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INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s boundary with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. Between the River Thames at Chelsea Harbour and the southern extent of Little Wormwood Scrubs, we are proposing to realign the boundary to the east side of the West London railway line, departing from this alignment in only one area, to unite the Earls Court complex in Kensington and Chelsea. This has enabled us to deal with anomalies, such as the division of properties or areas of similar development. Our report explains how we arrived at our proposals.

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
are 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 body or person 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" (April 1988), to explain in some detail the approach we take to our work and the factors which we take into consideration when conducting reviews, including the guidelines given to us by the Secretary of State (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

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 therefore published a general report in May 1992, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs" (Report No 627), which discusses a number of the wider London issues which have arisen during the course of our review of London.

THE BOUNDARY COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Kensington and Chelsea's boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham. We have already submitted to you our final proposals for Kensington and Chelsea's boundaries with Brent (Report No 651), Westminster (Report No 666) and Wandsworth (Report No 669).

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

10. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the Hammersmith Labour Party, the Metropolitan Police, Earls Court Olympia, two residents' associations and two members of the public.

OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS LETTER AND THE RESPONSES RECEIVED

11. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published a further consultation letter, announcing our draft proposals and interim decision to make no proposals. This was published on 4 March 1992. However, as there was an error in the accompanying mapping, we published an amended letter on 3 April 1992, and extended the consultation period. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. We arranged for a notice to be published announcing our draft proposals and interim decision. In addition, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham were asked 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 29 May 1992.

12. In response to our draft proposals letter, we received comments from Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham, from seven organisations, two councillors and three businesses and from 36 individuals. In addition, we received a number of petitions and pro forma letters from the Edward Woods Action Committee, containing a total of 584 signatures. The Metropolitan Police indicated that it had no comments on our draft proposal.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

(a) West London railway line

Draft Proposal

13. We received a number of suggestions, mainly of a minor nature, for changes affecting almost the whole length of Kensington and Chelsea’s boundary with Hammersmith and Fulham, from Chelsea Harbour in the south to Kensal Green Cemetery in the north. In addition to these two locations, we received suggestions for realignments at Wandon Road, Earls Court Exhibition Centre, Holland Park roundabout, the West Cross Route, the Silchester Estate, the Westway roundabout and Little Wormwood Scrubs.

14. We first considered whether the West London railway line would be a suitable boundary throughout its length between the River Thames at Chelsea Harbour and Little Wormwood Scrubs. Much of the boundary between Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham already follows or runs near to this railway line, which we considered to be a significant and clearly identifiable feature in this area. Although there are road crossings at a number of points, the railway line appeared to us to have a barrier effect in the south, at Chelsea Harbour, and for most of its length between Shepherd’s Bush Green and Little Wormwood Scrubs, isolating those parts of Hammersmith and Fulham on the eastern side of the line from the remainder of the borough.
Between Shepherd's Bush Green and the Westway, we considered this sense of separation to be reinforced by the M41 West Cross Route, and by a large industrial estate on the western side of the line. Accordingly, we concluded that the scope for using the West London railway line as the basis of a realigned Kensington and Chelsea/Hammersmith and Fulham boundary, between the River Thames and Little Wormwood Scrubs, should be investigated.

15. We considered that areas of Hammersmith and Fulham to the east of the railway line, such as the Edward Woods Estate, the Silchester Estate, Latimer Road and Bracewell Road, appeared to look more to Kensington and Chelsea, from which they are predominantly accessed. Although, clearly, local government services are provided to these areas by Hammersmith and Fulham despite the West London railway line, we took the view that a realignment of the boundary to the West London railway line would result in more effective and convenient local government. Such a realignment would subsume many of the suggestions which we had received for more minor change to remove anomalies in the existing boundary. We considered that a realignment of the boundary to the eastern side of the railway would be the most appropriate, because it would involve the minimum amount of change compared to the use of either the centre or western side of the railway.

16. We recognised that the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, which has recently been extended over the West London railway line, is divided by the existing boundary, and that a realignment along the railway would leave the site divided. However, we considered that this should not dissuade us from the general principle of using the very clear feature of the railway, subject to the need to address the division of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre. Our consideration of the exhibition centre is discussed in paragraphs 79-96 below.

17. Accordingly, with the exception of that part of the boundary in the vicinity of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment to the eastern side of the West London railway line between the River Thames and Little Wormwood Scrubs. This proposal subsumed the many
suggestions which we had received for detailed change to the boundary. Our view was that only the use of the railway would deal adequately with the many anomalies which had been brought to our attention.

Final Proposal

18. Our draft proposal for the use of the West London railway line affected a long stretch of boundary and we consequently received responses relating to a number of separate areas. We have therefore felt it appropriate to record the responses to our draft proposal, and our consideration of them, in sections from south to north (excluding the Earls Court Exhibition Centre).

