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INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Hackney's boundaries with the London Boroughs of Haringey and Islington. During the review we considered the desirability of major change, particularly to Hackney's boundary with Haringey. However, in the light of the responses to our draft proposals, we have confined our final proposals to limited change only, with the intention of removing anomalies, for example, where properties are split by the existing boundary.

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

3. Copies of our letter were sent to the adjoining London boroughs; the appropriate county, district and parish councils bordering Greater London; the local authority associations; Members of Parliament with constituency interests; and the headquarters of the main political parties. In addition, copies were sent to the Metropolitan Police and to those government departments, regional health authorities, electricity, gas and water undertakings which might have an interest, as well as to local television and radio stations serving the Greater London area, and to a number of other interested persons and organisations.
4. The London boroughs and the City of London were requested to assist us in publicising the start of the review by inserting a notice for two successive weeks in local newspapers so as to give a wide coverage in the areas concerned.

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

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

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". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as it makes proposals for changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.

8. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since London government reorganisation in 1965 and to offer our thoughts on the issues which have been raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We have therefore
published a general report, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London boroughs" (Report No 627), which discusses a number of the wider London issues which have arisen during the course of this review.

BOUNDARIES COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Hackney's boundaries with Haringey and Islington. Our final proposals for Hackney's boundaries with Waltham Forest, Tower Hamlets, City of London and Newham have already been submitted to you (Report Nos 618, 634, 636 and 661 respectively).

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

10. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Hackney, Haringey and Islington, and from a member of the public.

11. The submissions from Hackney, Haringey and Islington suggested only minor realignments of the boundaries. However, a member of the public suggested more major change to the Hackney/Haringey boundary, to transfer the area bounded by Seven Sisters Road north of the junction with Eade Road, St Anne's Road and the A10 north of the existing boundary from Haringey to Hackney.

OUR DRAFT AND FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS, AND THE RESPONSES RECEIVED

12. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published two further consultation letters in connection with this review of Hackney's boundaries with Haringey and Islington. The first, announcing our draft proposals and interim decision to make no proposals, was published on 9 July 1991. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. We arranged for a notice to be published advertising our draft proposals and interim decision. In addition, Hackney, Haringey and Islington were requested to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of
our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 10 September 1991.

13. We received a total of 65 individual representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decision. They included comments from Hackney, Haringey and Islington, and from local councillors, residents and organisations. We also received six petitions, bearing a total of 2,902 signatures, and 170 pro-forma letters and slips.

14. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposal for Hackney’s boundary with Haringey, was issued on 24 February 1992, and received similar publicity. Copies were sent to Hackney and Haringey, and to all those who had made representations to us. Comments were invited by 21 April 1992.

15. We received a total of eight individual representations in response to our further draft proposal. They included comments from Hackney and Haringey, and from local councillors, residents and organisations. We also received a joint letter from nine residents in one road.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HACKNEY AND ISLINGTON

a) Finsbury Square/City Road

16. Hackney suggested a realignment of the boundary to follow Finsbury Pavement, the western side of Finsbury Square and City Road. In support of its suggestion, the Council commented that these roads represent a major dividing line and that, in splitting South Shoreditch, the existing boundary prevented a consistent approach being taken to the planning of that area. However, Islington opposed Hackney’s suggestion, arguing that its effect would be to sever community ties in Finsbury.

17. Whilst acknowledging that a realignment along City Road and Finsbury Pavement would provide a clear, identifiable boundary,
we nevertheless observed that the existing boundary is neither ill-defined nor defaced. We agreed with Islington that Hackney's suggestion would sever community ties in Finsbury, and considered the latter's argument, that benefits would be derived from uniting South Shoreditch in a single planning authority, had not been substantiated. We therefore concluded that Hackney's suggestion would be unlikely to result in any significant improvement in terms of effective and convenient local government, and took an interim decision to make no proposals.

18. Our interim decision to propose no change in the South Shoreditch area was supported by Islington, but opposed by Hackney. We received no other representations.

