

Ret. To Rm 123

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.529

Review of Electoral Arrangements
BOROUGH OF
CHELMSFORD

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN Mr G J Ellerton CMG MBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr J G Powell FRICS FSVA

MEMBERS Lady Ackner

Mr G R Prentice

Professor G E Cherry

Mr K J L Newell

Mr B Scholes OBE

TO THE RT. HON. DOUGLAS HURD MP
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE BOROUGH OF CHELMSFORD
IN THE COUNTY OF ESSEX

BACKGROUND

1. The present electoral arrangements for the Borough of Chelmsford date from 6 May 1976 when the District of Chelmsford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975, giving effect to the proposals contained in our Report No. 49, came into force. Under these arrangements the Borough Council consists of 60 members representing 30 wards, ten returning one member, ten returning two members, and ten returning three members. Elections are of the whole council.

2. In September 1984 the Chief Executive of Chelmsford Borough Council wrote to us stating that the level of representation throughout the Borough was poor, and that two wards in particular, Boreham and Springfield, and South Woodham Ferrers, were under-represented and would become more so in future because of development in each of the two areas. In a further letter in November 1984, the Chief Executive stressed that levels of representation would, by 1989, further deteriorate, and that only a review of the electoral arrangements for the whole borough would result in a satisfactory situation. The Chief Executive also stressed that his Council hoped we would be able to conduct a review to effect revised arrangements in time for the next local elections, due to take place in 1987.

3. We decided to conduct a further review of the district electoral arrangements in accordance with the provisions of section 50(3) of the Local Government Act 1972. We formally announced the start of the review on 30 January 1985 by means of a letter to the Borough Council, in which we invited them, having regard to Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, to prepare and submit to us a draft scheme of electoral arrangements for the whole of their area. Copies of the letter were

also sent for information to Essex County Council, all the parish councils in the borough, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties, local newspapers and the local government press. The start of the review was also announced by public and press notices.

BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DRAFT SCHEME

4. The Borough Council submitted a draft scheme to us on 6 September 1985. The draft scheme, showing 1985 electorates and 1990 forecast electorates, provided for 28 wards, seven returning three councillors, twelve returning two councillors and nine returning one councillor, giving a revised council size of 54. Seven of the proposed wards - Cathedral, Patching Hall, The Lawns, Great and Little Leighs and Little Waltham, Woodham Ferrers North, East and West Hanningfield/^{and} Galleywood - were exactly coterminous with existing wards of the same name, and existing names had been used for the majority of the remaining wards.

5. The Borough Council also forwarded 14 comments they had received on their draft scheme as a result of it having been advertised locally prior to its submission to us. The comments were from the Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party, and the Chelmsford District Labour Party, the Braintree Constituency Labour Party, the Little Baddow Branch of the Chelmsford Constituency Conservative Association, the Chelmsford Constituency Group of the Social Democratic Party, the Rt. Hon. Norman St. John-Stevas MP, the parish councils of Danbury, Great Waltham, Highwood, Little Baddow, Pleshey, Rettendon and South Hanningfield, the Little Baddow Conservation Society and one private individual.

6. The Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party accepted the need for an electoral review but objected to the Borough Council's draft scheme and submitted one of their own based on retention of the existing council size of 60. They claimed that their scheme allowed for future growth in the electorate

up to 1991, gave maximum representation, produced a more equitable distribution of councillors in both the urban and rural parts of the Borough, and in particular gave an additional councillor to each of the under-represented wards of Springfield and South Woodham Ferrers. They disagreed with the Borough Council's approach, in so far as it sought to establish a smaller council now so as to be able simply to increase its size after 1990/91 to reflect any increase in electorate which might then occur. They believed that the scale and location of development beyond 1991 could not be predicted, and that any significant growth at that time would call for a further electoral review. The Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party wrote to us direct following submission of the draft scheme, stating in response to comments made on the Labour Party's scheme by the Borough Council, that they had considered producing a scheme based on a council size of less than 60, but had rejected it. They felt the Labour Party scheme met the relevant statutory requirements and should be considered on its merits.

