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REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON, THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON
BEXLEY AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH DARTFORD, BARKING AND DAGENHAM, HAVERING AND THURROCK

COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT AND PROPOSALS

INTRODUCTION

1. 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 and wrote to each of the local authorities concerned.

2. Copies of our letter were sent to 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 those government departments, regional health authorities, the Metropolitan Police, water authorities, electricity and gas undertakings which might have an interest, as well as to local television and radio stations serving the Greater London area and to a number of other interested persons and organisations.

3. 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.
4. A period of seven months from the date of our letter was allowed for all local authorities and any person or body interested in the review to send us their views on whether changes to the 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.

5. This report concerns the Bexley/Dartford boundary from the River Thames to Chalk Wood and Bexley's river boundaries with Barking and Dagenham, Havering and Thurrock. On the Bexley/Dartford boundary, we received submissions suggesting change in the area of Birchwood Corner and Upper Hockenden. However, as this section of the boundary also affects the London Borough of Bromley, Sevenoaks District Council and Swanley Town Council, it will be considered as part of the review of the London Borough of Bromley. Bexley's boundary with Greenwich will be considered as part of review of the London Borough of Greenwich.

APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

6. As this is one of the first of our reports on London boundaries, we have thought it appropriate to commence with some relevant general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of Bexley this and other London borough areas.

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

Wider London Issues

9. Our review of the London boroughs and the City of London is the first such review to have been undertaken since their formation in 1965, under the provisions of the London Government Act 1963. Although our view remains that this Review is not the right occasion for a fundamental reappraisal of the extent of London or the pattern of London boroughs, which would inevitably raise questions about the nature and structure of London government, we do see it as very much part of our role to identify and record any general issues which arise and which may need to be brought to the attention of any body charged with undertaking a more fundamental review of London in the future.

The outer boundary of London

10. In his guidelines, the Secretary of State said that special care would be required in considering changes to the outer boundary of Greater London, because the distribution of functions is different within and without that boundary. The Commission's press notice also referred to the particular problems presented by the outer London boundary, which does not always follow the edge of the built-up area and where the relevance of the M25 and the Green Belt would need to be considered. We have borne in mind the need to find, if possible, a clear boundary for outer London which
will not be rapidly overlaid by development. On the other hand, where continuous development already spills over the outer London boundary, we may not necessarily seek to extend the boundary up to the limit of that development. Indeed, the conurbation of London has in some places already stretched far into the countryside along salients of development. We have to reach a balanced view as to where the boundary should lie, taking account of shape, community ties and the impact of major and new infrastructure, as well as the extent of development.

More specifically, in relation to our review of Bexley's boundary with Dartford, we noted that continuous development has overlain the boundary between Crayford and Dartford. While the local authorities concerned had proposed only minor changes to the boundary in this area, in the light of our guidelines to give special care to the outer boundary of Greater London, we considered whether effective and convenient local government might be better served by more extensive adjustments of the boundary east of Crayford. However, we concluded that there is unlikely to be any alternative boundary that would offer clear benefits, and felt that we should confine our draft and final proposals to minor changes. Our draft proposals for this area are given in paragraphs 26-31 below. They address the problem of the boundary dividing properties and roads, but it seems inevitable that neighbouring houses will find themselves in different authorities.

London's Green Belt

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

THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

13. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987 we received representations on the Bexley/Dartford boundary from the London Borough of Bexley, Dartford Borough Council, Kent County Council and from various interested organisations and residents.

14. During the consultation period, both Bexley and Dartford carried out surveys seeking the views of residents who might be affected by proposals to change the boundary. Bexley wrote to residents of the Joyden’s Wood estate and of the Maypole area (in Dartford) requesting their assistance with a survey and asking whether they wished to remain in Kent. In response, three petitions with a total of 2,880 signatures were presented to Dartford objecting to boundary change in these areas and were subsequently forwarded to us. Letters of protest were sent to us by Wilmington Parish Council, Mr Robert Dunn MP and three individuals. Dartford also sent questionnaires to the residents of Joyden’s Wood and Maypole asking them to indicate their preference between living in Kent or Greater London. Of the 1,229
forms completed only five indicated a preference for Greater London.

15. Dartford conducted a similar exercise among the Bexley residents of Baldwyns Park, Coldblow and that part of Crayford south of the Bexley/Dartford railway line. The Baldwyns Park survey proved inconclusive while those for Coldblow and Crayford indicated a majority against transfer to Kent.