19. In support of its original suggestion, Hackney reiterated its view that South Shoreditch is a homogeneous area, bounded in the west by the City Road and in the east by Great Eastern Street, which is artificially divided by the existing boundary. It argued that uniting the area would facilitate traffic management and allow for a more co-ordinated approach to planning matters. The Council also commented that land use in both South Shoreditch and Finsbury is predominantly commercial; it therefore expressed doubts about whether community ties, in the conventional sense, could be said to exist across the City Road.

20. It is often difficult in urban areas - particularly in central business districts - to find boundaries which clearly define communities. We therefore questioned whether South Shoreditch could be as clearly delineated as Hackney had suggested. Moreover, we could find no compelling reason to suppose that the area between the existing boundary and the City Road would be any more effectively and conveniently administered by Hackney than it is by Islington. Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient justification for change on such a scale, and in view of the fact that the existing boundary is not defaced, we have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.
Draft proposal

21. The existing boundary divides buildings where it runs arbitrarily through the Old Street LT Station roundabout. Although neither Hackney nor Islington had suggested any realignment to resolve this anomaly, we felt that the division of the roundabout between the two authorities was unsatisfactory. We considered that the anomaly could be resolved by uniting the roundabout in Islington, and decided to adopt a draft proposal to that effect.

Final proposal

22. Our draft proposal was supported by Islington. Hackney did not oppose it. We received no other representations and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

Draft proposal

23. Hackney, supported by Islington, suggested realigning the boundary along the mid-course of the Grand Union Canal, between Rosemary Branch Bridge and Sturt Lock. The Councils expressed the view that such a realignment, involving the transfer of all properties north of this stretch of the canal to Islington, would result in a more rational and less confusing boundary.

24. We agreed that a realignment along the canal would provide a clearer, more identifiable boundary than the current alignment along residential streets. We considered that the canal created a sense of separation between the areas to its north and south, and took the view that Arlington Avenue and Baring Street, being physically isolated from Hackney by the canal, could be more effectively administered from Islington.

25. Hackney's suggested realignment rejoined the existing boundary at Arlington Wharf, thereby dividing Sturt Lock.
However, we felt that the canal, as a significant break in development, would form a suitable boundary for its entire length between Rosemary Branch Bridge and Wharf Road Bridge. Accordingly, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal Hackney’s suggestion for the Regent’s Canal, subject to a modification to extend the realignment along the mid-course of the canal between Sturt Lock and Wharf Road.

Final proposal

26. Our draft proposal was supported by Islington, and noted by Hackney. We received no other representations and have decided to confirm it as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HACKNEY AND HARINGEY

South Tottenham Maps 4-6

Draft proposal

27. Hackney and Haringey both suggested minor realignments to the existing boundary between Green Lanes and the River Lee. These were intended to unite properties, a school and the Timberwharf Defined Employment Area in one authority. We agreed that parts of the existing boundary were defaced, and required realignment. However, there appeared to us to be communities of interest across the existing boundary, and we were concerned that the relatively minor changes proposed by the two Councils might not adequately address these. We therefore decided to explore the options for more major change along this boundary.

28. A member of the public had suggested realigning the boundary along Seven Sisters Road north of Eade Road, and then south-east along St. Ann’s Road, before rejoining the existing boundary via the A10. The rationale behind this suggestion was that the area bounded by the above roads looked south, to Hackney, and that residents in that area primarily used the shops, libraries and leisure facilities located in that Borough. We acknowledged that this suggestion sought to reflect the view that residents to the north of the Hackney/Haringey boundary had an affinity with
Hackney. However, we felt that the precise alignment was flawed, in that it would isolate Plevna Crescent in Haringey, which would be enclosed by the new boundary and two intersecting railway lines.

29. We observed that the New River, Seven Sisters Road and the Tottenham to Hampstead railway line constituted a continuous structural break in this area. We noted in particular that the railway and the New River have only five crossing points, and appear to act as barriers to north-south movement. Our preliminary view was that this structural break could provide a well-defined, enduring boundary. However, before adopting such a realignment as our draft proposal we required further information on community links in the area. We therefore wrote to both Hackney and Haringey, and are grateful for the additional material which the two Councils provided.