7. Braintree Constituency Labour Party supported the alternative scheme put forward by the Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party. In particular they objected to the grouping of the parishes of Highwood and Writtle in the Borough Council's draft scheme, as these areas are in separate parliamentary constituencies and it would be preferable in their view if district ward boundaries did not cross parliamentary constituency boundaries.

8. The Chelmsford Constituency Group of the Social Democratic Party fully supported the Borough Council's draft scheme of representation,

9. Little Baddow Parish Council stated that their parish should be allowed to retain its own councillor and they therefore objected to the Borough Council's draft scheme as it would place the parish in a 3 member ward with the parishes of Danbury

and Sandon, Danbury Parish Council, the Little Baddow Branch of the Chelmsford Constituency Conservative Association, the Rt. Hon. Norman St. John-Stevas MP, the Little Baddow Conservation Society and one private individual wrote letters in support of the objection made by Little Baddow Parish Council.

10. Great Waltham Parish Council opposed the idea of a smaller Borough Council, which they felt would not best serve the interests of the rural areas of Chelmsford. They considered that the Borough Council's draft scheme was too far-reaching, showed little regard for the grouping of different communities, and would cause confusion because proposed ward boundaries did not match those of county electoral divisions. The Parish Council preferred to see the existing electoral arrangements left unchanged. If, however, a change was to be made, they particularly objected to being grouped under the draft scheme with the parish of Broomfield. They felt that they should form a 2 member ward together with the parishes of Great and Little Leighs, Little Waltham and Pleshey.

11. Pleshey Parish Council claimed closer ties with the parish of Great Waltham than with the parish of Chignall with which they had been grouped under the draft scheme.

12. Highwood Parish Council objected to the Borough Council's proposing to place them in the same ward as the parish of Writtle, and stated they would prefer to remain with the parish of Margaretting; failing that they would opt to form part of a ward comprising the parishes of Chignall, Good Easter, Highwood, Mashbury, Pleshey and Roxwell.

13. Rettendon Parish Council objected to the Borough Council's grouping of Rettendon within the same ward as the parish of Runwell; they expressed a preference for a ward comprising the parishes of Rettendon and East and West Hanningfield.

14. South Hanningfield Parish Council objected to the reduction in the level of their areas representation on the Borough Council which they believed would result from the scheme.

15. Boreham Parish Council wrote to the Borough Council following submission to us of the draft scheme in effect expressing their support for it.

16. Following submission of the draft scheme, Chelmsford Borough Council wrote to us stating that they had decided to revise certain of the parish groupings to reflect local wishes. As a result, the parish of Writtle would be in a ward by itself; the parish of Highwood would form part of a ward comprising Chignal, Good Easter, Highwood, Mashbury and Roxwell; and the parish of Pleshey would form part of a ward comprising Broomfield, Pleshey and Great Waltham. Highwood Parish Council wrote to us to reiterate their preference for being grouped with the parish of/ Margaretting. The Borough Council also wrote to us asking that the ward of Woodham Ferrers North be renamed "Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre" to reflect the new name of the parish, which had been enlarged following the parish review of the borough.

FURTHER CONSULTATION - COMMISSION'S DRAFT PROPOSALS

17. We considered the draft scheme together with the representations received. We noted that none of the proposed Borough ward boundaries would run through unwarded parishes or parish wards so the requirements of paragraph 3(2)(b) and (c) of Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act were met. We noted also that if adopted the draft scheme would by 1990 secure some improvement in the overall standard of representation within the Borough - indeed none of the proposed wards would have a level of representation which deviated more than 20% from the Borough average. However in our view the draft scheme still fell short of sufficient numerical equality of representation between the wards. The Labour Party scheme would/provide a marginally better overall standard of representation by 1991, but it included two very large wards - one to return six councillors, the other seven - and one which would be heavily under-represented. This last point seemed to us a particular disadvantage.

