsborough Road section of Kew, this would still only make an entitlement of 5.33. Unless many more electors were to be added (and the Liberal suggestion for electors to be added from the area east of Manor Road did not appear to be popularly accepted) the Richmond area would only be entitled to 5 Councillors.

Therefore, if a change had to be made from the proposals in the draft Scheme and the Boundary Commission's proposals that Richmond Hill Ward should have 3 Councillors and Richmond Town Ward should have 2 Councillors (in other words if the representation of the two Wards should be reversed) there would have to be a major change of the boundary line. It seemed to me that the Sheen Road, Paradise Road, Ormond Road and Richmond Bridge line, which would only move about 241 electors from one ward to the other, would not be satisfactory and, from figures supplied to me, it seemed that if one had to revert to the boundary line now existing between the two wards, namely, the line of Sheen Road, Church Road and The Vineyard down to the River, only a further 829 would be moved from one ward to the other. If these calculations were right, a change back to this existing line would give Richmond Hill Ward 6659 electors (with an entitlement of 2.65) and Richmond Town Ward an electorate of 6329 (with an entitlement of 2.52). (If some 400 electors were also added from the Fitzwilliam Avenue/Gainsborough Road area, this would make an electorate of 6729 with an entitlement of 2.69.) I said that, in my view (and no doubt in the view of the Boundary Commission) these figures would not be satisfactory figures.

Councillor Arbour then said that this was exactly the position as the Council saw it. Boundary lines selected by the Council gave good representation figures, namely Richmond Hill Ward 7729 with an entitlement of 3.08 and Richmond Town Ward 5259 electors with an entitlement of 2.10.

The view was then expressed that it was perhaps wrong to feel that the electors had only a parochial interest in the Ward affairs but that the people in the two Richmond Wards were all likely to be interested in the affairs of Richmond Town Centre. If the boundary line between the two Wards went along Sheen Road, George Street and Water Lane to the River, that would provide an interest by the people of both Wards in the affairs of the Town Centre.

Councillor Williams then referred to the Barnes area and said that the Liberals felt that there should be a major change of the Wards and representation in this area. He said that they would like to see a rather enlarged area of Barnes divided into two Wards, namely, North Barnes Ward and Barnes Common Ward, each returning 2 members. In order to achieve these two Wards and this representation, the Liberals suggested that the area (comprising about 1181 electors) to the north east of the railway line near Barnes Bridge and bounded on the north east by Station Road, and now in Mortlake Ward, should be added into the proposed Barnes Common Ward, and an area (comprising some 704 electors) bounded by Upper Richmond Road, Treen Avenue, the railway line near to Barnes Station and Queens Ride and the Borough boundary on the east also added into Barnes Common Ward. This would have the effect of further reducing the electorate in Mortlake Ward and would also reduce the electorate in Palewell Ward. (The Liberals had a further suggestion of moving 1134 electors on the western end of Palewell Ward into East Sheen Ward.) Councillor Williams then outlined the boundary line which the Liberals had in mind between the proposed North Barnes Ward and Barnes Common Ward.
Councillor Arbour said that these proposals were very much against the Council's guiding principle that there should be minimum change in the new ward proposals.

Councillor A. Manners, who said he was representing the Liberals of Palewell Ward, said that he could not support any change of Palewell Ward as proposed in the draft proposals of the Boundary Commission. He was against moving part of the Ward into the Barnes Ward or Wards and against reducing the representation from 3 to 2.

This interjection by Councillor Manners, of course, very much weakened the submissions being made by Councillor Williams on behalf of the Liberal Association. It was, however, something of a surprise when Councillor Williams then said that, having regard to the obvious opposition to the Liberals' Scheme A, and also the strength of the argument for a warding scheme based on "minimum change" from existing wards, he felt that he should now withdraw Scheme A and submit to the meeting Scheme B which the Liberals had also submitted.

This caused some little outcry, for obviously it was felt that the Liberals should have made up their mind as to which Scheme they wanted. In fairness, however, it should be recorded that in submitting Scheme B to the Boundary Commission as early as February 1976, the Richmond and Barnes Liberals had said that if, despite the case argued in suggested Scheme A, the Commission decided to recommend a minimum change Scheme, then the Liberals would ask that Scheme B be considered in preference to the Council's draft scheme.

Councillor Williams said that, in support of the minimum change principle, Scheme B made only three alterations to the existing ward pattern, namely:-

(i) It added the area bounded by Paradise Road, Ormond Road, Church Road, The Vineyard and River Thames (electorate 829) into Richmond Hill Ward (from Richmond Town Ward).

(ii) It added into Richmond Town Ward the area lying between Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway line running into North Sheen Station (this area was in the existing East Sheen Ward but placed in Mortlake Ward in the draft proposals).

(iii) It added into Richmond Town Ward (from Kew Ward) a rather larger area, comprising 845 electors, bounded by Kew Road, The Avenue, Ennerdale Road, the rear of the southern side of Windsor Road, Sandycombe Road, Wyndham Road and Stanmore Road.

He said that, in applying these Scheme B suggested amendments to the Council's draft scheme and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals, the following were the effects:-

(1) The amended boundary between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward would be Sheen Road, Paradise Road, Ormond Road, Bridge Street to Richmond Bridge and would transfer only 241 electors from the proposed Richmond Hill Ward to Richmond Town Ward.

(2) Moving the area bounded by Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway
line running to North Sheen Station, with an electorate of 959, would take this area out of the proposed Mortlake Ward and into Richmond Town Ward.

(3) The proposal as to Kew Ward would first of all return into Kew Ward the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road, but would take out of Kew Ward the area between Kew Road and Sandycombe Road (a rather larger area than had previously been considered) with an electorate of 845.

In discussing these proposed amendments it was pointed out that if the amendments were effected:

(a) Kew Ward would have an electorate of 7409 (as in draft scheme) minus 845 plus 795: i.e. 7347 electors, with an entitlement of 2.93 and allocated 3 Councillors.

(b) Mortlake Ward would have an electorate of 7554 (as in draft scheme) minus 793 and minus 959: i.e. 5802, with an entitlement of 2.31 and an allocation of 2 Councillors only.

(c) Richmond Town Ward would have an electorate of 5259 plus 845 plus 241 plus 959: i.e. 7304 electors, with an entitlement of 2.91 and allocated 3 Councillors (and not 2 as in the draft scheme).

(d) Richmond Hill Ward would have an electorate of 7729 (as in draft scheme) minus 241: i.e. 7488 electors, with an entitlement of 2.98 and allocated 3 Councillors.

I had to point out to the Meeting that it was obvious that the proposals as contained in Scheme B depended on a decision as to whether the area comprising 959 electors in Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway line running to North Sheen Station was more properly in Richmond Town Ward than in Mortlake Ward. There also seemed a further weakness in Scheme B as to the area comprising 845 electors which it was now proposed should be moved from the Kew Ward into Richmond Town Ward. An appreciable part of this area were properties very near to, and some facing, the Kew Royal Botanic Gardens and one would think more in Kew than in Richmond Town.

Councillor Lady Connor said that she represented the Richmond Labour Party (and also the Twickenham Labour Party) for Mr. K. R. Hathaway, who had previously submitted on behalf of both Labour Parties representations in respect of the Ward scheme in February 1976, was unable to attend. She said at the outset that the Boundary Commission's proposals as put forward this morning were unacceptable to the Labour Party. She felt that the majority Conservative Scheme was more acceptable than the Liberal Schemes but she now wished formally to resubmit the Richmond Labour Party's proposals as submitted in February 1976.

Lady Connor did not speak to these proposals but it should, perhaps, be recorded here that the Labour Party, in comparison to the Council's draft scheme and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals, envisaged (a) a smaller Kew Ward (returning only 2 Councillors); (b) a larger Mortlake Ward taking in an appreciable area of North Sheen (including the area bounded by
North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road and also other properties to the east); (c) a larger Richmond Town Ward taking in properties south of the Avenue near to Kew Gardens; (d) a differently shaped Palewell Ward, this Ward comprising only the area bounded by Manor Road on the west, the North Sheen to Barnes railway line on the north, the borough boundary on the east and the Upper Richmond Road and Sheen Road on the south; and (e) a differently shaped East Sheen Ward which was wholly situated to the south of Upper Richmond Road. The suggested boundary between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward was Sheen Road, Paradise Road, Hill Street and a boundary line to the east of Richmond Bridge. In these proposals Richmond Town Ward returned 3 Councillors (not 2 as in the Council's draft scheme).

