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

LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH THE LONDON BOROUGHS OF ENFIELD, HACKNEY AND HARINGEY, AND WITH THE DISTRICT OF EPPING FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF ESSEX

AND THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD AND ITS BOUNDARY WITH THE DISTRICT OF EPPING FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF ESSEX, IN THE AREA OF THE LEE VALLEY

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. We 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 Waltham Forest's boundaries with Enfield, Hackney, Haringey and Epping Forest, and that part of Enfield's boundary with Epping Forest south of the M25 motorway in the area of the Lee Valley. Waltham Forest's boundaries with Redbridge and Newham are being considered separately, as part of our reviews of the London Boroughs of Redbridge and Newham respectively.

APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

General

6. We have thought it appropriate to commence this report with some relevant general considerations on the Review of London which have been raised by our examination of Waltham Forest 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 we have been given (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 borough 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 part of 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 the formation of these boroughs 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. Waltham Forest is an outer London borough. Our guidelines advise us that special care needs to be taken 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.

Significant boundary features

11. As with the outer London boundary, when reviewing the boundaries between London boroughs we have sought, where possible, to find clear realignments which will not be overlaid by development within a short period of time. However, the boundaries between London boroughs are mostly based on historic lines, following those of former authorities, and often pre-dating the urban development that created the present built-up area of London. Accordingly, many of these boundaries do not relate to well defined features, whether natural or otherwise. This has meant that, in many cases, we have had to consider boundaries meandering through areas of similar characteristics.

12. Our attempts to rectify even the worst anomalies have frequently met with strong resistance, both from residents and the boroughs concerned. We have consequently refrained from proposing changes to boundaries in a number of cases which, at the outset of our review, had seemed desirable, but which have been opposed.

13. However, in the context of this review of Waltham Forest, we identified the Lee Valley, with its reservoirs, marshlands and watercourses as one of the few remaining natural barriers in London, clearly separating residential areas to its east and west. We considered that the opportunity afforded by the Lee Valley to provide long-lasting, well-defined boundaries in this
part of North East London should not be lost, and have pursued this objective during the course of this review. It is for this reason that this report includes consideration of the boundary between Enfield and Epping Forest south of the M25 in the area of the Lee Valley.

THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

14. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Waltham Forest, Enfield, Hackney and Haringey. Waltham Forest did not, however, make any suggestions for changes to the boundaries which are the subject of this report. We also received submissions from Essex County Council and Epping Forest District Council. Essex County Council advised us that it did not wish to propose any changes to the boundary between Essex and Greater London; it did, however, comment on those submitted by Epping Forest District Council. We also received a suggestion from a commercial firm for a change to Waltham Forest's boundary with Enfield.


Draft Proposals

15. The existing boundary between Enfield and Epping Forest follows the former course of the River Lee. Consequently, the boundary is ill-defined in the north, in the area known as Enfield Lock, and divides King George’s Reservoir in the south. Enfield and Epping Forest submitted identical suggestions to unite Enfield Lock and King George’s Reservoir in Enfield by a realignment following, from north to south, the Rammey Marsh Flood Relief Channel, the Cattlegate Flood Relief Channel and the River Lee Diversion. The Councils submitted this suggestion on the grounds that the area of Enfield Lock, which includes a Royal Ordnance site, is accessible only from Enfield. In addition, we were informed that the existing boundary, by dividing the
reservoir and several properties, also causes administrative difficulties for all local authorities.

16. Essex County Council supported the suggestion that King George's Reservoir should be united in Enfield but, north of the Reservoir, it commented that it would prefer realignment along the River Lee rather than the Rammey Marsh and Cattlegate Flood Relief Channels.

17. We considered that the defaced and ill-defined boundary in this area required rectification. In considering the suggestions made to us, we noted that Essex County Council's suggestion to adopt the River Lee as the boundary north of the Reservoir would not resolve the current situation whereby the Royal Ordnance site, adjacent to Enfield Lock, is isolated between the Cattlegate Flood Relief Channel and the existing boundary. We considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the Royal Ordnance factory at Enfield Lock to be within the authority from which it derives access. We noted that the realignment offered by the Rammey Marsh Flood Relief Channel, the Cattlegate Flood Relief Channel and the River Lee Diversion, as suggested by Enfield and Epping Forest, would achieve this, while providing a well-defined and durable boundary. We therefore adopted Enfield and Epping Forest's suggestion as our draft proposal for this section of their boundary south of the M25.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND ENFIELD

Draft Proposals

18. We noted that this boundary also follows the old course of the River Lee. Consequently, it arbitrarily divides the King George's and William Girling Reservoirs, adjacent open land to the south, the Lee Valley Trading Estate, and the Banbury Reservoir.
19. Enfield suggested a realignment along the River Lee Diversion to unite the King George's Reservoir, the William Girling Reservoir and the Lee Valley Trading Estate in Enfield, and the Banbury Reservoir in Waltham Forest. Enfield's suggestion was supported by a commercial firm (a developer of part of the Lee Valley Trading Estate), on the grounds that the existing boundary causes confusion and administrative problems.