18. It was not clear to us ^{why} exactly/the Borough Council had proposed a reduction in council size. In our letter announcing the start of the review we had drawn attention to the flexibility

within the 30-60 council size range, and we were concerned in case the Council had interpreted that as positive guidance towards a smaller council. We felt that the Borough Council might themselves have been able to produce a more equitable scheme had they considered a larger council. We therefore decided to ask the Borough Council to explain the reasoning behind their proposal for a reduced council, and to give them the opportunity of producing a revised scheme on the basis of a larger council if that enabled them to secure greater equality of representation. Any such revised scheme could then be considered along with the Labour Party scheme. A letter to this effect was sent to the Chief Executive of Chelmsford Borough Council on 19 May 1986.

19. The Chief Executive of the Borough Council sent us a very detailed reply on 9 July 1986. His letter explained how his Council, after comparing the sizes of councils and electorates in districts throughout England, had concluded that a range between 54 and 57 would be reasonable for Chelmsford. The letter went on to explain how the Council finally agreed upon a 54 member scheme and why they had rejected various alternatives. It also contained forecast electorates updated to 1991. The Chief Executive's letter also made it clear that part of the Council's reasoning in proposing a smaller council was to leave room for the addition of further members later, to respond to future growth in population, which they saw occurring in discrete blocks, without exceeding the normal maximum of 60. The Council recognised that it would clearly be contrary to the Local Government Act 1972 to take into account population growth outside the five year period when calculating the ratio of electors to Councillors, but considered that the continuity and stability in representation such a margin would ensure was a legitimate consideration in establishing the size of the Council.

20. We noted that there were only two areas - Springfield and South Woodham Ferrers - where there would be a marked difference in the forecast electorate

figures between the years 1990 and 1991, and that the Chief Executive was of the opinion that in the light of the 1991 figures the Council might well have recommended that an additional councillor should be allocated to each of those areas. We considered that although the Labour Party 60 member scheme provided a reasonable representation there was some indication of urban weighting and, as we have already said, one of the proposed wards would be heavily under-represented by 1991. Consequently, we concluded that a 56 member scheme would provide a better overall level of representation. We further noted the measure of local agreement which had been achieved by the Borough Council's scheme. We took note of the further argument advanced by the Chief Executive, in favour of leaving room for growth in the electorate beyond 1991. We had some doubt about this line of argument, bearing in mind that the only guidance in the Act as to the proper period for consideration is the five years mentioned in paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 11. We noted however that the Council's choice of a size of 54 did not depend on that argument alone but also on their comparison of sizes in other Districts and on their view as to the proper and effective discharge of the Council's business.

21. We decided therefore to issue draft proposals based on Chelmsford Borough Council's draft scheme, amended to provide an additional member in both the Springfield and South Woodham Ferrers areas to take account of large scale continuing development. We also decided to incorporate in our draft proposals the revisions to the groupings of some parishes, which, in the interests of reflecting local ties, the Borough Council had suggested, following submission of their scheme, and to incorporate the alteration of the name of the Woodham Ferrers North ward to Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre, to reflect the name of the new parish proposed under the parish review. Our draft proposals included some minor technical adjustments at Ordnance Survey's suggestion

in order to produce better defined boundaries - these had been agreed in principle by the Borough Council.

22. Our draft proposals were issued on 1 October 1986. Details were sent to everyone who had received our consultation letter or had been involved in the draft scheme. Notices were also inserted in the local press announcing that the draft proposals had been issued and were available for inspection at the Borough Council's offices.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT PROPOSALS

23. We received eight representations in response to our draft proposals. Chelmsford Borough Council agreed to accept the draft proposals. The Little Baddow Conservation Society expressed concern that the parish of Little Baddow was to be grouped with the parishes of Danbury and Sandon, and asked us to reconsider our proposal. They felt that since the population of Danbury is so much greater than that of Sandon and Little Baddow, Little Baddow would be completely outvoted in elections, and stressed the separate and rural nature of the village. Rettendon Parish Council reiterated their earlier objections and stated that whilst they accepted the principles of redrafting boundaries to take account of population growth and resettlement, they did not wish to be amalgamated with Runwell. Great Waltham Parish Council expressed their continued opposition to the whole concept of a review, contended that the Borough Council's scheme did not take account of local ties and maintained that they did not wish to form part of the same ward as the parish of Broomfield. The Broomfield and Chignal Branch of the Braintree Constituency Conservative Association also objected to the grouping of the parishes of Broomfield, Pleshey and Great Waltham and the inclusion of the North Melbourne area in a ward in the unparished area of Chelmsford. Their objections were supported by a private individual. Highwood Parish Council again asked that they be

placed within the same ward as the parish of Margaretting.

