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INTRODUCTION

1. This report contains our final proposals for the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames' boundaries with the London Boroughs of Merton, Richmond upon Thames, Sutton and Wandsworth; and with the Boroughs of Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell, and the District of Mole Valley, in Surrey. It also describes consequential final proposals for the related issue of Sutton's boundary with Epsom and Ewell in the Worcester Park area.

2. We have considered a number of proposals which have been made to us for radical change, including Kingston's case to expand its area to encompass parts of Richmond, Sutton, Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell; Surrey County Council's case to return the Royal Borough to Surrey as a shire district; and various suggestions made by members of the public recommending the amalgamation of a number of existing local authorities in South-west London and North-west Surrey. We have also investigated a number of possible options for intermediate scale change, with a view to uniting the Worcester Park area in a single authority, and to producing a more satisfactory outer London boundary between Kingston and Elmbridge.

3. However, in the light of the responses to our draft proposals, we have confined our final proposals to limited change
only, with the intention of removing anomalies, for example, where properties are divided by boundaries. This report explains how we arrived at our proposals. Nevertheless, we have also taken the opportunity in paragraphs 47 to 66 and 81 to 85 below to set out our views on some of the strategic issues which we identified during the course of this review, and on the pattern and structure of local authorities along the South-west London/North-west Surrey boundary. These views do not form part of our proposals, but are expressed in the belief that the historic anomalies of the outer London boundary in this area require to be addressed in a wider context, encompassing more than just the London boroughs.

BACKGROUND

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

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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

8. 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).

9. 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 changes to the boundaries of London boroughs.

10. 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 have therefore published a general report, 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 the review. Of particular relevance is the question of the relationship of the outer London boundary to the pattern of development in South-west London, which is discussed in paragraphs 45 to 52 of that report.
INITIAL SUBMISSIONS MADE TO US

11. In response to our letter of 1 April 1987, we received submissions from Kingston, Richmond, Merton, Sutton, Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, and from Surrey County Council. The London Borough of Wandsworth indicated that it had no proposals for change to its boundary with Kingston.

12. In response to the publicity given to the commencement of the review, and to the well publicised different suggestions for radical change submitted by Kingston and Surrey, we received a total of 844 letters from members of the public and interested organisations, six petitions and three sets of proforma letters, totalling 954 and 928 signatures respectively. We also received representations from five local Members of Parliament.

OUR DRAFT PROPOSALS AND THE RESPONSES TO THEM

13. In addition to our letter of 1 April 1987, we published a further consultation letter on 26 November 1991 in connection with this review of Kingston's boundaries. This letter announced our draft proposals and interim decisions to make no proposals, and contained a statement of our views on the pattern and structure of local authorities on the South-west London/North-west Surrey boundary. Copies were sent to all the local authorities concerned and to all those who had submitted representations to us concerning the review. We arranged for a notice to be published advertising our draft proposals and interim decisions, and issued a press release outlining our general conclusions. In addition, the local authorities 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 twelve weeks. Comments were invited by 18 February 1992.

14. We received a total of 970 individual representations in response to our draft proposals and interim decisions. They included comments from Kingston, Richmond, Sutton, Merton, Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Surrey, the Rt Hon
Norman Lamont MP, Mr Richard Tracey MP, Mr Archie Hamilton MP, Mr Ian Taylor MP and Dr Charles Goodson-Wickes MP. The remainder were from local councillors, residents and organisations. We also received 191 proforma letters and 12 petitions, containing a total of 2645 signatures.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE AND OUR CONCLUSIONS

Initial Response to the Review

15. All the initial submissions received from the local authorities in response to our letter of 1 April 1987 recommended relatively minor changes to Kingston's boundaries.

16. In addition to its recommendations for minor change, Kingston made a submission in support of possible major change to its boundaries, in the event that we considered radical change to this part of South-west London appropriate. It asked that any wider review should reflect what it later called its "objective community", and suggested that the areas with the closest affinity to Kingston should be brought within the borough.

17. Kingston considered Kingston town centre to be a prominent and strategic centre in this part of London, both in terms of the geographical area and the population it served. The Council commented that, primarily in respect of shopping and travel to work, but also with regard to education provision, health authority areas, legal, administrative and police areas, and other services, the catchment area of Kingston town centre, and its sphere of influence, extended to a number of areas well beyond the Borough boundary. It listed these areas, in order of claimed closest affinity, as Long Ditton and Thames Ditton; Ham and Petersham; Molesey; Hampton Wick and Teddington; Stoneleigh and West Ewell; Worcester Park; and Bushey Mead/West Barnes.

18. The Council's suggestion that these areas had a close affinity to Kingston and should be brought within the Borough was opposed by Richmond, Elmbridge and Surrey.
19. In its initial response to the review, Merton took the view that we should undertake a review "at macro level to establish the optimum borough size for efficient, cost-effective London local government". The Council further recommended the transfer of Malden and Coombe to its area, on the grounds of historical linkage, and in the interests of placing Merton's level of population on a par with that of neighbouring authorities. The Council indicated that it had submitted this suggestion in response to speculation in the press that we were considering the abolition of the Royal Borough.

20. Epsom and Ewell, in addition to proposing minor boundary realignments, suggested the transfer of green belt land in the Chessington Spur to its area, to rationalise planning responsibility over a wider area, and in anticipation of the development of the Epsom Hospitals Cluster Site.

21. In our initial consideration of the response received to the review, we concluded that a further investigation of the pattern of boundaries in South-west London was required. Accordingly, using the model contained in Appendix F to our Report No 550 "People and Places", we sought further information from the local authorities on such matters as planned future development in the area, the location of public offices, schools, hospitals and other local authority buildings and services, together with details of public transport routes and usage. The information was sought from all authorities along the boundary from (but excluding) Heathrow in the west to Croydon in the east. We are grateful to the local authorities for the substantial body of additional material provided both then and throughout the course of this review.

Summary of Further Submissions

22. In response to Kingston's initial submission, entitled "The Strategic Importance of Kingston Upon Thames" and our request for further information, a number of authorities submitted further representations, specifically addressing the strategic South-west London/North-west Surrey issues in the vicinity of Kingston which had been identified.
23. Surrey expressed the view that Kingston's radical thinking was motivated by concerns over the Royal Borough's small population size, and therefore its viability as a unitary authority in the light of the introduction of the Community Charge and the Uniform Business Rate. Surrey argued that Kingston's shopping-based argument was out of date, as it took no account of new shopping developments at Staines, Woking, Guildford, Leatherhead and Epsom. The County Council considered that it would be impossible to produce satisfactory boundaries based on patterns of shopping, labour catchment areas, leisure facilities and further education usage.

24. While advocating the principle of minimum change, the County Council suggested that, if Kingston were to be rendered unviable as a London borough by the then new local government finance arrangements, the most satisfactory approach would be to return Kingston to Surrey. This, it claimed, would be least disruptive to neighbouring Surrey authorities, and would enable the planning and provision of services to be integrated over a larger and more cohesive area.

25. Kingston submitted a further paper, entitled "The Case for the Objective Community", clarifying and expanding on its earlier submission, and to rebut the County Council's radical suggestion that Kingston be returned to Surrey. In reaffirming its commitment to minimal change, Kingston said that its existing boundary with Surrey was the illogical product of Parliament's rejection in the 1960s of the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London (The Herbert Commission). The Herbert Commission had recommended that areas of North Surrey, including certain of the areas claimed by Kingston as being part of its objective community, should be part of Greater London. The Council expressed the view that these recommendations had not been adopted because of the strength of feeling against change expressed in residents' sentimental attachment to Surrey. This it regarded as a triumph of sentiment over logic.

26. Kingston opposed the suggestion that the Royal Borough be returned to the administrative County of Surrey, on the grounds
of the Borough's close links with London. It also opposed the suggestion on the grounds of the consequential loss to the County Council of control over the provision of certain services. It considered that the extension of two tier local government to metropolitan areas ran counter to the logic of recent changes to the structure of local government in such areas. It also took the view that the case for extending the boundary of South-west London into Surrey, as advocated by the Herbert Commission, had become stronger, rather than weaker, since the time of the Royal Commission.

27. In seeking to identify what it regarded as its wider catchment area, Kingston considered that its "objective community" comprised a social and economic community of interest, based on Kingston as a shopping and administrative centre. Nevertheless, the Council acknowledged that this community of interest might not necessarily be one to which its constituent population actually felt affinity. The community was defined as having a core area, including Long and Thames Ditton, Ham, Petersham, Hampton Wick, Hinchley Wood, Weston Green and the Moleseys, and an outer area, consisting of the Hamptons, Teddington, Stoneleigh, West Ewell and Worcester Park.

28. Kingston also referred to the changing role of local government, and its movement away from being the direct providers of services to acting as the catalysts and co-ordinators of services, in conjunction with other organisations. The Council considered that, in the interests of the effective delivery of services, the introduction of the community charge and the uniform business rate would increase the need for a correlation between the payers for, and the users of, local authority facilities. It therefore asked us to consider the benefit to community chargepayers, in terms of the cost, effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery, if local authority boundaries were to coincide with the operational areas of those organisations with which local government now worked.

29. Richmond's submission, entitled "The Strategic Importance of Richmond Upon Thames", sought to counter Kingston's objective community case for the transfer of Hampton Wick, Ham and
Petersham, by reference to the character and importance of Richmond, which it described as a federation of villages and communities. The submission contained an assessment of the relative importance of Richmond and Kingston in terms of shopping centres, travel to work, transport, leisure, recreation, education, library and information services, arts and cultural provision, trading standards, police and health services.

30. Richmond viewed Kingston's regional shopping argument as irrelevant to the pattern of local authority boundaries, especially in London, where shopping catchment areas and labour markets tended to overlap. Moreover, Richmond noted that no significant change in the size and distribution of the population of Richmond and Kingston had occurred since 1965. The Council therefore reiterated its view that major change would be unjustified, and outside the scope of the Commission's review.

31. In response to Richmond's further submission, Kingston noted that all but one of the eight regional shopping centres in London, identified by the London Planning Advisory Committee, formed the administrative centre for their areas and, with the exceptions of Kingston and Sutton, each of these boroughs had populations in excess of 200,000. However, Kingston asserted that its regional shopping arguments had been advanced in relation to Kingston alone, and that it did not consider that they should be employed to justify radical change elsewhere in London; it was not part of the Council's case that the absence of a regional shopping centre within an authority meant that radical change to other London boroughs should be contemplated.

