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PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Hackney in accordance with section 50(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that London borough.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 10 June 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Hackney Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Greater London Council, the London Boroughs Association, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.

3. The Hackney Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size of council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also
asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 24 February 1976, Hackney Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 23 wards, each returning 2 or 3 members to form a council of 60.

5. We received comments from two local political associations who suggested alternative warding arrangements for the Shoreditch, South Hackney, East Hackney and Stoke Newington areas of the borough in order to avoid breaking local ties. No other comment was received.

6. We studied the draft scheme submitted by the Borough Council and noted that it would provide a basis of representation in compliance with the rules of the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines.

7. We studied the comments on the draft scheme but we could find no reason to accept the changes which were suggested.

8. Subject to a minor alteration recommended by Ordnance Survey in the interests of better boundaries, we decided to adopt the Borough Council's draft scheme as the basis of our draft proposals. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

9. On 18 June 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter and to those who had commented on the draft scheme. The Borough Council were asked to make our draft proposals and the accompanying map which
defined the ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 13 August 1976.

10. Hackney Borough Council advised us that they had no comments to make on our draft proposals.

11. Two local political associations reiterated their earlier comments suggesting alternative warding arrangements for the Shoreditch, South Hackney, East Hackney and Stoke Newington areas of the borough. One of these political associations also suggested modifications to a number of ward boundaries we had proposed.

12. In view of these comments on our draft proposals, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr R E Millard CBE, was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

13. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting in Hackney Town Hall on 24 November 1976. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

14. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals subject to replacing our proposed North Kingsmead and South Kingsmead wards by the Homerton and Kings Park wards suggested by a local political association and to modifications in the Moorfields/Haggerston and Haggerston/Cueensbridge ward boundaries suggested by another local
political association. The Assistant Commissioner's recommendation for a modification to the Moorfields/Haggerston ward boundary was subject to verification of the standard of representation. Subsequent examination has shown, however, that the standard resulting would not be compatible with the statutory rules set out in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972. We have therefore retained the boundary between these two wards which had been included in our draft proposals.

15. After considering the remainder of the Assistant Commissioner's report and the comments received after the local meeting we concluded that, with the exception of the above mentioned Moorfields/Haggerston ward boundary modification, the recommendations put forward by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.

16. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the numbers of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION
17. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Hackney Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main
offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.
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1. GENERAL

I have to report that on the 24th November, 1976, I held the local meeting to hear representations about the Commission’s draft proposals for the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Hackney. The meeting took place at the Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London, E. 8.

2. The names and addresses of those who attended the meeting, and particulars of the interests they represented, are set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

3. The Commission’s draft proposals are set out in Appendix 2, with the detailed ward boundaries in Annex A to this Appendix.

4. The Commission’s draft proposals were identical to the Borough Council’s draft Scheme, subject to one minor boundary realignment, which was suggested by the Ordnance Survey.

5. The Borough Council made no comment on the Commission’s draft proposals. The only formal representations about the proposals were received from the Hackney Conservative Local Government Committee and the Hackney South and Shoreditch Liberal Association. The Conservatives merely repeated the representation they had made on the Borough Council’s draft proposals: the Liberals referred to their earlier representations on the Council’s draft proposals but added a number of detailed comments on the Commission’s draft proposals. These two groups of representations are referred to in detail later.
6. POPULATION AND ELECTORATE PROJECTIONS

The Borough Council's draft proposals were based on an assumed continuing substantial decline in population and electorate in the Borough. Their assumptions were founded on the facts between 1970 and 1975, coupled with the findings of the Greater London Council's Research Memorandum on Demographic Projections in the Greater London Area published in 1974: the Council took the highest of the Research Memoranda's population projections for the Borough for 1981, namely 182,500 and, after making adjustments for slight changes expected in age ranges, produced from this a total anticipated 1981 electorate of 134,191, compared with a 1975 figure of 149,504. In distributing this total between wards, the Council took account of redistribution of population between them likely to arise from planned housing projects and redevelopment schemes.

7. I was greatly helped in my consideration of these and other figures by Mr. I. Singh, a statistician in the Council's Research and Intelligence Unit. He satisfied me that the estimates which the Council had made of the 1981 electorate were reasonable: as, with one exception to which I refer later, the figures were not in serious contention, it is not necessary to set them out in detail here. While the individual ward figures for 1975 showed some undesirable variations in representation, the 1981 figures seemed to me (as to the Commission) to be sufficiently near the average for practical purposes. The Victoria ward, with three members and an entitlement of 3.43 in 1981, was the least satisfactory, but no suitable alternative boundaries were advanced to me in argument or were apparent on inspection.