24. The Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party objected to our draft proposals and forwarded a revised alternative scheme for a council which would return 60 members. In their view we had received no remit from either the Borough Council or the local community to propose a council of less than 60 members. The Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party stated that the Borough Council's original decision to propose a smaller council for the purposes of their draft scheme had been made on the basis that additional members could be added at a later stage in areas where growth had taken place. They stated that the additional members in the South Woodham Ferrers and Springfield wards as embodied in our draft proposals would take each ward to the normal maximum of three members and would mean that ward boundaries would still have to be redrawn if additional representation was required because of future growth, so invalidating the continuity argument. They asked us to reconsider our draft proposals and put forward a scheme which would return 60 members or hold a local enquiry to establish whether or not the local community wanted a permanently reduced council size. The Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party pointed out that their alternative scheme, as revised, broke down the larger wards in South Woodham Ferrers and Great Baddow/Galleywood to which we had drawn attention. They also stated that the parish of Boreham, which would be heavily under-represented if their scheme were to be adopted, had expressed the desire to be in a single member ward and was in fact coterminous with the Boreham ward in our draft proposals. They claimed that the under-representation of that ward under their 60 member scheme was no more than a quirk of statistics, and that they were not aware of any local objections to their 60 member proposal.

FINAL PROPOSALS

25. As required by section 60(2)(d) of the 1972 Act, we have considered the representations made to us.

26. We have noted the concern expressed by the Little Baddow Conservation Society, but note that a single member ward for the parish of Little Baddow would be heavily over-represented, and that a two member ward for the parishes of Danbury and Sandon would be heavily under-represented. We also noted that there was no other parish with which Little Baddow could be grouped conveniently because of its location on the edge of the borough.

We have noted the concern expressed by Rettendon Parish Council about their being placed in the same ward as the parish of Runwell, but it would appear from the representations they have made to us that they are under the misapprehension that this would lead to the amalgamation of the parishes of Rettendon and Runwell for the purposes of parish government - this would not in fact be the case. We have given careful consideration to the suggestion made by Great Waltham Parish Council that they be placed in a two member ward together with the parishes of Pleshey, Little Waltham and Great and Little Leighs but noted that to do so would have an adverse effect on the entitlements of a number of other wards and we were not satisfied that there would be any satisfactory way of regrouping the parishes in that area. We have considered the suggestion made by the Broomfield and Chignal branch of the Braintree Constituency Conservative Association and a private individual that the parishes of Broomfield and Chignal be grouped to form a district ward but we noted that the electorate of such a ward, if allocated one member, would be heavily under-represented and, if allocated two, would be heavily over-represented. We have noted the concern expressed by the Conservative Association about the inclusion of the North Melbourne area within the St Andrews and Patching Hall wards but we noted that the North Melbourne

area is being transferred to the unparished area under the parish review due to take effect on 1 April 1987. To retain North Melbourne in the same ward as Broomfield or Chignal, therefore, would result in a ward boundary crossing a parish boundary, which would be contrary to the provisions of Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. We have noted the continuing wish of Highwood Parish Council to be grouped in the same ward as the parish of Margaretting but concluded that our draft proposals would secure a more even standard of representation in this area.

