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

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON AND ITS BOUNDARIES WITH THE LONDON BOROUGHS OF EALING AND HOUNSLOW, AND WITH THE DISTRICTS OF THREE RIVERS IN HERTFORDSHIRE AND SOUTH BUCKS IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT AND PROPOSALS

INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the London Borough of Hillingdon's boundaries with the London Boroughs of Ealing and Hounslow, with the District of Three Rivers in Hertfordshire and the District of South Bucks in Buckinghamshire. We are making a number of minor proposals to remove anomalies, for example where the existing local authority boundary is undefined, or where it divides properties. We considered larger scale changes to unite Yeading, Eastbury, and New Denham and Willowbank in Hillingdon. However, in the light of the response to our draft proposals for these areas, we decided to recommend minor changes only. Our report explains how we arrived at our final proposals and decisions.

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

3. Copies of our letter were sent to the adjoining London boroughs; the appropriate county, district and parish councils bordering Greater London; the local authority associations; Members of Parliament with constituency interests; and the
headquarters of the main political parties. In addition, copies were sent to the Metropolitan Police and to those government departments, regional health authorities, electricity, gas and water undertakings which might have an interest, as well as to local television and radio stations serving the Greater London area, and to a number of other interested persons and organisations.

4. The London boroughs and the City of London were requested to assist us in publicising the start of the review by inserting a notice for two successive weeks in local newspapers so as to give a wide coverage in the areas concerned.

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

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF GREATER LONDON

6. We took the opportunity in our Report No 550, "People and Places" (April 1988), to explain in some detail the approach we take to our work and the factors which we take into consideration when conducting reviews, including the guidelines given to us by the Secretary of State (set out in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86 in the case of the reviews of London).

7. Subsequently, in July 1988, we issued a press notice, copies of which were sent to London boroughs, explaining the manner in which we proposed to conduct the review of London boundaries. In the notice we said that, from the evidence seen so far, this was unlikely to be the right time to advocate comprehensive change in the pattern of London government - although the notice listed a number of submissions for major changes to particular
boundaries which had been made to the Commission, some of which the Commission had itself foreseen in "People and Places". These and other major changes to particular boundaries are being considered by the Commission as it makes proposals for change to the boundaries of London boroughs.

8. More recently, we have felt it appropriate to explain our approach to this, the first major review of London since London government reorganisation in 1965 and to offer our thoughts on the issues which have been raised by the representations made to us, and by our consideration of them. We therefore published a general report in May 1992, entitled "The Boundaries of Greater London and the London Boroughs" (Report No 627), which discusses a number of the wider London issues which have arisen during the course of this review.

THE BOUNDARIES COVERED BY THIS REPORT

9. This report concerns Hillingdon’s boundaries with Hounslow (part), Ealing, Three Rivers in the County of Hertfordshire and South Bucks in the County of Buckinghamshire. We have already submitted to you our final proposals for Hillingdon’s boundary with Harrow (Report No 610) and for its boundary with Hounslow to the south of the M4, which was considered as part of our review of Heathrow Airport (Report No 665).

THE INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

10. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from the London Boroughs of Hillingdon, Ealing and Hounslow, Three Rivers District Council, Hertfordshire County Council, South Bucks District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Denham Parish Council and Iver Parish Council. Comments were also received from the Hillingdon Health Authority, Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee, Hillingdon Local Medical Committee, Mr Terry Dicks MP, Mr John Wilkinson MP, two Councillors and from 195 local organisations, businesses and
members of the public.

**OUR DRAFT AND FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS LETTERS, AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM**

11. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published two other consultation letters in connection with this review. The first, announcing our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, was published on 5 March 1990. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us. Hillingdon, Ealing, Hounslow, Three Rivers and South Bucks were asked to publish a notice advertising our draft proposals and interim decisions. In addition, they and the two County Councils (Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire) were requested to post copies of the notice at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 30 April 1990.

12. We received a total of 603 representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decisions, including two petitions containing a total of 1932 signatures. The majority of the representations were in response to our draft proposals for the Yeading, Northwood/Eastbury, and New Denham and Willowbank areas. They included nine submissions from the local authorities concerned, five letters from Members of Parliament, one from a Member of the European Parliament and two from local Councillors. The remainder were from interested local persons and bodies.

13. Our second letter, announcing our further draft proposals, was issued on 24 February 1992, and received similar publicity. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had made representations to us. Comments were invited by 21 April 1992.
14. In response to our further draft proposals letter, we received comments from Hillingdon, Ealing, South Bucks, the Metropolitan Police, Northolt First and Middle School, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association, the Harlington Women's Institute, the West Drayton Amenity Association and from one member of the public.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

a) Radical Suggestions

15. We received a suggestion from the Labour Group on Hillingdon Council for the transfer of Harefield, Northwood, Eastcote and parts of Ruislip to Three Rivers and Harrow. However, we had already concluded, in the context of our review of the London Borough of Harrow, that although the Harrow/Hillingdon boundary follows an arbitrary alignment, little could be achieved without a major restructuring of this part of London and of South West Hertfordshire. Additionally, we recognised that, in terms of patterns of communications and development, Hillingdon has an east-west orientation, radially centred towards inner London, yet the Borough itself lies on a north-south axis. No evidence had been adduced to suggest that the present arrangements were incapable of delivering effective and convenient local government in the area, or that radically different arrangements, such as those suggested by the Hillingdon Council Labour Group, would hold out the promise of substantial improvement. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposal for radical change, but to consider each of Hillingdon’s boundaries in turn.

16. We received no comments in response to our conclusions on the radical change, or on our interim decision to make no proposal. We have therefore confirmed our interim decision as final.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HILLINGDON AND HOUNSLow (EXCLUDING THAT PART OF THE BOUNDARY IN THE VICINITY OF HEATHROW AIRPORT)

17. We received representations from the Labour and Alliance Groups on Hillingdon Council, and from the Ealing Social Democratic Party (SDP), all of which suggested realigning the boundary north of the M4 along the present A312 and the future Hayes By-pass. However, the present boundary follows the River Crane, which is a clear physical feature in the area, and we could see little justification for the suggested change. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals for this part of Hillingdon’s boundary with Hounslow.

18. Hillingdon stated that it accepted our interim decision. Hounslow did not comment. We received no other representations, and have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HILLINGDON AND EALING

(a) Between Bull’s Bridge and Spikes Bridge

Draft proposal Maps 1-3

19. Hillingdon suggested a realignment of the boundary along the east bank of the Grand Union Canal between Bull’s Bridge and Spikes Bridge, on the grounds that the present boundary severs industrial developments and residential properties in Delamere Road from the rest of the borough. The Council’s suggestion was supported by Ealing, Mr Terry Dicks MP, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association, the Ealing Conservative Association and by one member of the public. A number of groups and organisations suggested an alternative realignment, based on the future Hayes By-pass which, when constructed, they considered would constitute a barrier between communities. However, this suggestion was opposed by Ealing, which said that a realignment to the by-pass would artificially divide existing communities.
20. We agreed that the present boundary is defective. However, it appeared to us that the Grand Union Canal was likely to be a greater barrier to east-west movement in the area than the new Hayes By-pass, which was being provided with a number of crossing points. We noted Ealing’s comment that realigning the boundary to the by-pass would split existing communities, and agreed that its use in this area would risk leaving an area of Ealing, situated between the by-pass and the canal, isolated from rest of that Borough. We therefore decided to adopt Hillingdon’s suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

21. Our draft proposal was supported by Hillingdon. Ealing did not oppose it, but suggested a modification to realign the boundary to the eastern side of the towpath between Bull’s Bridge and the Taylor Woodrow site, in order to avoid dividing the canal from its towpath.