16. In the event, Bexley submitted no suggestions to us in respect of Joyden's Wood or Maypole. Dartford, however, submitted suggestions in respect of Baldwyns Park, Joyden's Wood, Coldblow and part of Crayford. Our consideration of these suggestions is discussed below.

**BEXLEY'S RIVER BOUNDARIES WITH BARKING AND DAGENHAM, HAVERING AND THURROCK**

17. We considered Bexley's river boundaries as part of our initial consideration of the Borough's boundaries with Dartford. However, references to them were unfortunately omitted from our subsequent draft proposals letter.

18. We had received no suggestions for alterations to the river boundaries in response to our letter of 1 April 1987 and were not ourselves minded to propose any realignments. We have consequently considered whether the publication of an interim decision to make no proposals would be justified, given the stage now reached in our review of Bexley's land boundaries. Having confirmed with all the local authorities concerned that they at least have no wish to submit suggestions to us in respect of the river boundary, we have concluded that publication would not be justified.

We have consequently decided to confirm our interim decision as final.
19. We are nevertheless concerned that no body or individual should be disadvantaged as a result of our interim decision not having been publicised. Copies of this report are being sent to all those who have made representations to us, and to other interested parties. In addition, it is being given the normal publicity. We are therefore satisfied that interested parties will have the opportunity to comment on the river boundary to you direct, should they so wish.

20. The remainder of this report concerns Bexley’s boundary with Dartford.

**BEXLEY’S BOUNDARY WITH DARTFORD**

**SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES AND OUR INITIAL CONCLUSIONS**

**DRAFT PROPOSALS**

**(a) Land North of Thames Road**

21. The London Borough of Bexley had suggested the transfer from Bexley to Dartford of some grazing land between the Thames Road Depot and the Borough boundary. Kent County Council and Dartford Borough Council had supported this suggestion in principle. The reason given for the suggestion was that the land is required for the construction of a northern by-pass for Dartford.

22. In view of the agreement of all the local authorities concerned we decided to adopt Bexley’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

**(b) Stanham Farm**

23. Dartford had suggested the realignment of the boundary between the Bexley/Dartford railway line and Slade Green Station east of Maiden Lane. This stretch of the boundary currently follows the line of the River Stanham. Dartford suggested that it
be realigned to follow the railway between Crayford and Dartford Stations. The effect would be to unite Stanham Farm in Dartford, which the Council argued would be more convenient in planning terms.

24. The suggestion was supported in principle by Kent County Council but opposed by Bexley, on the grounds that no advantage would be gained by altering a well-established boundary.

25. We concluded that the case for transfer outweighed Bexley’s opposition and accordingly adopted Dartford’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

(c) Maiden Lane and Crayford Road

26. Bexley had suggested realigning the boundary, which currently follows the centre of Maiden Lane and Crayford Road, to the edge of the road, thereby making Kent County Council the sole highway authority in this area and facilitating efficient highway maintenance. Dartford had suggested a similar realignment, which was supported by the County Council.

27. We agreed that highway maintenance would be facilitated by the suggested realignment. In view of this and the agreement between the councils, we decided to adopt Bexley’s suggestion as our draft proposal for this area.

(d) Waltham Close

28. Bexley had suggested the transfer of the properties numbered 16-50 (even) Waltham Close to Dartford, so that the whole of Waltham Close would lie in that Borough. Dartford had submitted a similar suggestion, supported by Kent County Council.

29. Given the agreement between the Councils, we decided to adopt Bexley’s suggestion as our draft proposal for this area, subject
to realigning the boundary between Waltham Close and Chastilian Road to fence detail.

(e) **Chastilian Road and Station Road**

30. Both Bexley and Dartford had suggested boundary realignments in the area of Chastilian Road and Station Road. Kent County Council had supported Dartford’s suggestion, as it would result in the whole of Chastilian Road and its junction with Heath Road being under the County Council as Highway Authority.

31. We preferred Dartford’s suggested realignment and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

(f) **The former Gun Club site**

32. Bexley had suggested the transfer of some open land, formerly the site of a gun club, from Dartford to Bexley, on the grounds that, as the site is likely to be developed, it should be administered by a single planning authority. Kent County Council supported the suggestion.

33. We agreed with Bexley’s argument and decided to adopt its suggestion as our draft proposal.

(g) **Joyden’s Wood/Chalk Wood**

34. Bexley had suggested two options for this area of woodland and open space, either:

   (a) a major realignment of the boundary to transfer most of Joyden’s Wood (but not the adjoining housing estate) to Bexley on the grounds that the area is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and would be better served if control were exercised by a single authority; or
(b) a minor realignment of the boundary north of Chalk Wood, transferring some land owned and managed by Bexley, but located in Dartford, to Bexley.