We were now reaching the end of our discussion on the Ward arrangements in Richmond and Barnes and I therefore called on Councillor Arbour to make such final statements as he wished to put forward. He said that, in his view, the Liberal Schemes were contrived Schemes to produce a smaller Mortlake Ward and a larger Richmond Town Ward. He was convinced that the Liberal Schemes were not as good as the Council's draft scheme which had become the Boundary Commission's proposals.

Councillor Mrs. A. Cornish then said that viewed on community terms the Liberal Schemes made more sense.

To this Councillor Arbour replied that he did not consider that the Council's scheme broke up any communities. This was borne out by the fact that generally there were no representations made on these lines to the Council's scheme, apart from those relating to the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road, which admittedly posed a problem.

ASSESSMENT OF ARGUMENTS

It should first be noted that the Council aimed to prepare a Scheme which involved minimum change from the existing Ward electoral arrangements but, (as they submitted) they had had to make some changes in order to meet the requirement of equality of ratio of representation ward by ward throughout the Borough.

Dealing as yet only with the area of Richmond and Barnes, this draft scheme had perhaps arguable weak points, namely,

(1) the boundary between Kew Ward and Richmond Town Ward and Mortlake Ward;

(2) the size and shape of Mortlake Ward; and

(3) the boundary between Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward and the Councillor representation of these two Wards.

The existing Kew Ward (1975 electorate) has 8288 electors and, with an average figure of 2509 per Councillor (based on 52 Councillors for a total projected 1980 electorate of 130468), it was necessary to try to transfer some 650/700 electors away from the Ward.

At the same time there was the problem of that area bounded by Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road,
Clifford Avenue and the railway line to North Sheen Station (which was somewhat isolated from the rest of the existing East Sheen Ward).

The Council moved this area into Mortlake Ward (and let me say here and now that I think that this was right - it seems to me more Mortlake than East Sheen or Richmond Town). They then looked northwards across Lower Richmond Road into Kew Ward and eventually decided to transfer into Mortlake Ward the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and Lower Richmond Road (some 793 electors).

I believe that the Council never considered this transfer wholly satisfactory and, as I have recorded, this caused a lot of protest and representation. Mrs. Jeffries' petition summed up the objections, namely - isolation of a few streets from the surrounding area - a bit "tacked on" to Mortlake Ward but separated from it by a six-lane highway - adjacent streets closer to Mortlake being allowed to remain in Kew - and the petition suggested that, if numbers must be reduced, then streets to the west should be added from Kew Ward into Richmond Town Ward.

The Liberal Party had similar suggestions but it seemed for different reasons. The Labour Party suggested a much smaller Kew Ward with a boundary as far north as the Avenue and Atwood Avenue.

I spent some time visiting this area on the day following the meeting (and I also know the area well) and came to the conclusion that the real boundary line between Kew Ward and Mortlake Ward was the Lower Richmond Road; and that the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and the Lower Richmond Road would be isolated in Mortlake Ward; and I was convinced that, unless electorate numbers were absolutely impossible, this area should be in Kew Ward.

Unfortunately, transferring back to Kew these 793 electors would bring the Mortlake 1980 projected electorate figure down to 6761 (giving an entitlement of 2.69 for 3 Councillors or 0.90 per Councillor) and would push the Kew electorate figure back to 8202 (the 1980 electorate figure with an entitlement of 5.27 for 3 Councillors, i.e. 1.09 per Councillor).

Then there was the question of moving some electors from Kew Ward to Richmond Town Ward (as suggested in the petition and also at the public meeting). Already the Richmond Town Ward had an electorate in the draft scheme of 5259 (giving an entitlement of 2.22 for 2 Councillors i.e. 1.11 per Councillor). This entitlement is already higher than the increased Kew Ward figure per Councillor and therefore there seems no reason to move any electorate over from Kew to Richmond Town Ward.

Now as to Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward and the boundary between the two. In the draft scheme the total electorate of these Wards is 12988 giving an entitlement of 5.18. If, say, 350 electors...
were added from the Kew Ward (from near to Fitzwilliam Avenue and Lion Gate Gardens) this would give 13338 (with an entitlement of 3.32). I have already indicated that I could not support the addition into Richmond Town Ward of the area bounded by Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway line to North Sheen Station for I believe this to be more properly included in Mortlake Ward.

My recommendation is that the Richmond area (i.e. Richmond Town Ward and Richmond Hill Ward) should return 5 Councillors and therefore a decision has to be taken as to the appropriate boundary line between the two Wards.

The Council's draft scheme (and the Boundary Commission's proposal) suggests a boundary line along Sheen Road, George Street and Water Lane to the River, giving Richmond Town Ward an electorate of 5259 (entitlement 2.10 and returning 2 Councillors) and Richmond Hill Ward 7229 (entitlement 3.08 and returning 3 Councillors).

The Liberals suggested the line of Sheen Road, Paradise Road, Ormond Road to the Richmond Bridge giving Richmond Hill Ward an electorate of 7488 (with an entitlement of 2.98 and returning 3 Councillors) and then taking the remaining part of Richmond to form a Richmond Town Ward and enlarging it (to return 3 Councillors) by adding some other areas. I am unable to support these suggestions. The area bounded by Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway line I have referred to above and as to the areas adjacent to the southern part of Kew Gardens (of different sizes in Schemes A and B) I must say that I am not satisfied that these can be regarded as other than situated in Kew and therefore appropriately in Kew Ward.

The Labour Party suggested a line of Sheen Road, Paradise Road and Hill Street to a point on the River Thames east of the Richmond Bridge. This was very similar to the Liberals' suggested line, but here again an enlarged Richmond Town Ward was envisaged returning 3 Councillors by taking into Richmond Town Ward a considerable area of Kew and so making a smaller Kew Ward for 2 Councillors.

In this matter, I must say that in my opinion the draft scheme line is the best line, both as to clear identity and also because it gives Wards with the more acceptable electorate figures and Councillor entitlements. It is true that the draft scheme boundary is a line through the centre of the Town and does not meet Mr. Brooke's objection and his wish, living in Dynevor Road, to be in the Richmond Town Ward so that he could be more concerned with Town development schemes etc. In this respect, however, it is my view that the area of Richmond Hill is so near to, and caught up with, the development of the Town (particularly as to its traffic scheme) that it is no longer possible for either Ward to have a purely parochial attitude to Richmond affairs.
Finally, as to the Barnes area, the Liberal Party submitted suggestions in Scheme A for a new structure in the Barnes area which would have affected also Mortlake Ward and Palewell Ward but these were then withdrawn at the meeting. In any event I would have found great difficulty in supporting any of these suggestions.

In summary therefore:–

(1) I am of the opinion that the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Avenue, Marksbury Avenue and the Lower Richmond Road should be in Kew Ward (not Mortlake Ward) and although this transfer will give Kew Ward a somewhat high electorate and entitlement (namely 8202 with a 3.27 entitlement and returning 3 Councillors) and give Mortlake Ward a somewhat low electorate and entitlement (namely 6761 with a 2.69 entitlement and returning 3 Councillors) I believe that these figures are not unacceptable.

(2) I consider that there should be no change in the Stanmore Road and Wyndham Road boundary between Kew Ward and Richmond Town Ward. The properties in the three or four streets to the north of this line are so near the frontage of Kew Royal Botanic Gardens that I cannot consider them other than in Kew.

(3) I consider that the area bounded by Manor Road, Lower Richmond Road, Clifford Avenue and the railway line to North Sheen Station should be in Mortlake Ward as in draft proposals (not in Richmond Town Ward).

(4) I support the draft proposal that the boundary line between Richmond Hill Ward and Richmond Town Ward be Sheen Road, George Street, Water Lane to the River Thames.

(5) I cannot recommend any change in the Ward arrangements in Barnes Ward, Palewell Ward and East Sheen Ward.