30. The further information we received suggested that the South Tottenham area did have significant cultural links with Hackney. Shopping centres in Stamford Hill and Stoke Newington to the south, in Hackney, seemed to exert a considerable pull, and many people in South Tottenham appeared to rely heavily on facilities provided in those areas. The similarity of housing on either side of the current boundary, and the fact that the catchment areas of some schools located in Hackney extended north into South Tottenham, seemed to reinforce these links.

31. Accordingly, having carefully considered all the evidence presented to us, we concluded that the South Tottenham area did appear to have a community of interest with Hackney. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment along the railway and Seven Sisters Road and, to the west of Seven Sisters Road, the major barrier provided by the New River.

32. In deciding to adopt this realignment as our draft proposal, we recognised that several Haringey-funded facilities are located in the area between the railway line and the existing boundary. The residents of this area are from various ethnic backgrounds and we were concerned that the views of the various minority groups should be canvassed, so that the full implications of our
draft proposals could be accurately assessed. Accordingly, we ensured that our draft proposals letter was copied to ethnic minority groups in the area, and asked Hackney and Haringey to draw our letter to the attention of any other groups or organisations which might have an interest.

Further draft proposal

33. Our draft proposal was opposed by both Hackney and Haringey. We also received objections from 57 organisations and individuals, including the Haringey Labour Party Local Government Committee, the Tottenham Labour Party, the Haringey Community Health Council, the Save South Tottenham Campaign, the Stamford Hill Parents’ Action Group, the Haringey Teachers’ Association, the Headteachers of Gladesmore, Crowland, Stamford Hill and St Ignatius Schools and the Mayor and Mayoress of Haringey. We also received six petitions opposing our draft proposal, containing a total of 2,829 signatures, together with 170 pro-forma letters and slips.

34. Our draft proposal was supported by the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, by three members of the public and by a petition containing 73 signatures.

35. Hackney agreed that South Tottenham has links with Stamford Hill to the south, in its authority. However, it expressed concern over the cost and the degree of reorganisation that would be required in taking over responsibility for the four grant-maintained schools which, under our draft proposal, would be transferred from Haringey. The Council supported that part of our draft proposal for the New River, but suggested that the boundary should then be realigned along Vartry Road, Hillside Road and Craven Park Road. This would have the effect of uniting Craven Park School, which is administered by Hackney, and the Ravensdale Industrial Estate in that authority.

36. Haringey commented that South Tottenham should not be viewed in isolation from the rest of the Borough and, in particular, from the rest of Tottenham. It expressed the view that well-established ties exist between South Tottenham and Tottenham,
which are reinforced by shopping, leisure and employment patterns. Particular concern was expressed over the effect which our draft proposal would have on education, social services and housing provision within the Borough. The Council reiterated its view that the anomalies along the existing Hackney/Haringey boundary could be rectified through a number of minor changes. However, on traffic management grounds, it supported that part of our draft proposal for the New River, albeit suggesting a south side of river alignment. Similar support for the New River part of our draft proposal was received from a number of residents.

37. A number of respondents emphasised the degree of disruption to services which might result from our draft proposal. The Haringey Teachers' Association noted that, with the introduction of Local Management of Schools (LMS), education services in both Hackney and Haringey would be undergoing change. The transfer of schools from one authority to another would, in the Association's view, add another layer of confusion and disruption. The Association pointed out that Haringey had already introduced a "scheme of delegation" to ease the passage to LMS, but that Hackney had no equivalent scheme, having only become an education authority in 1990.

38. We received similar comments from the head teachers and staff of the four schools which, under our draft proposal, would be transferred to Hackney. In addition to doubting Hackney's ability to absorb four extra schools, the respondents commented that the draft proposal would undermine long-established links between the schools and their catchment areas. Other respondents, including the Stamford Hill Parents' Action Group, expressed concern at the impact major change might have on the provision of nursery education and Haringey-funded play centres, and questioned whether these facilities would be retained by Hackney.