35. Both Dartford and Kent County Council had opposed the first option, stating that a positive advantage had been gained in terms of conservation by the involvement of all three local authorities in protecting this area of open space. However, the County Council supported Bexley's second, less radical, suggestion on the grounds that the transfer would facilitate the making and enforcement of local bye-laws.

36. We noted the County Council's observations and agreed that there appeared to be no difficulty with the provision of local government services in the area. Accordingly, we decided against Bexley's suggestion for a major realignment and adopted the Council's second, less radical, suggestion as our draft proposal.

(h) Baldwyns Park

37. Dartford had suggested the transfer of the community of Baldwyns Park from Bexley to Dartford. Kent County Council supported the suggestion.

38. We considered that the results of the survey carried out by Dartford among the residents of Baldwyns Park were inconclusive but agreed with the County Council that the estate appeared to link the communities of Maypole and Joyden's Wood Estate, both in Dartford. Accordingly, we decided to adopt Dartford's suggestion as our draft proposal.

INTERIM DECISIONS TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS

(a) Part of Crayford south of the Bexley/Dartford railway, Coldblow, Baldwyns Park and Joyden's Wood

39. In its submission to us, Dartford had stated that the natural
boundary dividing Greater London from Kent follows a track to the west of Joyden's Wood woodland and the Coldblow Estate and then the Bexley/ Dartford railway line. It sought the transfer of the area to the south and east of that line to Dartford. However, in its own response, Kent County Council indicated that it had found insufficient evidence to support Dartford's suggestion for this area.

40. We considered all the survey and mapping evidence produced by Dartford in support of its suggestion. We noted that difficulties were said to exist in the provision of local government services for residents of that part of Crayford south of the railway line. However, we were not satisfied that the railway line was a distinctly better alternative to the present boundary; it can be crossed in three places and divides the obvious community of Crayford. Nor did we feel that there was any major difficulty in the provision of services. Accordingly, we took an interim decision to make no proposals in respect of this area.

(b) Bexley Hospital

41. Bexley had suggested the transfer of Bexley Hospital from Dartford to Bexley, on the grounds that the Hospital is owned and managed by Bexley Health Authority whose boundaries are otherwise coterminous with those of the Borough.

42. Dartford opposed this suggestion, stating that the Hospital had been part of the Borough of Dartford since 1899 and that its location had never caused any problems with the delivery of health services. Kent County Council also opposed the suggestion.

43. We considered all the evidence presented to us by the local authorities concerned and by Bexley Health Authority. However, we were not convinced by the arguments in favour of transferring the Hospital and felt that such a change would not lead to any obvious benefits. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals.
ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

44. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 11 July 1988. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. The London Borough of Bexley and Dartford Borough Council were asked to publish a notice announcing our proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the Borough Councils and Kent County Council were asked to post copies of this 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 12 September 1988.

RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS:

45. We received a total of 113 responses to our draft proposals letter. They included comments from the London Borough of Bexley, Dartford Borough Council, Kent County Council, three from interested organisations and two from local Members of Parliament. The remainder were from members of the public.

46. As indicated in paragraph 14 above, following our letter of 1 April 1987 announcing the commencement of the review, both Bexley and Dartford had carried out surveys of residents in both the Joyden's Wood and Maypole areas of Dartford. These surveys had elicited a considerable reaction against any change and, as a result, neither authority submitted suggestions to us for these areas. For similar reasons, we had made no draft proposals for Joyden's Wood estate or Maypole. Nevertheless, we mentioned the issue in our draft proposals letter and, in response, received 52 letters from members of the public in support of the status quo in these areas. Mr Robert Dunn MP also wrote to us supporting our draft proposals in general.
47. One resident of the Joyden's Wood estate, in supporting the estate's retention in Dartford, suggested that postal addresses should be co-terminous with post codes. However, this matter is not within the scope of our review.

OUR FINAL PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

(a) Land North of Thames Road

48. We received no comments on our draft proposal to transfer grazing land north of the Thames Road Depot to Dartford, to facilitate the construction of the northern by-pass. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(b) Stanham Farm

49. We received two objections to our draft proposal to realign the Bexley/Dartford boundary from the course of the River Stanham to the side of the Bexley/Dartford railway line, transferring some land from Dartford to Bexley.

50. The tenant farmer and part-owner of Stanham Farm opposed our draft proposal, stating that it would split the farm, currently wholly in Dartford. A similar representation was received from GA Property Services acting on behalf of Swaisland Settled Estates, also owners of land at the farm, claiming that there would be no advantage to be gained in altering a well-established boundary, which might cause further complications for their clients by splitting their land holdings between two authorities.