(4) Wards in the Twickenham part of the Borough

Councillor Arbour said that his Council supported the draft proposals of the Boundary Commission, for the Boundary Commission had approved the draft scheme of the Council as to the Twickenham Wards with only one modification, namely, the boundary line between West Twickenham Ward and Central Twickenham Ward which, incidentally, gave a better electoral ratio of representation. He reiterated that the Council in formulating its draft scheme had very much in mind the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972 that the ratio of the number of electors to the number of Councillors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every Ward of the Borough; and that the boundaries between the Wards should be easily identifiable; and also had considered (and this was most important to the Council from a fundamental policy point of view) that there should be in the new Wards scheme minimum change from the existing Ward arrangements. Some changes, however, had had to be made which affected certain small estates, namely, the Dene Estate which had been placed in Whitton Ward and also the Rivermeads Estate which had been placed in Heathfield Ward. Representations had been made about these areas and no doubt the difficulties about them would be discussed at the Local
Meeting. There was also the difficulty of dealing with the area of the Hampton Nursery lands which at the present time the Council were purchasing for future housing development.

I said that the Boundary Commission had obviously been very concerned as to the proposals put forward in the Council’s draft scheme for Nursery Ward which showed an electorate in 1975 of only 1840 but with a 1980 projected electorate figure of 4719, a figure which would give an entitlement of some 1.88 in a scheme for 52 Councillors for the Borough. I then asked Councillor Arbour to give to me and the Meeting up-to-date information as to the proposals for the development of the Hampton Nursery lands.

First, Councillor Arbour informed me that the 1976 register of electors had shown no appreciable change from the 1975 electorate figure for this proposed Ward area and, indeed, he did not anticipate that the 1977 register would show any appreciable change in the figures. He went on to say that the Council’s scheme was for the purchase of some 14½ acres of land; and that a compulsory purchase order had been made for the purchase of these lands but that already agreement had been reached for the purchase of 153 acres, of which 25 acres were to be used for education purposes. The Public Inquiry as to the compulsory purchase order and also as to the planning application for the erection of some 1480 houses had been held in November 1976 and there was every reason to believe that the necessary approvals would be given.

Councillor Arbour then gave details of the housing development likely to be carried out in the Nursery area, viz: 1,480 units, made up of approximately 30 units in the central area development around the community centre and shopping etc.; 720 houses in private development; 240 units to be erected by housing associations; 370 units of Council development for letting; and 120 units of Council development for sale. In answer to my question he said that new occupants of the housing units would come from the Borough itself, others would be nominated by the Greater London Council in mutual arrangements between the GLC and the Borough and others would come from anywhere around if they were making purchases of the private development properties.

I then asked if there had yet been any indication as to any possible delay in going forward with the housing development scheme because of the present economic situation and I was informed that there had been no such indication and I concluded that it was the Council’s view that this development could be carried out by 1980 if all went well, but that surely it would be carried out by 1982, which would be the date of Council elections, the first relevant Council elections being in 1978.

This then raised the point that for the 1978 elections the Nursery Ward (if it were so agreed that this should form a Ward) would have only sufficient electorate to give an entitlement for one Councillor although later by 1980 or 1982 it would have sufficient electors to give an entitlement for 2 Councillors. It was obvious as to whether or not it would be possible to make a scheme for there to be one Councillor in the first place and then 2 Councillors for the Ward later after 1980, but I said that I understood that the Secretary of State would not be likely to make an order on these lines, in fact I doubted if it were legally possible for this to happen. If, therefore, the Nursery Ward had to stand as a viable and acceptable proposition the representation for the Ward would appear to be 2 Councillors, warranted by the projected development now going forward.
I then questioned Councillor Arbour as to the Council's ideas for the make-up of Nursery Ward for I had noticed that the existing development in such Ward was wholly situated in the northern part of the Ward and that the Council had not seen fit to add into that Ward properties to the east of the Nursery lands or properties to the south. Perhaps some additional properties here should be included if the Council wished the new development on the Nursery lands to fit in with existing development and so form a viable and satisfactory Ward. I also queried whether it was satisfactory to include in Nursery Ward the properties north of the Longford River (namely the properties in Graham Road, Winifred Road, Longford Close and Ringwood Way which lay south of Hampton Road East) for it appeared to me that these houses were isolated from the rest of the proposed Nursery Ward (linked only by a footbridge over the River) and perhaps these would be more conveniently situated in Hampton Hill Ward.

Councillor Arbour said that it had been very much in the mind of the Council to form a Ward here bringing in the new development and merging it with existing development in the vicinity which would be a nucleus of the Ward, but he said that he did not think it appropriate to add other properties to the east or the south for they were firmly in the existing Wards. He went on to say that he felt it would be satisfactory for the area north of the Longford River to remain in the proposed Nursery Ward. Once the Ward boundary was fixed suitable polling arrangements would be made.

Mr. Cyril J. Barnes, President of the Twickenham Liberal Association, then formally submitted his Association's representations as to the warding arrangements in Twickenhan, and I invited him first to deal with suggested arrangements in the Hampton area.

Mr. Barnes first strongly criticised the proposals in the Council's draft scheme (and in the Boundary Commission's draft proposals) for Hampton Hill Ward. He said that, although the Council had put forward the principle of "minimum change" they had considerably changed the southern boundary of this Ward and these changes had some considerable political significance. Hampton Hill Ward was very much a marginal Ward with, at the present time, two Labour members and one Conservative member. The boundary had previously run along Uxbridge Road and Hanworth Road, but now the new proposals took into Hampton Hill Ward (from Hampton Ward) the area northeast of Broad Lane, Nightingale Road, Acacia Road, Buckingham Road and Dean Road, thereby adding Conservative votes into Hampton Hill Ward. They had then taken out of Hampton Hill Ward (to be placed in the new proposed Nursery Ward) the properties in the Bishops Grove area, so taking out Labour votes. In the Liberal Association's view Hampton Hill Ward should remain as previously (less the Rivermeads Estate which it was accepted should be taken out of the Ward). This would give Hampton Hill Ward an electorate of 7566 with an entitlement of 3.01 returning 3 Councillors.

Mr. Barnes pointed out that this would then leave a very large Hampton Ward (as existing) with the possibility of adding some 2879 new electors in the Hampton Nursery land over the next four years. He submitted that the present electorate of the existing Hampton Ward was 9018 with a likely increase of some 650 (expansion in the Ward other than in the Nursery land) and then an addition of 2879 making a total of 12547, so entitling the area of this Ward eventually to a representation of 5 Councillors.

In the Liberal Association's view this area of the Hampton Ward should be split into two, namely, a southern ward and a northern ward and that this should be a more equal division of
of the Ward than was envisaged in the Council's draft scheme, so making a much larger North Hampton Ward into which the Nursery development could be more properly integrated. His Association envisaged the boundary between the two Wards being, from the western boundary of the Borough, along the railway line to Tudor Road and thence along the centre of Tudor Road, Tudor Avenue, Marlborough Road, part of Acacia Road and Nightingale Road to Hanworth Road. He said that this would produce two Wards with projected electorates of 4956 in the South Ward and 7312 in the North Ward and would mean that the election in 1978 in the North Ward would be contested with an electorate of about 4400 (that being for 3 Councillors on the basis of the projected electorate of 7312).

In referring again to the development of the Hampton Nursery land, he said that his Association felt that a development area of this nature was more likely to become a viable community if it was part of a larger established area.

I noted that the Liberal Association's proposals to add back into Hampton Hill Ward the Bishops Grove area would inevitably mean that this particular area would be somewhat isolated from the rest of Hampton Hill Ward but I questioned Mr. Barnes particularly on his Association's proposal that the boundary line between his proposed North Hampton Ward and South Hampton Ward should be the rather unsatisfactory line of Tudor Road, Tudor Avenue, Marlborough Road and part of Acacia Road and Nightingale Road. Did this not leave somewhat isolated from the rest of his proposed South Hampton Ward the triangular area bounded by Tudor Road, Tudor Avenue, Broad Lane and the railway line at the rear of the south eastern side of Gloucester Road?