39. A number of respondents referred to South Tottenham's community ties and affinities with the rest of Haringey. They commented that residents of the area make regular use of health, leisure and shopping facilities north of the Tottenham/Hampstead
railway line. Supermarkets in Tottenham High Road and the leisure centre at Tottenham Green were said to draw a significant number of customers from South Tottenham.

40. Haringey and a number of residents were also concerned over the transfer to Hackney of some 750 Haringey-owned dwellings, and the division of the Tiverton Estate, where schemes to involve tenants in the management of the housing stock are in progress. Haringey acknowledged that it could retain ownership of these properties, but felt that our draft proposal would complicate service delivery.

41. In support of our draft proposal, the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations said that Hackney is more responsive to the special needs of the Jewish community, particularly in the area of planning permission for house alterations. It also listed a number of other issues in which it considered Hackney to be more responsive to Jewish concerns. Similar points were made by a resident, who also commented that the existing boundary causes confusion and inconvenience. Another resident argued in favour of the draft proposal on the grounds that Haringey is oversized, and that a smaller, leaner Borough could be more effectively administered.

42. We noted that our proposed realignment along the New River had been widely accepted, but that the remainder of the draft proposal had been strongly opposed by local residents and organisations, and by both Hackney and Haringey. While the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations had supported the transfer of South Tottenham to Hackney, other organisations and individuals had provided significant evidence of the area’s links with Haringey. In particular, the residents of South Tottenham appeared to rely heavily on shopping and health facilities in that Borough. We acknowledged the concerns of local residents that education in the area would suffer significant disruption as a result of our draft proposal, as well as their uncertainties over the future of community facilities.

43. The response to our draft proposal had indicated that South Tottenham does have close ties with the rest of Haringey, though
some residents do undoubtedly look rather more to Hackney. We also accepted the evidence that neither the Seven Sisters Road nor the Tottenham/Hampstead railway line represented significant barriers, or had any practical role in defining communities. We therefore concluded that, in the context of this review, there was no justification for major change in this area.

44. However, we noted that the existing boundary is defaced, and that realignments are required in several areas. Having examined the various suggestions for minor changes proposed by respondents, we decided to confirm that part of our draft proposal concerning the New River, and to adopt as our further draft proposal a realignment which would have the effect of uniting Vartry Road in Haringey, and uniting Northdene Gardens, Hillside Road and the eastern part of Craven Park Road in Hackney.

Final proposal

45. Our further draft proposal was opposed by Hackney, Haringey and six organisations and individuals, including the Haringey Labour Party Local Government Committee and the Hackney Council Conservative Opposition Group.

46. Both Hackney and Haringey withdrew their earlier support for our proposed realignment along the centre of the New River, and resubmitted their original suggestions for this area. Hackney proposed a realignment along Green Lanes, Hermitage Road and Eade Road. Haringey suggested a similar realignment, but proposed retaining the existing boundary to the north of Hermitage Road. The effect of both these suggestions would be to retain in Hackney a number of residential properties to the north of the New River.

47. We observed that the properties in question form part of a larger residential area of similar character in Haringey, and considered that the New River effectively isolated them from Hackney, to the south. We therefore reaffirmed our view that the New River has a barrier effect in this area, and would provide the most clearly defined boundary.
48. To the east of Seven Sisters Road, Hackney supported that part of our further draft proposal for Vartry Road. However, for the remainder of the boundary, between Vartry Road and the River Lee, the Council resubmitted an earlier suggestion for a realignment along Hillside Road and Craven Park Road. Conversely, Haringey suggested retaining the existing boundary in the vicinity of Vartry Road, and proposed minor realignments in Hillside Road, along Northdene Gardens, Castlewood Road, Craven Park Road, Leadale Road and Timberwharf Road.