19. Kensington and Chelsea supported the general principle of realigning the boundary to the West London railway line, but suggested a realignment to the centre of the railway. The Council said that this would allow the interests of residents of its borough to be safeguarded in planning decisions in respect of future proposals affecting the railway land, as the railway features in British Rail’s strategies in connection with Channel Tunnel freight.

20. The London Tourist Board also supported the principle of using the railway line as the boundary, but suggested a realignment to its western side from the River Thames to Kensington High Street and, thereafter, to its eastern side.

21. The Association of London Authorities said that, although there was a certain logic in the use of the West London railway line as the boundary in this part of London, it had been applied too rigidly. The Association pointed to other cases, such as the North Circular Road between Enfield and Haringey, where we had not used similar features which might be regarded as effective barriers. It argued that the boundary between Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham should depart from the West London railway line in some places (discussed below) and that this would not be inconsistent with the practice in other London boroughs.
22. We took the view that there was considerable merit in realigning the boundary to the side of the railway, as this would provide a very well defined boundary and also allow British Rail to deal with only one authority in respect of planning and environmental matters. We considered that the interests of local residents, on both sides of the railway line, would be safeguarded by recent changes to the General Development Order 1988, which now make it a statutory requirement for all local authorities to publicise planning applications, even if they affect residents in a different borough. We also maintained our view that realigning the boundary to the eastern side of the railway line would represent the minimum necessary change in this case.

23. We therefore decided, subject to our consideration of the individual issues, to reaffirm our view that effective and convenient local government would be best served by an east side of railway alignment between the River Thames and Little Wormwood Scrubs, except at Earls Court.

(i) Chelsea Harbour

24. Our draft proposal in this area was supported by Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham, the Chelsea Harbour Residents' Association and 17 individual respondents. However, it was opposed by Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives, the Fulham Society, two local councillors, a former Chairman of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Committee and by a local resident. The London Tourist Board suggested a west side of railway alignment in this area.

25. Kensington and Chelsea said that Chelsea Harbour's main links were with its borough, rather than Hammersmith and Fulham. It considered that transferring the area to Kensington and Chelsea would help to resolve longstanding issues of access, and would unite this part of the river frontage so that a consistent development policy could be followed. However, it suggested that our draft proposal be modified to a centre of railway alignment.
26. Hammersmith and Fulham agreed that the Chelsea Harbour development looks largely to Chelsea, and stated that the main access to the development is from Lots Road, in Kensington and Chelsea. It reported that local residents who had responded to its Council had unanimously supported the area’s transfer to Kensington and Chelsea.

27. The Fulham Society said that, as the land to the west of Chelsea Creek had always been part of Fulham, Chelsea Harbour was historically part of Fulham and should remain so.

28. A local Kensington and Chelsea councillor, in opposing our draft proposal, also referred to the historic use of Chelsea Creek as the boundary in this area. He commented that, although the Council had now filled in part of the Creek near Kings Road, enough of it was left at its southern end to constitute a natural boundary between the two boroughs. He considered Chelsea Harbour to be quite different from Lots Road, the adjoining residential area in Kensington and Chelsea, which he represents.

29. Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives, a local Hammersmith and Fulham councillor and a former Chairman of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Committee opposed our draft proposal on the grounds of access and planning. They commented that, as the only access to the site from Kensington and Chelsea is by means of a narrow road bridge from Lots Road, Kensington and Chelsea had originally been concerned about the traffic implications of the development. Consequently, a complex traffic arrangement had been worked out, allowing residents to use the Lots Road access but requiring all commercial vehicles to use the access from Townmead Road, in Hammersmith and Fulham. However, we were informed that these conditions were not being strictly enforced, except at peak hours. It was argued that, if the restrictions were enforced, access for some types of Council service vehicles, such as refuse lorries, would be available only from Fulham.

30. The Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives, the local Hammersmith and Fulham councillor and the former Chairman of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Committee commented that Chelsea Harbour is a integral part of the redevelopment of the South
Fulham riverside area, which includes plans to develop the land to the west of the West London railway line. The councillor and the former Planning Committee Chairman stated that Hammersmith and Fulham planned to provide an additional link between Chelsea Harbour and Fulham by means of a riverside footpath under the railway line. They said that a similar footpath link would not be possible from Chelsea, because of the natural barrier formed by Chelsea Creek.

31. A local resident, in opposing our draft proposal, expressed the view that the whole of the riverside development from Chelsea Harbour to Wandsworth Bridge should remain in Hammersmith and Fulham. She also believed that Chelsea Creek provided a well defined boundary in this area.