8. THE CONSERVATIVE CASE

The representations made by the Hackney Conservative Local Government Committee on the Borough Council's draft proposals, and repeated in respect of the Commission's virtually identical proposals, fall into two distinct parts; one proposed a different set of wards in the North-West of the Borough and the other a different division of the former Kingsmead ward in the East. Each part of these representations is best dealt with separately: Mr. C.D. Sills, the
Honorary Secretary of the Conservative Committee, submitted their written representations and also appeared at the meeting to explain and elaborate these views.

9. **Suggested Woodberry, Bethune and Stamford Hill Wards**

   The Borough Council's, and the Commission's, draft proposals in the North-West of the Borough envisaged retaining the existing New River and Northfield Wards (with a slight boundary adjustment on the Southern boundary of the latter), each as three member wards. The Conservatives suggested that these two wards should be divided into three new wards, to be known as Woodberry, Bethune and Stamford Hill, each returning two members. Their Woodberry ward would combine the North-West part of New River, Bethune the remainder of New River and part of Northfield and Stamford Hill the remainder of Northfield.

10. Mr. Sills supported the Conservative suggestions on two main grounds. In the first place he questioned the Borough Council's estimates of the 1981 electorate in their New River Ward. He pointed out that the 1976 electorate for this ward of 8349 showed only a small drop from the 1975 figure of 8422, whereas the Northfield electorate had dropped from 8055 in 1975 to 7311 in 1976. Mr. Sills also contended that the Borough Council were wrong in assuming (as he suggested they had) that the Greater London Council's Woodberry Down estate would be modernised by 1981, with a resultant drop in the population of that estate. The estate would form a natural two-member ward by itself.

11. From this basis Mr. Sills argued that the New River Ward would have a total electorate of 7813 in 1981 instead of the 7070 estimated by the Borough Council: this would mean 2604 electors per member, as against the 2357 projected by the Borough Council, so that the ward would not be adequately represented.

12. The following table gives a comparative numerical analysis of the Commissioners' draft proposals and the alternative Scheme advanced by the Conservatives:
The figures in brackets are the Borough Council's estimates of the likely electorate in 1981 and the resultant entitlements. The Conservatives' estimate of the 1981 electorate of the New River Ward would produce an entitlement of 3.49 for that ward.

13. Mr. Sill's second ground in support of the suggested regrouping of wards was that there was a large Jewish community living in parts of the existing New River and Northfield wards which was split by the existing ward boundaries, as it would also be by the Borough Council's and Commission's new boundaries. The Conservative's suggested Bethune ward would embrace this community in one ward, thus preserving local ties. This ground had not been mentioned in the Conservative's written representations.

14. The spokesmen for the Borough Council contested Mr. Sill's arguments on a number of grounds. First, Mr. Singh said that the assumed decline in population was likely to be constant over the Borough as a whole, subject to adjustments for special factors; for instance, an allowance of 52 above the
average had been made in respect of the New River Ward to allow for development. While he accepted that the drop in electorate for this ward between 1975 and 1976 had been smaller than average, he did not agree that this justified the Conservatives assumption that the electorate in 1981 was likely to be 7813. In Mr. Singh's opinion it was statistically unsound to base a projection to 1981 on the figures for one year and, taking all factors into account, he saw no reason to revise the Council's estimate of 7070 by 1981.

15. A good deal of discussion took place about the alleged allowance for a drop in population due to the modernisation of the Woodberry Down Estate. No one seemed to be clear whether any such scheme was in fact in contemplation by the Greater London Council and, in any case, there seemed to be no reason to assume that the Borough Council's estimates had allowed for a reduction on this account, especially as there had been the small allowance for an increase in New River of 52 above the average, to which Mr. Singh referred. At my request, enquiries were made subsequently and I was later told that there were no known proposals for modernising this estate. It is clear however that the issue could have involved only very small figures.

16. Mr. O'Loghlen, the Borough Electoral Registration Officer, agreed that there was a substantial Jewish population in the New River and Northfield wards, both existing and proposed: but he did not agree that the Conservative proposals would bring them all together into one ward. The Jewish community was in a band stretching across the North of the Borough through New River, Northfield and Springfield wards: they had been split between wards since at least 1964 and he had never heard any complaint on this account (Mr. Sills said he had heard one such complaint).

17. Mr. Ottolangi, the leader of the Council, said that it was wrong to regard the Jewish population as forming a single community: they belonged to several different sects and did not form a cohesive whole.

18. Mr. O'Loghlen said that the suggested Bethune ward would raise practical problems about the provision of polling places, although no such problems arose in relation to the other two suggested wards. New polling places were
difficult to arrange in Hackney and the Borough Council's proposals had
throughout been framed so that existing polling places would be used.

19. I visited the area of the suggested Woodberry, Bethune and Stamford
Hill wards. There were no physical or other features apparent on Inspection
which favoured either the draft proposals or the Conservatives' alternative.
Likewise, the boundaries of each seemed reasonably satisfactory, although
boundaries drawn through areas which are largely heavily built up are bound
in places to appear somewhat arbitrary and less than ideal.

20. Conclusions and Recommendations

As I have already indicated, Mr. Sills supported the Conservative
case for their alternative proposal on two main grounds. The first was on
figures and I have summarised the arguments on either side. I came to the
conclusion that, although Mr. Sills put his case with clarity and force, there
really were insufficient grounds for his assumption that the electorate of the
New River Ward was likely to be 7813 in 1981, rather than the 7070 predicted
by the Borough Council. The latter prediction was based on sound statistical
principles, ably expounded by Mr. Singh, and flowed from a reasonable Inter-
pretation of the Greater London Council's Research Memorandum. I do not regard
the issue about possible population changes which might have resulted from
modernisation of the Woodberry Down Estate as significant, as the figures
in issue are small. I therefore preferred the Borough Council's estimate.
While Mr. Sills' figures would result in a meagre representation for the New
River ward, a figure somewhere between his prediction and that of the Borough
Council would still result in a reasonable representation. I, therefore, reject
the Conservative case on the statistical ground.

21. The case put forward by Mr. Sills in relation to the Jewish community
is superficially impressive. But I accept the Borough Council's views that
even Mr. Sills' proposals would still split the community and that the community
is not itself a cohesive whole.
22. I have also had regard to the problems over polling places which would arise in the suggested Bethune ward.

23. I accordingly recommend that there should be no change in the draft proposals for the New River and Northfield wards.

24. **Suggested Homerton and Kings Park wards.**

   The essence of the second part of the Conservative representations is that the existing Kingsmead ward should be divided by a line running roughly North to South, instead of one running East to West, as envisaged in the draft proposals. This would also produce two two-member wards, to be known as Homerton and Kings Park instead of North and South Kingsmead. Numerically there would be little to choose between the draft proposal and the alternative and it, therefore, unnecessary to examine the relevant figures. Both proposals take the same outer boundaries for the two new wards, which are the same as those of the existing single Kingsmead ward, except for the transfer of a small area around Wardle Street to the Chatham ward.

25. Mr. Sills explained that the existing Kingsmead ward comprised two large estates of Council housing, the Greater London Council's Kingsmead estate Park and the Borough Council's Clapton estate, together with a large area of mostly private housing. The draft proposals split the area of private housing into two, Place the Northern part with the Clapton estate to form the North Kingsmead ward and the Southern part with the Kingsmead estate to form the South Kingsmead ward. The Conservative's alternative would form one ward, the suggested Homerton ward, from the area of private housing, and place the two Council estates in the second ward to form the suggested Kings Park ward.

26. Mr. Sills supported the alternative on the ground that the area of private housing, which would largely form the suggested Homerton ward, was a natural community; that it had a residents association (The Clapton, Homerton and District Residents' Association - known as C.H.A.D.R.A.), which had sprung up because the area felt that its problems were inadequately considered by the Borough Council; and that it would be wrong to split this area between two wards.
27. Mr. Sills referred to and quoted from a letter which he understood that C.H.A.D.R.A. had sent to me supporting the Conservative suggestions. Unfortunately this letter did not reach me until the end of the hearing but copies have since been circulated to the parties: It was dated 22nd November, was signed by the Honorary Secretary and read as follows:

"The above Association represents the Area bounded by Lea Bridge Road, Lower Clapton Road, Homerton Road, and the River Lea, with the bulk of our membership coming from the Polling Districts KA, KC, and KD.

"This area is a cohesive Community with common problems and a feeling of identity.

"The proposals of the Commission split this Community in two and add a large Council Estate to each half. The two halves of each new Ward will then have nothing in common and the Councillors of each Ward will have the present impossible problem of representing two different and often conflicting interests. If the Ward is split East/West as opposed to North/South then this problem disappears.

"Both the large Estates have their own Tenants Associations which look after their own special interests and this strengthens the case for linking them in one Ward.

"This Association which is non political has a membership representing over two hundred households, and was formed because it was found that the local Councillors spent too much time looking after the considerable problems of the two large Estates, and so neglecting the remainder of the area.

"The opportunity now exists to correct this situation.

"This letter was approved by a meeting of the Committee held last Thursday 18th November 1976."

28. Mr. Sills mentioned that the two Council estates each had their own tenants' associations: residents there could also belong to C.H.A.D.R.A., but very few did.
29. Mr. Ottolangi, the leader of the Council, contended that C.H.A.D.R.A. covered a much wider area than the suggested Homerton ward: in addition to members in the Kings Mead estate, there were also members in the Lea Bridge and Chatham wards, so that the Association's membership was already divided between wards. Mr. Sills accepted this (as is indeed evident from C.H.A.D.R.A.'s letter), but he contended that the nucleus of their membership was in the suggested Homerton ward.

30. Mr. Wood, the Chief Executive, said that the Conservative proposal would separate the two large Council estates from their main shopping centre and market in Chatsworth Road; there were only neighbourhood shopping areas on the estates. The Borough Council were anxious to avoid the creation of Council housing ghettos and thought it better to mix the two types of development in each ward, with the focal points of the shopping and commercial centre in Chatsworth Road.

31. Both Mr. Ottolangi and Mr. Wood stressed that it would be socially divisive to put Council dwellings in one ward and private housing in the other; the Borough Council were trying to get a social mix in each ward by dividing the area up as they had proposed.

32. I inspected the area. The Kingsmead and Clapton Park estates are almost solid Council housing developments, parts of Clapton Park being still under construction. The Homerton area is mostly occupied by modest, fairly dense private housing, much of it probably built about the turn of the century. There is a considerable amount of shopping in Chatsworth Road and I understand a market is held there.

33. Conclusions and Recommendations

The arguments for the draft proposals and the Conservative alternative are delicately balanced. Taken by itself, the case for the Homerton ward is very strong: it is clearly a cohesive community, which has long been in the same ward and C.H.A.D.R.A. is a unifying influence. While I accept that some C.H.A.D.R.A. members live in adjoining wards, and some on the Kings Mead estate, I accept that the Association is really based on Homerton,
where the bulk of its members live.

34. The troublesome question, however, is whether it is right to divide the existing Kingsmead ward in such a way as to leave the private housing in one ward and the Council housing in another, or whether the preferable course is to adopt the social mix embodied in the draft proposals. I have concluded that, in the context of electoral arrangements, there is nothing fundamentally wrong in placing all the Council housing in one ward, where the inhabitants will have broadly identical interests, and placing the private housing in another. This division only, of course, affects representation on the Borough Council and does nothing physically to create the sort of ghetto which the Borough Council are naturally anxious to avoid. In electoral terms, I am also unimpressed by the argument that this division would cut off the Council tenants from their main, as distinct from their local, shopping centre, as this division for electoral purposes would have no practical effect on shopping habits. On the other hand, I am quite clear that the draft proposals, with the resultant division of the Homerton area, would produce an undesirable severance of local ties.

35. I therefore recommend the acceptance of the Conservative alternative of Homerton and Kings Park Wards in preference to the draft proposal for North and South Kingsmead wards.

36. The Conservative alternative is only shown on an overlay which is not entirely clear, but I have assumed that it would involve a boundary between the Homerton and Kings Park Wards running along Millfields Road, then down Glyn Road to Reowald Road, along the latter, down Daubney Road to Meeson Street, along the latter and then down Adley Street to the present ward boundary in Marsh Hill and Homerton Road. This is, of course, in parts a somewhat arbitrary boundary but it has the effect of producing wards of the appropriate size of electorate, as well as giving effect to the basic principles which I have recommended.

37. **The Liberal Case**

In their initial representations on the Borough Council's draft
proposals, the Hackney South and Shoreditch Constituency Liberal Association advocated a major recasting of the wards and ward boundaries in the South of the Borough. At the local meeting Mr. A. E. Rayner, who appeared on their behalf, stated that his Association did not wish to pursue these representations, especially as the Liberal Associations for the Hackney North and Stoke Newington, and Hackney Central, constituencies had not made the corresponding representations for their areas which it was anticipated that they would. I might perhaps add that these original representations involved a transfer to the Chatham ward which would have resulted in that ward being under represented. It would thus have been difficult, if not impossible, to give effect to the Liberal representations without a substantial recasting of other wards to the North and East.

38. Mr. Rayner accordingly confined his presentation to the five suggested minor amendments to the draft proposals which were listed in his letter to the Commission dated 11th August, 1976, and I will deal with these seriatim.

39. Moorfields

The Liberals disliked the section of the proposed boundary between the Moorfields and Haggerston Wards where it runs South from Whiston Road through Shap Street to Dunloe Street: they suggested that it would sever the new development on either side of Shap Street and might well become difficult to follow in the context of the new development. Mr. Rayner accepted that, although not part of an existing ward boundary, this was the existing polling district boundary: he contended however that the new development altered the position.

40. Mr. Rayner said the Liberals put forward two alternative lines; the first, which they preferred, was to follow the line of the North London Railway South from Whiston Road: the second was a line running South down Thurtle Road and Weymouth Terrace. In his letter of 1st September he had indicated that the former would involve a transfer of just over 100 electors from Moorfields to Haggerston, but no figures were given for the second alternative and none appeared to be available at the meeting.
41. Mr. O'Loughlen said that the Borough Council would prefer the second alternative, if there were to be a change from the draft proposals, as all those living East of Kingsland Road voted on the East of that road and it would be easier to re-arrange the polling places. Mr. Rayner indicated that he would accept the second alternative.

42. I inspected the area. It is correct that the boundary in the draft proposals would divide the new development on either side of the Southern end of Shap Street, and the old development at the Northern end of that street. As this is a new ward boundary, this seems undesirable, but any boundary in such a close-knit urban area is open to some objection. However, the line of Thurtle Road and Weymouth Terrace seemed marginally preferable on the ground.

43. Conclusions and Recommendations

I consider that the Liberal objection has substance and that their second alternative would provide a better boundary than that in the draft proposals. I am however somewhat concerned as to the number of electors who would thus be transferred from the Moorfields to the Haggerston ward, but I would rather doubt if this would be sufficient to raise the entitlement of the Moorfields ward to too high a figure. Subject, therefore, to the result of any further inquiries which the Commission may decide to make about the numbers involved, I recommend that the boundary between the Moorfields and Haggerston wards in the vicinity of Shap Street should be amended to run South from Whiston Road along Thurtle Road, Weymouth Place and Weymouth Terrace to Dunloe Street.

44. Haggerston

The Liberals argued that the boundary between Haggerston and Queensbridge wards in the area of Albion Square was unsatisfactory in that it breaks community ties and divides the Albion Square general improvement area. They suggested that the boundary should go either along Lee Street, Haggerston Road and Scriven Street to Queensbridge Road, or up the line of the North London Railway from Lee Street and then along Middleton Road and down Queensbridge Road; they preferred the latter alternative. Mr. Rayner
said this would involve the transfer of 265 electors from Queensbridge to
Haggerston ward.

45. Mr. O'Loghlen said that the draft proposal boundary followed the
polling district boundary, although he accepted that it was a new ward boundary.
The change favoured by the Liberals would cause a problem because the only
available polling place for the two adjoining polling districts in Queensbridge
ward would then be in Haggerston ward.

46. I inspected the area, which contains a large number of substantial
houses of some basic charm which are at present rather derelict but are being
restored, I gather under the aegis of a general improvement area. The South
side of Albion Square would be in Haggerston and the remainder with other similar
streets in Queensbridge ward. Furthermore, as will be apparent from the map,
the zig-zag boundary at this point has an air of illogicality.

47. Conclusions and Recommendations

I have no doubt that the Liberals are right in their contention that
the draft proposal boundary severs community ties in the Albion Square area,
and that there should be an adjustment. I strongly favour the second of the
Liberals suggestions. While I appreciate Mr. O'Loghlen's concern about the
polling place, he tells me that the Parliamentary Election Rules 26(3) in
Schedule 2 of the Representation of the People Act, 1949, and the Local
Elections (Principal Areas) Rules, 1933, Rule 21(3), enable a polling place to
be outside a polling district, so that the school in question could still be used
as polling place for the transferred area. Incidentally, the transfer of electors
to the Haggerston ward would largely compensate for the transfer from that ward
to Moorfields, recommended in paragraph 43.

48. Accordingly I recommend that the proposed boundary between the
Haggerston and Queensbridge wards should be amended in the vicinity of
Albion Square to run North from Lee Street along the line of the North London
Railway to Middleton Road, thence East along that road to Queensbridge Road
and thence South to join the draft proposal boundary.

49. Victoria
The Liberals suggested that part of the Northern boundary of Victoria ward in the neighbourhood of Well Street Common was unsatisfactory in that the paths on the common were not good permanent boundaries and that the loop round Church Crescent and then along Croombridge Road divides communities. Mr. Rayner suggested a line either along Well Street, Cassland Road and Gascoyne Road, or, less satisfactorily, round Church Crescent and Meynell Crescent to join Gascoyne Road. He accepted that the former would add over 500 electors to Victoria ward.

50. The Borough Council opposed the suggested change as being unnecessary.

51. I inspected the area. The paths on Well Street Common are in fact surfaced with tarmacadam and look very permanent. It did not seem to me that the boundary in the draft proposals, which around Church Crescent and Croombridge Road is also the existing ward boundary, caused any obvious separation of communities.

52. Conclusions and Recommendations

I was not satisfied, either from the argument or from any inspection, that draft proposal boundary had any particular defects, and certainly saw no objection to the use for this purpose of the well-defined and surfaced paths across Well Street Common. But the most serious objection to the Liberals' suggestion was that it would add substantially to the electorate of Victoria Ward and make it even more inadequately represented than it is under the draft proposals.

53. I, therefore, recommend that there should be no change in the Northern boundary of the Victoria ward in the neighbourhood of Well Street Common as set out in the draft proposals.

54. Wenlock

The Liberals suggested an amendment of the Northern boundary of the Wenlock ward which was not easy to follow. First, they said that Baring Street
and Arlington Avenue should be transferred to Islington at the next borough boundary review. Secondly they suggested that the area bounded by the canal, New North Road and Poole Street should be transferred to De Beauvoir ward. Mr. Rayner said, however, that he did not wish to press this amendment.

55. I visited the area; the Liberal proposal would leave an isolated tongue North of the canal, presumably awaiting transfer to Islington. The remainder of the proposal would create a tongue protruding into Wenlock ward.

56. Conclusions and Recommendations

I am quite clear that this suggestion is impracticable and incidentally seeks to anticipate a borough boundary review. I accordingly recommend no change in the draft proposals relating to the Northern boundary of Wenlock Road.

57. Kingsland Road

The Liberals proposed moving the Eastern boundary of De Beauvoir and part of Moorfields wards from the Kingsland Road to the railway. When Mr. O’Loghlen explained that the voters on that side of Kingsland Road were allotted to polling stations to the East of the railway, so that they did not have to cross the main road, and that anyway the railway, on embankment and viaduct, was not a good boundary, Mr. Rayner withdrew this suggestion.

Assistant Commissioner.
## Attendance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Organisation Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.D. Sills</td>
<td>Hackney Conservative Local Government Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.E. Rayner</td>
<td>Hackney South &amp; Shoreditch Liberal Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Singh</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. A.F. Brett</td>
<td>My property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Dennis Wood</td>
<td>Chief Executive &amp; T.C. Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. O'Loghlen</td>
<td>Electoral and Elections Officer, London Borough of Hackney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Cooper</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ottolangi</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Daniel</td>
<td>Westminster City Council Labour Group (Observer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy McQuaide</td>
<td>Sec/Agent Hackney South C.L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lightening</td>
<td>Chief Exec's Westminster City Council Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Roberts</td>
<td>Asst. Committee Clerk, London Borough of Hackney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS
FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWNSWOOD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLISSOLD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALSTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE BEAUVOIR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTDOWN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGGERSTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEABRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORFIELDS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW RIVER</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DEFOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH KINGSMEAD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWOLD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSBRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECTORY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DEFOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH KINGSMEAD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENLOCK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTDOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed ward boundaries are defined on a map which can be inspected at the Council's offices. A description of the proposed wards as defined on the map is at Annex A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWNSWOOD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLISSOLD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALSTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE BEAUVOIR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTDOWN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGGERSTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMERTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGS PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEABRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORFIELDS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW RIVER</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DEFOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWOLD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSBRIDGE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECTORY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DEFOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENLOCK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTDOWN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

MOORFIELDS WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets East Road, thence northwards along said road to New North Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to Pitfield Street, thence northwards along said street to Purcell Street, thence eastwards along said street to Hoxton Street, thence northwards along said street to a point opposite the southern boundary of 186 Hoxton Street, thence eastwards to and along said southern boundary, the southern boundary of St Leonard's Hospital and the southern boundary of No 199 Kingsland Road to Kingsland Road, thence northwards along said road to Whiston Road, thence eastwards along said road to Shap Street, thence southwards along said street to the access path leading from Shap Street to How's Street, thence southwards along said access path, crossing How's Street and continuing southwards along Shap Street to Dunloe Street, thence eastwards along said street to Weymouth Terrace, thence southwards along said terrace to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said southern boundary and northwards along the western boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

WENLOCK WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Moorfields Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said Borough boundary to the junction of Southgate Road and Rosemary Branch Bridge, thence southwards to and along said bridge and the road known as Bridport Place to Penn Street, thence eastwards along said street to Hyde Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the centre of the roundabout at the junction of said road and Pitfield Street, thence southwestwards and southwards along said street to the western boundary of Moorfields Ward, thence southwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.
DE BEAUVIOR WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Wenlock Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards and eastwards along said Borough boundary and continuing eastwards along Ball's Pond Road to Kingsland Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Moorfields Ward, thence southwards and generally westwards along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of Wenlock Ward, thence northwards, westwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

HAGGERSTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Moorfields Ward meets the eastern boundary of De Beauvoir Ward thence northwards along said eastern boundary to Lee Street, thence eastwards along said street to the Broad Street Station to Dalston Junction Station railway, thence northwards along said railway to Middleton Road, thence eastwards along said road to Queensbridge Road, thence southwards along said road to the Grand Union Canal (Regent's Canal), thence eastwards along said canal to the southeastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards and westwards along said south-eastern boundary to the eastern boundary of Moorfields Ward, thence northwards, westwards and northwards along said eastern boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

QUEENSBRIDGE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Haggerston Ward meets the eastern boundary of De Beauvoir Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to Richmond Road, thence eastwards along said road crossing Holly Street, Queensbridge Road, Lansdowne Drive and Eleanor Road to Mare Street, thence southwards along said street to the southeastern boundary
of the Borough, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said south-eastern boundary to the northern boundary of Haggerston Ward, thence westwards, northwards and generally southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

VICTORIA WARD
Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Queensbridge Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to Brethouse Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Elsdale Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Well Street, thence southwestwards and southwards along said street to Lauriston Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to the southern end of Church Crescent, thence northeastwards and northwards along said road to the eastern boundary of 53 Broombridge Road, thence northeastwards along said road and in prolongation thereof to the path running northwards parallel with the eastern boundary of 53 Broombridge Road, thence northwards along said path to the main path joining Church Crescent to the Gascoyne Road-Victoria Park Road junction, thence eastwards along said path to its end, thence eastwards in a straight line to Queens Gate, being the northwestern end of the unnamed road running between Queens Gate and Cadogan Terrace north of the botanical gardens, thence south-eastwards along said unnamed road to the southeastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said southeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

DALSTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Queensbridge Ward meets the eastern boundary of De Beauvoir Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards along Kingsland High Street to Dalston Lane, thence eastwards, northwards and eastwards, crossing Amhurst Road and continuing eastwards to Mare Street, thence southwards along said street to the northern boundary of Queensbridge Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.
CHATHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Victoria Ward meets the eastern boundary of Queensbridge Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary, the eastern boundary of Dalston Ward and Clarence Road to Goulton Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Lower Clapton Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the western end of Glenarm Road, thence northeastwards to and along said road, crossing Median Road and continuing northeastwards along Glenarm Road to Elderfield Road, thence southeastwards along said road, crossing Dunlace Road and continuing southeastwards along Elderfield Road to Clifden Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Chatsworth Road, thence southeastwards along said road and Brooksby's Walk to Homerton High Street, thence eastwards along said street to Crozier Terrace, thence southeastwards along said terrace and in prolongation thereof to the Stratford to Canonbury Railway, thence westwards along said railway to Barnabas Road, thence southwards along said road to Wick Road, thence westwards along said road to Well Street, thence southwestwards along said street to the northern boundary of Victoria Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WICK WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Victoria Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Chatham Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to Homerton High Street, thence northeastwards along said street, the road known as Marsh Hill, Homerton Road and continuing eastwards along the last named road to the road known as Eastway, thence northeastwards along said road to Temple Mills Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along
said eastern boundary and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of the Borough to the northern boundary of Victoria Ward, thence northwestwards, westwards and northwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

WESTDOWN WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of De Beauvoir Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said western boundary to the road known as Crossway, thence northeastwards along said road, crossing Stoke Newington Road to Shacklewell Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane, passing through the Shacklewell Lane roundabout and continuing northeastwards along said lane and the unnamed road on the southeastern side of Shacklewell Green to its junction with Cecilia Road thence southeastwards along said road to the path known as Amhurst Passage, thence northeastwards along said path, crossing Amhurst Road and continuing northeastwards along the said named path to the Rectory Road to Hackney Downs Railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to Amhurst Road, thence eastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Dalston Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said northern boundary to the northern boundary of De Beauvoir Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

CLISSOLD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Westdown Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and northwards along said western boundary to Stoke Newington Church Street, thence northeastwards along said street to Clissold Road, thence southeastwards along said road and Albion Grove to Milton Grove, thence southwards along said grove to Allen Road, thence eastwards along said road, crossing Shakespeare Walk, and continuing eastwards along said road to Nevill Road, thence northwards along said road to Walford Road, thence eastwards along said road to Stoke Newington Road, thence southwards along said road to the northwestern boundary of Westdown Ward, thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to the point of commencement.
SOUTH DEFOE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Clissold Ward meets Stoke Newington Church Street, thence generally northeastwards along said street to a point opposite the path running southwards adjacent to the eastern boundary of No 105 Stoke Newington Church Street from said street to Oldfield Road, thence southwards to and along said path to Oldfield Road, thence southwards along said road to Kynaston Road, thence eastwards along said road to Nevill Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 116 Nevill Road, thence eastwards to and along said southern boundary to the western boundary of No 34 Chesholm Road, thence southwards along said western boundary and eastwards along the southern boundary of said property, thence northeastwards crossing Chesholm Road to and along Lavers Road to a point opposite the western boundary of Nos 2 and 4 Lavers Road, thence northwards along said western boundary, northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2 and 4 to No 48 Lavers Road and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of No 48 Lavers Road to the southern boundary of No 64 Dynevor Road, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to Dynevor Road, thence southwards and eastwards along said road to Stoke Newington High Street, thence southwards along said street to the northeastern boundary of Clissold Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

RECTORY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Westdown Ward meets the eastern boundary of Clissold Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary, the eastern boundary of South Defoe Ward and continuing northwards along Stoke Newington High Street to Brooke Road, thence generally eastwards along said road, crossing Rectory Road, Jenner Road, Benthall Road, Maury Road, Norcott Road and Evering Road to Rendlesham Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Downs Road, thence westwards along said road to the
Rectory Road to Hackney Downs Railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the northwestern boundary of Westdown Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to the point of commencement.