51. It is not our normal practice to recommend boundary realignments which divide properties. However, it would appear that the main access to Stanham Farm is north from Thames Road, in Bexley, and that the River Stanham, on which the existing boundary is based, is now little more than a ditch and no longer the natural boundary in this area. We also understand that the area subject to our draft proposal may have development potential,
which may have already generated interest. This latter factor argues in favour of the area being under the control of a single planning authority. We have carefully considered the two objections received to our draft proposal but we feel they are not based on the broader considerations of effective and convenient local government which we must take into account. Consequently, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(c) Maiden Lane and Crayford Road

52. We received no comments on our draft proposal to realign Bexley’s boundary from the centre to the side of Maiden Lane and Crayford Road in the interests of facilitating efficient highway maintenance by Kent County Council. We have accordingly decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(d) Waltham Close

53. We received one objection from a resident of Waltham Close to our draft proposal for the transfer of numbers 16-50 (even) Waltham Close from Bexley to Dartford.

54. The objection centred on the provision of health and education services and a claim that Dartford’s refuse collection service was inferior to Bexley’s. However, we noted the respondent’s claim that she can draw on the health and education services provided in both authorities’ areas and the fact that refuse collection in this part of Waltham Close is undertaken by Dartford under agency arrangements with Bexley.

55. Notwithstanding this objection, we take the view that our draft proposal, based on an agreed suggestion from all three local authorities concerned, will rectify a clear anomaly where the current boundary bisects properties in a cul-de-sac. In the interests of effective and convenient local government we have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
(e) **Chastilian Road/Station Road**

56. We received one letter objecting to our draft proposal to realign the boundary in the area of Chastilian Road and Station Road.

57. The respondent, a senior citizen with mobility difficulties, objected on the grounds that a transfer to Dartford would reduce his ability to travel, in particular depriving him of a free London bus pass and London Taxi card. However, having established that the respondent’s property would be unaffected by our draft proposal, we have decided to confirm it as final.

(f) **The former Gun Club site**

58. We received one letter from Dougal Bros (Transport) Ltd, a firm of haulage contractors, registering an objection to our draft proposal to transfer this site from Dartford to Bexley.

59. The firm indicated that its property would be affected by our draft proposal and that its detailed objections would follow. However, despite written reminders, we received no further information from the firm. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(g) **Joyden’s Wood/Chalk Wood**

60. We received only one specific comment on our draft proposal for a minor realignment of the boundary as it crosses Joyden’s Wood. This came from the Woodland Trust, which owns part of the woodland area affected. We received no objections.

61. The Trust agreed with our draft proposal for only minor change in this area, commenting that while the existing boundary may cause some confusion over which fire service should take responsibility for the wood, this was a matter which it would be
discussing with the fire services concerned. We have accordingly confirmed our draft proposal as final.

(h) **Baldwyns Park**

62. Dartford Borough Council and Kent County Council supported our draft proposal for the transfer of the Baldwyns Park community and neighbouring roads from Bexley to Dartford, as did the Minister of St Barnabas Church. It was opposed by Bexley, the Rt Hon Edward Heath MBE MP, Baldwyns Park Freeholders Association and Baldwyns Park Community Committee. The latter enclosed with its submission a 332 signature petition, and the results of a further survey of residents’ views. Another 48 letters objecting to the draft proposal were received from other local organisations and members of the public.

634. Bexley opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that it would not be in the interests of effective and efficient local government. It claimed that the residents of Baldwyns Park identify with Bexley and are satisfied with the local authority services they currently receive. Bexley suggested that the present anomalous division of properties by the current boundary, in Tile Kiln Lane and Wickstead Close, could be rectified by a minor easterly realignment of the existing boundary.

64. Other representations argued that Baldwyns Park residents make extensive use of facilities in Bexley, particularly those of Bexley Village. Some also claimed that Baldwyns Park has more affinity with Coldblow than with Maypole. Nine members of the public who objected to our draft proposal suggested alternative minor realignments similar to, or the same as, that suggested by Bexley.

65. One member of the public provided details of a poll taken at a residents’ meeting to discuss our draft proposals and claimed that the majority (97%) of those who attended wished to stay in Bexley. Similar results had been obtained from a survey
undertaken by the Baldwyns Park Community Committee, with a claimed 93% of households affected objecting to our draft proposal.