32. We are grateful to the Fulham Society and other respondents for the detailed history of the area which they provided. We recognise the importance of local history. However, we have to consider whether the historic boundaries reflect the present configuration and land usage of an area, and are conducive to effective and convenient local government.

33. We considered the argument that Chelsea Harbour is an integral part of the Fulham riverside and that there would be advantages in terms of planning and access for it to be retained in Hammersmith and Fulham. However, we took the view that Chelsea Harbour could also be seen to form part of the Chelsea riverside, and observed that both local authorities had supported our draft proposal. Furthermore, Kensington and Chelsea had expressed the view that the proposed transfer would assist in resolving access difficulties to Chelsea Harbour. We therefore concluded that the West London railway line would provide the most satisfactory boundary in this area.

34. As indicated in paragraph 22 above, we considered that the boundary should be realigned to the eastern side of the railway line. No evidence had been provided to suggest that there would be any benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government in modifying our proposed realignment to follow the centre or the western side of the railway in this area. We have
therefore decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.

(ii) Wandon Road

35. Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives all supported our draft proposal. However, Kensington and Chelsea suggested that it be modified to a centre of railway alignment. The London Tourist Board suggested a west side of railway alignment.

36. Our reasons for proposing a realignment to the eastern side of the West London railway line are given in paragraph 22 above, and we considered that a modification to realign the boundary to the centre or to the western side of the railway would seem to offer no improvement in terms of effective and convenient local government. No other responses were received, and we have decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.

(iii) Kensington Olympia Station (Russell Road)

37. Hammersmith and Fulham supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary along the east side of the West London railway line. However, it was opposed by Kensington and Chelsea, on the grounds that part of this area is being considered by British Rail as the site for a major European Parcels Depot, whose access would be from Russell Road in Kensington and Chelsea.

38. Accordingly, Kensington and Chelsea suggested realigning the boundary along the centre of the railway. The Council believed that this would be in the best interests of the local community affected by the proposed development.

39. As British Rail has submitted no planning application, we considered that the proposed development could not reasonably be taken into account in this review. We have therefore decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.
40. Our draft proposal to use the West London railway line as the boundary, thus transferring the Edward Woods Estate to Kensington and Chelsea, was supported by the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives, a local resident and a local business. However, it was opposed by Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham, the Association of London Authorities, the Edward Woods Action Committee, which enclosed petitions and pro forma letters containing 584 signatures, eight individuals, two businesses and the agent for a firm of developers.

41. Both Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham suggested retaining the existing boundary in this area, except in the vicinity of the community centre; Hammersmith and Fulham resubmitted its original suggestion for the community centre’s transfer to its authority.

42. Kensington and Chelsea commented that, although access to the Edward Woods Estate is obtained from its borough, the area principally comprises council housing provided and serviced by Hammersmith and Fulham, with residents who have community ties, traditions and a strong loyalty to that borough. Kensington and Chelsea said that even if the ownership of the properties remained unchanged, it would still oppose the area’s transfer to its borough.

43. Hammersmith and Fulham stated that the Edward Woods Estate is a large purpose-built local authority estate comprising 812 residential units. It explained that the estate represents approximately 5% of its housing stock, and a significantly larger proportion of its smaller housing units. Whereas in the borough’s housing stock as a whole, just over one third of the units are bedsitters or one-bedroom units, in the Edward Woods Estate over half the dwellings are of that size. The Council expressed the view that it would have great difficulty in fulfilling its statutory duty to house single, vulnerable people if the estate was transferred to Kensington and Chelsea.
44. Hammersmith and Fulham submitted the results of a questionnaire which it had distributed to all its tenants on the Edward Woods Estate. 246 responses were received from 812 units. 80% of those responding had said that they wished to remain in Hammersmith and Fulham, and 78% had felt that the West London Railway line did not form a barrier. Between 70% and 80% of all those responding said that they used Shepherd's Bush for shopping and for public transport. A similar proportion claimed family or social ties with Shepherds Bush and Hammersmith. The Council reported that it had also arranged a public meeting at the community centre on the estate. This had been attended by over 120 people. As a result of this meeting, an action group had been formed to oppose our draft proposal for the area.

45. Hammersmith and Fulham also opposed our draft proposal for a realignment of the boundary to the north of the Edward Woods Estate, which would affect an area of mixed residential and commercial property. The Council said that it had invested in infrastructure and environmental improvements to the Freston Road Industrial Improvement Area, and was supporting the Netting Dale Technology Centre, which is located in Freston Road, through the Urban Programme and the Council's own resources.

46. The Association of London Authorities opposed our draft proposal, submitting similar evidence to that of Hammersmith and Fulham. It concluded that residents have strong links with Shepherd's Bush and Hammersmith and Fulham, and that our draft proposal would have an adverse impact on Hammersmith and Fulham's ability to fulfil its duties as a housing authority.