20. We considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the Lee Valley Trading Estate to be united in one authority, and that it has an affinity of interest with the larger industrial area in Enfield, to the west. We noted that Enfield's suggestion would unite the Lee Valley Trading Estate in Enfield, rectify the defaced stretch of boundary in the vicinity of the reservoirs and provide an identifiable and durable realignment. We therefore decided to adopt Enfield's suggestion as our draft proposal for this area.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HARINGEY

Draft Proposals

21. The existing boundary is undefined as it passes from north to south down the Lee Valley, dividing the Banbury, Lockwood and Warwick West Reservoirs. Haringey suggested a realignment along the River Lee Flood Relief Channel, the western banks of the High and Low Maynard Reservoirs and the River Lee. This suggestion would have the effect of uniting Banbury and Warwick Reservoirs in Waltham Forest and Lockwood Reservoir in Haringey.

22. We noted that Haringey's suggestion would provide a well-defined boundary. However, we considered that, to be consistent with our draft proposals to the north and south, between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane the realignment should follow the River Lee Diversion. We also noted that this modification would have the effect of uniting all the reservoirs in the area in Waltham Forest. We therefore decided to adopt Haringey's suggestion as
our draft proposal, subject to a modification to follow the River Lee Diversion between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HACKNEY

Draft Proposals

(a) Boundary along the River Lee

23. In the main, the existing boundary follows the course of the River Lee, but is ill-defined in the areas of Warwick Reservoir West, Horse Shoe Point and the Leyton and Hackney Marshes. Hackney suggested that in these areas the boundary should be realigned to the centre of the River Lee.

24. We considered that a realignment along the centre of the River Lee would provide a clear boundary and unite Warwick Reservoir West, the wharves at Horse Shoe Point and land at Leyton Marshes in Waltham Forest. We therefore decided to adopt Hackney’s suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to an additional realignment to the centre of the river where the existing boundary meanders towards the north bank between the Hackney and Leyton Marshes.

(b) Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground

25. We noted that in the area of the Hackney Marsh the existing boundary diverts from the River Lee and is ill-defined and defaced as it passes through Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground, and crosses a railway line and other British Rail property. Neither Waltham Forest nor Hackney submitted any suggestions for realignments in this area. However, we considered it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to rectify the current division of property and create a clearly defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt a realignment to the northern curtilage of the Recreation Ground as our draft proposal for this area.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND EPPING FOREST IN ESSEX

Interim decision to make no proposals

26. The existing boundary between Waltham Forest and Epping Forest extends eastwards from King George’s reservoir and, passing to the north and east of urban development, meets the boundary between Waltham Forest and Redbridge to the east of Chingford. We received no suggestions for change to this boundary.

27. Our draft proposals for the Enfield/Epping Forest and Waltham Forest/Enfield boundaries, described in paragraphs 15 to 20 above, have the consequence of eliminating that section of the Waltham Forest/Epping Forest boundary which currently passes arbitrarily through the King George’s Reservoir and north along the River Lee Diversion. As a result of these draft proposals, the Waltham Forest/Epping Forest boundary would terminate in the west at the point where it joins the realigned Enfield boundary along the centre of the River Lee Diversion.

28. We considered the remainder of Waltham Forest’s boundary with Epping Forest to be satisfactory and, in the absence of any suggestions for change, took an interim decision to make no proposals for change.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

29. The letter announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions was published on 19 September 1988. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Waltham Forest, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey and Epping Forest District Council were asked to publish a notice announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, the above-mentioned London Borough Councils, Epping Forest District Council and Essex County Council 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 14 November 1988.

RESPONSE TO OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS/INTERIM DECISIONS

30. We received a total of eight responses to our draft proposals letter. They comprised comments from all the local authorities involved and from a commercial firm. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority advised us that it had no comments to make on our draft proposals.

OUR FINAL PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS


31. Enfield, Epping Forest and Essex County Council all supported our draft proposal to rectify this ill-defined and defaced boundary by means of a realignment along the Rammey Marsh Flood Relief Channel, the Cattlegate Flood Relief Channel and the River Lee Diversion. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND ENFIELD

32. Our draft proposal, to unite the Lee Valley Trading Estate and the King George’s and William Girling Reservoirs in Enfield, was supported by Enfield and by a commercial firm. However, Waltham Forest opposed our draft proposal and submitted an alternative suggestion to realign the boundary along the River Lee Navigation north of Chalk Bridge. This suggestion would have the effect of uniting the Lee Valley Trading Estate and the William Girling Reservoir in Waltham Forest, rather than in Enfield. Waltham Forest commented that the activities and traffic associated with both these areas had the greater impact on
residents of its Borough. Both Enfield and the commercial firm refuted Waltham Forest’s claims.