EASTDOWN WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Dalston Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Westdown Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and continuing northwestwards and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of Rectory Ward to Evering Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Upper Clapton Road, thence southeastwards along said road and Lower Clapton Road to the northern boundary of Chatham Ward, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along the northern and western boundaries of said ward to the northern boundary of Dalston Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTH DEFOE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Clissold Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said western boundary to the junction of Mountgrove Road and the road known as Green Lanes, thence northwards along said Green Lanes to the road known as Lordship Park, thence northeastwards along said road, crossing Queen Elizabeth's Walk, Lordship Road and continuing northeastwards and southeastwards along Manor Road to the road known as Stamford Hill, thence southwards along said road, Stoke Newington High Street and the western boundary of Rectory Ward, to the northern boundary of South Defoe Ward, thence westwards, northwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary and continuing southwestwards along the northern boundary of Clissold Ward to the point of commencement.

BROWNSWOOD WARD
Commencing at a point where the western boundary of North Defoe Ward meets the
western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards and northeast
wards along said borough boundary to the road known as Green Lanes, thence southeaster
wards along said road to the western boundary of North Defoe Ward, thence southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTHWOLD WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Rectory Ward meets the eastern boundary of North Defoe Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards along the road known as Stamford Hill to Lampard Grove, thence eastwards along said grove to Oldhill Street, thence southwards along said street to Filey Avenue, thence northeastwards along said avenue crossing Osbaldeston Road and Chardmore Road to Upper Clapton Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the northwestern boundary of Eastdown Ward, thence southwestwards along said northwestern boundary to the northern boundary of Rectory Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

LEABRIDGE WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Chatham Ward meets the eastern boundary of Eastdown Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary along said grove crossing Mount Pleasant Lane to Leaside Road, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said road to the Clapton to Clapton Junction Railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said northeastern boundary to the River Lee Navigation (Hackney Cut), thence southeastwards along said River Lee Navigation to a point opposite the Path running from northwest of Weir Cottage, across South Millfields Recreation Ground to Chatsworth Road, thence southwestwards to and along said path to Chatsworth Road, thence southeastwards along said road, crossing Millfields
Road and continuing southeastwards along Chatsworth Road to Powerscroft Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Mayola Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Rushmore Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Powerscroft Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Median Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Chatham Ward, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

HOMERTON WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Wick Ward meets the eastern boundary of Chatham Ward, thence generally northwestwards and southwestwards along said eastern boundary and the northern boundary of said ward to the eastern boundary of Leabridge Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said boundary to Millfields Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Glyn Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Redwald Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Daubney Road, thence southwards along said road to Meeson Street, thence eastwards along said street to Adley Street, thence southwards along said street to the northern boundary of Wick Ward, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

KINGS PARK WARD
Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Wick Ward meets the eastern boundary of Homerton Ward, thence generally northwestwards and southwestwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of said ward to the eastern boundary of Leabridge Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards and southeastwards along said Borough boundary to the northern boundary of Wick Ward, thence generally westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.
NEW RIVER WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of North Defoe Ward meets the eastern boundary of Brownswood Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said western boundary and eastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to the eastern boundary of No 90 Amhurst Park, thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary and crossing Amhurst Park to and southeastwards along Bethune Road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 112 Bethune Road, thence northeastwards to and along said southeastern boundary and the southeastern boundary of No 1 Cranwich Road to Cranwich Road, thence southwards along said road to Dunsmure Road, thence eastwards along said road to the Stamford Hill to Stoke Newington Railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the northern boundary of North Defoe Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTHFIELD WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Northwold Ward meets the eastern boundary of New River Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said northern boundary to the road known as Stamford Hill, thence southwards along said road to the road known as Clapton Common, thence southeastwards along said road and that part of the road on the southwestern side of Clapton Common to Portland Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Kyverdale Road, thence southwards along said road, crossing Lynmouth Road and continuing southwards to the northern boundary of Northwold Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary and southwards along the western boundary of said Ward to the point of commencement.
SPRINGFIELD WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Northwold Ward meets the eastern boundary of Northfield Ward, thence northwards, northwestwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said northern boundary and southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of the Borough to the northern boundary of Leabridge Ward, thence southwestwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the northeastern boundary of Northwold Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and southwestwards, northwards and westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.