47. The Edward Woods Action Committee enclosed with its response petitions and pro forma letters containing 584 signatures, all opposing our draft proposal. The Committee called for a local meeting. We also received a further 17 pro forma letters and eight individual letters opposing our draft proposal. Residents said that they were content with the services provided by Hammersmith and Fulham, and feared an increase in rent if the estate were transferred to Kensington and Chelsea. Two residents commented that they used Shepherds Bush for shopping and travel. One local resident supported our draft proposal, on the grounds
that Hammersmith and Fulham does not take an interest in the safety of estate residents.

48. Our draft proposal was supported by one local business, on the grounds that it was logical. Two businesses opposed it, one commenting that Hammersmith and Fulham has invested in both industry and sheltered housing in the area, and has achieved real and continuing improvement. The other business was concerned that our draft proposal might affect highway agreements which it has with Hammersmith and Fulham.

49. The agents for a firm of developers opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that it would split the proposed "White City Centre" development, a large scheme which extends to the east side of the West Cross Route. Planning applications had been submitted for the whole development, which includes the construction of a road across the M41 to link the White City site with 24 proposed industrial units to the rear of Nos 115-161 Freston Road (to the east of the West Cross Route). In 1990, Hammersmith and Fulham resolved to grant planning permission and Conservation Area consent for the whole scheme, subject to various conditions, including the completion of legal agreements under the Planning and Highways Acts. The agents pointed out that, although these agreements are under discussion with other landowners, implementation of the White City scheme would ultimately depend upon the completion of planning and highway legal agreements. They argued that our draft proposal would not only lead to duplication of effort, as another authority would become involved in the planning process, but that Kensington and Chelsea had expressed its opposition to the White City development on highway grounds.

50. The Kensington Conservative Association opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that it would cut across long established community boundaries. It felt that residents of the Edward Woods Estate were not really part of the North Kensington community, and that the adjacent industrial estate was not an important source of employment for existing Kensington residents.
51. Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported our draft proposal. They considered the M41 to be the natural boundary in this area, as all vehicular access is through Kensington and Chelsea and the only pedestrian access is by an unpopular pedestrian subway at Holland Park roundabout.

52. The wishes of the local residents are an important (but not necessarily the determining) factor in any boundary review we undertake. We therefore gave careful consideration to residents' views, as expressed to us through the petitions and the pro forma and individually written letters submitted to us, and the results of the questionnaire survey which Hammersmith and Fulham had undertaken.

53. We were concerned that, with the exception of one letter, none of the petitions or pro forma letters had given any reasons why residents opposed our draft proposal, other than referring to a lack of information about the effect of a boundary change on individual residents. Of the nine residents who wrote individual letters to us, a number referred to their links and affinities with Shepherd's Bush and Hammersmith. Others commented on their satisfaction with Hammersmith and Fulham services to the estate, and expressed concern that these might be funded differently by Kensington and Chelsea. One commented that his rent might increase if the estate were transferred.

54. The results of the survey undertaken by Hammersmith and Fulham provided us with rather more information on residents' views, although we observed that, of the questionnaires issued, only just over 30% were returned. Of those residents who did respond, 20% felt that the West London railway line formed a barrier between the estate and the rest of Hammersmith and Fulham, while 78% felt it did not. Between 73% and 87% indicated that they had links with Hammersmith or Shepherd's Bush for shopping, transport, and had friends or relations in those areas. The majority (82%) who responded to Hammersmith and Fulham's survey indicated that they wished to remain in that authority; 15% said that they wished to be transferred to Kensington and Chelsea.
55. We did not doubt the influence which Hammersmith and Shepherd's Bush, both of which have shopping centres and transport interchanges, exert on communities in this area. However, we questioned whether these were the only influences on residents of the Edward Woods Estate, observing that the shopping centre at Holland Park/Notting Hill was considerably closer to the area than Hammersmith, and that those at Hammersmith and Kensington High Street are approximately equidistant. In this respect, we noted that Hammersmith and Fulham's survey had not sought to identify the general pattern of residents' links and affinities, restricting itself only to those between the estate and remainder of the Borough.

56. We also considered it noteworthy that we had received no similar expressions of affinity with Hammersmith and Fulham from tenants of the Silchester Estate, immediately to the north of the Edward Woods Estate. As discussed in paragraphs 64-74 below, the Silchester Estate is owned and administered by Kensington and Chelsea, but is split by the existing boundary. Hammersmith and Fulham informed us that it had asked residents and businesses in this area whether they wished to be transferred to Kensington and Chelsea. The response was low, and evenly split between those wishing to remain in Hammersmith and Fulham and those wishing to transfer. This response was markedly different from that of residents of the Edward Woods Estate, possibly reflecting the different tenancy arrangements on the two estates.