33. We considered it likely that the residents of both Enfield and Waltham Forest were affected by traffic and parking problems arising from the Lee Valley Trading Estate, and were not convinced that the reasons given by Waltham Forest in support of its alternative suggestion were justified. Furthermore, we noted that Waltham Forest’s suggestion would perpetuate the division of the King George’s Reservoir. We reaffirmed our view that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the Lee Valley Trading Estate to be united in Enfield and that a realignment along the River Lee Diversion would provide the clearest and most durable boundary in this area. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HARINGEY

34. Waltham Forest supported our draft proposal to unite the Banbury, Lockwood and Warwick (West) Reservoirs in its authority by means of a realignment along the River Lee Diversion and the River Lee. Haringey opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that, by modifying its original suggestion for that stretch of boundary between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane, we had divided the Lockwood Reservoir and a small area of Tottenham Marshes from the main part of the Marshes in Haringey. Haringey maintained that in so doing we had failed to take account of the homogeneity of the Marsh area. The Council considered that Lockwood Reservoir and the Tottenham Marshes share a unified ecological identity and that the area, which was being developed as an educational resource, should be planned and administered as a whole. The Council therefore resubmitted its original suggestion that, between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane, the boundary should be realigned along the River Lee Flood Relief Channel and the western banks of the High and Low Maynard Reservoirs.
35. We had noted during our initial consideration of this area that Haringey's suggestion provided a well-defined boundary. However, we had adopted an alternative alignment along the River Lee Diversion between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane, to be consistent with our draft proposals to the north and south.

36. In considering the further information provided by Haringey in response to our draft proposal, we took the view that, if the Lockwood Reservoir and Tottenham Marshes have been identified as sharing a common ecological interest, it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for them to be managed as a whole. We concluded that this outweighed the benefits to be derived from seeking to unite all three reservoirs in Waltham Forest. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal, and to issue a further draft proposal for a realignment south from Chalk Bridge along the River Lee Flood Relief Channel and the western banks of the High and Low Maynard Reservoirs, to rejoin our draft proposal at the River Lee, to the north of Ferry Lane.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HACKNEY

(a) Boundary along the River Lee

37. Both Waltham Forest and Hackney supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the centre of the River Lee at Warwick (West) Reservoir, Horseshoe Point, and in the area of the Leyton and Hackney Marshes. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal for these areas as final.

38. However, Waltham Forest also suggested that, to the north of the Lea Bridge, the boundary should be similarly realigned where it currently departs from the course of the River Lee, passes arbitrarily through a further area of the Leyton Marshes and separates the Essex and Eastwood Wharves from Waltham Forest.
39. We agreed that this area clearly looks to Waltham Forest, and that access to the wharves is only obtainable from that Borough. We therefore decided to adopt Waltham Forest’s suggestion as our further draft proposal in the area of the Essex and Eastwood Wharves.

(b) Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground

40. Both Waltham Forest and Hackney supported our draft proposal to realign the boundary along the northern curtilage of the Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground to avoid the division of British Rail properties. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND EPPING FOREST (ESSEX)

Interim decision to make no proposals

41. Waltham Forest, Epping Forest District Council and Essex County Council all supported our interim decision to make no proposals for this boundary. In the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

RESPONSE TO OUR FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS: OUR FINAL PROPOSALS

42. Our further draft proposals letter was issued on 26 April 1991. The local authorities concerned were asked to ensure that it received the same publicity as our original draft proposals. Copies of our letter were also sent to all those who had made representations to us on the issues covered by our further draft proposals. Comments were invited by 21 June 1991.

43. In response to our letter of 26 April 1991, we received comments from Waltham Forest, Hackney and Haringey. The Metropolitan Police and the Enfield and Haringey Family Health Services Association informed us that they had no objections to our further draft proposals. The North East Thames Regional
Health Authority and the London Waste Regulation Authority stated that they had no comments to make.

44. As required by section 60(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, we have carefully considered all the representations made to us and set out below our final proposals.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HARINGEY

45. Haringey supported our further draft proposal to realign the boundary from Chalk Bridge along the River Lee Flood Relief Channel and the western edges of the High and Low Maynard reservoirs, to rejoin our original draft proposal at the River Lee, slightly north of Ferry Lane.