32. Epsom and Ewell questioned whether we should be considering Kingston's case for radical change. It disagreed with Kingston's view that the existing pattern of boundaries in South-west London had been based more on sentiment than on logic. It said that the current Epsom and Ewell/Greater London boundary reflected Parliament's acceptance of the clearly expressed wishes of the residents in the northern wards of the Borough to remain outside London, and within their unique residents' association-controlled, non-party political Council.
33. In commenting on Kingston's assertion that the existing Kingston/Epsom and Ewell boundary is overlain by development, Epsom and Ewell noted that corridors of open space largely separate the two authorities, and that of the five road links, only two pass through areas of continuous development. It also considered that Kingston's regional shopping argument had not taken recent development in Epsom town centre into account. The Council concluded that major change to its boundaries should not be adopted, since a significant reduction in population could threaten its own continuing viability.

34. No further major representations were submitted by Elmbridge, Merton, Sutton or Wandsworth. However, both Elmbridge and Sutton reiterated their opposition to major change. Sutton expressed the view that South-west London is a fluid area, where people cross boundaries for many purposes, paying little or no regard to them. It saw no justification for major boundary change, and therefore opposed both the extension of Kingston into Worcester Park, and the return of Kingston to Surrey.

Local Authority Leaflet Surveys

35. During the course of the review, both Kingston and Surrey undertook surveys of local residents. Kingston distributed one set of leaflets to residents of the Royal Borough, to elicit their views on Surrey's claim to Kingston, and another set to the residents of other London boroughs and Surrey districts, within the area defined as its objective community, to elicit their views on Kingston's objective community case. Of the latter leaflets, the Council informed us that less than 5% of the total number distributed were returned, approximately a third of which supported Kingston's case.

36. Surrey also canvassed those residents of the county affected by Kingston's suggestion, issuing 25,000 leaflets. Of the 3,179 of these leaflets returned, 87% expressed a wish to remain in Surrey and only 13% favoured transfer to Kingston.
Other Comments on Major Submissions

37. Kingston's case for expanding the Borough to include all of its claimed objective community was supported, to varying degrees, by a number of respondents. Mr Richard Tracey MP favoured the transfer of the Dittons to Kingston and opposed the possibility of the Borough's partition, reduction in size, or transfer to Surrey. Lord Rawlinson of Ewell favoured a move towards a unitary system of local government. The Kaleidoscope Youth and Community Project, the Kingston and Esher Health Authority and a Kingston department store supported Kingston's case. The Kingston Arts Council supported the transfer of Hampton Wick, Thames Ditton and Hinchley Wood to Kingston. Transport 2000 supported the inclusion of the Moleseys, the Dittons, Hinchley Wood, Stoneleigh and West Ewell within the Borough. The Kingston, Merton and Wandsworth Training and Enterprise Council (AZTEC) considered that Kingston, Merton, Wandsworth, Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell formed a continuous area of business development, and favoured uniting Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell within Kingston.

38. We also received representations in support of Kingston's case from three residents of Button, eight residents of Epsom and Ewell, and eleven residents of Elmbridge.

39. The suggestion that Kingston be returned to Surrey was specifically opposed by many of those who supported the expansion of the Royal Borough. It was also opposed by the Parochial Church of St Paul at Hook with Southborough, the London Fire and Civil Defence Authority, the Kingston upon Thames Magistrates' Courts Committee and by 25 members of the public.

40. In support of Surrey's suggestion that Kingston be returned to the county as a shire district, we received a representation from Mr Archie Hamilton MP, and 78 letters from local residents' associations and private individuals.

41. In opposition to Kingston's objective community claims, we received 154 individual letters from residents and local organisations in Epsom and Ewell and Sutton, and 190 letters from
residents and local organisations in Elmbridge. We also received 300 letters, six petitions and three sets of pro forma letters, totalling 954 and 928 signatures respectively, from residents of Richmond. Mr Jeremy Hanley MP, Mr Toby Jessel MP and Mr Ian Taylor MP also wrote to us, opposing the expansion of Kingston into areas covered by their constituencies.

42. We received a number of suggestions from members of the public for radical change to the pattern of boundaries in South-west London.

43. One individual suggested that, were Kingston to become unviable as a local authority, two new authorities should be created from the areas currently covered by Kingston, Merton and Sutton. Another individual considered that recent changes to the structure and financing of London local government merited a change in the configuration of boundaries in South-west London. He suggested the creation of three new boroughs as follows: first, an amalgamation of Kingston, Surbiton, Richmond centre, Barnes and Long Ditton; second, an amalgamation of Twickenham, Teddington, Hampton, Feltham and Spelthorne to form a London Borough of South Middlesex; and, lastly, the amalgamation of Chessington and Old Malden with Epsom and Ewell. Eight members of the public favoured the merging of Kingston and Richmond.

Our Consideration of the Major Submissions Received

44. In considering the existing pattern of boundaries in South-west London, we arrived at a number of conclusions in respect of the strategic arguments submitted. In regard to Kingston's case for its claimed objective community, we were mindful that the Council had advanced its regional shopping centre argument solely in relation to the review of its own boundaries. However, we considered that it was impracticable for the area and boundaries of any local authority to reflect the regional importance of its shopping centre or centres. Similarly, we were not wholly convinced by Kingston's argument concerning the relationship between community chargepayers and the provision of services by Kingston as a regional centre. Nevertheless, we did consider that there was some justification, in the context of this review,
for some limited change in relation to certain of the areas closest to Kingston's present boundaries, in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

45. We considered that there was evidence of strong community ties across Kingston's boundary with Richmond, Sutton and, to a lesser extent, with Merton and Wandsworth. However, we concluded that community ties and service catchment areas are far more likely to overlap in a densely populated area such as London. We were not, therefore, convinced that, with the exception of the Worcester Park area, radical change to Kingston's boundaries with its neighbouring London boroughs was required.

46. In considering the County Council's suggestion that Kingston be returned to Surrey, we observed that such a change would be contrary to the findings of the Herbert Commission. The Herbert Commission had applied three "tests" in considering whether an area should be brought within the outer London boundary. These were: how strong is the area as an independent centre in its own right; how strong are its ties to London; and how strongly is it drawn outwards towards the country rather than inwards towards London. Notwithstanding the time which has elapsed since the Herbert Commission reported, we considered these tests to be still valid in determining the extent of the outer London boundary. Analysis of the 1981 census information illustrated the very close links which the Surrey districts closest to London appear to have with both central London and their neighbouring outer London boroughs. In our view, and in contrast to the County Council's suggestion, this tended to reinforce rather than weaken the findings of the Herbert Commission that wider areas of North Surrey are effectively part of Greater London. Accordingly, we concluded that it would be a retrograde step to propose the return of Kingston to Surrey as a shire district in the county.

OUR APPROACH TO THE REVIEW AND VIEWS ON THE STRATEGIC ISSUES

47. We recognised at an early stage in this review that the historical development of boundaries in South-west London had produced a number of obvious anomalies.
48. First, the outer London boundary between Kingston and Epsom and Ewell, between Sutton and Epsom and Ewell and between Kingston and Elmbridge fails, in places, to reflect the present pattern of development. Our guidelines from the Secretary of State for the Environment (contained in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86) advise that where the Greater London boundary has become overlain by development, change might be required to correct anomalies. However, the guidelines also advise us to exercise special care in considering such change, since the distribution of local authority functions is substantially different on either side of the outer London boundary.

49. Second, we noted that a number of authorities in this area, including Kingston and Epsom and Ewell, are relatively small in terms of population, and recognised that the viability of these authorities might be brought into question by significant reductions in their populations as a consequence of any major boundary changes. In this respect, we were mindful of our guidelines from the Secretary of State that we should have regard to the need for authorities affected by boundary changes to have an adequate population base for the efficient and cost-effective discharge of their functions.

50. In the light of these issues and their potential consequences, we concluded that we would need to take an overall view of London's south-western boundary and, in particular, the boundaries of Kingston upon Thames.

51. We took the view that major change would be required if improved and enduring outer London boundaries were to be produced in this part of London. In such circumstances, the Secretary of State's guidelines advise that consideration be given to the merging of existing local government areas, rather than any more widespread redrawing of boundaries. This, we considered, would be likely to affect both the pattern and number of local authorities in the area, with the possible merging of at least one Surrey district with one or more London boroughs. However, it was clear to the Commission that the present review, with its fairly restrictive guidelines, was not the occasion for the
restructuring of London local authorities. Moreover, London boroughs and shire districts are not "areas of like description" under the 1972 Act, and it is at least questionable whether such a merger could properly be proposed under existing legislation.

52. Accordingly, we considered that it would be preferable for the boundary problems of South-west London to be addressed at some stage by a wider review, encompassing more than just the London boroughs. Such a review would need to examine the correct location for the outer London boundary, having regard to the types of local authorities either side of the boundary, and the likely size and pattern of authorities required in the interests of effective and convenient local government. It should have regard to the extent of the continuous built up area of London, to the green belt and to the economic and community links that exist to main centres in the South West London area, as well as to central London and other main centres of employment. It would need to consider how the wishes of the people could be reflected in appropriate units of local government, and the best way of representing loyalties at parish, district/borough and county level.

53. We noted that such a review might also be the appropriate occasion to consider Merton's request for a "macro level" review, as mentioned in paragraph 19 above. With this in mind, we decided not to issue draft proposals for radical change to the pattern of boundaries in South-west London, but instead to make a number of draft proposals for minor and intermediate changes, in order to rectify the more glaring boundary anomalies and to provide better building blocks for any future review. We also decided to set out the main areas which, in our view, may require consideration as part of a wider future review.

54. We identified two particular areas where radical change might, in the future, be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government: the Worcester Park area; and along Kingston's boundary with Elmbridge.
Worcester Park (Kingston/Epsom and Ewell/Sutton)

55. As part of its proposals, Kingston had suggested transferring the northern wards of Epsom and Ewell and part of Sutton (encompassing Worcester Park) to its authority. However, we considered that Kingston's suggestion appeared to divide existing community ties in North Cheam and would, if adopted, bring the viability of Epsom and Ewell into question, given the already small population size of the Borough.