22. A local resident suggested an alignment to the west bank of the canal to retain it in Ealing, in which authority much of the canal is already located.

23. We agreed that it would be undesirable for the canal to be split from its towpath. However, we considered that a centre of canal alignment would be the clearest alignment, and be consistent with our approach to the use of rivers as boundaries. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final, subject to a modification realigning the boundary along the centre of the Grand Union Canal.

b) Yeading

Draft proposal

24. Hillingdon suggested a number of minor realignments intended to rectify boundary anomalies in the Yeading area. Hillingdon’s
view that minor change only was necessary in this area was supported by Mr Terry Dicks MP, and by the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association. Ealing also advocated minor change only, and submitted similar suggestions. However, two members of the public and a number of groups and organisations suggested more radical adjustments to unite Yeading, through which the current boundary passes, in either Hillingdon or Ealing.

25. We observed that, as well as splitting the community of Yeading, the existing boundary divides properties, and that the suggestions by Hillingdon and Ealing did not appear to address all the anomalies. We also felt that the proposals we had received for uniting Yeading in one borough suggested the existence of a more substantial boundary problem in this area.

26. While Yeading did not appear to be a clearly defined community, we felt that the construction of the new Hayes By-pass to ease traffic on the A312, which passes through Yeading, would have the effect of strengthening the community. In view of this, and of the submissions received, we considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the Yeading area in one borough.

27. One respondent had suggested the adoption of the Yeading Brook as the new boundary, thereby uniting Yeading in Ealing. Although the Yeading Brook would have provided a clear physical break, we considered that the links of those residents who would thereby be transferred to Ealing were more likely to be with Hayes, in Hillingdon. We also observed that the majority of suggestions received from local organisations had proposed uniting Yeading in Hillingdon, which suggested that Yeading’s affinities were with that Borough, rather than with Ealing.

28. Of the other suggestions intended to unite Yeading, a number had combined the Hayes By-pass with various alignments northwards from the point at which the by-pass terminates in Yeading. These included the use of the B455, the A312, and a line to the east
of the developed area, striking northeastwards to the A40. Another suggestion was to use the A312 and the B455 as the new boundary.

29. As indicated in paragraph 20 above, we considered that the by-pass, which is provided with crossing points, would be unlikely to act as a barrier to east-west movement. Consequently we felt that its use as a boundary would create artificial divisions between a number of residential areas, as would the suggested use of either the B455 or the A312 to the north. In any event, we concluded that the balance of evidence pointed to Yeading having more affinity with Hillingdon than with Ealing.

30. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment of the boundary to the southern and western edge of Taywood sports ground, the east side of Broadmead Road, the north side of Ruislip Road, the western curtilage of Rectory Park and the south side of the Western Avenue, to unite Yeading in Hillingdon.

Further Draft Proposal

31. Our draft proposal was supported by the Radcliffe Way Estate Tenants' and Residents' Association and by three local residents. However, it was opposed by Hillingdon, Ealing, Mr Terry Dicks MP, Mr Harry Greenway MP, Mr Michael Elliott MEP, a local Ealing Councillor, 59 individuals and eleven organisations. The latter included the Ealing Branch of the National and Local Government Officers Association, Ealing Voluntary Service Council, the Greenford, Northolt and Perivale Unified Community Action Group, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association, the Ealing Association of the National Association of School Masters and Union of Women Teachers, Ealing Teachers Association, Northolt C.F.M School Parent Teacher Association and the headteachers of several local schools.

32. Hillingdon said that the existing boundary had not caused
any significant problems. Consequently, it did not accept our view that there was a need to unite the Yeading area in one authority. It also expressed concern over the considerable disruption to services which it foresaw would result from our draft proposal, noting in particular the significant differences between the education systems in Hillingdon and Ealing.

33. Ealing strongly opposed our draft proposal, and expressed the view that such a change would not reflect either the pattern of community life in this area, or the wishes of the people. It contended that uniting Yeading in Hillingdon would severely disrupt Ealing community services, such as libraries, parks and recreation facilities, and that youth and community services would also be affected. The Council considered this would have disturbing social implications.

34. Ealing was also concerned about the effect our draft proposal might have on education provision. The Council pointed out that considerable time and effort is required to build up satisfactory relationships between an authority, its schools, governors, parents and pupils and, in Ealing's opinion, any undermining of this relationship would be unacceptable. Ealing also believed that teacher recruitment could prove more difficult, as Hillingdon teachers do not receive Inner London Weighting. Consequently, Hillingdon might encounter difficulties in the retention and recruitment of teachers for those Ealing schools which would be transferred. It also considered that the difference in approach between the two Councils over special needs provision could have serious implications for the John Chilton School for the physically handicapped, which our draft proposal would transfer to Hillingdon.

35. Other areas of concern included housing and social services provision. Ealing commented that the area proposed for transfer contained approximately 2000 council properties, which represented 10% of its entire housing stock. The Council also said that a substantial proportion of its total social service
provision was currently devoted to the West End ward of the borough, of which Yeading formed a part.

36. Ealing also expressed the opinion that the transfer to Hillingdon of 5000 households, several hundred council houses and local authority buildings would have a significant impact on the provision of Ealing technical services, such as building maintenance, highways and street lighting, street cleaning and refuse collection, and would lead to diseconomies of scale.

37. The Council reaffirmed its support for the minor boundary changes which it had originally proposed.

38. Mr Terry Dicks MP opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that our recommendations had not taken sufficient account of historical factors. That part of Ealing which we had considered formed part of Yeading had never been recognised as such by local historians, nor by Yeading residents themselves.

39. Mr Harry Greenway MP and Mr Michael Elliott MEP both expressed the view that Yeading did not exist as a community. Mr Elliott explained that the area proposed for transfer had never had any significant links with Yeading, having always been part of Northolt, in Ealing, whereas the area of Yeading to the south of the existing boundary was part of the former Hayes Urban District. Mr Greenway stated that if there were a sense of community in the area proposed for transfer, it centred around Northolt. He said that Northolt had an ancient history and had grown as an integrated area, in a way in which Yeading had not.

40. The potential effect of our draft proposal on education in the area evoked particular concern from a number of respondents. The National Association of School Masters and Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT), and the Ealing Teachers' Association, commented that a boundary change would have severe repercussions on the education authorities, which were already undergoing a period of massive reorganisation of their services.
due to the introduction of Local Management of Schools (LMS). Similar comments were received from the head teachers of all the schools which, under our draft proposal, would be transferred to Hillingdon, as well as from two parent teacher associations. Respondents also drew our attention to their concern for the future of the John Chilton School for physically disabled children, which they considered offers unique opportunities for its pupils to be supportively integrated into the complex of mainstream schools with which it shares a campus.

41. The head teachers of the schools affected, writing jointly, also pointed out what they regarded as the significant differences between the education services provided by Hillingdon and Ealing. We were informed that the two boroughs had different systems of primary education, with different ages for admission and for transfer to secondary school, and that their policies for nursery education and school medical service provision also differed.

42. A number of respondents, including local voluntary organisations, referred to the possible disruption of community services and expressed concern for the future of existing local projects, particularly in the West End Ward. The National and Local Government Officers Association (NALGO) said that our draft proposal would have significant planning implications, not only for the local authorities but also for other agencies whose boundaries are co-terminous with Hillingdon and Ealing, such as the fire, police and ambulance services.

43. A local Ealing Councillor expressed concern that such services might be less accessible should our draft proposal be confirmed. He listed the services currently provided, giving their present location in relation to the affected area. He also pointed out that there is no direct bus service to Hillingdon Civic Centre, whereas there is a bus that goes direct to Ealing, via Greenford. One local resident informed us that Ealing had recently begun to devolve a number of its services to sites
within the community, where residents could apply for a full range of council services and not have to travel to the Civic Centre.