57. Despite the views expressed in response to the Council's survey, we still considered that the West London railway line, taken together with the West Cross Route and the industrial area to the west, is a barrier to movement in this area. The only pedestrian access between the estate and Shepherd's Bush is via a tunnel at the Holland Park roundabout which, it was reported to us, residents are reluctant to use. While perhaps less of a barrier to vehicular movement, access to the busy Holland Park roundabout can only be gained by travelling through Kensington and Chelsea.

58. We considered the concern expressed by both Hammersmith and Fulham and the Association of London Authorities that the
transfer of the Edward Woods Estate might impair the Council's ability to fulfil its statutory duty to house single, vulnerable people. We appreciate that, especially in smaller authorities, facilities may be clustered in particular areas rather than spread evenly throughout the authority. However, section 68 of the Local Government Act 1972 contains provision for the retention of rights over property which might otherwise be transferred under any Boundary Changes Order. We did not feel therefore that the stated concentration of a particular type of accommodation should stand in the way of what we believed to be a worthwhile boundary change.

59. We took the view that concern about the effect of the proposed transfer on a highway agreement, which a local business had negotiated with Hammersmith and Fulham, was unfounded; all rights and liabilities associated with the agreement would automatically transfer to Kensington and Chelsea.

60. Similarly, given the stage reached over the planning and implementation of the White City redevelopment, we did not consider that a boundary change was likely to have any significant impact on the development. As with the highway agreement referred to in the preceding paragraph, all rights and liabilities associated with planning permissions for the development would be equally binding on Kensington and Chelsea. Nor did we consider that the proposed development was likely to have any demonstrable effect on the isolation of the Edward Woods Estate from Hammersmith and Fulham, particularly in the short term.

61. We reaffirmed our view that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Edward Woods Estate is unsatisfactory, as it splits the Holland Park roundabout and divides the community centre from the rest of the Edward Woods Estate. While the realignment suggested by Hammersmith and Fulham would unite the community centre with the estate, it would not resolve the problem of the division of the Holland Park roundabout. We continued to believe that, although the estate is said to look to Hammersmith and Fulham, the West London railway line and the M41 West Cross Route effectively separate it from the rest of
Hammersmith and Fulham. Moreover, the pattern of land uses in the area shows that North Kensington, adjacent to the estate, is residential, while the nearest parts of Hammersmith and Fulham (across the railway) are industrial.

62. We recognised that the transfer of this area would be contrary to the expressed wishes of a large number of local residents and of both authorities. However, as we have said above, the wishes of the people are only one of the factors we are enjoined to take into consideration by our guidelines from the Secretary of State; we also have to consider the pattern of community life in the area and whether a boundary change would be likely to lead to benefits in the provision of local government services.

63. It appeared to us, in short, that the Edward Woods Estate is essentially an extension of Kensington and Chelsea, and is isolated from Hammersmith and Fulham by significant barriers to movement. We concluded that our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the east side of the West London railway line would provide a clear, long-lasting boundary reflecting the pattern of development, and would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.

(v) Silchester Estate  
Maps 7 and 8

64. Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham, the Association of London Authorities and the Kensington Conservative Association all opposed the use of the West London railway line as the boundary in this area, but supported the principle of uniting the Silchester Estate in Kensington and Chelsea.

65. Kensington and Chelsea suggested realigning the boundary from Latimer Road Underground Station, south west along the Hammersmith and City line and then north along the centre of Freston Road. The suggested realignment would then follow the eastern side of the roundabout to the centre of the West London railway line. Kensington and Chelsea commented that this would unite the Silchester Estate, the Westway roundabout and the
greater part of the land held by the North Kensington Amenity Trust under the Westway in its area, but would retain the travellers’ site, located under the Westway, in Hammersmith and Fulham, which manages the site on behalf of both boroughs on a cost sharing basis.

66. Hammersmith and Fulham also supported uniting the Silchester Estate, including the Latimer Day Nursery, previously run by its authority but now administered by Kensington and Chelsea, in that authority’s area. However, it suggested a realignment that would retain the rest of the area to the east of the railway line, including the Latimer Education Centre, in Hammersmith and Fulham. The Council said that the Latimer Education Centre, which is used by the Community Education Service, also provides a youth centre and education facilities for residents on the travellers’ site.

67. Hammersmith and Fulham stated that its survey of local residents in the area had attracted a small response, which had been evenly balanced between those wishing to remain in Hammersmith and Fulham and those wishing to transfer to Kensington and Chelsea.

68. The Association of London Authorities suggested that most of the area should remain in Hammersmith and Fulham, subject to some realignment of the boundary between Latimer Road Station and the Westway.