56. In addition to Kingston's suggestion, we also received a number of radical suggestions from members of the public, intended to resolve the boundary anomalies in the Worcester Park area. They included:

a. uniting the Worcester Park postal district in Kingston;

b. transferring Worcester Park (with the exception of that part of it currently located within Kingston) to either Sutton or Epsom and Ewell.

57. We considered that these suggestions would arbitrarily divide the centre of North Cheam in Sutton and the northern wards of Epsom and Ewell. We also noted that uniting Worcester Park in Epsom and Ewell would have the effect of extending the administrative County of Surrey into London. We considered that this would be inconsistent with the apparent ties which the area has to Greater London.

58. Other individuals suggested:

a. using the A240 and the A24 to divide Epsom and Ewell between Kingston, Sutton and Reigate and Banstead, or using the Motspur Park/Epsom railway line to similar effect;

b. the amalgamation of Epsom and Ashtead with Kingston, and the amalgamation of Ewell and Banstead with Sutton, to form two unitary authorities; and

c. transferring Worcester Park to Sutton, and the return of
Kingston and Sutton to Surrey.

59. We considered that these suggestions constituted measures of restructuring outside the scope of this review.

60. Nevertheless, we concluded that strong evidence had been presented to us which had demonstrated that local authority boundaries in the Worcester Park area do not reflect the pattern of community life. The local shopping centre and BR station serve an area arbitrarily divided not only between three authorities, but also between two different types of authority (shire district and London borough). While noting that local public opinion was opposed to change, we took the view that the existing pattern of boundaries in this area is fundamentally flawed.

61. In our view, the present boundary is poorly related to the pattern of development. It does not provide a sound basis for a boundary, either between London boroughs, or for outer London, and it is a tribute to the local authorities concerned that, since 1965, it has been made to work.

62. For the reasons given in paragraph 51 above, we did not consider that we could propose radical change, such as bringing Epsom and Ewell into London, in the context of this review. We therefore took the view that the boundary in this area should be considered at some stage in a wider context, encompassing more than just the London boroughs.

Kingston's boundary with Elmbridge

63. We considered that much evidence had been presented to demonstrate the existence of a strong community of interest across this ill-defined boundary, together with some evidence of a need for joint local authority service and planning arrangements. We noted that Kingston, as part of its objective community claim, had recommended encompassing within its authority a wider area of Elmbridge, including Long and Thames Ditton, Hinchley Wood, Weston Green and the Moleseys.
64. Of the areas claimed by Kingston as part of its objective community case, we found persuasive the arguments for some expansion westwards, into Elmbridge, in terms of community of interest and the pattern of development. However, we considered Kingston's claim as a whole to parts of Elmbridge to be outside the scope of our current review.

65. We considered that there was sufficient information to call into question the present pattern of local authorities and the outer London boundary west of Kingston. The fact that the administration of police and health services crosses the outer London boundary, the relative dominance of Kingston as a centre, and the break in development caused by several reservoirs and the green belt, suggested to us that more radical change was desirable than was possible in the context of this review.

66. We considered that to prolong the current review would cause unnecessary uncertainty to local authorities in an area where, in detail, several different boundary realignments could be found. Unlike the area to the east of Kingston, the edge of the continuous built up area of "London" may be more difficult to define, and an all-embracing solution such as the absorption by Kingston of the Borough of Elmbridge does not obviously present itself. We therefore came to the view that any future, wider review should examine various options for the boundary of Kingston, encompassing more than just the London boroughs.

Response to our views on the strategic issues, and our conclusions

67. Our views on the existing pattern of boundaries in South-west London and North-west Surrey were supported by Kingston and by Mr Richard Tracey MP. Kingston welcomed our decision not to adopt Surrey's suggestion to return the Royal Borough to Surrey as a shire district, and our identification of a need for a wider review of boundaries in South-west London. This it considered to be an endorsement of some of the arguments contained in its own "objective community" case.
68. Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Surrey, a Surrey county councillor, five local residents' associations and three Conservative Associations in Elmbridge criticised our stated views on the wider boundary issues in South-west London, and our approach to the review. The County Council expressed the view that our attempt to create better building blocks for a possible future, wider, review was inappropriate.

69. Elmbridge considered that we had failed to justify our view that the existing Kingston/Elmbridge boundary did not reflect the strong pattern of community life. The Council also questioned whether, in stating that the existing boundary between Kingston and Elmbridge is overlain by development, we were suggesting that the boundary was unsatisfactory when created, or that it had become so over time.

70. Elmbridge considered that the validity of Parliament's reasons for rejecting the Herbert Commission's proposals to include the former Esher Urban District Council within Greater London had not been diminished since the reorganisation of local government in Greater London in the early 1960s. The Council also commented that the existing Kingston/Elmbridge boundary had not become overlain by development since its creation.

71. Both Elmbridge and the Hinchley Wood Residents' Association expressed the view that we had been over-reliant on the findings of the Herbert Commission in formulating our views, and had overlooked recent significant retail and other commercial developments at Guildford and Woking.

72. Epsom and Ewell considered that we had relied solely on the pattern of development in South-west London to justify our views. In response to our comments on the possibility of merging Epsom and Ewell with one or more London boroughs as part of a wider review, the Council commented that our views had been derived from the consideration of a narrow and limited range of information and factors, and were therefore "unsafe".

73. Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Surrey, the Long Ditton Residents' Association, the Hinchley Wood Residents' Association,
the Long Ditton Conservative Association, the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Conservative Association, the Claygate Conservative Association and a Surrey county councillor all expressed the view that the overall effect of our comments, together with our draft proposal for change to Kingston's boundary with Elmbridge at Long Ditton, would be to pre-empt the findings of the new Local Government Commission in its review of the pattern of local government in South-west London and North-west Surrey. Both Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell expressed concern that our approach to this review could jeopardise their respective bids for unitary status as part of the impending review of local government structure in England.

74. The Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents' Association expressed the view that changes to local authority boundaries could not be justified by reference to the boundaries of other administrative bodies, such as police and health authorities. Moreover, both the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents' Association and the Hinchley Wood Residents' Association expressed the view that a case for limiting the Metropolitan Police area to the existing boundaries of Greater London could be made.

75. The Cuddington Residents' Association considered our statement of a need for a future wider review to be unwarranted.

76. We also received a number of other general comments and suggestions in response to our views on the desirability of radical change in this part of London. Three members of the public suggested that Epsom and Ewell should be incorporated into Greater London, while another considered that a case could be made for abolishing Epsom and Ewell as a borough, and dividing its area between neighbouring authorities.

77. One member of the public suggested uniting Worcester Park in Kingston, while another suggested uniting Worcester Park in Epsom and Ewell. A third considered that the existing pattern of boundaries at Worcester Park should be retained pending the creation of unitary authorities in Surrey.
78. Mr Archie Hamilton MP considered that Epsom and Ewell should not be incorporated into Greater London. He felt that Epsom and Ewell was linked to Surrey by long-standing community ties, and expressed the view that a case could be made for returning areas of Greater London to Surrey. Two members of the public also opposed a transfer of Epsom and Ewell to Greater London.

79. Three members of the public supported Surrey's original suggestion to transfer Kingston to Surrey as a shire district.

80. One member of the public suggested amalgamating Kingston with the London Borough of Hounslow, while another suggested that the pre-1972 Esher Urban District Council should be recreated.

Our conclusions on radical change

81. We explained in our letter of 26 November 1991 that our views on the pattern and structure of the local authorities along the South-west London/North-west Surrey boundary did not form part of our draft proposals, and we did not specifically seek comments on them. Nevertheless, we have given careful consideration to all the comments we received, and to the suggestions for alternative patterns of boroughs and districts.

82. Our view remains that the outer London boundary in this area, and the pattern and structure of the authorities along its length, contains a number of significant and fundamental flaws which need to be addressed. We are also of the view that satisfactory solutions are unlikely to be achieved without major change, and that such change would need to encompass more than just the London boroughs in this part of London.

83. We have a duty under the 1972 Act to make proposals to the Secretary of State for boundary changes which appear to us desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government. However, as previously indicated, we do not feel that this review of Greater London is the appropriate occasion for radical change; and it is questionable whether such change as might be necessary along the South-west London/North-west Surrey boundary would be achievable under the provisions of the
1972 Act governing the conduct of this review.

84. We have therefore confirmed our view that there is no scope, given our remit, for radical change in the context of this review. Having considered all the evidence submitted to us on Kingston's boundaries with Epsom and Ewell and with Elmbridge (including the case for and against minor changes discussed in paragraphs 102 to 176 below), we remain of the view that it would be sensible for radical change to be investigated in the context of a wider review.

85. We consider it important that the structural issues we have identified above should not be overlooked in any future review of the outer London boundary in this area, and should be drawn to the attention of our successor, the Local Government Commission, and to the Secretary of State. We do not see that the identification of these issues in any way fetters the discretion of either the new Commission or the Secretary of State, as had been suggested.

OUR PROPOSALS AND DECISIONS

LOCAL AUTHORITY BOUNDARIES IN THE WORCESTER PARK AREA

A. KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH SUTTON

The Station Estate

Draft Proposal

86. The existing boundary divides properties on Pembury Avenue, part of the Station Estate, and Caverleigh Way, and divides the Kingston-administered Green Lane Primary School, in Sutton, from its playing fields in Kingston. Kingston, supported by the Metropolitan Police, one individual and the Station Estate Residents' Association, suggested realigning the boundary to the centre of Green Lane and Central Road to unite the "Station Estate" in its authority.
87. Sutton agreed with the principle of uniting the Estate, but opposed Kingston's realignment, commenting that it would create problems over highway maintenance and transfer to Kingston an area of open land, west of Green Lane, which is used by Sutton residents, and by the Worcester Park Athletic Club. It suggested a less extensive realignment, to follow rear garden fence lines. This would unite the playing fields adjacent to Green Lane in Sutton. The Worcester Park Athletic Club supported Sutton's suggestion to unite its ground in its authority.

88. One local resident commented that Sutton's alignment could create future planning difficulties. He claimed that the residents of the Estate have an affinity with Sutton and are isolated from Kingston by the railway line which, in his view, represented the best and most clearly defined boundary. This suggestion was supported by one other resident.

89. We agreed that the Station Estate appeared to look to Sutton, and to be isolated from Kingston by the Motspur Park/Epsom railway line, and considered that the use of the railway would provide a more logical boundary between Kingston and Sutton in the Worcester Park area. We therefore adopted as our draft proposal the suggestion submitted by a member of the public to unite the Estate in Sutton by aligning the boundary to the railway line, subject to extending the alignment south to Worcester Park Station, thereby also uniting the Worcester Park Sports Ground in Sutton.