44. Many respondents commented to the effect that the area is not perceived locally as a community, and that the area of Yeading which lies to the north of the existing boundary is an integral part of the strong and active community of Northolt, in Ealing. They considered that, in seeking to unite the area of Yeading in one authority, our draft proposal divided another, more established, community centred on Northolt. Several residents of the area to be transferred under our draft proposal described both community and personal links with the area to the north. A member of the Northolt Festival Committee drew our attention to the Festival which, she contended, is a focal point for the Northolt community as a whole and is held in Rectory Park, within the area affected by our draft proposal.

45. We received responses from two clergywomen with parishioners in the area proposed for transfer. One expressed the belief that it was difficult for an area on the edge of any borough to communicate effectively with the centre. She was concerned that dividing Northolt would exacerbate an already difficult situation, and would aggravate the isolation felt by those in the Wood End part of the area. The other commented that she would regret the need to build a new network of contacts with the borough services, which is an essential part of the community liaison on which much of her pastoral work is founded.

46. Several respondents suggested realignments to define the extent of Northolt, uniting that community in Ealing. Two local residents and NALGO suggested that the boundary should be realigned along the Yeading Brook to the south. They considered that the Northolt community extended southwards to the existing boundary in Attlee Road. Other respondents said that Northolt extends northwards beyond the A40 to the Harrow border, and southwards to Yeading Lane.
47. We observed that the total number of responses from residents and local organisations had been relatively small, given the scale of our draft proposal. We felt that this supported the view, expressed by many respondents, that there was little Yeading community identity as such. Indeed, the evidence provided by respondents suggested that the northern part of the area which we had proposed transferring to Hillingdon had links with Northolt, in Ealing, and that the effect of our draft proposal would be to sever these links. We also recognised the substantial effort in terms of housing and other services, currently being committed by Ealing to its West End Ward, which the Council considered to be an area of special need. We took note of the concern expressed by both authorities, by residents and by the schools themselves, that our draft proposal would have an adverse effect on education in the area, and in Ealing as a whole, and that the differing policies of the two education authorities in relation to special needs provision, and ages of admission could also have serious implications at least in the shorter term.

48. We concluded that our perception of the existence of an identifiable Yeading community had not been substantiated by the response to our draft proposal and, furthermore, the disruption to services that would result from the transfer of north Yeading to Hillingdon could not be justified in terms of effective and convenient local government.

49. Several respondents had submitted alternative suggestions to unite the community of Northolt in Ealing. However, Mr Michael Elliott MEP had commented that, while the area to the north of the existing boundary had links with Northolt, in Ealing, the area of Yeading to the south had been part of the former Urban District of Hayes, in Hillingdon. This, together with the lack of supporting evidence, reinforced our earlier view, that it would not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to realign the boundary to the Yeading Brook, uniting the area in Ealing, or to Yeading Lane.
50. We therefore decided to withdraw the major part of our draft proposal, but to confirm as final that part of it in the vicinity of the sports and social club in Broadmead Road. We considered that, in general, the existing boundary probably best reflected the affinities of the area. However, a number of minor anomalies remained to be addressed, and we decided to consider the suggestions we had received for minor change to the boundary in this area. These are discussed in paragraphs 51 to 65 below.

c) Wayfarer Road and Dove Close, "Aircraft Estate", Northolt

Further draft proposal Map 4

51. Hillingdon, Ealing and the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association submitted almost identical suggestions to unite the whole of Wayfarer Road and Dove Close, known locally as the ‘Aircraft Estate’, in Ealing, on the grounds that it is only accessible from that authority. All the submissions had suggested a realignment to the southern and eastern curtilage of the estate, although Ealing suggested an extended realignment, to tie the boundary to ground detail to the east of the estate. The suggestions that the estate should be united in Ealing were supported by Mr Terry Dicks MP, the Hillingdon Health Authority, the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee and the Ealing Conservative Association.

52. The existing boundary is defaced, dividing property and a residential estate in the vicinity of Wayfarer Road. As the majority of the Aircraft Estate already lies within Ealing, from which authority it is accessed, we agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government to unite the estate in that authority. This could be achieved by adopting any of the suggested boundary realignments. However, we considered that Ealing’s proposed realignment, utilising the fenceline to the south and east of the estate, would provide the most clearly defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Ealing’s suggestion as our further draft proposal.
Final Proposal

53. Our further draft proposal was supported by Ealing, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association, the Harlington Women's Institute and by a member of the public. However, the latter also reiterated his preference for a realignment along the Yeading Brook, which we had considered and decided against on two previous occasions.

54. The Metropolitan Police suggested a more extensive realignment of the boundary, to unite the new Hayes By-Pass in Hillingdon. They pointed out that the existing boundary leaves most of the by-pass in the Hayes police division but that the northernmost 400 yards comes within the Southall division. The Police said that there would be a similar division of responsibility between the Ealing and the Uxbridge magistrates' courts.

55. We considered alternative realignments of the boundary to avoid the division of responsibilities drawn to our attention by the Metropolitan Police. However, it appeared to us that the issue could only be satisfactorily resolved by a realignment which would also transfer a significant number of Ealing residents to Hillingdon. In the light of the response received to our original draft proposal for Yeading, we considered that the operational and administrative benefits to the Metropolitan Police of such a realignment would be insufficient to justify severing the links which this area was said to have with Northolt, in Ealing. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

d) Kingshill Avenue

Further draft proposal Map 5

56. In Kingshill Avenue, Hillingdon suggested a minor realignment to the northern curtilage of the bridge over the
Yeading Brook, on the grounds that its authority has sole responsibility for the bridge’s maintenance. The Council’s suggestion was supported by Ealing, the Hillingdon Health Authority and by the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee. The Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association suggested a more extensive realignment of the boundary, to follow the centre of Kingshill Avenue east to Yeading Lane, on the grounds that the existing boundary divides both Bryant Road and Hughenden Gardens. The Conservative Association’s suggestion was supported by Mr Terry Dicks MP.

57. We considered that the existing boundary along the rear fence line of properties in Kingshill Road was satisfactory, and noted that we had received no evidence to suggest that the division of Bryant Road and Hughenden Gardens caused problems in service delivery. We therefore took the view that there was no justification for change on the scale suggested by the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association. However, we agreed that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the bridge over the Yeading Brook to be entirely within the authority responsible for its maintenance. We therefore decided to adopt Hillingdon’s suggestion as our further draft proposal, subject to a modification to realign the boundary to the centre of Yeading Brook, north of the bridge.

Final proposal

58. Our further draft proposal was supported by Ealing, the Harlington Women’s Institute and by a local resident. Hillingdon and the Metropolitan Police stated that they had no objections. The Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association also supported our further draft proposal, but reiterated its preference for an extension of the proposed boundary realignment to follow the centre of Kingshill Avenue eastward as far as Yeading Lane, to unite Bryant Road and Hughenden Gardens in Hillingdon.

59. We considered that the Hayes and Harlington Conservative
Association had provided no new evidence to suggest that the division of Bryant Road and Hughenden Gardens caused problems in service delivery. We have therefore decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.

f) Sharvel Lane, Northolt

Further draft proposal

60. Ealing suggested a realignment of the boundary to the south side of Sharvel Lane. We observed that the existing boundary was ill-defined to the south of Sharvel Lane and divided a number of properties, and agreed that Ealing's suggestion would rectify these anomalies and provide a clearly defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt it as our further draft proposal.