69. The Kensington Conservative Association supported Kensington and Chelsea’s alternative suggestion to unite the Silchester Estate in its authority. However, it opposed the transfer of any other parts of this area, on the grounds that the strip of land to the north of the Westway looked more to Hammersmith and Fulham.

70. Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported our draft proposal. It considered the M41 to be the natural boundary in this area, as all vehicular access is through Kensington and Chelsea.
71. We agreed that the suggestions for minor change submitted by the two Councils would have the effect of uniting the Silchester Estate in Kensington and Chelsea. However, we considered neither suggestion to be totally satisfactory, as they would both leave an area of Hammersmith and Fulham separated from the rest of that authority by the West Cross Route and the railway. The only access to that area would continue to be through Kensington and Chelsea. Additionally, Kensington and Chelsea's suggested realignment would perpetuate the division of property owned by the North Kensington Amenity Trust, which is located beneath the elevated Westway roundabout.

72. In respect of the travellers' site, we took the view that, although the present system of management and funding works well, there is no reason to suggest that it would not continue to do so, were the site to be transferred to Kensington and Chelsea.

73. Both our draft proposal and Kensington and Chelsea's suggestion would transfer the Latimer Education Centre from Hammersmith and Fulham to Kensington and Chelsea. In addition to its use by Hammersmith and Fulham's Community Education Service, it also houses part of Kensington and Chelsea's St Ann's Nursery, and various voluntary organisations. Given the existing arrangements between the two boroughs over the use of this facility, we considered that its transfer to Kensington and Chelsea would be unlikely to have a significant effect on the education centre's activities.

74. We concluded that none of the suggestions for minor change adequately addressed the arbitrary nature of the existing boundary, or the area's isolation from Hammersmith and Fulham. Conversely, we considered that our draft proposal would provide a clear, long lasting boundary and remove the existing anomalies. It appeared to us that a realignment to the railway in this area would be conducive to more effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.
75. Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported this part of our draft proposal for the area north of the A40(M) Westway. Hammersmith and Fulham commented that the area is relatively remote from its borough. Kensington and Chelsea suggested that our draft proposal be modified to a centre of railway alignment. It commented that this area is functionally part of North Kensington and uniting it in its area would be in the best interests of the Council's planning and transportation policies.

76. The Kensington Conservative Association opposed our draft proposal, commenting that in community terms it saw no advantage in transferring the area to Kensington and Chelsea. It suggested that the residents of Bracewell Road had little enthusiasm for our draft proposal.

77. Three residents supported our draft proposal. One commented that residents use facilities in Kensington, and that they are easier to reach than those in Hammersmith and Fulham, from which they are separated by the A40(M) and substantial areas of offices and industrial premises.

78. We considered that, from the evidence received from the two boroughs and from local residents, there was little doubt that this thin strip of land to the east of the railway is separated from Hammersmith and Fulham and looks to North Kensington. We have therefore decided to confirm this part of our draft proposal as final.

(b) **Earls Court Exhibition Centre**

**Draft Proposal**

79. Kensington and Chelsea suggested uniting the exhibition centre in its area, on the grounds that the main part of the complex is already located in Kensington and Chelsea, and that the Council licenses and services the entire facility.
80. Hammersmith and Fulham suggested realigning the boundary along the eastern side of the West London railway line in the vicinity of Earls Court, thereby uniting Earls Court 2 in its area, but leaving the main part of the exhibition centre in Kensington and Chelsea. In response to Kensington and Chelsea's suggestion that the whole of the site should be united in Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham expressed the view such a realignment would create an unnecessarily convoluted boundary. It commented that access to Earls Court 2 was from Lillie Road, in Hammersmith and Fulham, and that any traffic problems arising from the events at the exhibition centre would have to be tackled by its Council. It also expressed the view that, if there were a need for the site to be united in a single borough, it should be united in Hammersmith and Fulham.

81. The Hammersmith Labour Party supported Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion that the boundary should be realigned along the eastern side of the West London railway line. Earls Court Olympia, owners of the exhibition centre, said that the exhibition site should be united in one borough to facilitate the planning and licensing controls. The Metropolitan Police also suggested that the complex should be united in one authority.

82. We recognised that both authorities have to deal with additional traffic and parking problems when the exhibition centre is in use. However, we took the view that the administration of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, including the arrangements for planning, licensing and safety, would be facilitated if it were united in one borough. As the main part of the complex is currently in Kensington and Chelsea, and it is primarily accessible from that Borough, we concluded that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the exhibition centre in Kensington and Chelsea.

83. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment round the western curtilage of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, uniting it in Kensington and Chelsea.
Final Proposal

84. Our draft proposal was supported by Earls Court Olympia and, in principle, by Kensington and Chelsea and the London Tourist Board. However, it was opposed by Hammersmith and Fulham, the Association of London Authorities and six local residents, three of them officials of the Empress Place Action Group.