Final Proposal

90. Kingston opposed our draft proposal, on the grounds that residents of the Station Estate were opposed to it. As evidence of this, Kingston noted that it had received, but not forwarded to us, a petition in September 1987, prior to the publication of our draft proposal, containing the signatures of 370 Estate residents, expressing the wish to remain in Kingston. Since the publication of our draft proposal, it had received a further petition, bearing 451 signatures opposing the transfer of the Station Estate to Sutton, organised by the Station Estate Residents' Association. This was submitted to us.
91. The Council also informed us that it had circulated a questionnaire, with the agreement of Sutton, to Kingston residents of the Estate, seeking their views on our draft proposal. It reported that, of the 145 replies received (a 40% response rate), some 70% had expressed a wish to stay in Kingston, and only 14% had supported our draft proposal.

92. Kingston also commented that our draft proposal would result in a loss to the Borough of twelve council properties, together with the main catchment area for Green Lane Primary School. It observed that, of 196 pupils attending the school, 105 were resident in Kingston, 66 were resident in Sutton and 25 were resident in other authorities.

93. The Council suggested that the Station Estate, Green Lane Primary School and the Worcester Park Sports Ground should be united in Kingston, by realigning the boundary to follow a combination of the east side of Green Lane, the rear curtilages of properties fronting the east side of Caverleigh Way, and the Beverley Brook.

94. Our draft proposal was also opposed by Sutton, which suggested uniting Green Lane Primary School in Kingston, by realigning the boundary to follow the west side of Green Lane. It also suggested realigning the boundary to follow the east side of Caverleigh Way to unite in Sutton a number of divided properties fronting the east side of the road.

95. Our draft proposal was also opposed by two Kingston councillors, the Malden and Coombe Civic Society and 26 members of the public. All commented that Kingston residents of the Station Estate looked to that authority, and not to Sutton. In addition to opposing our draft proposal, three members of the public suggested realigning the boundary to follow Green Lane; another two suggested realigning the boundary to follow the Beverley Brook; and one Kingston councillor and four members of the public suggested realigning the boundary to follow either Green Lane or the Beverley Brook.
96. We received a further submission from a member of the public, who expressed the view that the overall effect of our draft proposal, taken together with past and possible future residential development, would be to reduce the standard of representation in Sutton's Worcester Park North Ward. He therefore suggested dividing the Ward into two two-member wards.

97. We considered that the arguments for and against the draft proposal were finely balanced. On the one hand, there was the apparent barrier effect of the railway line, but on the other the strong opposition voiced locally to its adoption as the boundary in this area. In the light of the representations received, we concluded that our draft proposal could not be sustained solely on the basis that the railway line created a physical barrier. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal.

98. Nevertheless, we considered that some change to the existing boundary was required in order to resolve the current division of Green Lane Primary School, the Worcester Park Sports Ground and properties fronting the east side of Caverleigh Way.

99. We observed that suggestions made by Kingston, one of the Kingston councillors and a number of residents would unite the Station Estate, Green Lane School and the sports ground in Kingston. However, we had received no evidence to suggest that the residents of the properties fronting the east side of Caverleigh Way have an affinity with Kingston, or would welcome being transferred to that Borough. We also considered that the Worcester Park Sports Ground appeared to be associated more with Sutton than with Kingston.

100. Both Kingston and Sutton had suggested uniting Green Lane Primary School in Kingston, which owns and administers it. However, neither authority had identified any specific problems resulting from the school's out-of-borough location. Additionally, we had been informed that a substantial proportion of its pupils live outside Kingston. We considered that the Beverley Brook appeared to form a clear boundary to the west of the school and, in the circumstances, we could see no overriding reason why the current boundary should not be retained.
101. In the absence of more substantial change in this area, we concluded that the anomalies present in the existing boundary could reasonably be resolved by uniting in Sutton Green Lane Primary School, the Worcester Park Sports Ground and the divided properties fronting the east side of Caverleigh Way. We therefore adopted as our final proposal a realignment of the boundary to follow the Beverley Brook, to the west of Green Lane School; the centre line of Caverleigh Way; and, in the vicinity of the Worcester Park Sports Ground, a combination of the rear fence lines of properties fronting the south side of Pembury Avenue, and the east side of the Motspur Park/Epsom railway line.

B. KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH EPSOM AND EWELL

The Avenue

Draft Proposal

102. Kingston suggested a minor realignment of the boundary to rationalise the current arbitrary division of The Avenue, which would have the effect of transferring the Worcester Park Baptist Church to Epsom and Ewell. Surrey County Council submitted a similar suggestion, but which would result in the boundary passing around rather than through sites, and which differentiated in its alignment between commercial and residential areas. Surrey argued that Kingston's suggestion did not fully resolve the boundary anomalies in the vicinity of the Baptist Church and Forrester's Court.

103. In a later submission, Kingston revised its suggestion, proposing a realignment which would leave the church in Kingston and transfer Forrester's Court to its authority.

104. Epsom and Ewell suggested a more extensive boundary realignment, which would unite The Avenue and related residential and commercial properties in its authority. It commented that this would reflect community ties in the area and unite maintenance responsibility for The Avenue and Park Terrace within one authority.
105. We agreed that Epsom and Ewell's suggested realignment appeared to provide the clearest delineation of local authority responsibilities in the area. We therefore decided to adopt that Council's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

106. Our draft proposal was supported by Epsom and Ewell, Surrey, the Ewell Court Residents' Association, the Cuddington Residents' Association and one member of the public. However, it was opposed by Kingston, a Kingston councillor, the Orchard Court Residents' Association, Briarwood Residents Limited, and eight members of the public. We also received two petitions, containing 37 and 23 signatures respectively, opposing our draft proposal.

107. We also received a representation from a member of the public suggesting that a wider area of Worcester Park should be transferred to Kingston by realigning the boundary between Kingston and Epsom and Ewell to follow the A240 Kingston Road and the Motspur Park railway line.

108. We took the view that the present alignment in this area provides a clear example of the illogicality of the existing outer London boundary in South-west London. However, mindful of our conclusion that major change would be required to create a satisfactory outer London boundary, and in the light of the opposition to our draft proposal expressed by Kingston and by local residents, we concluded that there would be little benefit to be gained in terms of effective and convenient local government by transferring Orchard Court, Briarwood Court, the Worcester Park Hotel and the Worcester Park Baptist Church from Kingston to Epsom and Ewell. We therefore decided to withdraw our draft proposal.

109. We considered the alternative suggestion we had received to transfer a wider area of Worcester Park to Kingston. However, we had received no public support for such major change, and we were aware that such a transfer might call into question the future viability of Epsom and Ewell. We therefore decided to
limit our final proposals for this area to minor change only, and to unite the divided properties of Forrester's Court and Purdey Court in Epsom and Ewell.

C. SUTTON'S BOUNDARY WITH EPSOM AND EWELL

Richlands Avenue, Woodstone Avenue, Sparrow Farm Road and London Road - Sutton/Epsom and Ewell Boundary

Draft Proposal

110. Sutton suggested realigning the boundary to the north side of London Road, Sparrow Farm Road and Woodstone Avenue, and to the rear garden fencelines of properties fronting Richlands Avenue. In support of its suggestion, the Council commented that residents of these properties look to Sutton for services and shopping; that Richlands Avenue represents a watershed between Stoneleigh and Worcester Park; and that this alignment would effect an equal exchange of properties with Epsom and Ewell.

111. Surrey County Council and Epsom and Ewell submitted suggestions for realignments along the south side of Sparrow Farm Road as far as Woodstone Avenue, and then the rear fencelines of properties fronting Sparrow Farm Road. This, they claimed, would reflect the differences in the character of properties on either side of the proposed realignment.

112. We considered that Epsom and Ewell's suggestion appeared to provide the most consistent alignment, in that it would unite the whole of Woodstone Avenue in Surrey, and decided to adopt it as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

113. Our draft proposal was supported by Epsom and Ewell, Surrey, the Stoneleigh Residents' Association, the Ewell Court Residents' Association and by one member of the public. However, it was opposed by Sutton, a Sutton councillor and 46 members of the public. We also received two petitions opposing our draft proposal, containing 87 and 18 signatures respectively.
114. Sutton said that our draft proposal failed to reflect the wishes of residents of Richlands Avenue, Gayfere Road and Woodstone Avenue, and reiterated its original suggestion for minor change only. The Council later revised its suggestion to retain a greater number of Gayfere Road properties in its authority.

115. In addition to opposing our draft proposal, two members of the public also suggested a number of alternative realignments to the south of Richlands Avenue. One recommended three alternative suggestions:

a. a realignment to transfer a number of properties fronting Rosedale Road, Richlands Avenue, Gayfere Road and Woodstone Avenue from Epsom and Ewell to Sutton;

b. a minor realignment to unite a number of divided properties in Sutton; and

c. a minor realignment to unite all but one of the properties fronting the south side of Richlands Avenue in Sutton.

116. The other member of the public suggested uniting in Sutton all but two of the properties fronting the south side of Richlands Avenue.

117. We considered that the present boundary at Stoneleigh provided yet another example of the unsatisfactory nature of the outer London boundary in South-west London. However, having concluded that the scale of change necessary to produce a satisfactory outer London boundary in this area was beyond the scope of our current review, we took the view that our draft proposal would produce the best alternative, rectifying the more obvious boundary anomalies. We have therefore decided to confirm it as final.
LOCAL AUTHORITY BOUNDARIES IN THE VICINITY OF THE HOGSMILL RIVER, CHESSINGTON SPUR AND MALDEN RUSHETT

A. KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH EPSOM AND EWELL

(i) Hogsmill River

Draft Proposal

118. Surrey County Council and Epsom and Ewell submitted similar suggestions for a realignment of the boundary to follow the new course of the Hogsmill River. Surrey's suggested alignment followed the eastern bank of the river, while Epsom and Ewell preferred the mid course of the river. Kingston supported Epsom and Ewell's suggestion.

119. A member of the public suggested aligning the boundary to Old Maiden Lane, to reflect the affinity she considered residents on the west side of the lane to have with Kingston.