Final proposal

61. Our further draft proposal was supported by Ealing, the Metropolitan Police, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association and by the Harlington Women's Institute. Hillingdon stated that it had no objection. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

9) Area east of West End Road, including Harvey Road

Further draft proposal

62. The existing boundary is ill-defined and defaced where it passes through a sports complex and the rear of properties to the east of West End Road. We received suggestions from Hillingdon, Ealing, Mr John Wilkinson MP, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association and the Ruislip-Northwood Conservative Association for similar realignments along Western Avenue and West End Road, to rejoin the existing boundary at the northern end of the Ruislip Road. All the suggestions, which would have the effect of uniting the sports complex in Ealing and
transferring Harvey Road to that authority, were submitted primarily on the grounds that Harvey Road is isolated from the rest of Hillingdon.

63. Eleven residents of Harvey Road opposed the transfer of their road to Ealing, and expressed strong links with Hillingdon. The South Ruislip Residents' Association also pointed out that, despite the geographical location of Harvey Road, residents look to Hillingdon with regard to shopping, education, leisure, recreation and religious facilities.

64. We agreed that the current division of the sports complex was not in the interests of effective and convenient local government, and observed that Harvey Road appeared to be somewhat isolated from the main centres of both Hillingdon and Ealing. However, we also noted the significant local opposition to change, and residents' expressions of affinity with Hillingdon. We concluded that although Harvey Road is almost equidistant from South Ruislip and Northolt, it is likely that the residents look more to the former for shopping and other facilities. Accordingly we considered that the local authorities' suggestions went further than was necessary to rectify the deficiencies in the existing boundary to the east of West End Road. We therefore decided to adopt as our further draft proposal a realignment of the boundary to the rear fenceline of properties in Harvey Road, leaving them in Hillingdon, and the curtilage of the sports complex, so as to unite it with the adjacent sports ground to the east, in Ealing.

Final proposal

65. Our further draft proposal was supported by Ealing, the Hayes and Harlington Conservative Association, the Harlington Women's Institute and by a local resident. Hillingdon and the Metropolitan Police stated that they had no objections. We received no other comments, and have decided to confirm our further draft proposal as final.
THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HILLINGDON AND THREE RIVERS (HERTFORDSHIRE)

(a) Northwood/Eastbury

Draft proposal

66. We received a submission from the Ruislip-Northwood Conservative Association suggesting a realignment of the boundary to Batchworth Lane, to unite Northwood in Hillingdon, on the grounds that the ancient boundary between Middlesex and Hertfordshire had been overlain by development, creating an artificial boundary. The Association considered the area which would thereby be transferred to be physically and socially part of Northwood. The suggestion was supported by Mr John Wilkinson MP, for the same reasons. He added that residents of the area were parishioners of churches located in Hillingdon.

67. Hertfordshire County Council agreed that the present boundary splits an area of continuous development. However, the Council did not consider it possible to devise a significantly better boundary. Other than minor adjustments to realign the boundary to roads, it did not support any change.

68. While noting Hertfordshire’s comments, we considered the boundary to be arbitrary, in that it appeared to cut through an area of continuous residential development. The whole of this area, including Eastbury, was of a similar character on both sides of the present boundary. Accordingly, we did not feel that Batchworth Lane represented the northern limit of Hillingdon, as it appeared to substitute one arbitrary boundary for another.

69. We considered whether Moor Park, to the north of Batchworth Lane but to the west of Eastbury, was also part of this same development. However, Mr John Wilkinson had expressed the view that Moor Park was a separate community, and we accepted that it displayed different characteristics from Eastbury and Northwood, and that it should remain in Three Rivers.
70. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a realignment east along Batchworth Lane, north along the Northwood to Moor Park railway line, east along the rear curtilages of the houses in Westbury Road and south along Sandy Lane to rejoin the existing boundary. We considered that such a realignment would better reflect the extent of the Hillingdon urban development.

Final decision

71. Our draft proposal was supported by Hillingdon, Mr John Wilkinson MP and four individuals, all of whom agreed that the existing boundary divided the community of Northwood. One respondent considered that Eastbury was a neglected area of Three Rivers, and said that he would welcome access to the leisure and social service facilities nearby in Northwood, Hillingdon. Another resident commented that, having lived in both boroughs, he found very little difference between the two.

72. However, our draft proposal was opposed by Hertfordshire, Three Rivers, Watford Rural Parish Council, Mr Richard Page MP, a Hertfordshire County Councillor, 183 individuals and by a number of organisations. These included the South West Hertfordshire Conservative Association, the South West Hertfordshire Social and Liberal Democratic Party, Eastbury Residents Association, Moor Park (1958) Limited, Eastbury Farm School Association and the Police Federation of England and Wales Joint Central Committee. We also received a petition containing 1426 signatures opposing our draft proposal.

73. Hertfordshire considered that education and policing would be unduly affected by our draft proposal. The Council also stated that the residents of Eastbury looked to Hertfordshire for the provision of most local services. It believed that Hillingdon’s administrative centre in Uxbridge was too remote from the residents of Eastbury for our draft proposal to result in the delivery of more effective and convenient local government.
74. The County Council also reported a comment by the Chief Constable of Hertfordshire that the transfer of Eastbury to the Metropolitan Police area would split the two sections of his Force's Rickmansworth sub-division, which might result in the need for a complete review of police sub-divisional boundaries in South Hertfordshire. The Police Federation of England and Wales wrote to us in similar terms. It feared that the loss of the area proposed for transfer would necessitate the closure of Oxhey Police Station, and commented that this would have significant implications for the policing of what it considered to be a very sensitive area.

75. The County Council maintained that Eastbury residents were totally opposed to any boundary change which would take them into Hillingdon, and had no wish to be united in one authority. The Council believed that this opposition was based not only on the natural resistance to change, but reflected the allegiances and loyalties which residents felt towards Three Rivers and Hertfordshire, and their strong opposition to the planning policies exercised in Hillingdon.

76. Three Rivers pointed out that Eastbury is part of a substantial area of residential development in the south of its authority comprising, from west to east, Moor Park, Eastbury, Oxhey Hall and South Oxhey, which adjoin the southern area of Watford to the east. The Council expressed the view that these areas each have their own special character, and that the density of residential development increases from west to east in the areas described. The Council said that South West Hertfordshire is a major area of employment, and that shopping and cultural facilities are used both by Three Rivers and Hillingdon residents in the Eastbury/Northwood area. The nearest areas to Eastbury which provided facilities of comparable size and variety were said to be Uxbridge and Slough.

77. The Council argued that the ancient footpath between Eastbury and Northwood along which the existing boundary is aligned, is
logical, easily identifiable, well-defined and recognisable by the local authorities and residents alike. It expressed the view that the fact that development had taken place up to the footpath did not make the boundary arbitrary; rather, the boundary had been reinforced by the development, both physically and visually.

78. Three Rivers did not support our view that Eastbury forms a continuation of urban Hillingdon, with similar characteristics being displayed by residential areas either side of the present boundary. It commented that, over the years, Hillingdon had allowed substantial and intensive development in the Northwood area, a policy which had raised vociferous local objection. By contrast, Three Rivers had maintained a policy of low density development, in recognition of the character of the open space in the area.

79. The Council did not believe that our draft proposal would be conducive to effective and convenient local government. It was also concerned that the transfer of approximately 2,000 electors from its authority to Hillingdon, and the consequent loss of income, would severely affect the provision of services in Three Rivers as a whole. The Council also expressed concern about the effect such a transfer would have on its service contracts.