46. Waltham Forest opposed our further draft proposal on a number of grounds. The Council considered that the Lockwood Reservoir should be united with the other nine reservoirs which lie south of the Tottenham Marshes, and which are known as the Walthamstow Reservoirs. Waltham Forest pointed out that the other nine reservoirs in the group currently lie within its area, and that both vehicle and pedestrian access to Lockwood Reservoir is obtained from the other reservoirs in Waltham Forest, not Haringey, from which, it maintained, there is no access.

47. Waltham Forest also disputed Haringey’s claim that Tottenham Marshes and Lockwood Reservoir are one ecological area and commented that, within the Walthamstow Reservoirs, Lockwood Reservoir is an integral part of a large site of European conservation interest and should not be detached from the rest of the group. Additionally, the Council stated that the only vehicle access to that part of the Tottenham Marshes which, under our original draft proposal, would have been transferred to its authority, is from Waltham Forest, and that the nearest residents also live in that Borough. Waltham Forest therefore suggested that, between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane, we should revert to
our original draft proposal and adopt the River Lee Diversion as the boundary in this area.

48. We noted that the Walthamstow Reservoirs are all managed by Thames Water Utilities Ltd. We also noted that, largely on account of its visiting and resident bird population, the group is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and that, in addition, English Nature has proposals to further designate the area as a Special Protection Area (SPA) under a 1988 EC Directive. We further noted that, unlike Lockwood Reservoir, the Tottenham Marshes are not part of the SSSI or the proposed SPA.

49. We considered that the further evidence submitted in response to our further draft proposal indicated that the main area of ecological sensitivity in the Lee Valley is that designated by the SSSI. Furthermore, we were able to establish the existence of only a minimal relationship between the Tottenham Marshes and the Lockwood Reservoir. We considered that the Lockwood Reservoir has greater links with Waltham Forest, and the other reservoirs, than with Haringey, and that effective and convenient local government demanded that the interests of this group of reservoirs, which comprise the SSSI, should be given a higher priority than those of the Tottenham Marshes. We concluded that unifying the Walthamstow Reservoirs, including the Lockwood Reservoir, in Waltham Forest would reflect the community of interest of the area and simplify liaison between conservation interests and the local authority. Further, as we originally concluded, adoption of the River Lee Diversion would be consistent with our draft proposals to the north and south. We have therefore decided to withdraw our further draft proposal and confirm our original draft proposal, to realign the boundary along the River Lee Diversion, between Chalk Bridge and Ferry Lane, and the River Lee, as final.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN WALTHAM FOREST AND HACKNEY

(a) Boundary in the vicinity of the Essex and Eastwood Wharves, River Lee

50. Waltham Forest supported our further draft proposal to realign the boundary along the centre of the River Lee north of Lea Bridge thereby transferring the Essex and Eastwood Wharves to its area. Hackney expressed its regret over the loss of its links to riverside activity across the river. However, in recognition of the fact that the river presents a considerable obstacle to movement, the Council accepted the principle of our further draft proposal. Accordingly, in the absence of opposition, we have decided to confirm as final our further draft proposal to realign the boundary to the centre of the River Lee north of Lea Bridge.

CONCLUSION

51. We believe that our final proposals and decisions, 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

52. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Waltham Forest, Enfield, Hackney and Haringey, the District of Epping Forest and the County Council of Essex, 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 we have fulfilled our 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 proposals letters of 19 September 1988 and 26 April 1991 and to those who made written representations to us.
Signed:  

G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

K J F ENNALS

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

R D COMPTON
Secretary
23 January 1992
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**ANNEX B**

*All transfers are within Greater London unless otherwise stated*
**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES**
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rammey Marsh, Enfield</td>
<td>Realignment to the</td>
<td>31, 32, &amp; 33,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock and King George’s Reservoir</td>
<td>Rammey Marsh and</td>
<td>Maps 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattlegate Flood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relief Channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the River Lee Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary between Waltham Forest and Enfield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George’s and William Girling Reservoirs and the Lee Valley Trading</td>
<td>Realignment to the</td>
<td>45 to 49, Maps 3 &amp; 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>River Lee Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boundary between Waltham Forest and Haringey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Realignment of the boundary to the</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Marshes and the Walthamstow Reservoirs</td>
<td>Realignment to the</td>
<td>45 to 49, Maps 3 &amp; 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Lee Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the River Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boundary between Waltham Forest and Hackney

Warwick Reservoir (West), Horseshoe Point and the Hackney and Leyton Marshes

Realignment of the boundary to the centre of the River Lee

Paragraphs 37 to 39
Maps 4 & 6

Essex Wharf, Lea Bridge

Realignment of the boundary to the centre of the River Lee

Paragraph 50
Map 5

Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground

Realignment of the boundary to the northern curtilage of the Hackney Marsh Recreation Ground

Paragraph 40
Maps 6 & 7