120. We observed that the Hogsmill River, and the area of open land to the north of it, formed a clear break in development between Kingston and Epsom and Ewell in this area. While noting the affinity residents on the western side of Old Maiden Lane were said to have with Kingston, we concluded that the Hogsmill River would provide the most clearly defined boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Epsom and Ewell's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

121. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston, Surrey and Epsom and Ewell. We received no other comments and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

(ii) Chessington Road/Headley Close/Ashby Avenue

Draft Proposal

122. Surrey County Council suggested a realignment which would
transfer all of the properties fronting Chessington Road to Surrey. Epsom and Ewell suggested a similar alignment, but also recommended the transfer to its authority of properties in Headley Close, which can be accessed only from Chessington Road. Without giving any reasons, Kingston opposed both suggestions.

123. We considered the suggestions submitted by Surrey and Epsom and Ewell, but concluded that no major change was required to this stretch of boundary. However, we noted that there were proposals to widen Chessington Road, from single to wide single or dual-carriageway status, as part of the proposed development of the Epsom Hospitals Site. Accordingly, in the interests of producing a more durable boundary in this area, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal a centre of road alignment along Chessington Road.

Final Proposal

124. Kingston, Epsom and Ewell and Surrey all opposed our draft proposal, on the grounds that the proposed centre of road alignment would militate against the provision of highway services in this area. Surrey resubmitted its original suggestion, while Kingston suggested that the boundary should be realigned to follow the south side of Chessington Road. Epsom and Ewell considered that the existing boundary should be retained.

125. We were also informed that the major road widening proposals for Chessington Road had been dropped since we had published our draft proposals. In the light of this, and the opposition of the local authorities, we decided to withdraw our draft proposal. However, we considered that some minor change was required in order to tie the boundary to firm ground detail. We have therefore decided to adopt as our final proposal Kingston's suggestion to realign the boundary to follow the south side of Chessington Road.
B. KINGSTON'S BOUNDARIES WITH EPSOM AND EWELL AND MOLE VALLEY

Chessington Spur and Malden Rushett

Draft Proposal and Interim Decision

126. Epsom and Ewell suggested a realignment which would have the effect of transferring a substantial part of the Chessington Spur, including Malden Rushett, to its authority, and transferring the Star Public House and surrounding properties to Mole Valley. The Council expressed the view that the Greater London boundary in this area is anomalous in shape, and that Malden Rushett and its environs have a substantial community of interest with the recently developed Epsom Town Centre.

127. Epsom and Ewell also considered that the expected residential and related transport development of the Epsom Hospitals Site merited the inclusion of this wider area in its Borough, thereby providing that one authority exerted overall planning control over the area. Surrey County Council commented that, should the Commission adopt Epsom and Ewell's suggestion, it would not raise any objections. One member of the public suggested that Chessington be split between Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell. We also received a number of other suggestions for the transfer of Malden Rushett to either Epsom and Ewell or Elmbridge.

128. Kingston expressed the view that the Malden Rushett area has clear links to the rest of its authority. The Council therefore opposed Epsom and Ewell's suggestion, as did Mr Richard Tracey MP, the Parochial Church Council of St Paul at Hook with Southborough, and nine residents of the area. Instead, Kingston suggested only minor realignments to the boundary in the vicinity of The Star public house, to bring the public house and a number of isolated properties on the eastern side of the A243 Leatherhead Road into its area, on the basis of their community links with Malden Rushett.

129. Mole Valley opposed Kingston's suggestion, on the grounds that the area in question related more to Surrey than to London,
but did not suggest any realignment. Surrey suggested a realignment in the area of The Star public house identical to that submitted by Epsom and Ewell, to unite the area in Mole Valley, on the grounds of its community links to Leatherhead.

130. Despite the fact that Malden Rushett is located in the green belt, we had received a number of representations from the area suggesting that residents had strong links and affinities with Kingston, rather than with Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley or Elmbridge. In considering the matter, we reaffirmed the view we have taken in relation to a number of other London borough reviews, that there should be no general policy of transferring green belt out of Greater London, on the sole ground that it is green belt.

131. We therefore took an interim decision not to propose any major change to the boundary in respect of either Chessington or Malden Rushett. We also agreed with Kingston that The Star public house and other nearby properties appeared to look to Malden Rushett. We therefore decided to adopt Kingston's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to minor modifications to make better use of ground detail.

Final Proposal

132. Kingston supported our interim decision to make no proposals for radical change to the boundary in respect of Chessington and Malden Rushett, and our draft proposal for minor change in the area of The Star public house. However, Epsom and Ewell expressed disappointment at our interim decision not to propose the transfer of part of the Chessington Spur, including Malden Rushett, to its authority, commenting that its suggested realignment would have provided the basis for good and effective local government, particularly with regard to planning and development.

133. Mole Valley opposed our draft proposal for minor change in the vicinity of The Star public house. The Council said that it would oppose the transfer of any part of its area to another authority, and reported that it had contacted the residents of
two properties affected by our draft proposal to seek their views. It informed us that the owner of D'Abernon House had objected to our draft proposal on the grounds that his landholding would be divided by our proposed alignment, forwarding to us a copy of his letter. Mole Valley therefore suggested an alternative realignment which would retain the resident's property wholly within its area.

134. We also received a representation from a member of the public, who expressed disappointment at our interim decision not to adopt Epsom and Ewell's major suggestion, commenting that a new Surrey magistrates' court division, straddling the salient formed by Kingston's existing boundaries with Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley and Elmbridge, was due to be created in 1993.

135. We gave careful consideration to all the comments received in response to our interim decision. However, we reaffirmed our view that the Chessington Spur appeared to be linked more to Kingston than either Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley or Elmbridge, and that there was insufficient justification for transferring the open land to the south of Chessington out of Kingston. We have therefore decided to confirm as final our interim decision to make no proposals for major change to the existing pattern of boundaries to the south of Chessington.

136. We considered the response to our draft proposal for minor change in the area of The Star public house. However, we concluded that our draft proposal appeared to reflect the community in that area, and its affinities. We acknowledged that it would divide the D'Abernon House landholding, but observed that the property is already split to some extent, by a minor road and a number of public footpaths. We concluded that, although it was often sensible for local authority boundaries to respect patterns of property ownership, there were bound to be occasions when this was not the case. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH ELMBRIDGE

A. Long Ditton

Draft Proposal

137. Both Surrey County Council and Elmbridge had suggested only minor change to the Kingston/Elmbridge boundary in the vicinity of Long Ditton, as had, originally, Kingston. The concept of minor change was supported by the Long Ditton Residents' Association. However, we considered that these suggestions failed to recognise the strong affinities, and the community of interest, which we believed that certain parts of Elmbridge had with Kingston. Nor did they recognise the desirability of creating a clearly identifiable Greater London boundary which is not overlain by development.

138. In our guidelines from the Secretary of State, contained in Department of the Environment Circular 20/86, we are advised to pay particular regard to, inter alia, the outer London boundary, in view of the difference in the distribution of functions between metropolitan and shire authorities. As discussed in paragraph 49 above, we have been constrained during the course of this review of Kingston's boundaries by the potential implications of intermediate to major change for the viability of authorities, notably in relation to Kingston's boundary with Epsom and Ewell in the Worcester Park area. However, we took the view that these constraints did not apply to the same extent in respect of Kingston's boundary with Elmbridge.

139. As previously indicated, we were unable to accept Kingston's entire objective community claim in respect of its boundary with Elmbridge. However, we considered that there was evidence to suggest that Long Ditton, which forms part of a continuous built up residential area with Southborough and, more generally, Surbiton, has strong links with, and looks to, the Royal Borough.
140. We also observed that the Surbiton Water Works Site was subject to a joint Kingston/Elmbridge residential development brief. We considered that this site also looked to Kingston.

141. Accordingly, we decided to adopt as our draft proposal for this area a realignment to unite Long Ditton and the Surbiton Water Works Site in Kingston.

Final Proposals

142. Kingston considered that our draft proposal would produce a more rational delineation of planning responsibilities in the Long Ditton area. However, while the Council expressed confidence in its ability to assume full responsibility for providing local services to Long Ditton, it considered that our draft proposal fell short of creating a clearly identifiable boundary for Greater London.

143. The Council therefore asked us to consider whether it would be preferable to propose extensive change now, involving the transfer of both Thames Ditton and Long Ditton to its authority, rather than proposing only intermediate change in this review. It also commented that many of the concerns expressed by residents of Long Ditton were based on a misapprehension of its policies, and of the practical impact of change.

144. However, Kingston also commented that if we were minded to withdraw our draft proposal for Long Ditton, it would still wish to have the Surbiton Water Works Site transferred to its area. In addition, it suggested that the Thames Marina should also be transferred from Elmbridge, since it would form part of the water works site development. The Council also reiterated its original suggestions for minor change to the boundary, between the Surbiton/Esher railway line and the A3.

145. Our draft proposal was also supported by Mr Richard Tracey MP, who felt that it represented an improvement on the existing boundary. The Pastoral Committee of the Diocese of Southwark, while supporting the principle of transferring Long Ditton to Kingston, suggested that the boundary should be realigned to
follow an ecclesiastical parish boundary to the north of the A3 Kingston by-pass.

146. We also received 23 letters from members of the public and one local body in support of our draft proposal. One member of the public suggested that the greater part of Elmbridge's existing Long Ditton ward, to the north of the A309, should be transferred to Kingston. However, he suggested that the Long Ditton Recreation Ground and the Surbiton Hockey Club ground should remain in Elmbridge. Conversely, the Surbiton Hockey Club suggested that its ground and landholding should be transferred to Kingston, on the grounds that this would be beneficial to the Club and to local sports provision.

147. Our draft proposal was opposed by Elmbridge, Surrey, Mr Ian Taylor MBE MP, a Kingston Councillor, three Surrey County Councillors and eight Elmbridge Borough Councillors. We also received 623 representations from members of the public and local organisations, two sets of proforma letters (comprising 161 and 30 letters respectively) and three petitions (comprising 1372, 244 and 108 signatures respectively), all opposing our draft proposal.

148. Elmbridge considered our draft proposal for major change to its boundary with Kingston at Long Ditton to be inconsistent with our general approach to the review, and opposed it on a number of grounds. It reported that it had conducted a leaflet survey of Long Ditton residents seeking their views. Of 1,201 questionnaires despatched, 723 (75%) were returned. Of these, 173 (24%) supported our draft proposal, 539 (75%) opposed it, and 11 expressed no preference. The Council considered that local residents' wishes and community identity should be the paramount factor in our deliberations, and argued that its survey had revealed their wish to remain in its authority.