80. Three Rivers pointed out that Hertfordshire County Council has a highways agency agreement with all district councils in its area. Whilst the County Council is directly responsible for most principal roads in the county, most works on other roads are carried out on an agency basis by the district councils concerned. Thus, apart from principal roads, trunk roads and motorways, highway matters for roads in its authority were the responsibility of Three Rivers Technical Services Department. This agency agreement allowed for considerable influence to be exerted locally and, moreover, enabled the Council to be much more responsive to local problems, such as snow clearance and gritting.
81. The Council contended that, due to the proximity of its main offices and operating depots at Rickmansworth, other local government services, such as planning, housing and environmental health, would be more effectively and conveniently provided to residents of Eastbury if the area remained in Three Rivers.

82. Three Rivers also expressed concern about the effect of our draft proposal on local policing, and reported the comments of the Chief Constable.

83. Watford Rural Parish Council also opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that it would create difficulties in administration.

84. Many of the points made by Mr Richard Page MP were similar to those argued by Three Rivers. Mr Page claimed that when a petition was circulated to every household in the area, 76% of residents who responded, opposed our draft proposal.

85. Mr Page submitted three alternative suggestions for a boundary change in this area. The first was for a realignment along Green Lane, to join the existing boundary at the Greene Man public house. He contended that, apart from the clear boundary line offered by Green Lane, it also recognised the individual character of old Northwood, which would remain in Hillingdon. His second suggestion was to transfer the whole of the Northwood residential area to Three Rivers. The third would effectively transfer the whole of Hillingdon’s Northwood Ward to Three Rivers. Mr Page said that a preliminary survey in the Northwood area of Hillingdon had indicated that a substantial number of residents would favour the area’s transfer to Hertfordshire.

86. The Eastbury Farm School Association and the Chairman of the Governors of Eastbury Farm Junior Mixed and Infant School opposed our draft proposal on the grounds of disruption to local education. The School Association explained that Eastbury Farm School was built to cater for the primary schooling needs of
Hertfordshire children residing in Eastbury, Hampermill, Oxhey and those adjoining areas whose boundaries and affinities lay within the County. The Association said that, over the years, the school had developed as the centre of activity for parents and residents, both educationally and socially, and had developed close links with other primary schools in Hertfordshire, particularly in relation to sport and recreation. The Chairman of Governors stated that if the school were moved to Hillingdon, significant changes would be required in the composition of the School’s governing body, the curriculum, teaching methods, the use of local education authority support services, school management and the school development planning process.

87. Moor Park (1958) Limited considered Moor Park and Eastbury to be very similar in character, both in styles of housing, layout and in lifestyles, and expressed the view that the communities living within these areas shared many common aims and interests. It believed that our draft proposal could have serious repercussions in splitting these communities. The Company stated that it had "territorial responsibilities" both on the North and south sides of Batchworth Lane, and was concerned that if our draft proposal were approved, the company would have to negotiate with both Three Rivers and Hillingdon.

88. The Eastbury Residents' Association was concerned that the transfer of Eastbury to Hillingdon would leave Oxhey and Moor Park isolated. It also felt that Eastbury would be isolated from the centre of Hillingdon at Uxbridge. Both the Residents' Association and the South West Hertfordshire Conservative Association considered that our draft proposal would be detrimental in terms of effective and convenient local government.

89. Those Eastbury residents who wrote to us expressed strong opposition to the area’s transfer. Their opposition centred on three main points: that Eastbury looks to Rickmansworth, from where services can be, and are, in their view most effectively
delivered; that Eastbury has a 'rural' orientation and would become urbanised as a result of Hillingdon's different planning policies; and that our draft proposal would have adverse policing implications in Hertfordshire. The residents also pointed to differences between Eastbury and Hillingdon, and stated that the former had more in common with Moor Park. They also said that Moor Park and Eastbury share higher standards of street care and cleanliness, have more trees, and lower density housing with less infill development.

90. From the responses to our draft proposal, it appeared to us that both Rickmansworth and Watford were quite easily accessible from Eastbury, and that residents made use of facilities in Hertfordshire. However, Eastbury's nearest rail link is at Northwood, and we concluded that it was unlikely that Eastbury residents do not use facilities or share at least some community of interest with this urban area, to which Eastbury is contiguous.

91. We acknowledged that Rickmansworth is closer to Eastbury than Uxbridge, and that our draft proposal would result in a longer journey for those Eastbury residents who required to visit the Town Hall.

92. We considered the alternative realignments proposed by Mr Page, but concluded that these suggestions, which would have the effect of transferring a large number of residents out of Hillingdon, failed to reflect the extent of the continuous development in the area, and offered no improvement on the existing boundary.

93. We reaffirmed our view that the existing boundary separates residential areas of similar characteristics, and was a clear example of the Greater London boundary being overlain by development.

94. However, we were conscious that our draft proposal had been
vigorously opposed by a considerable number of residents and organisations, who were clearly concerned that Eastbury’s transfer to Hillingdon would have a detrimental effect on a wide range of local services. We carefully considered and weighed all the evidence provided to us concerning service provision to the Eastbury/Northwood area, residents’ links and affinities, and the wider implications of a boundary change. We concluded that, on balance, we would not be justified in confirming our draft proposal, and we have decided to withdraw it and to retain the existing boundary between Northwood and Eastbury. The footpath along which the existing boundary is aligned is clearly defined and the boundary undefaced.

b) Stocker’s Lake/Springwell Lake

Draft proposal

95. Hillingdon suggested a minor realignment to follow the Grand Union Canal west from the existing boundary, and then north and east, following the River Colne to the point at which it meets the boundary. This would unite the whole of Stocker’s Lake in Three Rivers. Hillingdon’s suggestion was supported by the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee.

96. Three Rivers agreed that the lake should be united in one authority, in view of its importance as a nature reserve. However, the Council submitted a more extensive suggestion, to use the Grand Union Canal as the new boundary, thereby transferring both Stocker’s Lake and Springwell Lake to its authority. The Council considered that the present boundary arbitrarily divided this system of lakes, rivers and waterways which primarily lie within Three Rivers. It also considered that, as the area is more accessible from its authority, its residents are affected by industrial and other activities in Hillingdon. Three Rivers’ suggestion was supported in principle by Hertfordshire County Council. However, it was opposed by Hillingdon, on the grounds that the Borough would lose one of its
Canal Locks Conservation Areas.

97. We agreed that Stocker's Lake should be united in Three Rivers. However, we felt that Hillingdon's suggestion would create an odd-shaped salient at the northwestern extremity of Hillingdon. We also accepted Three Rivers' contention that access to the industrial sites in the affected area was from its authority rather than from Hillingdon, and agreed that the Grand Union Canal would offer the best boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Three Rivers' suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final decision

98. Hertfordshire and the Police Federation of England and Wales Joint Central Committee supported our draft proposal. However, it was opposed by Hillingdon, the Hillingdon Conservation Council and by two local residents.

99. Hillingdon's grounds for opposition were that our draft proposal would result in the loss to the Borough of an attractive area of Green Belt countryside, and one which is very important for nature conservation. The Council said that it was committed to certain projects in this area, including the designation of the Hillingdon section of Stocker's Lake as a local nature reserve, and the provision of a picnic and parking area with landscaping and general environmental improvements, at the Springwell Lock Conservation Area.

100. The two local residents opposed the draft proposal on historical grounds. However, they also felt that Hillingdon had shown great skill in controlling land use in this area of Green Belt.

101. The Hillingdon Conservation Council, which advised us that it is responsible for formulating conservation planning policy and advising Hillingdon, recognised the need to rationalise the
boundary, but said that any realignment in this area should be coterminous with conservation area boundaries. The Conservation Council submitted two alternative suggestions for realignments.

102. The Conservation Council said that its experience showed that the local authorities which border the Springwell and Denham Conservation Areas (Three Rivers and South Bucks) would wish to pursue policies contrary to those of the Conservation Council and Hillingdon. It considered that the differences in local planning policy between the authorities, and their fundamentally different methods of maintaining and administering conservation areas, would inevitably lead to disharmony within each area, resulting in the eventual dilution of the essential characteristics which led to the areas' designation in the first place.

103. We agreed that the division of the conservation area should, if possible, be avoided. However, we considered that the alternative realignments suggested by the Hillingdon Conservation Council were not entirely satisfactory. The first would split the conservation area, and create a section of defaced boundary across the lake. The second followed the boundary of the conservation area, but would divide a works, situated between Springwell Lake and the canal, from its access.

104. We also reconsidered Hillingdon's original suggestion which was to realign the boundary to the Grand Union Canal and the River Colne. While superficially attractive in that it would unite Stocker's Lake in Three Rivers, we considered that the suggestion would create an undesirable salient to the west, between the river and the existing boundary.

105. We gave further consideration to the need for a boundary realignment in this area, and observed that the boundary is not defaced and, for the most part, follows the River Colne. In view of this, and in the light of the concern expressed about splitting a conservation area, we have decided to withdraw our draft proposal and retain the existing boundary.
c) Shrubs Road, Northwood Road

106. Three Rivers suggested a minor realignment to bring into its authority the whole of Shrubs Road, and a small group of cottages at the junction of Shrubs Road and Northwood Road. The Council said that as it already had responsibility for the maintenance of Shrubs Road, and provided services to nearby properties, the suggested transfer would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. It also suggested that the new boundary would be more logical and would recognise the pattern of development in the area, which the Council considered to have a greater affinity with Rickmansworth, in Three Rivers, than with Hillingdon. Hillingdon opposed the suggestion.

107. We doubted whether the cottages concerned could be considered to have a greater affinity with Three Rivers than with Hillingdon, particularly as the centres of both Harefield and Northwood (in Hillingdon) are closer than Rickmansworth, and felt that Three Rivers had provided insufficient justification in support of its suggestion. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals in this area.

108. Hillingdon noted our interim decision. However, Three Rivers resubmitted its original suggestion, though providing no further information in support.

109. In the absence of any additional justification for Three Rivers' suggestion, we have decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

d) Coppermill Lane/Park Lane

110. Three Rivers suggested a realignment of the boundary to follow the Grand Union Canal, on the grounds that the existing boundary was unsatisfactory and difficult to identify. The Council commented that, as it already provided services to properties and industrial development along the existing
boundary, it would have no difficulty in extending these services to the twelve properties fronting the canal. Hillingdon opposed the suggestion, on the grounds that it would result in the loss of part of the Coppermill Lock Conservation Area.

111. We observed that Three Rivers' suggestion would result in the transfer to that authority of twelve properties. However, we considered that these properties formed part of Mount Pleasant in Hillingdon. We therefore took an interim decision to make no proposals in this area.

112. Our interim decision was supported by three local residents and by the Hillingdon Conservation Council. Hillingdon noted our interim decision, but did not comment.

113. The local residents who responded said that there was an affinity between the houses on both sides of the canal in this conservation area, and that the canal did not form a natural boundary. One respondent suggested that the River Colne, which runs to the rear gardens of the houses concerned, forms a natural boundary between Mount Pleasant and the remainder of Valley Bottom. Another respondent considered that the area looks towards Harefield and Hillingdon rather than towards Maple Cross and Rickmansworth (Three Rivers) or Denham (South Bucks).

114. In supporting our interim decision, the Hillingdon Conservation Council commented that Three Rivers had permitted development bordering the Coppermill Conservation Area. As an alternative to Three Rivers' suggestion, the Conservation Council proposed that the boundary should be realigned to the River Colne, from which it departs south of Fishery Cottages.

115. We considered this suggestion, and observed that, in the vicinity of Fishery Cottages, the boundary departs from the River Colne and follows the Grand Union Canal for a short stretch. However, with the exception of a very short stretch in the vicinity of Coppermill Lane, it is not defaced and does not
divide properties. We therefore considered that a realignment to the River Colne would have little advantage in terms of effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our interim decision as final.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN HILLINGDON AND SOUTH Bucks (BUCKINGHAMSHIRE)

a) Denham Court

Draft proposal

116. South Bucks suggested uniting Denham Court in its authority, by realigning the boundary from Denham Lock north along the Grand Union Canal, and then west to follow the West Ruislip to Denham railway line to rejoin the existing boundary. In support of its suggestion, the Council said that ownership of Denham Court and its environs, which are split by the existing boundary, was transferred to Buckinghamshire County Council following the abolition of the Greater London Council. South Bucks' suggestion was supported by Buckinghamshire County Council.

117. Hillingdon pointed out that the land concerned forms part of its Denham Lock Conservation Area, and that the whole area falls within an area designated by the Greater London Ecology Unit as a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. The Council considered that, though one of the most important wildlife sites in London, in the context of Buckinghamshire it might not have the same significance and, if transferred, might not receive the same degree of protection.

118. We considered that there was no evidence to support the contention that this area would, if transferred, receive less protection, and agreed with South Bucks that Denham Court should be united in one authority. As the majority of the site is in Buckinghamshire, we decided to adopt South Bucks' suggestion as our draft proposal.
Final decision

119. Our draft proposal was supported by South Bucks. However, it was opposed by Hillingdon and by the Hillingdon Conservation Council.

120. Hillingdon reiterated its view that, if transferred to South Bucks, the area would lose its designation as a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and, in the context of Buckinghamshire, it would not assume the same importance. The Council expressed the view that a boundary change could significantly lessen the protection at present afforded to the area as a London nature conservation site.

121. Hillingdon pointed out that, taken together with other changes proposed for its boundary with Three Rivers, the Borough’s Canal Locks Conservation Areas would be significantly reduced by realigning the boundary from the River Colne to the Grand Union Canal.

122. In response to Hillingdon’s comments, South Bucks stated that the Council’s grounds for objecting were unreasonable; South Bucks recognised that land such as that at Denham Court, which comprises part of an historic landscape, must be given protection.

123. South Bucks disputed Hillingdon’s assertion that sites of high value landscape or nature conservation interest were less important in the Buckinghamshire than in the London context. The Council pointed out that its Local Plan afforded protection to sites of significant nature conservation interest and that, as the River Colne and adjacent land in its authority had been identified as such in the Nature Conservancy Council’s Biological and Geographical Notification Maps, this policy would apply. If the area proposed for transfer was of similar value, it would be afforded the same protection. Furthermore, the Council stated that it had given its support to the Nature Conservancy Council’s
"Nature Conservation Strategy for Buckinghamshire", which takes a very positive approach to nature conservation in respect of sites such as that at Denham Court and had been involved in the preparation of the strategy.

124. South Bucks said that it had no record of developing or permitting the development of sites important for nature conservation, or of areas of Green Belt. Apart from its statutory Local Plan, which provides protection for Denham Court, the wide range of Green Belt policies which it had adopted would prevent all but a very limited range of exceptional development. The Council emphasised that the transfer of the land at Denham to its authority would be followed by the area’s incorporation into its Local Plan, and that any conservation area designated would remain in force.

125. The Hillingdon Conservation Council opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that it would divide a Hillingdon Conservation Area. The Conservation Council stated that if a conservation area is to remain so designated, then in practice it must fall wholly in one administrative area. It considered that local authorities bordering or close to the Springwell and Denham Conservation Areas (Three Rivers and South Bucks) would wish to pursue policies contrary to its own and those of Hillingdon.

126. We were concerned over the contentious nature of some of the conservation area issues which had been raised in the context of this review and, in relation to Denham Court, appreciated the force of the arguments both for and against our draft proposal. We did not doubt that the area affected by our draft proposal would continue to have the protection currently afforded to it, irrespective of whether it remained in Hillingdon or was transferred to South Bucks. Accordingly, we felt that the case for transfer was finely balanced. We therefore gave further consideration to the need for a boundary change in this area.
127. While South Bucks had submitted its suggestion on the grounds that it would unite Denham Court in its area, we observed that the existing boundary is relatively undefaced, apart from a short section to the south of St John's Covert. We concluded that, while South Bucks and Buckinghamshire might consider it desirable to unite the environs of Denham Court in one authority, given the opposition to our draft proposal and the minor nature of the boundary defacements in this area, this should not be the overriding consideration. We have therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal and to retain the existing boundary.

c) New Denham, Willowbank and Iver - the M25

Draft proposal

128. Hillingdon submitted two suggestions for boundary realignments in this area. The first was to extend the boundary westwards to follow the M25, from its junction with the M4 as far as the M40, thus transferring New Denham, Willowbank and part of the Parish of Iver to Hillingdon.

129. In support of its suggestion, Hillingdon said that the Little Britain Country Park should be united within Hillingdon, on the grounds that most of the park is already in the Borough. It also expressed concern over the future use of sites, currently in Buckinghamshire, that lie adjacent to ecologically sensitive areas in Hillingdon.

130. The Council drew our attention to a site at Thorney Mill Road which it proposed to designate for recreational use, linking it to the Frays Island local nature reserve. The site is split by the existing boundary, and Hillingdon felt that the amenity provided by the area was greatly spoiled by a rail aggregate depot and a scrap metal operation on the Buckinghamshire side of the boundary. The Council also considered that the area to the west of Uxbridge, Cowley and West Drayton formed an important buffer zone between town and country, and that the M25 would
provide a logical western boundary for the Borough. The Council suggested that if the M25 were adopted as the new boundary, Hillingdon would use the opportunity to pursue various countryside issues within this area.

131. The Council's suggestion was supported by the Hillingdon Health Authority, the Hillingdon Alliance Group, one member of the public and, in part, by a local voluntary organisation. Hillingdon Labour Group submitted an identical suggestion for a realignment to the M25.

132. The Health Authority felt that Hillingdon's suggested realignment to the M25 would reflect the pattern of health care and provision in the area between the motorway and the existing boundary. It said that residents of the communities in that area use Uxbridge and Harefield Medical Centres, Ickenham general practitioners, and that nursing services are provided from Hillingdon. A local voluntary organisation, providing care for recovering drug and alcohol abusers, supported the Health Authority's comments in respect of its own usage of local medical services, but expressed concern about the future of its re-entry house, which currently receives support from South Bucks.

133. A resident of Iver said that he would welcome the transfer of the area to Hillingdon, on the grounds that he would receive better services from Hillingdon.

134. Hillingdon's suggestion was opposed by South Bucks, Buckinghamshire County Council, Iver Parish Council, Iver Lane and District and Richings Park Residents' Associations, and by 36 individual members of the public.

135. Buckinghamshire strongly opposed Hillingdon's suggested use of the M25 motorway as the boundary. The Council said that the motorway was not a barrier, and pointed out that all roads radiating from Hillingdon to Buckinghamshire had been retained following the construction of the motorway and were now bridged
It discounted Hillingdon’s suggestion that the motorway would provide a buffer between the built-up area of Hillingdon and the open countryside, as it considered that the Colne Valley Park, where the approved strategy is to prevent further encroachment by developed areas of Greater London, already provides such a buffer.

136. South Bucks commented that, if Hillingdon’s argument regarding the Little Britain Country Park were applied in general, there would be a case for bringing the whole of the Colne Valley Park into Buckinghamshire. The Council said that it could find no evidence to support Hillingdon’s contention that the transfer of the area would result in any ecological gain. Nor did it accept that a transfer to Hillingdon would safeguard the integrity and inherent value of sites in the area, as South Bucks also wished to prevent the spread of urbanisation into the Green Belt.

137. Iver Parish Council objected to the loss of parish status for residents concerned who would be transferred under Hillingdon’s suggestion. One of the local residents’ associations pointed out that patterns of social and industrial activity, transport and services had all remained unchanged since the construction of the M25. These points were amplified in the individual responses from residents, who also indicated their strong ties with the rest of Iver, the historical origin of the Buckinghamshire/Middlesex boundary, and their concern over Hillingdon’s intentions towards the area in terms of future development.

138. Hillingdon’s alternative suggestion was to transfer only New Denham and Willowbank to its authority, by means of a realignment northwest from a point north of Uxbridge Moor and to the east of Watergate Farm, to Denham Road and the M40. New Denham and Willowbank adjoin Uxbridge, and Hillingdon was of the opinion that, in terms of the use of shopping and leisure facilities, libraries, schools, social services and health care
services, they have become part of Uxbridge. Hillingdon also considered the area encompassed by the M40 and the M25 to have been cut off from the rest of Buckinghamshire by the construction of these motorways. The Council stated that the area was subject to considerable development pressure, which would have an impact not only on the immediate highway network but on Uxbridge town centre and its traffic system. The Council said that it wished to be in a position to plan for the traffic needs of the area.

139. Hillingdon’s alternative suggestion was supported by the Hillingdon Health Authority, the Hillingdon Family Practitioner Committee, the Hillingdon Alliance Group and by one member of the public. It was opposed by Buckinghamshire, South Bucks, Denham Parish Council, the South Bucks Association of Local Councils and by 157 local residents.

140. A resident who supported Hillingdon’s suggestion agreed that New Denham and Willowbank were, to all intents and purposes, already part of Hillingdon and said that she looked to Uxbridge for all amenities, such as shopping, libraries, banks and adult education facilities.

141. Buckinghamshire opposed Hillingdon’s suggestion, commenting that, while New Denham and Willowbank residents may use certain facilities in Uxbridge, some of the leisure needs of Hillingdon residents were met by the Colne Valley Park, much of which lies in Buckinghamshire. It considered the urban fabric of Hillingdon to be quite different from that of Buckinghamshire, and the present boundary to be the point of transition. It emphasised that the area is in the Metropolitan Green Belt and that the Council’s past policies had successfully resisted development pressure.

142. South Bucks considered that, far from being a barrier, the M40 and the M25 had provided New Denham and Willowbank with greater access to the rest of the county. It considered that
development had not overlain existing boundaries, as both areas have remained unchanged since 1932. South Bucks also said that, with 80% of households owning a car, working, shopping and leisure activities are no longer constrained by distance, and people live, work and shop without regard to local authority boundaries.

143. Denham Parish Council, whose views were supported by the South Bucks Association of Local Councils, said that Hillingdon’s suggestion was opposed by the overwhelming majority of residents affected by it. The Parish Council reported the outcome of a meeting attended by over 400 local residents. Hillingdon’s suggestion had been opposed, with residents expressing a preference for the education and social services currently being provided by Buckinghamshire. The residents had also said that they preferred shopping centres other than Uxbridge.

144. A number of respondents stated that facilities in Uxbridge, particularly for leisure, were poor, and expressed a preference for other centres, such as Slough, Windsor, Ealing and Hounslow. They considered that their community links and affinities had not been affected by the construction of the motorway, which gave them ready access to other parts of Buckinghamshire, and expressed satisfaction with the existing boundary.

145. We did not accept that Hillingdon’s suggested realignment to the M25 would provide a better Greater London boundary, as we considered the buffer between London and Buckinghamshire to be the Colne Valley and Park rather than the motorway. We noted in this respect that pre-motorway links had remained substantially intact since the motorway’s construction, as had the patterns of social, industrial and transport activity.

146. However, we considered that New Denham and Willowbank appeared to be separated from the rest of the parish of Denham by the M40/A40 interchange. We recognised the strength of local opposition to Hillingdon’s suggestion. However, the location of
these communities, and their proximity to Uxbridge and the
M40/A40 interchange led us to conclude that, in the long term,
it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local
government for them to be transferred to Hillingdon. We
therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal Hillingdon's
more limited suggestion, to incorporate New Denham and Willowbank
in that authority, subject to a minor modification to improve the
boundary to the north of the A40.

Final decision

147. Hillingdon supported our draft proposal. However, it was
opposed by Buckinghamshire, South Bucks, Denham Parish Council
and the Gerrards Cross Parish Council. It was also opposed by Mr
Tim Smith MP, a South Bucks District and Denham Parish
Councillor, Tatling End Residents' Association, the Willowbank
Association Ltd, agents acting on behalf of a landowner in the
area and by 90 individual members of the public. We also received
213 proforma letters and a petition with 506 signatures opposing
our draft proposal.

148. Buckinghamshire considered that the arguments advanced by
Hillingdon in support of the transfer of Willowbank and New
Denham were unsupported by fact. The Council also said that it
was aware that many local residents had indicated that they did
not want to transfer to Hillingdon.

149. The Council also queried the inclusion of undeveloped
land, lying to the south west of Oxford Road, in the area
proposed for transfer. It pointed out that this land is to be
developed comprehensively as part of proposals for the Colne
Valley Regional Park, and forms part of an area stretching from
the existing boundary with Hillingdon to Barkers Wood which
includes smallholdings transferred to Buckinghamshire's ownership
from the former Greater London Council. The Council explained
that part of the area in the vicinity of New Denham will be
subject to mineral extraction, and is included in the County
Replacement Minerals Local Plan, which is being considered by the Department of the Environment.

150. In the Council’s view, our draft proposal would result in the division of the mineral extraction sites between Buckinghamshire and Hillingdon. It is proposed that, once the mineral working is completed, the area will be restored and form a major country park, contributing to the facilities available in the Colne Valley Regional Park. Buckinghamshire said that the effect of our draft proposal would be to make the mineral working difficult to control, and would not facilitate the management of the country park.

151. South Bucks expressed concern about the impact which our draft proposal, if implemented, would have on the viability of its authority. The Council pointed out that we appeared to have accepted its contention that, despite the construction of the M40 and M25, the road links between New Denham and Willowbank and the remainder of South Bucks were substantially unchanged. The Council found it difficult to reconcile our acceptance of this fact with our view that New Denham and Willowbank are effectively part of Uxbridge, separated from the rest of the parish of Denham by the M40/A40 interchange. According to the Council, the residential area of New Denham and Willowbank represent only 25% of the area proposed for transfer; the remaining 75% is Green Belt land which, in the Council’s opinion, has a greater affinity with semi-rural South Bucks than with urban Hillingdon.

152. South Bucks felt that we had given insufficient weight to its contention that, despite the fact that New Denham and Willowbank have existed for many years, there has been no development in the area since 1932. Accordingly, the area could not be considered either as development across existing boundaries or as an historical anomaly which causes specific problems. The Council also felt that we had given insufficient consideration to the wishes of the people.
153. Denham Parish Council made many of the same points as South Bucks.

154. Mr Tim Smith MP reported that he had written to all the residents affected by our draft proposal. Nearly 83% of the 52% who replied (43% of the total electorate) objected to our draft proposal.

155. A South Bucks District and Denham Parish Councillor opposed our draft proposal on the grounds that he believed the people of New Denham and Willowbank preferred the representation at parish, district and county levels which they presently enjoy. He commented that residents know their local representatives personally. The Councillor pointed out that our draft proposal would split the present parish of Denham, of which New Denham and Willowbank are an integral part, and considered that to place the two parts of the same area in different authorities would lead to bureaucratic complications, particularly regarding the division of gravel sites. He commented that there is concern among residents that Hillingdon views this area as one for future development, despite the fact that it is part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The Councillor felt that it was important to retain the existing boundary in order to contain any upsurge in development.

156. The Willowbank Association Ltd reported that, at a local meeting, all those present (approximately 250) opposed our draft proposal. The Tatling End Residents' Association expressed concern that its small community would be engulfed by Hillingdon, and become neglected.

157. Many of the respondents disputed our view that New Denham and Willowbank are outlying development, physically linked with Uxbridge. They considered New Denham and Willowbank to be entirely different in character, being rural settlements rather than developments. Residents of the area considered themselves to belong to Buckinghamshire, and expressed their preference for
the services and facilities provided within that county. They were concerned that what they perceived as a rural area would become urbanised under Hillingdon. Some respondents stated that the communities were separated from Hillingdon by agricultural land and, on the outskirts of Uxbridge, by several hundred yards of commercial and industrial development. One considered that the present boundary, which follows the River Colne, provides a much clearer and more natural division than would our draft proposal.

158. We recognised the strength of feeling expressed by those local residents who wrote to us in opposition to our draft proposal. Nevertheless, although respondents had stated that they looked to centres in Buckinghamshire for shopping and other facilities, we considered it unlikely, given its proximity, that they did not use facilities in Uxbridge.

159. However, we noted that a minerals local plan had identified New Denham as a site for mineral extraction, and that the realignment we had proposed would quickly become defaced once the mineral working began. We considered the possibility of an alternative realignment to unite the residential area in Hillingdon, while avoiding the proposed site for extraction. However we concluded that it would be difficult, at the present time, to find a realignment as clear as our draft proposal which would encompass the entire residential area. Nor, in the light of the responses to our draft proposal, did we feel that we would be justified in seeking a realignment which would encompass both the mineral working area and the communities of New Denham and Willowbank, incorporating them within Hillingdon. Accordingly as the existing boundary is clearly defined and not defaced, we have decided to withdraw our draft proposal.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

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

CONCLUSION

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

PUBLICATION

162. A separate letter is being sent to the London Boroughs of Hillingdon, Ealing and Hounslow, to Three Rivers and South Bucks District Councils and to Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire County Councils 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 this notice will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date our proposals are submitted to you. Copies of this report, with the maps attached at Annex A illustrating the proposed changes, are being sent to all those who received our draft proposals letter of 5 March 1990 and our further draft proposals letter of 24 February 1992 and to all those who made written representations to us.
Signed K F J ENNALS (Chairman)

G R PRENTICE

HELEN SARKANY

C W SMITH

K YOUNG

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP NO.</th>
<th>AREA REF.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<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>Ealing LB Northcote Ward</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Townfield Ward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Charville Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB West End Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Yeading Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB West End Ward</td>
<td>DEG</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Bourne Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB West End Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hillingdon LB Yeading Ward</td>
<td>Ealing LB Ravenor Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX C

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

#### Boundary between Hillingdon and Ealing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paragraphs/Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bull's Bridge to Spikes Bridge</td>
<td>Realignment of the boundary along the centre of the Grand Union Canal.</td>
<td>19-23, Maps 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfarer road and Dove Close,</td>
<td>Realignment of the boundary to the southern and eastern fenceline, to unite the &quot;Aircraft Estate&quot; in Ealing.</td>
<td>51-55, Map 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Aircraft Estate&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingshill Avenue</td>
<td>Minor realignment to the northern side of the bridge over the Yeading Brook</td>
<td>56-59, Map 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharvel Lane, Northolt</td>
<td>Realignment to the south side of Sharvel lane, to tie the boundary to firm ground detail.</td>
<td>60-61, Map 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area east of West End Road,</td>
<td>Realignment along the rear fenceline of properties in Harvey Road, and the west and north side of the sports complex, to unite the sports complex with the sports ground to the east</td>
<td>62-65, Map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Harvey Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>