Mr. Barnes acknowledged the point of my question and said that if the boundary line were the railway line from the borough boundary to Uxbridge Road the resulting electorate figures for the two suggested Wards would not be so satisfactory.

(On the day following the Meeting Councillor John Waller (a Liberal Councillor and Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Twickenham) handed to me a submission acknowledging the point I had made about the possible isolation of this triangular area between Broad Lane and Gloucester Road and Tudor Road and put forward to me a further suggestion that instead of the Tudor Road, Tudor Avenue, Marlborough Road, Nightingale Road, Acacia Road boundary, as previously suggested, the boundary between the two Wards might be the railway line from the western boundary of the Borough to the point where the railway passes under Oldfield Road, thence eastwards along Priory Road to the eastern end of the road, thence in a southwesterly direction along Wensleydale Passage, and so into Tudor Road and Station Approach to the bridge over the railway.

In his submission Councillor Waller said that this would give the North Hampton Ward an existing electorate of 4810 plus approximately 3000 to come on the Nursery development viz: 7810, entitling the Ward to return 3 Councillors and the South Hampton Ward would have an electorate of 4864 with an entitlement of 1.94 returning 2 Councillors.)
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Councillor Arbour then said that, in dealing with the Ward arrangements and also in meeting the problem of the considerable development shortly to be carried out on the Hampton Nursery lands, the Council were of the opinion that it would be preferable to form a smaller Nursery Ward with some existing electorate as a nucleus, for this would then make it possible for Hampton Hill Ward and Hampton Ward to remain virtually as they now existed. It was, however, agreed that, in order to get the numbers right, some amendments had had to be made to the boundary between the two Wards amending the boundary line from that of Hanworth Road to that of Broad Lane and Nightingale Road and Buckingham Road. He refuted, however, the allegation made by the Liberal Association that this had been done in order to add into Hampton Hill Ward some Conservative votes.

I then again questioned Councillor Arbour as to whether or not it would be preferable to add into Nursery Ward, to give it a broader base, some area to the east of the Nursery development land and also some properties to the south, e.g. all those properties north of Broad Lane. I pointed out that Broad Lane was already being used in its eastern half as a boundary between Hampton Hill Ward and Hampton Ward and therefore this might also be the boundary between Hampton Ward and Nursery Ward. I also again pointed out the difficulties of dealing with the properties north of the Longford River.

Councillor Arbour, in reply to my question, said that he was very much against adding any further areas into the Nursery Ward. He felt that if properties north of Broad Lane were added there would be substantial representations against that proposal. Furthermore, he did not see very much point in moving the electors in the area north of Longford River (some 400 of them) away from Nursery Ward. He went on to speak about existing Ward organisations and said that he was loath to make any move which would weaken those organisations.

It was then pointed out to him that he had already moved a number of electors who lived south of Hanworth Road from the existing Hampton Ward into Hampton Hill Ward.

Finally Councillor Arbour said that he did not favour in any way the proposals put forward by the Liberal Association for making a North Hampton Ward and a South Hampton Ward. He felt in any case that the boundary line which had been suggested, particularly that running from south to north from Hampton Station was not a very good boundary line, and why should the Hampton Ward be divided in this way near its central point?

Mr. C. J. Barnes, of the Twickenham Liberal Association, then went on to refer to the problems in West Twickenham Ward, Central Twickenham Ward and East Twickenham Ward, such problems relating to individual areas being also inter-related as to the electorate figures for each Ward.

Mr. Barnes said that Twickenham was now virtually divided by the line of Chertsey Road. A very good example of consequent difficulties was the problem of the Dene Estate which had been included (in the Council's Draft Scheme and the Boundary Commission's proposals) in the southeast corner of Whitton Ward. This Estate comprising Gladstone Avenue, Rosecroft Gardens and Denehurst Gardens had some 554 electors and had formerly been in West Twickenham Ward. If this area were now to be in Whitton Ward, voting arrangements may be that they would have to cross the busy Chertsey Road and it would also be readily seen that the properties on this Estate were isolated by that Road from the rest of the Ward.
Mrs. Steward, of 60 Gladstone Avenue, also spoke about this particular problem for the electors who lived in Gladstone Avenue, Rosecroft Avenue and Denehurst Gardens. She referred to the danger of crossing the busy Chertsey Road and said that there had been many approaches to the GLC about the problems of crossing this road but they had not been very helpful. They were very concerned that they should have convenient polling station arrangements for the people who lived on this Estate.

Mrs. D. Saunders spoke for Whitton Ward Conservatives in this matter and said that the proposition that this triangle of land should be included in Whitton Ward seemed to contravene the principle that Ward boundaries should follow natural boundaries wherever possible, the natural boundary in this case being the Chertsey Road. The Whitton Ward Conservatives felt that this triangle of land should be within West Twickenham Ward and that an area of land around or near to Whitton Road and Rugby Road near to the Twickenham Rugby Union Ground, and being north of the Chertsey Road, should be in Whitton Ward.

Miss Christine Livesey, of 76 Gladstone Road, wished to make sure that I had received the petition signed by 184 residents of this area who did not agree with the proposal to include this area in Whitton Ward because they said they would incur extra hazards in crossing the busy A316 (Chertsey Road) and have to travel a greater distance to vote.

During the discussion which then followed it appeared that the electors of this triangle of land were more concerned with the convenience of voting than with the fact that they had been included in a different Ward and Alderman Morell gave an assurance that the Council would do everything it could to make satisfactory polling station arrangements for the electors of these roads on the Dene Estate.

Mr. Barnes then referred to Central Twickenham Ward and said that his Association felt that the triangular area to the north of the Chertsey Road comprising Talma Gardens, Tayben Avenue, Chudleigh Road, Palmerston Road and Whitton Road should be included in Whitton Ward and not in Central Twickenham Ward. Again he felt that the Chertsey Road was a considerable barrier between properties on either side of the road, but on questioning him he said he did not feel that he should extend this principle by also including in another Ward the area around Marlow Crescent which was further east of Whitton Road. The area around Whitton Road comprised 541 electors.

Mr. Barnes then referred to East Twickenham Ward and particularly that small area in the northwest corner of the Ward which was west of the River Crane and which had been added into East Twickenham Ward, although previously it had been in Central Twickenham Ward. This area comprised some 356 electors. The roads affected were the northern part of Cole Park Road, the northern part of London Road (east side) and the northern part of Hill View Road.

The Boundary Commission had received representations on this matter from Mr. R. J. Lewis, of 22 Norman Avenue, who acknowledged the necessity to deal with numerical equality of electorate in each Ward but felt strongly that the properties west of the River Crane should be in Central Twickenham Ward and not in East Twickenham Ward.

Councillor Arbour felt that he could not see any appreciable advantage in carrying out the Ward boundary changes which the
Liberal Association had now put forward. He felt that the position as to the present electorate who lived on the Dene Estate could be dealt with satisfactorily by finding convenient polling station arrangements for them so that they did not have a difficult journey to the polling station across the Chertsey Road. He gave an assurance again that the Council would do everything it could to provide satisfactory polling station arrangements. As to the area near to the Rugby Union Ground and around Whitton Road and streets to the north of Chertsey Road, he felt that this was an area which should be in Central Twickenham Ward. It was an area he felt which would be isolated from the rest of Whitton Ward if it were placed in that Ward. Furthermore, he could not support the change in respect of the area of Cole Park Road for this would make the electorate figures less satisfactory.

The Liberal Association also referred to Heathfield Ward and the difficulty of dealing with the Rivermeads Estate which had formerly been an isolated corner of Hampton Hill Ward and which it was thought should now be in West Twickenham Ward. The Liberal Association, however, now accepted the draft proposals placing the Rivermeads Estate in Heathfield Ward although it was somewhat isolated from the remainder of that Ward.