49. We agreed that the Councils' suggestions for this stretch of the boundary would rectify a number of anomalies. However, neither appeared to resolve the division of the southern part of Hillside Road, nor the stretch of defaced boundary between Northdene Gardens and the A10 Tottenham High Road. In addition, we could see little justification for Hackney's suggestion for a realignment along the whole length of Craven Park Road, given that the existing boundary in that area is, for the most part, reasonably well-defined. Similarly, we felt that Haringey's suggested realignments for Craven Park Road, and the area to its south, were unnecessarily convoluted, and would maintain the division of a number of streets.

50. We also received a number of suggestions for realignments from members of the public. One suggested a realignment eastwards along the rear curtilages of properties on the north side of Hillside Road, along Craven Park Road to Castlewood Road, along the existing boundary to Maple Close, then along the south side of Maple Close to the River Lee. The rationale for this suggestion was to unite the whole of Hillside Road in Hackney and retain Craven Park Primary School in Haringey. However, we concluded that this failed to address the division of several properties by the present boundary, including Craven Park Primary School.

51. The Haringey Labour Party Local Government Committee and two members of the public opposed our further draft proposal insofar as it affected Hillside Road. They argued that the proposed alignment along the north side of the road would still leave the houses fronting it in Haringey, with the consequence that
residents would need to deal with two local authorities for refuse collection and road management issues. The Haringey Labour Party Local Government Committee referred to public order issues affecting Hillside Road, and both the Committee and a local resident pointed out that our draft proposal would transfer Allan Barclay Close to Hackney. The Committee commented that the Close is a new Haringey development, occupied mainly by elderly and unemployed residents dependent on a range of local authority services, and that it would not be in the residents' interests for the Close to be transferred to Hackney. One member of the public suggested that the entire road be united in Haringey, on the grounds that its southern extent, currently in Hackney, was not being adequately maintained.

52. The residents of nine properties at the north end of Moundfield Road suggested that their properties should be transferred to Hackney. They commented that our further draft proposal for a centre-of-road alignment along Moundfield Road at its junction with Craven Park Road would result in the former being split three ways between the two local authorities, and that this could only lead to further neglect of Moundfield Road by Haringey.

53. We agreed that, in terms of facilitating service provision to Hillside Road, it would be desirable for the entire road to be united in one borough. However, we observed that the effect of seeking to unite it in Haringey would be to isolate two cul-de-sac, Northdene Gardens and Hurstdene Gardens, which are in Hackney and only accessible via Hillside Road, from the rest of that Borough. We therefore concluded that all of Hillside Road should be united in Hackney, by a realignment along the south side of St Ignatius RC Primary School.

54. We also agreed with the residents of Moundfield Road that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the whole of that road to be united in Hackney, by a realignment to the west side of their properties.

55. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our draft and further draft proposals for Hackney's boundary with Haringey,
subject to the modifications referred to above and to a south side of road alignment along Craven Park Road.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

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

CONCLUSIONS

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

PUBLICATION

58. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Hackney, Haringey and Islington, asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft and further draft proposals letters of 9 July 1991 and 24 February 1992, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed

K F J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary
2 July 1992
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hackney LB Moorfields Ward</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunhill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hackney LB Wenlock Ward</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Peter Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hackney LB Wenlock Ward</td>
<td>Islington LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canonbury East Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hackney LB New River Ward</td>
<td>Haringey LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven Sisters Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hackney LB Northfield Ward</td>
<td>Haringey LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven Sisters Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Haringey LB South Tottenham</td>
<td>Hackney LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Springfield Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

1. **Boundary between Hackney and Islington**

   - **Old Street**
     - Realignment to unite the LT station roundabout in Islington
     - Paragraphs 21-22, Map 1

   - **Grand Union Canal**
     - Realignment to the centre of the canal between Rosemary Branch Bridge and Wharf Road Bridge
     - Paragraphs 23-26, Maps 2-3

2. **Boundary between Hackney and Haringey**

   - **South Tottenham**
     - Realignment to the centre of the New River between Green Lanes and Seven Sisters Road; to unite Vartry Road in Haringey and Hillside Road and the eastern part of Craven Park Road in Hackney between Seven Sisters Road and the River Lee
     - Paragraphs 27-56, Maps 4-6