27. We have given careful consideration to the comments made by the Chelmsford Constituency Labour Party and the Chelmsford District Labour Party. We noted their request that we should hold a local enquiry to establish whether or not the local community wish a permanent reduction in the size of the council. We concluded, however, that there had been sufficient local consultation, and that a local enquiry or meeting would not provide us with further information. We also considered the request that we should put forward as our final proposals the Labour Party revised alternative scheme. We noted that in this revised alternative scheme those wards which, in the earlier Labour Party scheme, had fallen outside our normal size limits were now broken down into smaller units. We should like to make clear that when considering the first Labour Party alternative scheme on formulation of our draft proposals, we had in fact considered the possibility of breaking down the oversize wards, but such a course would not in itself have remedied what we saw at that time as other defects in the Labour Party scheme - the oversize wards were not the main problem. We have noted the point that the Boreham ward as envisaged in our draft proposals is exactly coterminous with the Boreham ward in the Labour Party revised alternative scheme, but we do not consider that the under-representation of the ward under that scheme

can be dismissed as a "quirk of statistics". In our view that under-representation, together with the continuing element of urban weighting, makes the Labour Party's latest scheme less attractive than that on which we had based our draft proposals, notwithstanding that it would bring about some improvement in the existing levels of representation in the borough.

28. We are satisfied that our draft proposals would provide a slight improvement in the overall standard of representation for the borough straightaway and that the standard of representation would be significantly further improved by 1991. We are also satisfied that electoral arrangements based on our draft proposals would meet the other requirements of Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals. Details of our final proposals are set out in Schedule 1 to this report. A map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries will be submitted with this report. A detailed description of those boundaries is attached as Schedule 2.

PUBLICATION

29. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the 1972 Act, a copy of this report, together with a copy of the map, is being sent to Chelmsford Borough Council and will be available for inspection at the Council's main offices. A copy of this report is also being sent to everyone else who received the consultation letter.

L.S.

Signed: G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

J G POWELL (Deputy Chairman)

JOAN ACKNER

PROFESSOR G E CHERRY

K J L NEWELL

G R PRENTICE

BRIAN SCHOLES

S T GARRISH

Secretary

20th November 1986

CHELMSFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ALL SAINTS	2
BADDOW ROAD AND GREAT BADDOW VILLAGE	3
BOREHAM	1
BROOMFIELD, PLESHEY AND GREAT WALTHAM	2
CATHEDRAL	2
CHIGNAL, GOOD EASTER, HIGHWOOD, MASHBURY AND ROXWELL	1
GALLEYWOOD	2
GOAT HALL	2
GREAT AND LITTLE LEIGHS AND LITTLE WALTHAM	1
EAST AND WEST HANNINGFIELD	1
LITTLE BADDOW, DANBURY AND SANDON	3
MARGARETTING AND STOCK	1
MOULSHAM LODGE	2
OLD MOULSHAM	3
PATCHING HALL	3
RETTENDON AND RUNWELL	2
ROTHMANS	2
ST ANDREWS	3
SOUTH HANNINGFIELD	1
SOUTH WOODHAM - COLLINGWOOD EAST AND WEST	3
SOUTH WOODHAM - ELMWOOD AND WOODVILLE	3
SPRINGFIELD NORTH	3
SPRINGFIELD SOUTH	3
THE LAWNS	2
WATERHOUSE FARM	2
WOODHAM FERRERS AND BICKNACRE	1
WRITTLE	2
	<hr/>
TOTAL	56
	<hr/>

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND
BOROUGH OF CHELMSFORD - FURTHER ELECTORAL REVIEW

FINAL PROPOSALS

- Note 1. Where a feature is described as following a road, river, canal, or similar feature, it shall be understood to follow the centre line of that feature unless otherwise stated.
- Note 2. The Unparished Area, Parishes and Parish Wards referred to in this description are those recommended to LGBC(E) by Chelmsford Borough Council in their Parish Review Report and which LGBC(E) subsequently proposed to the Secretary of State for the Department of the Environment.

ST ANDREWS WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Writtle CP crosses Roxwell Road; then northwestwards and northeastwards along that boundary to the southern boundary of Chignal CP; then northwards, eastwards and southwards along that boundary and the western boundary of Broomfield CP to the northeasternmost point of OS Parcel 1106 as shown on 1952 Microfilm (A) TL 6909, then southwards along the eastern perimeter of that Parcel to the northwesternmost point of the Athletic Stadium; then southeastwards and southwards along the northern and eastern perimeter of that Athletic Stadium to the rear curtilage of 99 St Nazaire Road; then eastwards along that curtilage and the rear curtilages of 101-121 St Nazaire Road to the eastern curtilage of those properties, then southeastwards in a straight line; crossing St Nazaire Road, to the rear curtilage of 52 St Nazaire Road; then southeastwards along that curtilage and the rear curtilage of 50 St Nazaire Road to the northern perimeter of the garages to the rear of 40-50 St Nazaire Road; then southeastwards along that perimeter and continuing southeastwards in a straight line to the western perimeter of the Sports Ground; then southwards along that western perimeter and continuing generally southwards along the western perimeter of Melbourne Park County Infants School to the southwesternmost point of that School; then southwards in a straight line to the eastern curtilage of 1 Melbourne Avenue; then