149. The Council also considered that the transfer of Long Ditton to Kingston could have significant implications for the future viability of its authority. It commented that our draft proposal would transfer 2196 electors to Kingston, representing a loss to the Borough of £160,000 in community charge income.
It also said that the transfer of the Surbiton Water Works Site to Kingston would undermine a provision, contained in the Borough's draft Local Plan, for the construction of 430 dwellings to accommodate expected population growth in the Long Ditton area. Elmbridge considered that the loss of the water works site would compel it to identify alternative sites for this project, which might involve the development of green belt land.

150. Elmbridge resubmitted its original suggestions for minor change to the boundary.

151. The County Council said that our draft proposal would divide the recognised community ties which link Long Ditton with Thames Ditton, Hinchley Wood and other areas of Surrey. It also pointed out that our draft proposal failed to transfer the Long Ditton village hall and recreation ground to Kingston.

152. In commenting on the public reaction to the draft proposal, Surrey expressed the view that Long Ditton residents did not wish their village to acquire the urban characteristics of a London borough. The County Council also commented that local residents were concerned about the effects of our draft proposal on the provision of education services in the area, as the ratio of pupils to teachers is higher in Kingston schools than in Surrey schools; as Kingston's examination results are inferior to those attained in Surrey; and as Kingston does not provide a school meals service. Surrey also considered that the transfer of Long Ditton to Kingston could have implications for the future availability of nursery places at Long Ditton schools for pupils resident in neighbouring areas of Elmbridge.

153. Surrey expressed the view that Kingston would be unable to match the existing standard of services currently provided to elderly residents of Long Ditton by its Council and by Elmbridge. Furthermore, the Council noted that the transfer of Long Ditton to Kingston would result in the transfer of responsibility for some local services, such as fire, strategic planning, transportation and waste disposal, from elected Surrey councillors to non-elected London-wide bodies.
154. Surrey therefore argued that the existing boundary should be retained, subject to its original suggestions for minor change.

155. Virtually all the representations we received from residents, local councillors and local organisations opposing our draft proposal, including those from the Long Ditton Residents' Association, the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents' Association and the Hinchley Wood Residents' Association, commented on the existence of strong community ties linking Long Ditton to Thames Ditton and other areas of Elmbridge. A number of respondents also expressed concern at Kingston's past planning record, and doubts as to whether the authority would provide adequate protection for Long Ditton, and protect its surrounding areas of green belt and open land from future development pressures. Respondents also expressed concern over the implications our draft proposal might have for education and social service provision in Long Ditton.

156. The Surrey Family Health Authority, in opposing our draft proposal, suggested that the boundary should be realigned to follow either the A243, to transfer parts of Surbiton and Southborough to Surrey, or St Mary's Road and Balaclava Road, to transfer a reduced area of Long Ditton to Kingston. One member of the public considered that there was some logic in transferring parts of Long Ditton to Kingston, and suggested realigning the boundary to follow a combination of Love Lane, the rear curtilages of properties fronting the west side of Woodstock Lane and Rectory Lane, and the Surbiton/Esher railway line.

157. We considered that some of the arguments put forward by Elmbridge and Surrey in opposition to our draft proposal were unconvincing. We were impressed, however, by the quality of the representations we received from local organisations and residents of Long Ditton, who had commented that our draft proposal would sever the close links between Long Ditton and the neighbouring areas of Elmbridge, particularly Thames Ditton. We accept that we had underestimated Long Ditton's ties to Thames Ditton.
158. We remain of the view that the present boundary between Kingston and Elmbridge at Long Ditton is unsatisfactory as the outer London boundary with Surrey. It reflects neither a clear break in development nor the strong links which we believe to exist between Kingston and parts of Elmbridge. We do not doubt that there are equally strong, if not stronger, local ties between Long Ditton, Thames Ditton and other parts of Elmbridge: these have been amply demonstrated to us. However, we do not believe that these two influences are mutually exclusive. Indeed, we take the view that the case for including a wider area of Elmbridge in Kingston had, in a sense, been reinforced by the response received to our draft proposal. We recall that these areas, and the Moleseys, were included in Kingston's "core area" of interest on its objective criteria.

159. Nevertheless, as indicated earlier, we do not consider the current review to be the right occasion for radical change, for example, by extending the scope of our draft proposal to bring both Long Ditton and Thames Ditton, and perhaps even the Moleseys, within the Greater London boundary, on the grounds of their close affinity with each other, and links with Kingston. We consider our draft proposal to have been a step in the right direction in seeking to establish a good outer London boundary which recognised the links between Long Ditton and Kingston. However, the response to our draft proposal enabled us to appreciate the full extent of the affinity between Long Ditton and Thames Ditton and that the proposal would, if confirmed, sever strong community links. We have therefore decided to withdraw it.

160. We considered the alternative realignments suggested by the Pastoral Committee of the Diocese of Southwark, the Surrey Health Authority, the Surbiton Hockey Club and two members of the public. However, we concluded that none of these appeared adequately to reflect the existing pattern of community in this area. We therefore considered several options for minor change to resolve the most obvious anomalies present in the existing boundary.
161. As part of its response to our draft proposal, Kingston supported the transfer of the Surbiton Water Works Site to its authority, and commented that the Thames Marina should also be transferred. Both Kingston and Surrey also resubmitted their original suggestions for minor change in this area. While both authorities suggested that Beechwood Close should be united in Elmbridge, Surrey also suggested that a playing field and one property fronting the south side of Lovelace Road should be united in Elmbridge.

162. We agreed with Kingston's view that any development on the Surbiton Water Works Site would have a more significant impact on Surbiton than on neighbouring areas of Elmbridge. However, we observed that the Thames Marina was designated as strategic open land in Elmbridge's draft Borough Local Plan, and not therefore earmarked for residential development. We therefore concluded that the water works site should be transferred to Kingston, but that the Thames Marina should be retained in Elmbridge.

163. We also observed that the present boundary divides a Kingston-owned recreation ground, a sports ground which appeared to be owned by Surbiton High School in Kingston, and Beechwood Close. While both Kingston and Surrey had suggested uniting Beechwood Close in Elmbridge, we noted that access to the Close was via Kingston. We therefore adopted as our final proposal a realignment of the boundary to unite, in Kingston, the Surbiton Water Works Site, the Kingston-owned recreation ground, the Surbiton High School sports ground and Beechwood Close.

(ii) Saffron Way, Oaks Way, Mandeville Drive, Ditton Road, Herne Road and Shrewsbury Close

164. Kingston, Elmbridge and Surrey all resubmitted their original suggestions for minor change in response to our draft proposal at Long Ditton. Kingston suggested a realignment to unite Saffron Way, Mandeville Road, Ditton Road, and a number of
divided properties at the junction between Herne Road and Shrewsbury Close, in its authority, and to unite Oaks Way, and a number of divided properties fronting the north side of Herne Road, in Surrey.

165. Elmbridge and Surrey County Council submitted virtually identical realignments to unite Saffron Way, Mandeville Drive and a number of divided properties fronting the north side of Herne Road in Surrey, and to unite a number of divided properties at the junction between Herne Road and Shrewsbury Close in Kingston.

166. We considered the various realignments suggested by Kingston, Elmbridge and Surrey. We concluded that Kingston's suggestion to unite Saffron Way and Mandeville Drive in its authority best reflected the pattern of community ties in this area. However, we decided not to adopt Kingston's suggestion to unite Oaks Way in Elmbridge, on the grounds that, subject to minor realignments, the boundary was sufficiently well-defined. We also recalled that the occupiers affected by Kingston's suggestion for Oaks Way had, at an earlier stage of this review, opposed being transferred to Elmbridge.

167. Herne Road is arbitrarily divided by the boundary, as is a sports field to the south, which is owned by Southborough School in Kingston. We concluded that none of the suggestions submitted by the local authorities appeared to resolve these boundary anomalies satisfactorily.

168. We therefore adopted, as our final proposal, a combination of Kingston's suggestion to unite Mandeville Drive and Saffron Way in its authority, subject to a de minimis modification to tie the boundary to ground detail at Oaks Way, and a realignment of the boundary to unite in Kingston all the properties fronting Herne Road, and the playing field owned by Southborough School.
169. The existing boundary splits properties in Ruxley Crescent, Clayton Road and Oaklands Close. Kingston suggested rectifying these anomalies by realigning the boundary to the A3 Esher Bypass. It also claimed that the area which would thereby be transferred to the Borough is linked environmentally to the authority, and that development in the area would tend to have more impact on Kingston residents than on Elmbridge residents. Kingston's suggestion was supported by the Chessington and Hook Residents' Association, and by one member of the public.

170. Surrey suggested realigning the boundary to the eastern edge of the A3, as far north as Clayton Road, on the grounds that this would resolve existing boundary anomalies. It opposed the northern part of Kingston's suggestion, commenting that it favoured a tight delineation of the built-up area.

171. Elmbridge considered that any realignment of the boundary to the A3 would be an arbitrary line and unnecessary. As an alternative, the Council suggested minor boundary realignments to resolve specific anomalies, by uniting Ruxley Crescent in Elmbridge, and Clayton Road and Oaklands Close in Kingston. Surrey commented that Elmbridge's suggestion in respect of Clayton Road and Oaklands Close would be an acceptable alternative to its own suggestion for that part of the boundary. The Metropolitan Police supported the transfer of Ruxley Crescent to Elmbridge and Clayton Road and Oaklands Close to Kingston. One individual supported the transfer of Ruxley Crescent to Elmbridge.

172. We considered that realigning the boundary along the A3 would facilitate highway maintenance, and produce a clearly definable boundary. We therefore decided to adopt Kingston's suggestion as our draft proposal, as modified by Surrey's suggestion to use the eastern side of the highway, and to extend the realignment along the southern side of the A309, to
facilitate our draft proposal to transfer Long Ditton to Kingston.

Final Proposal

173. Both Kingston and Surrey resubmitted their original suggestions in response to our draft proposal. Elmbridge agreed that the boundary should be realigned to follow the A3 at Ruxley Crescent. However, the Council reiterated its opposition to our draft proposal to realign the boundary to follow the A3 to the north of Elm Farm.