85. Kensington and Chelsea considered that the Seagrave Road car park and the access to the exhibition centre from Lillie Road, which it said was linked with Earls Court 2 in a planning agreement, should be included in the proposed transfer. It suggested that the boundary should be realigned to the south of the car park, the centre of Seagrave Road, the north side of the car park, the centre of the railway, the south of Earls Court 2 and around the curtilage of the Lillie Road access, to join our draft proposal. North of Earls Court, Kensington and Chelsea suggested a centre of railway alignment, on the grounds that the land to the east of the railway is affected by a proposal to construct a road link to the exhibition centre. It said that our draft proposal would separate the proposed road link from Kensington and Chelsea, from which it would obtain its only access.

86. The London Tourist Board also suggested uniting the Seagrave Road car park in Kensington and Chelsea, on the grounds that it plays a major part in servicing the complex. The London Tourist Board also suggested a west side of railway alignment along the West London railway line.

87. Hammersmith and Fulham opposed the transfer of Earls Court 2 on the grounds that local residents, especially those in Empress Place, were seriously affected by the activities of the exhibition centre, and would be deprived of representation on the authority responsible for its control and development. The Council also considered that our draft proposal would produce a convoluted boundary, which would not be obvious on the ground, and that its positive impact on the delivery of services would be limited.
88. Hammersmith and Fulham pointed out that it was considering a planning application for a new road which would connect the Seagrave Road car park with the Earls Court complex. Earls Court Ltd would be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Seagrave Road Link, which would be a private right of way. The Council commented that the new road would not solve all the problems of the traffic generated by the Earls Court Exhibition Centre; it believed its Council should continue have the ability to protect the interests of local residents who are affected by traffic related to the exhibition centre. The Council cited the Royal Tournament as an example of an event which affected local residents because of the extensive security arrangements which were needed. At present, Hammersmith and Fulham had an involvement through its licensing and planning functions. Were we to confirm our draft proposal, the Council believed that the interests of Fulham residents would not be effectively represented.

89. Hammersmith and Fulham reported that it had circulated a letter to residents directly affected by the activities of Earls Court. Of over 100 replies received, 88 had agreed that it would be in the interests of Fulham residents if Earls Court 2 were to remain in Hammersmith and Fulham.

90. The Council resubmitted its original suggestion to unite Earls Court 2 in its area.

91. The Association of London Authorities opposed our draft proposal for the same reasons as those given by Hammersmith and Fulham. It added that the Centre can attract up to 2000 vehicles per day to service exhibitions, approximately 1800 of them using the Seagrave Road car park. It concluded that dividing Earls Court 1 and Earls Court 2 between two authorities might appear anomalous, but that uniting them in one borough would mean the effective exclusion of the other from having an influence on the activities of the centre, which impinges heavily on the lives of residents.

92. Six local residents, three of them officials of the Empress Place Action Group, also opposed our draft proposal, on the
grounds that Earls Court 2 would be controlled by a council which does not represent the residents affected by the exhibition centre. They supported Hammersmith and Fulham's suggestion to unite Earls Court 2 in its area, and commented that, as our draft proposal would leave the new access roads and the Seagrave Road car park in Hammersmith and Fulham, Earls Court Olympia would still have to deal with two boroughs. It was suggested by two of the residents that if the Earls Court Exhibition Centre were to be united in Kensington and Chelsea, the residential area most affected by the activities of the exhibition centre should also be transferred to Kensington and Chelsea. One resident believed that an additional exhibition hall might be built on the site of the Seagrave Road car park.

93. The objective of our draft proposal had been to unite the exhibition centre itself in one authority, thereby facilitating licensing, planning and safety controls. We considered Kensington and Chelsea's suggestion that the Seagrave Road car park and the access to the exhibition centre from Lillie Road should also be transferred to its authority. However, the car park is separated from Kensington and Chelsea by the West London railway line and Brompton Cemetery, and access to it is through Hammersmith and Fulham.

94. We recognised that the residents of both boroughs encountered traffic and parking problems when the exhibition centre is in use, and considered that Earls Court Olympia could not avoid continuing to consult both boroughs on traffic related issues. Moreover, we took the view that the retention of the Seagrave Road car park in Hammersmith and Fulham would mean that Fulham residents would, through their elected representatives, continue to have considerable influence over the avoidance of nuisance and disturbance associated with events taking place at the Earls Court Exhibition Centre. We therefore saw no justification for the suggested transfer of the residential area adjoining Earls Court 2 to Kensington and Chelsea.

95. As no planning permission has been granted for either of the proposed link roads, we considered that it would be premature to consider modifying our draft proposal, as suggested by Kensington
and Chelsea, to take account of either road. Similarly, we considered the possible development of a third exhibition hall to be purely speculative.