66. In paragraphs 6-12 above we explain in general terms the approach we have adopted to the review of London and some of the considerations to which we shall be having regard as the review progresses. So far as London’s outer boundary is concerned, we explain that where the conurbation of London has stretched into the countryside we have to take a balanced view as to where the boundary should lie, taking account of shape, community ties and the impact of major and new infrastructure, as well as the extent of development.

67. In the light of the information provided in the representations received, we were persuaded that the Baldwyns Park area has a stronger community of interest, both social and historical, with Bexley than with Dartford. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal and to issue a further draft proposal based on the minor realignment suggested by Bexley. This further draft proposal would transfer those houses in Staple Close and Wickstead Close at present in Dartford, or divided by the Borough boundary, to Bexley. We took the view that this would produce a clearer boundary and rectify the current division of properties.

68. Our further draft proposal letter was issued on 10 July 1989. The local authorities concerned were asked to ensure it received the same publicity as our original draft proposals. Copies of our letter were also sent to all those who had received our original draft proposals letter of 11 July 1988 or who had made representations to us. Comments were requested by 4 September 1989.

69. In response, the London Borough of Bexley supported our further draft proposal, as did the Baldwyns Park Community Committee and the Rt Hon Edward Heath MBE MP. It was opposed by
Dartford, Kent County Council and four members of the public, one of whom suggested an alternative approach.

70. Dartford commented that those residents of the area who had opposed the original draft proposal had done so to avoid a higher community charge and to keep their travel concessions, grounds unassociated with the provision of effective and convenient local government services. The Borough also argued that Baldwyns Park and Joyden's Wood constitute a single built-up community in Kent and should be united under a single authority in that County; it claimed that our further draft proposal would perpetuate an undesirable Bexley salient into Dartford at Baldwyns Park.

71. We have carefully considered the arguments put to us by Dartford, supported by Kent County Council. However, having regard to the expression by the residents of Baldwyns Park of their community ties with Bexley as opposed to Dartford, their satisfaction with Bexley services and the absence of significant new evidence from Dartford or the County Council in support of Dartford's original suggestion, we are not persuaded to revert to our original draft proposal.

72. As indicated in paragraph 69 above, a resident of Staple Close, writing in opposition to our further draft proposal, suggested an alternative boundary realignment which would have the effect of uniting Wickstead Close and Staple Close in Dartford instead of Bexley. Three other representations from residents of Wickstead Close and Staple Close opposed the transfer to Bexley.

73. The suggested alternative realignment, while addressing the problem of the division of the two Closes, in our view provided no better boundary in that it still appeared to cut through an area of similar development, between Wickstead Close and Whenmen Avenue. Consequently, we feel that our further draft proposal will remove an existing anomalous boundary and unite similar development in one authority. We accordingly decided to confirm it as final.
DECISIONS TO MAKE NO PROPOSALS

(a) **Part of Crayford south of the Bexley/Dartford railway line, Coldblow, Baldwyns Park and Joyden’s Wood**

74. We received no comments on our interim decision to make no proposals for the transfer of this area from Bexley to Dartford. Accordingly, we have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

(b) **Bexley Hospital**

75. We received no adverse comments on our interim decision to make no proposals for the transfer of Bexley Hospital from Dartford to Bexley. Indeed, in commenting on our original draft proposal for the Baldwyns Park area, 26 respondents supported our interim decision. We have therefore confirmed our interim decision as final.

CONCLUSIONS

76. We commend to you our final proposals and decisions as set out in paragraphs 17-19 and 48-75 above as being in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

PUBLICATION

77. A separate letter is being sent to the London Borough of Bexley, Dartford Borough Council and Kent County Council 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 a period of six weeks from the date our final proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the attached maps illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft and further draft proposal letters of 11 July 1988 and 19 July 1989, and to those who made written representations to us.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REVIEWS OF GREATER LONDON, THE LONDON BOROUGHS AND THE CITY OF LONDON

BEXLEY LB

AFFECTING KENT COUNTY, BOROUGH OF DARTFORD

FINAL PROPOSALS

Existing LB County Boundary
Proposed LB County Boundary
Existing other Boundary
Proposed other Boundary

## 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>Greater London Bexley LB North End Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Priory Ward Dartford West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Priory Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB North End Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Gundulf Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Gundulf Ward Dartford West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Crayford Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Upton Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Heath Ward Dartford West ED</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Upton Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB St Mary's Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Maypole Ward Dartford South West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB St Mary's Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Maypole Ward Dartford South West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB Cray Ward</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Maypole Ward Dartford South West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kent County Dartford Borough Maypole Ward Dartford South West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Bexley LB St Mary's Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>