174. Kingston's suggested realignment was supported by an Elmbridge councillor and a member of the public. However, many respondents, in opposing our draft proposal for Long Ditton, expressed the view that Kingston should not acquire any further green belt or open land. A limited use of the A3 as the boundary to the south of Clayton Road and Elm Farm was supported by the Hinchley Wood Residents' Association, the Claygate Residents' Association, two Elmbridge councillors and two members of the public.

175. We noted that, in withdrawing our draft proposal for Long Ditton, we were faced with the question of whether to confirm our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the east side of the A3, between the A3/A309 junction and the point where the A3 meets the existing boundary to the south of Barwell Court, and if so, how to link this proposed realignment to the present boundary at Hook.

176. We considered the realignments suggested by the local authorities. However, we reaffirmed our view that our draft proposal would provide the most clearly defined boundary in this area. We therefore decided to confirm it as final, subject to a realignment along the south side of the A309, thereby linking it to our final proposal for the Southborough School playing field (referred to in paragraph 168 above).
KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH RICHMOND UPON THAMES

177. As indicated in paragraph 45 above, we concluded that no radical change was required to Kingston's boundaries with its neighbouring London boroughs, including Richmond. We did not, therefore, endorse Kingston's claim to Ham, Petersham, Hampton Wick, Teddington and Hampton. Nevertheless, we identified a number of boundary anomalies which we felt should be rectified.

1. Ham

a) Larger Scale Proposals

Suggestions for change

178. Kingston had identified and commented on a number of anomalies in the Ham area, and expressed the view that the existing boundary divides a residential community centred on Dysart Avenue; the grounds of the Cassel Hospital; Ham Parade; the Parkleys Estate; the Beechrow development; properties on Latchmere Close and Latchmere Lane; the Latchmere House Detention Centre; land at the northern extremity of Park Road owned by Kingston and which has been subject to residential development; and land and buildings attached to Thatched House Lodge.

179. We were informed that Kingston and Richmond had sought to reach agreement over a common approach to these boundary anomalies. However, it was understood that no such agreement was reached. Kingston accordingly concluded, and recommended to us, that the clearest alternative boundary would be a realignment along the edge of Ham Common, with the exception of Dysart Avenue, which Kingston felt to be associated more with Ham to the north.

180. In response to Kingston's suggestion, we received 110 letters of objection from residents and local associations in Ham and Petersham. The Ham and Petersham Ratepayers' and Residents' Association, the Ham Amenities Group and four individuals considered that the centres of Dysart Avenue, Barnfield Avenue and Tudor Drive form the natural Kingston/Richmond boundary at
Ham. Nine other individuals suggested a realignment along Tudor Drive.

181. The Ham and Petersham Conservatives considered that public opinion in the areas affected by Kingston's suggestion was opposed to it and recommended minor realignments to unite the Parkleys Estate and Ham Parade in Richmond. A member of the public suggested a similar realignment in respect of the Parkleys Estate, but also suggested minor change in the vicinity of Latchmere Lane. Another individual suggested an alignment to the south side of Tudor Road, commenting that parking problems around the British Aerospace site would be reduced if the whole area were transferred to Richmond.

182. The Ham and Petersham Liberals had carried out a referendum of those residents affected by Kingston's suggestion. They reported that 70% of residents canvassed had responded, and that 94% of these had expressed a wish to remain in Richmond. The Ham Art Group submitted a petition containing 23 signatures, claiming the existence of historical, environmental and cultural ties between Ham and Richmond. The Richmond and Barnes Conservative Association objected to the transfer of any part of Ham to Kingston.

183. Richmond originally submitted a number of minor suggestions to unite Dysart Avenue, part of Dukes Avenue and Beechrow in its area, and suggested that Ham Parade, Latchmere House and Thatched House Lodge be united in Kingston. However, in response to Kingston's suggestion, and in the light of the opposition to it expressed by a number of Ham residents, Richmond subsequently revised its suggestions.

184. Richmond commented that Kingston's suggested realignment would transfer some 300 households to the Borough, without regard to the community ties between Richmond and the areas affected. Richmond suggested a number of alternative realignments to unite within its authority Dukes Avenue, Dysart Avenue, the Cassel Hospital, Ham Parade, the Parkleys Estate, Beechrow, Latchmere House Remand Centre and Latchmere Lane. The Council also suggested that an area of Kingston-owned land at the northern end
of Park Road should be transferred to Kingston.

185. Richmond also suggested that an area of Richmond Park, currently within Kingston, should be transferred to its authority, on the grounds that it would unite a community of interest, simplify the administration of planning and environmental matters associated with the park, and facilitate liaison with the Department of the Environment, which has responsibility for the park.

Our Conclusions

186. We considered that, at first sight, Kingston's suggestion appeared to offer a clear and satisfactory boundary. However, we noted the opposition from residents of properties fronting Ham Common, who had expressed strong affinities with Richmond. We therefore concluded that Kingston's suggested realignment did not appear to reflect community ties in the area.

187. We also considered that the suggestions of the Ham and Petersham Ratepayers' and Residents' Association and one private individual for a realignment of the boundary along a main road, would transfer an unjustifiably large number of Kingston residents to Richmond. For similar reasons, the suggestion from another member of the public, that the boundary be realigned to the south of Tudor Road, was felt to be defective.

188. We concluded that no one suggestion appeared both to take account of the expressed affinities of Ham residents and to resolve all the boundary anomalies in the area. We therefore decided to consider each anomaly separately. Our draft and final proposals for the Ham area are discussed in paragraphs 193 to 225 below.

189. In response to our letter, Kingston expressed the view that our approach to resolving individual boundary anomalies would not produce a satisfactory alternative to the existing boundary at Ham. The Council reported that, over the consultation period for our draft proposals, it had cooperated with Richmond in conducting a joint questionnaire survey to seek the views of
residents affected by our draft proposals. Kingston considered that this survey had produced an equivocal picture of local public opinion towards the location of the boundary. The Council therefore requested us to reconsider the weight of advantage attaching to its original suggestion to realign the boundary to follow the edge of Ham Common.

190. Richmond rejected Kingston's view that major change would be required to produce a satisfactory boundary at Ham. It considered that there was no public demand for such major change.

191. Our decision not to adopt Kingston's objective community claim to Ham, Petersham, Hampton Wick and other areas of Richmond was welcomed by Richmond, the Ham Amenities Group, the Ham and Petersham Association and the Hampton Wick Association. We also received nine letters from members of the public expressing support for all of our draft proposals for minor change to the Kingston/Richmond boundary at Ham.

192. We reconsidered Kingston's suggestion to realign the boundary to follow the edge of Ham Common. However, in the light of all the representations we received in response to our draft proposals for minor change, we concluded that the Council's suggestion failed to recognise the complex affinities and patterns of community in the Ham area. We therefore reaffirmed our view that each anomaly present in the existing Kingston/Richmond boundary at Ham should be considered separately.

B. Dysart Avenue, Dukes Avenue, Cassel Hospital and Ham Parade

Draft Proposal

193. We considered that Dysart Avenue, Dukes Avenue, the Cassel Hospital and Ham Parade were all linked to Richmond and detached from Kingston by the British Aerospace Works. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal the alignment suggested by Richmond in its revised submission, for the transfer of these areas to Richmond.
Final Proposal

194. That part of our draft proposal to transfer Dysart Avenue and Dukes Avenue from Kingston to Richmond was supported by Richmond and two members of the public, but opposed by Kingston, Mr Richard Tracey MP, the Rt Hon Norman Lamont MP, two Kingston councillors and 17 local bodies. We also received 60 letters from members of the public, together with two petitions, comprising 103 and 81 signatures respectively, also opposing our draft proposal.

195. By far the majority of respondents opposing our draft proposal did so on the grounds that it would transfer Dysart Special Needs School from Kingston to Richmond, thereby placing the future of the school in question. Richmond commented that it would have no objection to Kingston retaining control and ownership of Dysart School. A number of respondents also commented that the British Aerospace Site was due to be closed and replaced by residential development.

196. That part of our draft proposal to unite the grounds of the Cassel Hospital in Richmond was supported by Richmond and Kingston. It was also supported by seven members of the public and local organisations.

197. That part of our draft proposal to unite Ham Parade in Richmond was supported by Richmond, subject to a minor modification to retain an access road and two properties fronting the north side of Tudor Drive, in Kingston, and nine local organisations and residents. Kingston and one member of the public opposed our draft proposal, and suggested that Ham Parade should be united in the Royal Borough.

198. We reassessed our draft proposal in the light of all the responses, and acknowledged the strength of feeling expressed by the many individuals and bodies connected with Dysart School who had made their views known to us. We regretted that neither local authority had drawn the location and nature of Dysart School to our attention prior to the publication of our draft proposals.
199. Having consulted the Department of Education and Science, we were aware that it would be possible to transfer Dysart School to Richmond without affecting Kingston's control over the school. However, we concluded that the school appeared to be linked to Kingston by strong patterns of community and service provision. We also noted that any future development of the British Aerospace Site would be likely to diminish the current separation of Dysart Avenue and Dukes Avenue from Kingston. We therefore decided to withdraw that part of our draft proposal to transfer Dysart Avenue and Dukes Avenue from Kingston to Richmond.

200. Nevertheless, we concluded that the Cassel Hospital and Ham Parade should be united in Richmond. We therefore decided to confirm the remainder of our draft proposal as final, subject to adopting Kingston's suggestion to realign the boundary to follow the southern curtilage of the Cassel Hospital, and a realignment to unite Ham Parade in Richmond.

C. The Parkleys Estate

Draft Proposal

201. We noted the support of residents of the Parkleys Estate for Richmond's revised suggestion to transfer the Estate to its authority. We accordingly decided to adopt Richmond's suggestion as our draft proposal.

Final Proposal

202. Our draft proposal was supported by Richmond, and by thirteen members of the public and local organisations. We also received a petition, comprising 69 signatures, supporting our draft proposal. However, it was opposed by Kingston, the Tudor Ward Labour Party and by two members of the public.

203. Kingston commented that, over the consultation period for our draft proposals, it had cooperated with Richmond in conducting a leaflet survey to seek the views of Parkleys residents on our draft proposal. The Council reported that of 84 questionnaires despatched, 29 were returned, and that 14 of
these had opposed our draft proposal, while 11 had supported it. Kingston considered that the survey had failed to produce a consensus among Parkleys residents as to where the boundary should be located. The Council therefore suggested that an additional part of the Estate should be transferred to its authority in order to produce a clearer boundary.