southwards along that curtilage to the rear curtilage of 171 West Avenue; then southwards along that curtilage and continuing southwards along the rear curtilages of 169-65 West Avenue; then westwards to the eastern curtilage of 2 Langton Avenue; then southwards along that curtilage and continuing southwards in a straight line to the eastern curtilage of 9 Langton Avenue; then southwards along that curtilage to the eastern curtilage of 42 Fox Crescent and continuing southwards along that curtilage and the eastern curtilages of 40-2 Fox Crescent; then southwards in a straight line to the eastern perimeter of Rainsford School; then southwards along that perimeter and continuing southwards along the eastern perimeter of the Sports Ground to a point opposite the northwesternmost point of 31 Tower Avenue; then eastwards to that point; then generally southwards along the rear curtilages of 31-1 Tower Avenue to the rear curtilage of 266 Roxwell Road, then westwards and southwards along the northern and western curtilages of that property; then southwards in a straight line to the eastern perimeter of Tower Gardens, then southwestwards along that perimeter to the southernmost point of Tower Gardens, then southwards in a straight line to the River Can, then generally southwestwards along that River to a point opposite the stream flowing southeastwards from Old Bridge to the River Can; then northwestwards to that stream and the eastern boundary of Writtle CP; then northwestwards along that boundary to the point of commencement.

PATCHING HALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, as described above, meets Melbourne Avenue; then generally northwestwards along that boundary to the southern boundary of Broomfield CP; then southeastwards generally northeastwards, southeastwards and southwards along that boundary to the River Chelmer; then southwestwards and generally southwards along that River to a point due east of the northern perimeter of the Factory to the west of

Bishop Hall Lane; then westwards to and along that northern perimeter and continuing westwards in a straight line to the eastern perimeter of the playing fields; then southwards and westwards along the eastern and southern perimeters of that playing field to the eastern curtilage of the John Henry Keene Memorial Homes; then due west to the eastern perimeter of the path to the rear of that Home; then southwards and westwards along the eastern and southern perimeters of that path to Broomfield Road; then northwards along that road to Corporation Road; then northwestwards along that road to a point in line with the eastern perimeter of the access road leading northwards to "Okeley"; then northwards to and along the eastern perimeter of that road to a point in line with the southern curtilage of "Okeley"; then eastwards to and along that curtilage and northwards and westwards along the eastern and northern curtilages of that property; then northwards to the southwestern corner of 8 Jubilee Terrace and continuing northwards along the rear curtilages of 8-1 Jubilee Terrace to the southern perimeter of the Engineering Works; then westwards, generally northwards and northeastwards along the southern, western and northwestern perimeter of that works to Kings Road; then eastwards along that road to the eastern curtilage of 2 Kings Road; then northwards along that curtilage and westwards and northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 2-44 Kings Road and continuing northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 51-45 Eves Crescent to the northernmost point of the last mentioned property, then southwestwards along the northwestern curtilage of that property to the path leading to Sunrise Avenue; then northwestwards along that path and continuing northwestwards to the rear curtilage of 39 Eves Crescent; then northwestwards, northeastwards and generally westwards along the rear curtilages of 39-1 Eves Crescent to the rear curtilage of 42 Brownings Avenue; then northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 42-64 Brownings Avenue to the southernmost point of the allotment gardens; then northwards along the eastern perimeter of that allotment garden and

continuing northwards to the southern perimeter of St Pius X RC Primary School; then westwards and northwestwards along that southern perimeter to Partridge Avenue; then southwestwards along that Avenue to the point of commencement.