96. We concluded that our draft proposal would provide the best alignment to unite the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, while safeguarding the interests of Fulham residents affected by exhibition traffic using the Seagrave Road car park. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

Summary

97. In aggregate, we have therefore concluded that effective and convenient local government would be best served by an east side of railway alignment between the River Thames and Little Wormwood Scrubs, except for a diversion to unite the Earls Court Exhibition Centre in Kensington and Chelsea.

Draft Proposal

98. Kensington and Chelsea suggested a realignment of the boundary to unite Little Wormwood Scrubs in Hammersmith and Fulham, on the grounds that the majority of this recreation ground is already situated in that borough.

99. Hammersmith and Fulham also suggested uniting Little Wormwood Scrubs in its area, by realigning the boundary along the eastern edge of Little Wormwood Scrubs, and then north to the Grand Union Canal. The Council said that it was already responsible for maintaining the whole of the recreation ground. The Hammersmith Labour Party submitted an identical suggestion to that of Hammersmith and Fulham.

100. We considered that, as the major part of Little Wormwood Scrubs is already in Hammersmith and Fulham, uniting it in that borough would facilitate its administration and maintenance. However, we noted that Hammersmith and Fulham’s suggestion for the boundary north of Little Wormwood Scrubs did not follow
ground detail, and concluded that such a realignment would not improve significantly on the existing boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Kensington and Chelsea’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

**Final Proposal**

101. Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith and Fulham Conservatives supported our draft proposal. However, Kensington and Chelsea, having originally suggested such a realignment, opposed it, and suggested instead uniting Little Wormwood Scrubs in its area. The Council said that the recreation ground is already mainly used by Kensington and Chelsea residents from Dalgarno Gardens and is not easily accessible from Hammersmith and Fulham. It remarked that this is the only substantial open space available to Kensington and Chelsea residents in this area.

102. We maintained our view that, as Little Wormwood Scrubs forms part of the larger area of open space to the west, in Hammersmith and Fulham, its administration and maintenance would be facilitated if it were united in that authority. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

**INTERIM DECISION TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS**

**(d) Kensal Green Cemetery**

103. Hammersmith and Fulham and the Hammersmith Labour Party suggested uniting the whole of Kensal Green Cemetery in Kensington and Chelsea, by realigning the boundary north across the Westbourne Park-Acton railway, west along the edge of the towpath of the Grand Union Canal, and north along the boundary between St Mary’s Roman Catholic Cemetery and Kensal Green Cemetery.

104. There was no indication that the existing arrangements for maintaining the cemetery have caused difficulties, and we considered that Hammersmith and Fulham’s suggestion, taken together with our final proposal for Kensington and Chelsea’s boundary with Brent at College Park, would result in a very
unusual and undesirable salient. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals.

105. Kensington and Chelsea opposed our interim decision and suggested uniting Kensal Green Cemetery in its authority, on the grounds that this would ensure a consistent approach to planning and conservation policy, and simplify matters for the cemetery company. Hammersmith and Fulham did not comment.

106. We observed that Kensington and Chelsea’s suggestion would split St Mary’s cemetery from its northern access. As Kensal Green Cemetery is in private ownership and we had received no evidence to suggest that the existing arrangements present any difficulties to its administrators, we considered that there would be no apparent benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government in seeking to unite the cemetery in one borough. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

107. Our final proposals will have 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

108. 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

109. A separate letter is being sent to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham 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 proposals letters of 4 March and 3 April 1992, and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed

K P J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Commission Secretary
13 August 1992
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## CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES

<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>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Sands End Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB South Stanley Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB North Stanley Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Walham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB North Stanley Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Walham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Redcliffe Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Walham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB North Stanley Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Walham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Earls Court Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Gibbs Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Gibbs Green Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Earls Court Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Earls Court Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Gibbs Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Abingdon Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Avonmore Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Holland Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Brook Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Holland Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Brook Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Holland Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith And Fulham LB Brook Green Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB Addison Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Holland Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB White City and Shepherds Bush Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Avondale Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB White City and Shepherds Bush Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Avondale Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Kelfield Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Kelfield Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB Kelfield Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB St Charles Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea LB St Charles Ward</td>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham LB College Park and Old Oak Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX C

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

**Boundary between Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London Railway Line</td>
<td>Realignment along the east side of the West London railway line from the River Thames to Little Wormwood Scrubs, except in the vicinity of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 13-78 Maps 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earls Court Exhibition Centre</td>
<td>Realignment to unite the Earls Court Exhibition Centre in Hammersmith and Fulham.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 79-96 Map 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wormwood Scrubs</td>
<td>Realignment to unite Little Wormwood Scrubs in Hammersmith and Fulham.</td>
<td>Paragraphs 98-102 Map 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>