Mr. D. A. Horne, of 483 Staines Road, Twickenham, objected to the proposal to place the Rivermeads Estate in Heathfield Ward. He accepted that the present inclusion of this area within the Hampton Hill Ward was unsatisfactory for geographical and community reasons, but he considered the proposal of the Commission to place the area in Heathfield Ward was equally unsound. He felt that the Rivermeads Estate had no historical, geographical or cultural association with the Heathfield area, the only possible link being the need of some parents to take their children to Heathfield Junior School. There was no shopping attraction for Rivermeads residents in Heathfield Ward. There was also the difficulty of crossing the busy Chertsey Road and he felt therefore that there was a strong case for the Rivermeads Estate to be included in the West Twickenham Ward although, having heard what had transpired at this Meeting he realised that there would be difficulties about electoral numbers. There were 744 electors in the Rivermeads Estate and, if of course these were added to the 5346 already in West Twickenham Ward, the electoral figures would be thrown out. He realised also that the matter would be even worse numerically if it were subsequently agreed that the 354 electors from the Dene Estate were also transferred into West Twickenham Ward.

There appeared to be satisfactory polling station arrangements within the Rivermeads Estate but Mr. Horne concluded by saying that he felt the Rivermeads Estate electorate would have more say in electing 2 Councillors in West Twickenham Ward than they would have in the election of 3 Councillors in Heathfield Ward. The people of Rivermeads Estate certainly looked towards Twickenham rather than towards Heathfield.

Mention was then made of the representation made by the Rivermeads Residents' Association Club which said that, as a consequence of a recent Committee Meeting, it had been decided that the Rivermeads Estate would prefer to be physically related to West Twickenham for the purposes of local administration. The letter, however, said that this was determined by a vote of seven to four within the Residents' Association.

Councillor Lady Connor, formally re-submitted the Twickenham Labour Party's representations and suggestions as to warding.
arrangements in the Twickenham area. She did not speak to the proposals contained in those representations. It is noted, however, that the Labour Party had a similar idea to the Council and the Conservative Party as to the formation of a small Nursery Ward, although it comprised different areas outside the Nursery land. The Rivermeads Estate was placed within a Heathfield Ward, the Dene Estate was placed within a Whitton Ward, although the area around the Rugby Union Ground was also placed within Whitton Ward. In the Labour Party Plan the East Twickenham Ward area was divided into two Wards and there was also a different pattern of Wards in the Central and South Twickenham areas.

I now set out below the electorate figures (1980 projected) and the Councillor entitlement figures involved in the consideration of these suggested Ward boundary amendments affecting Whitton Ward, West Twickenham Ward, Central Twickenham Ward, East Twickenham Ward and Heathfield Ward:

### Whitton Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{As Draft Proposals})</th>
<th>(\text{Electorate})</th>
<th>(\text{Entitlement})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If Dene Estate were deleted})</td>
<td>7387</td>
<td>(2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If area around Whitton Road (now in Central Twickenham Ward) were added})</td>
<td>7033</td>
<td>(2.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Twickenham Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{As Draft Proposals})</th>
<th>(\text{Electorate})</th>
<th>(\text{Entitlement})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If Dene Estate were added})</td>
<td>5346</td>
<td>(2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If Rivermeads Estate (now in Heathfield Ward) were also added})</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{As Draft Proposals})</td>
<td>(\text{If Rivermeads Estate only were added})</td>
<td>6444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Central Twickenham Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{As Draft Proposals})</th>
<th>(\text{Electorate})</th>
<th>(\text{Entitlement})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If area around Whitton Road were deleted})</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{If Cole Park Area (now in East Twickenham) were added})</td>
<td>4768</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Central Twickenham Ward (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Draft Proposals</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Whitton Road were not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleted but Cole Park Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were added</td>
<td>+ 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5565 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Twickenham Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Draft Proposals</td>
<td>7666</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Cole Park Area were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleted</td>
<td>- 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7410 (2.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heathfield Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Draft Proposals</td>
<td>7648</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Rivermeads Estate were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleted and transferred to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Twickenham Ward</td>
<td>- 744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6904 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSESSMENT OF ARGUMENTS

(1) Wards in the Hampton Area

There is no doubt that a difficult problem was presented to the Council in dealing with the Hampton Nursery Area (shortly to be developed with 1480 new housing units of mixed development, more than half being private development for owner/occupation and the remainder for letting by Housing Associations, the Borough and the Greater London Council, and also with Community facilities).

I had first to satisfy myself as to the imminence of this development and, as will be seen, the preparatory procedures of this scheme are proceeding satisfactorily - already some 133 acres of land (of the total 145 acres) is being purchased by agreement leaving a remaining 12 acres only dependent on the outcome of the compulsory purchase order. This surely is a guarantee of the carrying out of a very large housing development on this site (with education and community facilities) and the only doubt seems to be as to the date by which the development will be completed and the housing units occupied. It will certainly not increase the existing electorate in time for the 1978 Register (for the 1978 Council Elections).

There is, of course, the possibility that the scheme may be somewhat delayed by reason of the present economic situation, so much so that it may not be completed by 1980 (so matching the 1980 projected electorate figures now given to the Boundary Commission), but it seems to me more than possible
that the development will be completed by 1981/82 in time for the 1982 Council Elections.

In dealing with the Ward arrangements and in compiling its draft scheme the Council had no doubt felt that the Hampton Nursery Area would develop as a Ward more satisfactorily if the Ward were comparatively small (returning 2 Councillors) relying on nearby properties only to form the basis of nucleus of that Ward. This then enabled the Council to keep the two existing Wards of Hampton and Hampton Hill, (with also their Ward organisations) virtually intact (each returning 3 Councillors), although some change of boundary had to be made to satisfy the numerical requirements of ratio equality. This had the effect of moving some 335 electors from Hampton Ward to Hampton Hill Ward and taking some 1840 electors from the two Wards to form the nucleus of the suggested new Nursery Ward.

The Conservative majority on the Council were accused by the Liberal Association that these moves of electors were of political expedience (viz. that Conservative voters had been moved into Hampton Hill Ward and Labour voters had been taken out of Hampton Hill Ward and moved into the new Nursery Ward).

The Liberal Association's plan was to leave Hampton Hill Ward as it now existed (less the Rivermeads Estate which move everyone accepted as sensible) and then to split the rest of Hampton into two parts - the North part which was to include the Nursery lands and development (to return 3 Councillors) and the South part to return only 2 Councillors. The Liberals felt that it was preferable to have a much larger Ward in order more satisfactorily to integrate the new housing development into the community but, as will be seen in this report, the Liberal Association had some difficulty in finding a satisfactory boundary between the two Wards.

It was no surprise that the Liberal Association were in turn accused of acting for political expedience. Why was it necessary to divide Hampton Ward "right down the middle"? Was the Conservative Ward organisation and vote too strong? Would not this be breaking local ties? Furthermore, the first boundary line suggested would have isolated north of the railway line the triangular area bounded by Tudor Road, Tudor Avenue, Marlborough Road and Hanworth Road. The second line suggested (this being suggested after the Meeting and therefore suggested without an opportunity for discussion) was from the western boundary of the Borough first along the railway line, then along the whole length of Priory Road and then southwards to the railway line near the Station and thence again along the railway line.

In my view neither of these suggested boundary lines is satisfactory. Nor do I favour this drastic division of the Hampton Ward and its organisations. In my view, without doubt no really satisfactory boundary line was suggested but I think I am equally concerned here as to the breaking of local ties.
I favour the principle put forward by the Council in its draft scheme (and this is also in the Boundary Commission's draft proposals) that there should be a 2 Councillors Ward to include the Hampton Nursery lands and the future housing development properties. I feel, however, that the Ward would be considerably improved if the boundary of this Ward were redrawn to bring into the Ward existing properties, not only to the north, but lying to the east and the south. If an elector living on the periphery of this Nursery Estate should wish to contact his Councillor on some aspect of the development, would he not be much more likely to receive interested action if that Councillor were the Councillor for Nursery Ward itself?

I wish to suggest, therefore, that to the east the small area (now placed in Hampton Hill Ward) bounded by Dean Road, Hanworth Road, Nightingale Road, Acacia Road and Buckingham Road be included in Nursery Ward. This would affect 342 electors. I suggest also that in the south the area (now placed in Hampton Ward) bounded by Broad Lane, Nightingale Road and Acacia Road be added into Nursery Ward. This would affect some 587 electors. Incidentally, making Broad Lane the southern boundary of the Ward would also improve the northern boundary line for Hampton Ward, for it would continue the Hampton Ward boundary along Broad Lane right to the Bowough boundary).

I suggest that in the north some modification be made to exclude from the proposed Nursery Ward the properties which lie north of the Longford River and transfer these back to the Hampton Hill Ward, for the River creates a considerable obstacle here (a linking footbridge only) and the electors there (just south of Hampton Road East) would I am sure be better served by being in Hampton Hill Ward. This affects some 414 electors.

I must, of course, record that the Council representatives opposed, when ventilated, this idea of adding to Nursery Ward the properties to the east and the south and did not see the necessity of moving the area north of Longford River back into Hampton Hill Ward.

I feel, however, that in this way the Nursery Ward would be given a sounder base with an existing electorate of some 2355 electors (this figure is arrived at by taking 1840, as in the Council's scheme, MINUS 414 North of Longford River PLUS 342 west of Dean Road and Buckingham Road PLUS 587 north of Broad Lane). This would then give a 1980 projected electorate of 5234 with an entitlement of 2.09 and the Ward returning 2 Councillors.

If these modifications were made Hampton Ward and Hampton Hill Ward would have the following 1980 projected electorate and entitlement figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Ward</td>
<td>7905 - 587 = 7318</td>
<td>(with an entitlement of 2.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hampton Hill Ward

7283 + 414 - 342 = 7355 (with an entitlement of 2.93)

All the 3 Wards would then have improved numerical electorate and entitlement ratios.

I recommend that the three Hampton Wards be formed with the suggested modifications and as outlined above.

(2) Other Areas in Twickenham

I now refer to the following areas which were the subject of representations:

(a) Dene Estate (354 electors) now in Whitton Ward (suggested to be in West Twickenham Ward)

(b) Rivermeads Estate (744 electors) now in Heathfield Ward (suggested to be in West Twickenham Ward)

(c) Area of Whitton Road, Talma Gardens, Tayben Avenue, Palmerstone Road and Rugby Road (north of Chertsey Road) (541 electors) now in Central Twickenham Ward (suggested to be in Whitton Ward)

(d) Area of Cole Park Road (North Part), east side of London Road (north part) and Hill View Road (west part) (236 electors) now in East Twickenham Ward (suggested to be in Central Twickenham Ward)

(a) There is no doubt that the Dene Estate is a most isolated triangular area - river and open space to the west, railway lines to the south and the considerable barrier of the Chertsey Road to the north west. It seems, however, that there will be no apparent benefit to the electorate in this area if the area were to be transferred into West Twickenham Ward (or for that matter into Central Twickenham Ward) but what is required (and indeed sought) is that there should be, if possible within the triangular area but certainly on the south side of the Chertsey Road within easy distance, convenient polling station arrangements for the 345 electors affected. The Council representatives appreciated this need and gave an assurance that they would do everything they could to meet this.

I recommend that this area remain in Whitton Ward.

(b) Our consideration of the Rivermeads Estate came late in the Meeting. This Estate had previously been in Hampton Hill Ward and everyone agreed that this was unsatisfactory. This area is again an almost isolated area (placed in Heathfield Ward in the draft scheme and the draft proposals) and on balance the preference appears to be for it to be in West Twickenham Ward (although the Residents' Association Committee only voted seven to four in
favour of this preference). There appears to be no difficulty about convenient polling station arrangements.

This problem, however, seems inevitably to be settled by the respective Ward electorate figures for, as at present planned, Heathfield Ward (including 744 electors from the Rivermeads Estate) has an electorate of 7648 and an entitlement of 3.05 Councillors but without the 744 electors would have only 6904 electors with an entitlement of 2.75, and West Twickenham Ward, without the Rivermeads Estate's 744 electors, already has 5346 electors with an entitlement of 2.13 and returning 2 Councillors, and with the addition of the 744 would have 6090 with an entitlement as large as 2.42.

There is no doubt that the Wards as included in the Council's draft scheme and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals, are more satisfactory and acceptable, and more nearly meet the requirements of the Local Government Act. I recommend no change from these proposals.

(c) It was suggested that the area comprising Whitton Road, Talma Gardens, Tayben Avenue, Palmerston Road and Rugby Road, being north of the main Chertsey Road (including 541 electors) would be more satisfactorily placed in Whitton Ward but this seemed to be offered more as a compensation in numbers for the move of the Dene Estate into West Twickenham Ward. I am afraid that I could not support this suggestion and I would have had difficulty in recommending it even if I had recommended the move of the Dene Estate into West Twickenham Ward.

This area around the Rugby Ground is surely part of Central Twickenham (and to be a little less serious it might have been thought almost heresy to move "Twickenham" (Rugby Ground) from Central Twickenham to Whitton!).

I recommend no change from the draft scheme and draft proposals for these Wards.

(d) The area of Cole Park Road (north part) the east side of London Road (north part) and Hill View Road (west part) which lies west of the River Crane (and with its 256 electors) was placed, in the draft scheme and the draft proposals, in East Twickenham Ward and forms a somewhat unsatisfactory salient into Central Twickenham Ward. The River Crane, a little further south, forms part of the boundary between the two Wards and I can fully understand the concern of the persons affected by the drawing of this boundary (indeed they showed dissatisfaction with the whole length of the dividing boundary in earlier stages). They appreciated in later stages the importance of electorate figures in the two Wards but pleaded finally that this small area only should be transferred into Central Twickenham Ward, claiming that this significant boundary of the River Crane almost completely divorced these roads from the East Twickenham community and that the
proposals separated them from the Central Twickenham area of which the electorate claim they form part.

I have no doubt that this area was taken into East Twickenham Ward purely to "get the Ward electorate numbers right". The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Twickenham Ward</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without the Cole Park Area (as now planned)</td>
<td>5309 (2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the Cole Park Area (256)</td>
<td>5565 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Twickenham Ward</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the Cole Park Area (as now planned)</td>
<td>7666 (3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without the Cole Park Area</td>
<td>7410 (2.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing planned Ward figures are a little more satisfactory but the figures resulting from a change would not be unacceptable.

I feel, in this case, that the present proposals are so unsatisfactory (and certainly not likely to be readily understood by the electorate concerned and the general public as a good decision) that I must recommend that this boundary be modified to place this area in Central Twickenham Ward by making the River Crane the dividing Ward boundary at this point.

I so recommend.

5. VISITS

On the day following the meeting, in the company of Mr. A. R. Wynne, the Council's Deputy Town Clerk (Administration) (an arrangement which I notified to the Public Meeting and with which those present concurred) I visited various parts of the London Borough. I made an extensive tour of the Hampton area especially in the vicinity of the Hampton Nursery lands; and then I visited the Rivermeads Estate, the Dene Estate and other areas in Central Twickenham Ward and East Twickenham Ward. Thereafter I visited the Richmond, Kew, Sheen and Mortlake areas. On both the morning of the Meeting and also on the morning following I had toured the Richmond Hill and Richmond Town areas to view the various suggested dividing Ward boundary lines.

It is relevant, perhaps, also to state that of the last 27 years I have lived 22 years within easy access of Richmond-Upon-Thames and therefore know the area well.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that, subject to the following amendments, the Wards and Ward boundaries and member representation as outlined in the Boundary Commission's proposals for the London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames be confirmed:

(a) The boundary between Kew Ward and Mortlake Ward be amended to be along Lower Richmond Road and Clifford Avenue (so taking into Kew Ward the area bounded by North Road, Atwood Road, Marksbury Road and Lower
Richmond Road) so forming Wards giving the following 1980 projected electorate figures, member entitlements and member allocations:—

Kew Ward 8202 (3.27) (3 members)
Mortlake Ward 6761 (2.69) (3 members)

(For Map - See Appendix "B" and for new Ward boundary descriptions - See Appendix "C")

(b) The boundaries of Hampton Hill Ward, Hampton Ward and Nursery Ward be amended as shown on the map at Appendix "B" (so taking into Hampton Hill Ward the area bounded by Hampton Road East in the north and the Longford River in the south comprising Graham Road, Winifred Road, Longford Close and Ringwood Way; and taking into Nursery Ward the area bounded by Dean Road, Hanworth Road, Nightingale Road, Acacia Road and Buckingham Road and the area to the north and west of Broad Lane and Nightingale Road) so forming Wards giving the following approximate existing electorate and projected 1980 electorate figures, member entitlements and member allocations:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Hill</td>
<td>7274</td>
<td>7355</td>
<td>(2.93) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>6871</td>
<td>7318</td>
<td>(2.92) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>5234</td>
<td>(2.09) (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For new Ward boundary descriptions - See Appendix "C")

(c) The boundary between Central Twickenham Ward and East Twickenham Ward be amended at its northern part to be along the River Crane (so taking into Central Twickenham Ward the area comprising Cole Park Road (north part) the east side of London Road (north part) and Hill View Road (west part)) so forming Wards giving the following 1980 projected electorate figures, member entitlements and member allocations:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Twickenham Ward</td>
<td>5565</td>
<td>(2.21)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Twickenham Ward</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>(2.95)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For Map - See Appendix "B" and for new Ward boundary descriptions—See Appendix "C")

(d) The correction of the boundary line dividing Barnes Ward and Palewell Ward (near to eastern boundary of the Borough) - viz. to run along Queen's Ride from the Borough boundary to the Railway line. (See paragraph 3 of this report).

7. APPENDICES

The following supporting documents are appended:—

Appendix "A" - Names and addresses of persons present at the Meeting
Appendix "B" - Map (6" to mile) of the Borough showing the recommended new boundaries of:—

Kew Ward
Mortlake Ward
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Hampton Hill Ward
Hampton Ward
Nursery Ward
Central Twickenham Ward
East Twickenham Ward
Barnes Ward (correction only)
Palewell Ward (correction only)

Appendix "C" - Ward boundary descriptions for new recommended Wards listed above in Appendix "B"

1st February 1977
**APPENDIX "A"**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**

**MEETING RE REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS**

6th January, 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING OR ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.W.A. Riley</td>
<td>51 Crane Way, Whitton, Twickenham, Middx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Connor (Councillor)</td>
<td>Twickenham &amp; Richmond C.L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Barnes</td>
<td>Twickenham Liberal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lloyd</td>
<td>28 Chilton Road, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Lloyd</td>
<td>28 Chilton Road, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Kirby</td>
<td>Richmond Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Worth (Councillor)</td>
<td>Kew Ward (20 West Park Avenue, Kew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enid P. Steward</td>
<td>60 Gladstone Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard English</td>
<td>Richmond &amp; Barnes Conservative Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.A. Horne</td>
<td>488 Staines Road, Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Cooper</td>
<td>Surrey Comet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Jeffries</td>
<td>61 Marksbury Avenue, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Cornish (Councillor)</td>
<td>39 Church Road, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope de Grunwald</td>
<td>34 Dancer Road, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Manners (Councillor)</td>
<td>4 Hertford Avenue, SW14 8EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Williams (Councillor)</td>
<td>25 Breamwater Gardens, Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thomson</td>
<td>11 Normanhurst Drive, Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Livesey</td>
<td>76 Gladstone Avenue, Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Saunders</td>
<td>36 Constance Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Worshaw</td>
<td>R.T. Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Waller (Councillor)</td>
<td>35 Grosvenor Road, Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.W. Newstead (Councillor)</td>
<td>11 Alton Gardens, Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.I. Morell (Alderman)</td>
<td>'Sunnysite', Marchmont Road, Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.F. Arbour (Councillor)</td>
<td>Chairman General Purposes Committee Richmond Upon Thames L.B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Selby</td>
<td>Liberal Party (Richmond &amp; Barnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Wynne</td>
<td>Deputy Town Clerk (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Twickenham Conservative Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX "C"

WARD BOUNDARY DESCRIPTIONS FOR
NEW RECOMMENDED WARDS

Kew Ward
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Richmond Town Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Chiswick Bridge, thence southwestwards along said Bridge and continuing southwestwards along Clifford Avenue and Lower Richmond Road to the eastern boundary of Richmond Town Ward, thence northwards and generally northwestwards along the boundary of the said Ward to the point of commencement.

Mortlake Ward
In existing description in Draft Proposals DELETE in 10th and 11th lines the words "northwards, eastwards, southwards and".

Hampton Hill Ward
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward meets the western boundary of Teddington Ward, thence generally southwards along said western boundary to the southwestern corner of said ward, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the junction of High Street and Uxbridge Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Broad Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Nightingale Road, thence northwards and northwards along said road to Hanworth Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Dean Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Pigeon Lane along said lane and in prolongation thereof to Longford River, thence generally westwards along said river to the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Heathfield Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

Hampton Ward
In existing description in Draft Proposals in 2nd line SUBSTITUTE the word "eastwards" for "northeastwards" and at the commencement of 4th line INSERT the words "eastwards and".

Nursery Ward
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the western boundary of Hampton Hill Ward, thence westwards, southwestwards and southeastwards along said ward boundary to Broad Lane, thence westwards along Broad Lane and the continuing footpath into and through the Recreation Ground to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

Central Twickenham Ward
In existing description in Draft Proposals DELETE in 3rd and 4th lines the words "London Road, thence southwards along said road to Hill View Road, thence generally northeastwards along said road to".

East Twickenham Ward
As existing description in Draft Proposals....
Barnes Ward

In existing description in Draft Proposals after "Borough boundary" in 3rd line ADD the words "to Queen's Ride thence southwestwards.

Palewell Ward

As existing description in Draft Proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARNES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL TWICKENHAM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST SHEEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST TWICKENHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAM AND PETERSHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON HILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON NURSERY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON WICK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATHFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTLAKE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALEWELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND HILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND TOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH TWICKENHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDDINGTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST TWICKENHAM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 3

LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

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

HEATHFIELD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of the Borough meets the Feltham to Hounslow railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to Feltham Junction, thence eastwards along the Feltham to Twickenham railway to Chertsey Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Hospital Bridge Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Staines Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeasterwards, northwesterwards and northeasterwards along said western boundary and the northern boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

WHITTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Heathfield Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said Borough boundary to the Duke of Northumberland's River, thence generally southwards along said river to the Feltham to Twickenham railway, thence westwards along said railway and continuing westwards and northeasterwards along the eastern boundary of Heathfield Ward to the point of commencement.

CENTRAL TWICKENHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Whitton Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said Borough boundary to the River Crane, thence generally southwards along said river to the footbridge on the footpath from Cole Park Road to Moor Mead Road, thence southeasterwards in a straight line to the most northerly corner of No 77 Amyand Park Road, thence southeasterwards along
the northeastern boundary of said property to said road, thence south-
westwards along said road to Strafford Road, thence southeastwards along
said road to Richmond Road, thence northeasterwards along said road to a
point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 1 Lebanon Park Mansions,
Richmond Road, thence southeasterwards to and along said boundary to the
southwestern boundary of Orleans Park (Sports Ground), thence continuing
deeastwards and northeasterwards along said boundary and the southeastern
boundary of said Park to the southern boundary of the property known as
The Garden Cottage, thence eastwards along said boundary to Orleans Road,
thence southeasterwards along said road and in prolongation thereof to the
River Thames, thence generally southwestwards along said river following
the channel on the southeastern side of Eel Pie Island to its junction
with the channel to the northwest of said Island, thence northeasterwards
along said channel to a point being the prolongation southeasterwards of
Wharf Lane, thence northwesterwards along said prolongation and said lane
to King Street, thence southwestwards along said street and Heath Road
to the Strawberry Hill to Twickenham Railway Line, thence northeasterwards
along said railway to the Twickenham to Whitton railway, thence westwards
along said railway to the eastern boundary of Whitton Ward, thence
northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

EAST TWICKENHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Central Twickenham
Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards
along said Borough boundary to the River Thames, thence generally south-
easterwards and southwestwards along said river following the channel to
the northeast of Corporation Island and the southeast of Glover's Island
to the eastern boundary of Central Twickenham Ward, thence generally
northwestwards, southwestwards and northwesterwards along said boundary to
the point of commencement.
WEST TWICKENHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Heathfield Ward meets the southern boundary of Whitton Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and eastwards and southwards along the southern boundary of Central Twickenham Ward to Heath Road, thence generally southsouthwestwards along said road, the road known as The Green running to the north of Twickenham Green, and continuing southsouthwestwards along Staines Road to the eastern boundary of Heathfield Ward, thence generally northnorthwestwards and northnortheastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SOUTH TWICKENHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Heathfield Ward meets the southern boundary of West Twickenham Ward, thence generally northnortheastwards along said southern boundary and continuing generally eastwards and southwards along the southern boundary of Central Twickenham Ward to the River Thames, thence southwards along said river to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the southern boundary of No 125 Strawberry Vale, thence southsouthwestwards along said prolongation and said southern boundary to the road known as Strawberry Vale, thence northwards along said road to the road known as Waldegrave Park, thence westwards along said road to the footpath to the rear of Nos 114 to 90 Strawberry Vale, thence northnorthwestwards along said footpath to Clive Road, thence westwards along said road and continuing westwards along the northern boundaries of the properties on the northern side of Waldegrave Park to Waldegrave Road, thence southsouthwestwards along said road to Shacklegate Lane, thence westwards along said lane to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the properties in Bridge Close, thence northnorthwestwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the Teddington to Hampton railway, thence northnorthwestwards and southsouthwestwards along said railway to Stanley Road, thence northnorthwestwards along said road to South Road, thence generally northnorthwestwards along said road and Sixth Cross Road to the point of commencement.
TEDDINGTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward meets the River Thames, thence southeastwards along said river and following the southern channel to the footbridge and footpath leading to Ferry Road, thence generally southwestwards along said footpath to Ferry Road, thence southwestwards along said road and High Street to Field Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Gomer Gardens, thence eastwards along said Gardens to Bolton Gardens, thence southwards along said Gardens and in prolongation thereof to the Teddington to Hampton Wick railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to a point being the prolongation northwards of the rear boundaries of Nos 93–67 Clarence Road, thence southwards along said prolongation and said rear boundaries to the eastern boundary of No 88 Sandy Lane, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Sandy Lane, thence southwestwards in a straight line to the southeastern corner of Hawthorn Lodge, thence westwards along the southern boundary of said lodge to the southwestern corner, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the most southerly corner of Round Plantation, thence northeastwards in a straight line to National Grid reference TQ 15058 70916 being a point on the western boundary of the National Physical Laboratory, thence northeastwards along said boundary and in continuation thereof to Hampton Road, thence eastwards along said road to Gloucester Road, thence northwards along said road to Stanley Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward, thence generally eastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HAMPTON HILL WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward meets the western boundary of Teddington Ward, thence generally southwards along said western boundary to the southwestern corner of said ward, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the junction of High
Street and Uxbridge Road, thence northwesterly along said road to Broad Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Nightingale Road, thence northwesterly and northwards along said road to Hanworth Road, thence northwesterly along said road to Dean Road, thence northeasterly along said road to Pigeon Lane, along said lane and in prolongation thereof to Longford River, thence generally westwards along said river to the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeasterly along said boundary to the southern boundary of Heathfield Ward, thence northeasterly along said boundary to the southern boundary of South Twickenham Ward, thence southeasterly along said boundary to the point of commencement.

NURSERY WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the western boundary of Hampton Hill Ward, thence generally southeasterly, southwesterly and southeasterly along said ward boundary to Broad Lane thence westwards along Broad Lane and the footpath that runs through the Recreation Ground to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HAMPTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Nursery Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the southern boundary of Hampton Hill Ward, thence eastwards and southeasterly along said boundary and continuing southeasterly along the southern boundary of Teddington Ward to Chestnut Avenue, thence southwards along said avenue following the eastern carriageway round Diana Fountain to Hampton Court Road, thence eastwards along said road to The Broad Walk, thence southwards along said walk to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence northwesterly along said boundary and generally northwards along the western boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.
HAMPTON WICK WARD
Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the
eastern boundary of Hampton Ward, thence northwards along said ward
boundary to the southern boundary of Teddington Ward, thence southeastwards
along said southern boundary and generally northeasterwards along the
eastern boundary of said ward to the River Thames, thence southeastwards
along said river to the Borough Boundary, thence generally southwards and
northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

RICHMOND TOWN WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of East Twickenham Ward
meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards,
and northeastwards along said Borough boundary to a point opposite the
northern boundary of the Old Deer Park, thence southeastwards to and
generally southeastwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of
the Sports Ground, thence generally eastwards along said boundary to Kew
Road, thence southwards along said road to Stanmore Road, thence eastwards
along said road and continuing eastwards and southeastwards along Windham
Road to Raleigh Road, thence northeastwards along said road to its junction
with Sandycombe Road, thence due eastwards in a straight line to the Kew
Gardens to Richmond railway thence southwéstwards along said railway to
Manor Road, thence southwards along said road to Sheen Road, thence
generally westwards along said road and southwestwards along The Square,
Lower George Street and George Street to Water Lane, thence southwest-
wards along said lane and in prolongation thereof to the eastern boundary
of East Twickenham Ward, thence northwéstwards along said boundary to
the point of commencement.
KEW WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Richmond Town Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Chiswick Bridge, thence southwestwards along said bridge and continuing southwestwards along Clifford Avenue and Lower Richmond Road to the eastern boundary of Richmond Town Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and generally northwestwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

MORTLAKE WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Kew Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said Borough boundary to a point due northwest of the junction of Lonsdale Road and Barnes High Street, thence southeastwards to and generally eastwards along said street to Station Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Beverley Brook, thence southwestwards along said brook to the Barnes Bridge to Barnes railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the Barnes to Richmond railway, thence westwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Richmond Town Ward, thence northwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Kew Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BARNES WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Mortlake Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along the Borough boundary to Queen's Ride thence southwestwards along said ride to the Putney to Mortlake railway, thence westwards along said railway to the northeastern boundary of Mortlake Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
PALEWELL WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Barnes Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards, westwards and southwestwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of Richmond Park, thence northwestwards and westwards along said boundary to Sheen Lane, thence northwards along said lane and continuing generally northwards along Richmond Park Road to Upper Richmond Road, thence westwards along said road to Connaught Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to the eastern boundary of No 2 Ormonde Road, thence northwards along said boundary and continuing northwards in a straight line to the eastern boundary of No 134 St Leonards Road, thence northwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of Mortlake Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Barnes Ward to the point of commencement.

EAST SHEEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Richmond Town Ward meets the southern boundary of Mortlake Ward, thence northeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Palewell Ward, thence generally southwards, eastwards, southwards and southeastwards along said western boundary and the southern boundary of said ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said Borough boundary to National Grid reference TQ 2146673085, thence westwards in a straight line to National Grid reference TQ 2004173085, thence northwestwards in a straight line to National Grid reference TQ 1924773593 being a point on the track known as Sawyer's Hill, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the southernmost corner of Richmond Cemetery, thence northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of said cemetery to the southern boundary of the Allotment Gardens, thence eastwards and northwards along the southern and eastern boundary of said allotment gardens and
continuing northwards along the eastern boundary of East Sheen Cemetery to the access road leading to Sheen Road, thence northwestwards along said access road to Sheen Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Richmond Town Ward, thence northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

RICHMOND HILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of East Twickenham Ward meets the southern boundary of Richmond Town Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of East Sheen Ward, thence generally eastwards, southwards, southwestwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the track known as Sawyer's Hill, thence westwards along said track to Richmond Gate, thence southwestwards in a straight line to National Grid reference TQ 1840873655, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the most southerly corner of Wick Cottage, thence continuing northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of said cottage to the southeastern boundary of the Star and Garter Hotel, thence southwestwards along said boundary and continuing southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of the Tudor Close public house to Petersham Road, thence in a straight line to the southern boundary of No 93 Petersham Road, thence westwards and northwestwards following said boundary and the eastern boundary of Parcel No 0062 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 plan TQ 18/1973 Edition of 1960 to its most northerly corner, thence due westwards in a straight line to the eastern boundary of East Twickenham Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
HAM AND PETERSHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of East Twickenham Ward meets the southern boundary of Richmond Hill Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of East Sheen Ward to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards, southwestwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along the Borough boundary to the northern boundary of Hampton Wick Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary and the northeastern boundary of Teddington Ward, northwards along the eastern boundary of South Twickenham Ward, continuing northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of Central Twickenham Ward and the eastern boundary of East Twickenham Ward to the point of commencement.