THE LAWNS WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Patching Hall Ward, as described above, meets the River Chelmer; then generally northwards along the eastern boundary of that ward to the southern boundary of Broomfield CP; then eastwards along that southern boundary and continuing eastwards and generally southeastwards along the western boundary of Springfield CP to the railway leading southwestwards from Colchester to Chelmsford; then southwestwards along the centre of that railway to the River Chelmer; then generally northwestwards along that river to the point of commencement.

CATHEDRAL WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of The Lawns Ward, as described above, meets the River Chelmer; then northeastwards along that southern boundary to the western boundary of Springfield CP; then southeastwards and southwestwards along that western boundary to the River Chelmer; then westwards and northwestwards along that River and continuing northwestwards along the River Can to Stone Bridge; then northeastwards along that Bridge and continuing northeastwards and northwestwards along High Street to Tindal Square; then westwards along that Square to Duke Street; then northwestwards along that Street to the railway leading northeastwards from Chelmsford to Colchester; then northeastwards along the centre of that railway to the point of commencement.

OLD MOULSHAM WARD

Commencing at the point where the westernmost point of Cathedral Ward as described above meets the Chelmsford to Colchester railway; then southeastwards and eastwards along the southern boundary of that ward to the southern boundary of Springfield CP; then eastwards along that boundary to the western boundary of Great Baddow CP; then southeastwards, southwards, westwards, generally southeastwards and southwestwards along that boundary to the path, leading northwestwards to Moulsham Chase; then northwestwards along that path and continuing northwestwards to and along the track leading to Princes Road (Chelmsford By Pass); then southwestwards and westwards along that road and continuing in a straight line to the centre of the roundabout junction with London Road; then eastwards in a straight line to and along that road to the railway leading northeastwards from Brentwood to Chelmsford; then northeastwards along the centre of that railway to the point of commencement.

MOULSHAM LODGE WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Old Moulsham Ward, as described above, meets the western boundary of Great Baddow CP; then southwestwards along that CP boundary to the path to the rear of 41 Lime Walk; then northwestwards and southwestwards along that path to a point opposite the eastern curtilage of 47 Petrel Way; then southwards to that curtilage; then southwestwards along the rear curtilages of 47-25 Petrel Way to the northwestern corner of the last mentioned property, then southwestwards in a straight line to the rear curtilage of 23 Petrel Way; then southwestwards along the rear curtilages of 23-1 Petrel Way and 265-263 Linnet Drive; then northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 261-215 Linnet Drive to the northernmost point of the last mentioned property and continuing northwestwards in a straight line to the eastern curtilage of 213 Linnet Drive; then northeastwards, northwestwards

and southwestwards along the eastern and rear curtilage of that property and continuing southwestwards and northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 211-165 Linnet Drive; then northwestwards in a straight line to the rear curtilage of 163 Linnet Drive and continuing northwestwards and westwards along the rear curtilages of 163-119 Linnet Drive; then northwestwards along the rear curtilages of 29-40 Fir Tree Rise and 20-18 Hornbeam Close to the rear curtilage of 507 Galleywood Road; then northwards, westwards and southwards along that curtilage to the southwestern curtilage of 135 Longstomps Avenue; then northwestwards along that curtilage to Longstomps Avenue; then northwards along that Avenue to a point opposite the southern curilage of 128 Longstomps Avenue; then westwards along that curtilage to the rear curtilage of that property; then northwards along the rear curtilages of 128-126 Longstomps Avenue to the southern curtilage of 124 Longstomps Avenue; then westwards along that curtilage to the rear curtilage of that property; then northwards, eastwards and generally northeastwards along the rear curtilages of 124-2 Longstomps Avenue and continuing northeastwards in a straight line to the southern boundary of Old Moulsham Ward, as described above; then eastwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along that boundary to the point of commencement.

GOAT HALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Writtle CP meets London Road at Widford Bridge; then northeastwards, northwards and eastwards along that road to the southern boundary of Old Moulsham Ward as described above; then eastwards along that boundary to the western boundary of Moulsham Lodge Ward as described above; then generally southwards and eastwards along the western and southern boundaries of that ward to the western boundary of Great Baddow CP; then southwestwards along that parish boundary and continuing southwestwards along the western boundaries of Galleywood CP and Stock CP to the eastern

boundary of Margaretting CP; then northwestwards and generally northwards along the eastern boundaries of Margaretting CP and Writtle CP to the point of commencement.

WATERHOUSE FARM WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Goat Hall Ward, as described above, meets the eastern boundary of Writtle CP at Widford Bridge; then generally northwards along that parish boundary to the southern boundary of St Andrews Ward as described above; then northeastwards along that boundary to the eastern boundary of that ward; then southeastwards along the River Can to a point opposite the eastern curtilage of 34 Rainsford Avenue; then northeastwards to and along that curtilage and continuing northeastwards along the eastern curtilage of 25 Rainsford Avenue and the rear curtilages of 21-1 Rainsford Avenue to the southern perimeter of the Works; then southeastwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along that perimeter to the rear curtilage of 91 South Primrose Hill; then northeastwards along that rear curtilage and the rear curtilages of 93-109 South Primrose Hill and the western curtilage of 21 Primrose Hill to Primrose Hill; then northwestwards along that Hill to Rainsford Road; then eastwards and southeastwards along that road to Rainsford Lane; then southwestwards along that lane to Parkway; then southeastwards along Parkway to the western boundary of Old Moulsham Ward, as described above; then southwestwards along that boundary and continuing generally southwestwards along the northern and western boundary of Goat Hall Ward, as described above, to the point of commencement.

ALL SAINTS WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Patching Hall Ward, as described above, meets the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward, as described

above, then eastwards, generally southeastwards and eastwards along that southern boundary to the western boundary of The Lawns Ward, as described above; then southeastwards along that boundary to the northwestern boundary of Cathedral Ward, as described above; then southwestwards along that boundary and continuing southwestwards along the western boundary of Old Moulsham Ward, as described above, to the northern boundary of Waterhouse Farm Ward, as described above; then northwestwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along that boundary to the eastern boundary of St Andrews Ward; then northwards along that boundary to the point of commencement.

BADDOW ROAD AND GREAT BADDOW VILLAGE WARD

The Baddow Road Ward and the Village Ward of Great Baddow CP.

BOREHAM WARD

The parish of Boreham.

BROOMFIELD, PLESHEY AND GREAT WALTHAM WARD

The parishes of Broomfield
 Great Waltham
 Pleshey

CHIGNAL, GOOD EASTER, MASHBURY, HIGHWOOD AND ROXWELL WARD

The parishes of Chignal
 Good Easter
 Highwood
 Mashbury
 Roxwell

EAST AND WEST HANNINGFIELD WARD

The parishes of East Hanningfield
West Hanningfield

GALLEYWOOD WARD

The parish of Galleywood

GREAT AND LITTLE LEIGHS AND LITTLE WALTHAM WARD

The parishes of Great and Little Leighs
Little Waltham

LITTLE BADDOW, DANBURY AND SANDON WARD

The parishes of Danbury
Little Baddow
Sandon

MARGARETTING AND STOCK WARD

The parishes of Margaretting
Stock

RETTENDON AND RUNWELL WARD

The parishes of Rettendon
Runwell

ROTHMANS WARD

The Rothmans Ward of Great Baddow CP.

SOUTH HANNINGFIELD WARD

The parish of South Hanningfield.

SOUTH WOODHAM - COLLINGWOOD EAST AND WEST WARD

The Collingwood East Ward and the Collingwood West Ward of South Woodham Ferrers CP.

SOUTH WOODHAM - ELMWOOD AND WOODVILLE WARD

The Elmwood Ward and the Woodville Ward of South Woodham Ferrers CP.

SPRINGFIELD NORTH WARD

The Springfield North Ward of Springfield CP.

SPRINGFIELD SOUTH WARD

The Springfield South Ward of Springfield CP.

WOODHAM FERRERS AND BICKNACRE WARD

The parish of Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre

WRITTLE WARD

The parish of Writtle.