204. We considered the points made by Kingston. However, we concluded that our draft proposal appeared best to reflect the wishes of Parkleys residents, and to produce the most clearly defined boundary in the area consistent with residents' affinities. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

D. Beechrow

Draft Proposal

205. We noted that the only access to Beechrow is from Kingston. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal an alignment which would unite the road in that authority.

Final Proposal

206. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston. However, it was opposed by Richmond, which commented that the joint local authority questionnaire survey had elicited a 60% response from Beechrow residents, and that 100% of respondents opposed our draft proposal. It was also opposed by the Beechrow Residents' Association and three members of the public.

207. We were informed that Beechrow could be accessed from Ham Common via a footpath. However, given that vehicular access to it is only possible via Barnfield Gardens in Kingston, we considered that there remained a strong case, in terms of service provision, for uniting Beechrow in Kingston. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.
E. Latchmere Close/Latchmere House Detention Centre

Draft Proposal

208. We concluded that Latchmere Close and the Detention Centre were more closely linked by proximity to Kingston than to Richmond. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal Richmond’s original suggestion for these areas to be united in Kingston.

Final Proposal

209. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston. However, it was opposed by Richmond, the Ham and Petersham Association and the Ham Amenities Group. Richmond said that Latchmere Close and the Detention Centre could only be accessed from its authority; and, moreover, that the Detention Centre was closely linked to its authority by patterns of service provision, in particular, library services. It suggested an alternative realignment to unite Latchmere Close and the Detention Centre in its authority.

210. We considered the points made by Richmond. However, we noted that we had received no representations in support of Richmond’s argument, nor any opposing our draft proposal from either the residents of Latchmere Close, or the management of the Detention Centre. Moreover, we found no evidence to suggest that Kingston could not assume responsibility for supplying services to either Latchmere Close or the Detention Centre. Nor could we see any reason why the centre could not be accessed from Kingston in the south, via Latchmere Lane. We have therefore reaffirmed our view that the Close and Detention Centre are more closely linked by proximity to Kingston than to Richmond, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

F. Latchmere Lane/Garth Close/Garth Road/Beard Road/Cowper Road/Ham Ridings

Draft Proposal

211. We considered that only minor change was required in this
area, to place all the properties fronting the junction between Garth Road and Latchmere Lane in Kingston, and leave the Richmond-built developments on Beard Road and Cowper Road in Richmond. We therefore decided to adopt as our draft proposal a suggestion submitted by a member of the public to achieve this end.

Final Proposal

212. Our draft proposal was opposed by Kingston, Richmond and by one member of the public. Kingston and one member of the public suggested realigning the boundary to follow the edge of Ham Common in this area. Richmond opposed Kingston's suggested realignment, on the grounds that it would transfer Richmond-owned properties in Beard Road and Cowper Road to Kingston. The Council resubmitted its original suggestion to unite Garth Close in Kingston, and a number of properties fronting the west side of Latchmere Lane to the north of Garth Road in Richmond.

213. We noted that whilst Kingston's suggested realignment would produce the clearest boundary in this area, there appeared to be no public demand for such a realignment. Moreover, we considered that Kingston's case was further weakened by the location of Richmond-owned properties in Beard Road and Cowper Road.

214. We concluded that this area appeared to be pulled towards both Kingston and Richmond by overlapping patterns of community, and it was therefore unlikely that any realignment would receive the support of all the residents and both local authorities. We therefore reaffirmed our view that only minor change was required in this area to resolve the most obvious existing boundary anomalies.

215. We considered Richmond's view that our draft proposal would disrupt the pattern of community life in this area. However, we had received no representations from local residents either opposing our draft proposal, or supporting the Council's alternative realignment. We concluded therefore that our draft proposal produced the most clearly defined boundary in this area consistent with residents' affinities, and have therefore decided
to confirm it as final.

G. Park Road

Draft Proposal

216. We considered that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the land at the northern end of Park Road to be transferred to Kingston's area. We therefore decided to adopt Richmond's suggestion as our draft proposal, subject to a modification to link it with our draft (and final) proposal for the preceding length of the boundary in this area.

Final Proposal

217. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston, Richmond and one member of the public. However, it was opposed by four members of the public. We also received a petition, comprising 52 signatures, opposing our draft proposal.

218. While the residents of a number of the recently constructed properties at the north end of Park Road had opposed our draft proposal, we observed that the properties were only accessible from Kingston. We therefore concluded that Kingston was better placed to provide local authority services to the properties than Richmond, and have decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

H. Richmond Park

Draft Proposal

219. We agreed with Richmond's view that liaison with the Department of the Environment over administration and management of the Park would be facilitated if it were united in one authority. We therefore decided to adopt Richmond's suggestion as our draft proposal, thereby subsuming the alternative suggestions we had received from Kingston and Richmond for minor change in the vicinity of the Thatched House Lodge.
220. Our draft proposal was supported by Richmond, but was opposed by Kingston, the Tudor Ward Labour Party and by one member of the public. Kingston considered that our draft proposal would lessen its influence over park policy, in particular, traffic management.

221. We acknowledged Kingston's concern to retain its interest in Richmond Park. However, we were not convinced that our draft proposal would significantly diminish the Borough's influence over the Park, or that it would affect the access to the Park currently enjoyed by Kingston residents. We do not, as a general principle, subscribe to the view that shared local authority responsibility for facilities is necessarily in the interests of local residents. It can weaken accountability, and result in a duplication of work and cost for the authorities concerned which, in our view, is not conducive to effective and convenient local government.

222. A member of the public commented that the existing Kingston/Richmond boundary at Richmond Park should be retained, on the grounds that it follows an ancient medieval boundary, and therefore has an educational value beyond its administrative function. However, we concluded that the retention of such an ill-defined stretch of boundary could not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft proposal as final.

2. Robin Hood Gate Lodge

Draft Proposal

223. We agreed that Kingston's suggestion to unite Robin Hood Gate Lodge in the Royal Borough reflected the Lodge's proximity to Kingston. We therefore decided to adopt Kingston's suggestion as our draft proposal.
Final Proposal

224. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston, but was opposed by Richmond, on the grounds that it would result in the Robin Hood Gate Lodge being the only Richmond Park lodge to be located outside the boundaries of its authority, thereby needlessly complicating the administration of and liaison over Richmond Park. The Council also commented that it believed the resident of the lodge to be opposed to our draft proposal.

225. We considered that the arguments for and against transferring the Lodge to Kingston, on the grounds of its proximity to the Royal Borough, or to leave the Lodge in Richmond, thereby reflecting its links with Richmond Park, were finely balanced. However, we concluded that our draft proposal would be more conducive to the delivery of local services to the Lodge, and have decided to confirm it as final.

KINGSTON'S BOUNDARIES WITH MERTON AND WANDSWORTH

226. As indicated in paragraph 45 above, we had concluded that no case had been made for radical change to Kingston's boundaries with adjoining London boroughs, including Merton. We did not therefore adopt Merton's suggestion to transfer Maiden and Coombe to Merton. Nevertheless, we considered that a number of boundary anomalies should be corrected in the interests of securing effective and convenient local government.
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227. Kingston expressed the view that, from Robin Hood Gate to Coombe Lane, the A3 forms an effective barrier between the residential development and open space on either side of the road. It therefore recommended realigning the boundary to the eastern side of the A3, with the exception of Vale Crescent and a slip road, east of Coombe Lane, where it suggested the boundary be aligned to retain these areas in Kingston. The effect of such a realignment would be largely to eliminate Kingston's short boundary with Wandsworth.
228. Merton objected to Kingston's suggestion, on the grounds that it saw no benefit for the areas affected. Wandsworth did not comment.

229. We observed that Kingston's suggested alignment departed from the A3 at Vale Crescent, and that the playing fields on the east of the A3 at Kingston Vale appeared to be associated with Kingston. We therefore considered that the existing boundary, which follows Beverley Brook, appeared to be satisfactory and definable. Accordingly, we took an interim decision to make no proposals for change to Kingston's boundary with Merton and Wandsworth in this area.

230. Our interim decision to make no proposals for change to the existing boundary between Robin Hood Gate and Coombe Lane was supported by Kingston and Dr Charles Goodson-Wickes MP. Wandsworth did not comment. Merton considered that we had been inconsistent in proposing that the boundary should remain unchanged in this area, while proposing that, to the south of Coombe Lane, it should be realigned to the A3. The Council expressed the view that, if we were minded to confirm as final our draft proposal to realign the boundary to the A3 to the south of Coombe Lane (detailed in paragraphs 232 to 237 below), we should adopt a further proposal to realign the remainder of its boundary with Kingston to follow the A3.

231. We considered the charge of inconsistency, but concluded that there was no case for a realignment of the boundary to follow the A3 between Robin Hood Gate and Coombe Lane, as this stretch appeared to be well defined and free of anomalies. We have therefore confirmed as final our interim decision to make no proposals for change to Kingston's boundary with Merton and Wandsworth in this area.
KINGSTON'S BOUNDARY WITH MERTON

The A3 - Coombe Lane to Albert Road

Draft Proposal

232. Kingston, as an extension of its suggestion for the A3 from Robin Hood Gate to Coombe Lane, suggested realigning the boundary along the eastern side of the A3 southwards, from Coombe Lane to Albert Road. The Council commented that this stretch of the A3 forms a substantial barrier to east-west movement, and expressed the view that it provides a natural dividing line between communities. It indicated that this part of the A3, although situated in Merton, is maintained by Kingston on an agency basis for the Department of Transport. Kingston said that the area which would be transferred to its authority by such a realignment has been under significant development pressures, and that this had affected Kingston centres such as New Malden, rather than centres in Merton.

233. Kingston's suggestion was supported by the Metropolitan Police, but was opposed by Merton. Merton claimed, at the time of writing, that a realignment of the boundary to the eastern side of the A3 would have an adverse effect on Merton ratepayers, due to the consequent loss of income to the Council under the old business rating system. Three residents of the area also opposed the suggestion.

234. A number of other suggestions were made for major change in this area. One individual considered that the boundary should be aligned to Coombe Lane, Grand Drive and Tudor Drive to transfer Raynes Park, West Barnes and Morden Park to Kingston, on the basis of their close affinity to New Malden and Kingston Town Centre. