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REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH THE COUNTY OF HERTFORDSHIRE, BOROUGH OF HERSTMEERE AND THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW
COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT AND PROPOSALS

INTRODUCTION

1. On 1 April 1987 we wrote to the London Borough of Barnet announcing the start of a review of Greater London, the London Boroughs and the City of London as part of the programme of reviews we are required to undertake by virtue of section 48(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

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

3. The London Boroughs were requested to assist us in publicising the start of the review by inserting a notice for two successive weeks in local newspapers so as to give a wide coverage in the areas concerned.
4. A period of seven months from the date of our letter was allowed for all local authorities and any person or body interested in the review to send us their views on whether changes to the Borough boundary were desirable and, if so, what those changes should be and how they would serve the interests of effective and convenient local government, the criterion laid down in the 1972 Act.

APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

5. As this is the first of our reports on London boundaries, we have thought it appropriate to commence with some general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of this area.

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

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

2
Wider London Issues

8. This is the first review of the London Boroughs to have been undertaken since their formation in 1965, under the provisions of the London Government Act 1963. Despite the publicity given to our Review, particularly after the issue of the Press Notice, we only received two representations concerning the pattern of London authorities as a whole. One member of the public suggested a restructuring of London to create a large central City of London borough and another proposed the merging of five East London boroughs. This was in marked contrast to the considerable number of representations we have received on individual boundaries. Although, our view remains that this Review is not the right occasion for a fundamental reappraisal of the extent of London or the pattern of London boroughs, which would inevitably raise questions about the nature and structure of London government, we do see it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which arise and which may need to be brought to the attention of any body charged with undertaking a more fundamental review in the future.

The outer boundary of London

9. The press notice also referred to the particular problems presented by the outer London boundary, which does not always follow the edge of the built-up area and where the relevance of the M25 and the Green Belt would need to be considered. We have borne in mind the need to find, if possible, a clear boundary for outer London which will not be rapidly overlaid by development. On the other hand, where continuous development already spills over the outer London boundary, we may not necessarily seek to extend the boundary up to the limit of that development. Indeed, the conurbation of London has in some places already stretched far into the countryside along salients of development. We have to reach a balanced view as to where the boundary should lie, taking account of shape, community ties and the impact of major and new infrastructure as well as the extent of development.
The M25

10. Early in our deliberations we acknowledged that, with a few exceptions, the M25 encompasses the continuous built-up area of London. We took the view that the capital's boundary should not normally extend beyond it. On the other hand, it could not be regarded as a satisfactory boundary for Greater London as a whole, particularly in the south where it encloses substantial areas of open countryside, including parts of the North Downs. Nevertheless, there are stretches of the M25 which are close to the present outer boundary of London. As we indicated in 'People and Places', we recognise the need to consider each one of these stretches to see whether it offers a better boundary for the future, taking into account the effect of the motorway itself on local ties in the vicinity.

London's Green Belt

11. There is a presumption against development in the green belt. Again, as we indicated in 'People and Places', fears are often expressed to us that an urban authority will more readily seek to extend its built-up areas into the green belt than will a rural authority. We do not accept this as a general premise: once an area of green belt has been defined, its status should not be affected by a change in the authority in which it lies. Nor is there any reason to suppose that London boroughs are any less able to preserve and maintain green belt than shire districts and counties. There are already significant tracts of green belt within the existing boundaries of Greater London and we have seen no evidence to suggest that they are under any greater threat than green belt land lying immediately beyond the boundaries of the capital. Indeed, policies for the protection and improvement of green belt are advocated in the Department of the Environment's Strategic Planning Guidance for London and will form part of boroughs' Unitary Development Plans. We have therefore taken the approach that, while the relevance of the green belt needs to be taken into account as we look at each section of the Outer London boundary, it would be inappropriate to consider excluding green belt land from London solely on the misplaced grounds that London boroughs are unsuitable custodians of it.
THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

12. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 to the London Borough of Barnet we received representations from that Council; the London Borough of Harrow; Hertsmere Borough Council; and Hertfordshire County Council.

We also received representations from Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council and from other interested local bodies and from residents of the authorities concerned. The submissions put to us concerned suggestions for some major and some relatively minor changes to the Borough boundary.

13. We also received submissions suggesting changes to Barnet's boundaries with Enfield and Haringey. These will be considered separately, as will Barnet's boundaries with Brent and Camden.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MAJOR CHANGES AND OUR INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HERTSHERE (HERTFORDSHIRE)

Interim decisions to make no proposals

(a) The M25

14. The London Borough of Barnet had proposed realigning the Borough's northern boundary along the edge of the M25, from the A1 in the west to the A111 in the east. This proposal was supported by one local organisation but was opposed by Hertfordshire County Council, Hertsmere Borough Council and three local organisations.

15. Barnet's proposal would have meant extending the area of Greater London well into rural Hertfordshire. While we recognised that the M25 would form a more identifiable boundary than the existing Outer London boundary in this area, we considered that this extensive proposal
appeared to have little justification in terms of effective and convenient local government. Moreover, we recognised that to have adopted this suggestion would have prejudged our consideration of the Arkley triangle. (See paragraphs 18-20 below). Accordingly we took an interim decision to make no proposals in respect of the M25 in this area.

16. Barnet's suggestion had also included the transfer of Hadley Wood from Enfield. We will report on the boundary in the Hadley Wood area in the context of our review of Enfield's boundaries with Barnet and Hertsmere.

(b) Borehamwood and Greater London

17. A member of the public had suggested that Borehamwood should be transferred into Greater London and that local government boundaries generally should be aligned according to telephone exchanges. We took the view that, as Borehamwood was separated from the built-up area of Greater London by open space, it would be more appropriate for it to remain in Hertsmere and we consequently made an interim decision to make no proposals on this area. We considered that the suggestion that local government boundaries should follow telephone exchange areas would not be conducive to effective and convenient local government.

Draft Proposals

Arkley

18. Hertsmere Borough Council had suggested using the A411 as the boundary from Stirling Corner to Grimsdyke Crescent. This would have the effect of straightening the boundary by transferring a large triangle of land north of Arkley, and the northern part of Arkley village, from Barnet to Hertsmere.
19. We received 60 representations concerning this proposal. It was supported by two local organisations but opposed by Barnet, Hertfordshire County Council, three local organisations and 53 members of the public.

20. While the northern part of the triangle seemed to us to be agricultural land in the green belt, and to have more in common with Hertsmere than Barnet, to have adopted the proposal in full would have divided the community of Arkley, which we felt would have been an undesirable consequence. Nevertheless, we accepted that the boundary in this area is anomalous and accordingly decided to adopt as our draft proposal a line which follows defined field boundaries between the present boundary and that suggested by Hertsmere. This would have the effect of transferring the northern part of the triangle from Barnet to Hertsmere while retaining the entire community of Arkley in Barnet.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET, HARROW AND HERTSMERE

Draft Proposals

Elstree

21. Several suggestions were put to us for boundary changes at Elstree. At present the village lies within three local authority areas: Barnet, Harrow and Hertsmere. Suggestions to overcome the division were made by Hertfordshire County Council, the London Borough of Harrow and Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council. Harrow's suggestion affected only the boundary between Harrow and Hertsmere but, as it concerned Elstree, it was considered at the same time.

22. Harrow's suggestion was to move the Harrow/Hertsmere boundary to the A41, thereby transferring residential property and the former Aldenham bus depot, which is separated from the rest of Harrow by the M1, from Harrow to Hertsmere. The justification given was that the area is detached from the rest of Harrow and is part of the Elstree community. Harrow also said that the present boundary causes administrative and service problems. Four members of the public commented on this suggestion, one in support and three opposing it.
23. Hertfordshire suggested a change to bring Elstree completely into Hertsmere. The effect would have been to transfer residential property from Harrow to Hertsmere and residential property, a police station and shops from Barnet to Hertsmere. This suggested realignment overlapped part of Harrow's suggestion (see paragraphs 21 and 22 above).

24. Hertfordshire's suggestion was opposed by Barnet, Hertsmere and signatories of the Stay in Barnet Campaign (an 83 signature petition organised by residents in the Barnet part of Elstree).

25. The suggestion put forward by Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council was to unite the Elstree community under one local authority by realigning the Hertsmere/Harrow boundary along the relevant section of the A41 and the Hertsmere/Barnet boundary along the A41, the M1, the proposed A1/M1 link road at Scratchwood and then north up the A1, to rejoin the present boundary at Stirling Corner. The effect of this would have been to bring the whole of Elstree into Hertsmere, as well as the Aldenham bus depot (currently in Harrow), the properties south of the A41 and west of the A1 (currently in Barnet), and the rural land in Barnet north of the M1. We noted that this suggestion subsumed those of Harrow and Hertfordshire.

26. Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council's suggested realignment was supported by Hertfordshire and Hertsmere. Harrow supported that part of the suggestion pertaining to its boundaries. However, it was opposed by Barnet and the Stay in Barnet Campaign.

27. In the absence of a generally accepted alternative, Barnet wished to retain the present boundary in this area. However, having carefully considered the submissions made to us regarding Elstree, we concluded that:

(a) Elstree is a distinct community and as such should not be divided by local government boundaries;

(b) its nearest centre for shopping, entertainment, transport and other amenities is Borehamwood in Hertsmere;
(c) it seemed to us to have a greater community of interest with Hertsmere than with Barnet or Harrow, neither of which is easily accessible;

(d) the area currently in Harrow is separated from the rest of Harrow by the M1 and looks towards Hertsmere for transport, shopping and other amenities;

(e) the properties on the south side of the A411 are similarly separate from the rest of Barnet;

(f) the A41 and M1 are well-established barriers and would provide clearly defined boundaries; and

(g) the most appropriate authority for a unified Elstree is Hertsmere.

We therefore decided to adopt Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council's suggested boundary as our draft proposal for this area, but with a modification at the eastern end, to enable the boundary to follow existing road alignments rather than the as yet unbuilt A1/M1 link road.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MINOR REALIGNMENTS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HERTSMERE

Draft Proposals

(a) Grimsdyke Crescent and Old Fold View

28. Barnet had suggested a boundary change for the residential area around Grimsdyke Crescent and Old Fold View, on the grounds that the present boundary divides properties and is unrelated to the pattern of residential development. The Council's suggestion was to transfer the area from Hertsmere to Barnet, uniting all the residential development in a single local authority.
29. The suggestion was supported by Hertfordshire County Council, three members of the public and three political party constituency associations. It was opposed by Hertsmere Borough Council and two local organisations.

30. We concluded that the area concerned was part of the built-up area of Barnet and that its transfer from Hertsmere was in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore decided to adopt the suggestion as our draft proposal, albeit with a slight modification to provide a more northerly boundary to avoid dividing the residential area from its neighbouring recreational area. We felt this would provide a boundary consistent with that proposed to the east and to the west.

(b) Byng Road Playing Fields and Allotments

31. Barnet had suggested a minor boundary change to transfer playing fields and allotment gardens from Hertsmere to Barnet. The justification given was that the London Borough already owned the land and the area was only accessible from Barnet. The suggestion was opposed by Hertsmere.

32. We considered that the area in question looks towards Barnet and is clearly separate from the rest of Hertsmere. We accordingly decided to adopt Barnet's suggested boundary as our draft proposal.

(c) Old Fold Manor Golf Course

33. Barnet had suggested a change to the present boundary at the point at which it divides the Old Fold Manor Golf Course. The suggested boundary would go around the northern curtilage and unify the course within Barnet. The realignment was opposed by Hertsmere.

34. We decided to adopt Barnet's suggestion as our draft proposal on the basis that the present boundary is clearly anomalous and that, as the nearest residential area to the course is within Barnet, it should be wholly in Barnet.
(d) Kitts End Road and Great North Road

35. Barnet had suggested a boundary change involving some land and properties to the north of Monken Hadley, directly east of the Old Fold Manor Golf Course. The effect would be to transfer the area from Hertsmere to Barnet. The suggestion was opposed by Hertsmere.

36. In terms of pattern of community life, we took the view that this area clearly forms part of the community of Monken Hadley; it is distinct and separate from any other development in Hertsmere. For these reasons we considered that this boundary change would be conducive to more effective and convenient local government and decided to adopt it as part of our draft proposals.

(e) Barnet Bypass

37. Barnet had suggested an alteration to a section of the boundary currently running parallel to the A1 in the Borehamwood area. The suggestion was to realign the boundary along the western curtilage of the A1, thereby transferring the land and properties between the present boundary and the A1 from Barnet to Hertsmere.

38. The suggestion was supported by Hertsmere Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council, Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council and several other interested local bodies. It was opposed by four residents.

39. The effect of the suggestion would be to realign the boundary along the A1 between Stirling Corner and Rowley Lane interchange. At that point it would link with our draft proposal for Arkley. (See paragraphs 18-20 above).

40. We agreed that the present boundary was unsatisfactory and that the A1 would be a preferable alignment. In view of this, and the agreement between the Councils, we decided to adopt this suggestion as our draft proposal.
41. Barnet had suggested moving the boundary at Stirling Corner to the southern edge of Barnet Lane (A411). The effect of this would be to transfer a field and part of a caravan park from Hertsmere into Barnet. The proposal was supported by Hertfordshire but was opposed by two residents of the caravan park. Hertsmere had suggested that if Elstree were to be united in its area, the caravan park should also be transferred to Hertsmere. Failing that, Hertsmere had suggested its transfer to Barnet.

42. The field in question is already owned by Barnet and the privately-owned caravan park is divided by the current boundary. We took the view that Barnet’s suggested boundary would be more readily identifiable and decided to adopt this suggestion as our draft proposal.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET, HARROW AND HERTSMERE

Interim decision to make no proposals

Deacon’s Hill

43. Barnet had suggested a boundary change in the area of Deacon’s Hill to realign the boundary to follow the southern curtilage of the A411. The suggested area of change was incorporated in our draft proposal for Elstree (see paragraphs 21-27 above).

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HARROW

Interim decision to make no proposals

44. Other than the suggestions concerning Elstree, no comments were received on the Barnet/Harrow boundary. We took an interim decision to propose no other change to this boundary.
ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

45. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 11 July 1988. Copies were sent to the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. The London Boroughs of Barnet and Harrow and Hertsmere Borough Council were asked to publish a notice announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the Borough Councils and Hertfordshire County Council were asked to post copies of it at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 12 September 1988.

RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS: OUR FINAL PROPOSALS

46. We received representations from 33 sources in response to our draft proposals letter. They included comments from the London Boroughs of Barnet and Harrow, Hertfordshire County Council, Hertsmere Borough Council and Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council. We also received comments from eight other interested local bodies or groups, including two petitions from the residents of the Elstree Hill Estate and the Stay in Barnet Campaign (of 316 and 150 signatures respectively) and from 20 individuals.

OUR DECISIONS ON AND FINAL PROPOSALS FOR MAJOR CHANGE

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HERTSMERE (HERTFORDSHIRE)

Decision to make no proposals for major change

(a) The M25

47. Hertfordshire and Hertsmere supported our interim decision to make no proposals to adopt the M25 as Barnet's northern boundary between the A1 and the A11. Our interim decision was opposed by Barnet, on the grounds that the land to the south of the M25 in this area has an affinity with Arkley and Barnet; that the M25 physically
separates Greater London from Hertfordshire; and that Barnet is a dependable custodian of the green belt. Similar responses were received from one local organisation and one individual.

48. We recognised that the land encompassed by the M25 in this area extends to recreational use and that it has an affinity with Arkley and Barnet. Nevertheless, no evidence was brought to our attention indicating any problems in the provision of services in the area, or of it having inadequate links with, or being separated from Hertsmere. Two 'A' class roads pass through it (the A1000 and A1081), one of which passes under the M25, as does a minor road and two footpaths. Consequently, we took the view that at this stretch of its length the M25 is not as significant a barrier to movement as it may be at other points around the perimeter of London. There was, therefore, no justification for the area to be transferred from Hertsmere to Barnet. We were satisfied that the anomalies in the present boundary could be resolved by changes of a more modest nature. Accordingly, we have reaffirmed our decision to make no proposals for the use of the M25 as a boundary in this area.

(b) Borehamwood and Greater London

49. We noted that there had been no dissent from our interim decision to make no proposals for this part of the boundary and have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

Proposals for major change

Arkley

50. Hertsmere supported our proposal, as did four individuals. While Barnet, one local organisation and four individuals welcomed the retention of the village of Arkley in Barnet, they opposed the transfer of the area to the north to Hertsmere. One individual commented that Barnet was considering the establishment of a gypsy caravan site in the area to be transferred to Hertsmere, as Barnet subsequently confirmed.
51. It appeared from the representations received that much of the area is used for recreation rather than agriculture. Barnet's objection to the draft proposal was based on that Council's history of protection of green belt land, its contention that the proposed boundary was arbitrary and the fact that the Council owns land within the proposed area of transfer. However, in proposing this boundary realignment we were making no assumptions about how individual authorities might care for green belt land, and we do not wish to suggest that any authority in this area manages it better than any other. In fact, as we have indicated in paragraph 11 above, the status of green belt land should be unaffected by any boundary change.

52. So far as the actual boundary alignment is concerned, we are satisfied that our draft proposal remains the best available solution, resolving, as it does, the clear anomalies in the current boundary, yet retaining in Barnet the land which appears to have a close affinity with Arkley. We take the view that the ownership of land by a local authority is not in itself a conclusive reason for its territorial inclusion within the authority which owns it. As the land in question is not managed by Barnet and is not a facility for Barnet residents alone, its transfer should have no adverse affect on the provision of local government services.

53. Others who objected to the transfer of the green belt land argued that the area was used by residents of Barnet for leisure activities. However, we consider that such use was not confined to them. We note that the present boundary is anomalous and that the area seems to have more affinity with Hertsmere than with Barnet. On the question of the proposed gypsy caravan site, we do not feel that such development should be a determining factor in any changes to the boundary in this area. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
54. The London Borough of Harrow had held two local meetings to discuss our draft proposal and had circulated a questionnaire to its Elstree residents. Of the 126 questionnaires returned, 111 opposed our draft proposal, 14 supported it and one expressed no preference. Nevertheless, the Borough supported our draft proposal.

55. Hertsmere Borough Council also held a local meeting to answer residents' questions. The Council supported the draft proposal in principle but suggested a different boundary. Similarly, Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council supported our draft proposal but also proposed a different alignment, suggesting that, in the east, the boundary should follow the line of the future A1/M1 link road. The Town Council also queried our suggested consequential warding arrangements. Further support came from two individuals, and two local organisations one of which opposed our suggested warding arrangements.

56. The London Borough of Barnet opposed our draft proposal, suggesting an alternative alignment which, they claimed, would unite Elstree with only minimal loss of land from Barnet. Opposition to the draft proposal also came from one local organisation and nine individuals, and from two petitions totalling 466 signatures.

57. We noted the opposition to our draft proposal. However, it was clear to us that Elstree is a distinct community and should be united in one authority. The authority which would best reflect its geographical position in relation to other towns and to the green belt, and which would recognise the separation caused by major roads, is Hertsmere in Hertfordshire. South of the village, the M1 clearly forms the major feature, and this would in our view make the most appropriate boundary.
58. The difficulty with the Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council suggestion that we should use the A1/M1 Link Road further east is that although it might form a good boundary, it does not yet exist. We do not normally anticipate development which is not yet committed and where the boundary which might be used is not already clear on the ground. In confirming our draft proposal for Elstree as final we have adopted a line which includes the whole of the Deacons Hill area in Hertfordshire.

59. Our draft proposal included placing the Stirling Corner Caravan Park in Barnet (paragraphs 41 and 42 above). However, should the A1/M1 link road be built, it would form a clearly defined physical feature, which would need to be considered in any future review of boundaries in this area. Were it later to be adopted as a suitable outer London boundary, some of the residents of the caravan park who would now be transferred to Barnet under our draft proposal might at some future date be transferred back to Hertsmere and this, we feel, would result in excessive disruption for them. Accordingly, in confirming our draft proposal in the area of Stirling Corner as final, we have decided to retain the existing boundary in the area of the Stirling Corner Caravan Park.

OUR DECISIONS AND FINAL PROPOSALS FOR MINOR REALIGNMENT

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HERTSMERE

(a) Grimsdyke Road and Old Fold View

60. Barnet, one local organisation and two individuals supported our draft proposal, although some suggestions for small changes in the consequential warding arrangements were made. It was opposed by Hertsmere and two local organisations. Hertfordshire pointed out that the draft proposal would divide a farm and suggested an alternative alignment to avoid this.
61. We still feel that this residential area is clearly part of Barnet and should be united with it. The alternative alignment suggested by the County Council seemed sensible in that it would avoid the division of land. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final but to adopt Hertfordshire's modification.

(b) Byng Road Playing Fields and Allotments

c) Old Fold Manor Golf Course

d) Kitts End Road and Great North Road

62. Barnet, one local organisation and one individual supported our draft proposals for these areas. They were opposed by Hertsmere.

63. We took the view that the present boundary was anomalous in that the areas in question seemed to have more affinity with Barnet than with Hertsmere. Accordingly, in the absence of any new grounds of objection by Hertsmere, we have decided to confirm our draft proposals for these areas as final.

(e) Barnet Bypass

64. Hertsmere, one local organisation and one individual supported our draft proposal. Barnet and one local organisation supported the proposed realignment along the western edge of the A1 but suggested that, as the London Borough is the Department of Transport's agent for this part of the A1, Rowley Lane interchange should remain in Barnet.

65. We agreed that, as Barnet is the agent authority for the road, effective and convenient local government would be better served by retaining Rowley Lane interchange in Barnet. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal, with this modification.

(f) Stirling Corner

66. The proposed boundary change in this area has been incorporated in our proposals for Elstree (see paragraph 59 above).
DECISION TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN BARNET AND HARROW

67. Other than in the area of Elstree, this boundary appears to be satisfactory. Although it divides areas of shops and commercial development, it is based on a long standing boundary and clear physical feature, namely, Watling Street/Edgware Road. We can see no alternative that would better serve effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision to make no proposals for this area.

CONCLUSION

68. We commend to you our final proposals as set out in paragraphs 47 to 67 as being in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

69. We recognise that our final proposals will have electoral consequences and these are detailed in the schedule to this report. The transfer of areas to Hertsmere Borough Council will have a significant effect on two wards, Kenilworth and Elstree. These are not adjacent wards and any adjustments would necessarily affect three if not more wards.

70. We have considered whether to propose such adjustments as part of our review. However, we have concluded that consequential changes to electoral boundaries should, at this stage, be confined to those detailed in the schedule, notwithstanding the imbalances they may create in Hertsmere. Nevertheless, we are prepared to consider a further electoral review in respect of Hertsmere, in advance of the next general review of electoral boundaries in 1996, should Hertsmere so request it.
71. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Barnet and Harrow, Hertfordshire County Council and Hertsmere Borough Council asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards and in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter, and that it now falls to you to make an order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are also being sent to all those who received our draft proposals and interim decisions letter, and to those who made written representations.
Signed
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K F J ENNALS

G R PRENTICE
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### CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES ANNEX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harrow LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Harrow LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conans Ward</td>
<td>Conans Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Edgware Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Barnet LB non-parished area</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Area Ref.</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB</td>
<td>Hertsmere Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-parished area</td>
<td>Ridge CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Potters Bar West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar South West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet LB</td>
<td>Hertsmere Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-parished area</td>
<td>Non Parished Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkley Ward</td>
<td>Potters Bar West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar South West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hertsmere Borough</td>
<td>Barnet LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Parished Area</td>
<td>Non Parished Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar West Ward</td>
<td>Hadley Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar South West ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hertfordshire County</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hertsmere Borough</td>
<td>Barnet LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Parished Area</td>
<td>non-parished area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar South Ward</td>
<td>Hadley Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Bar South West ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>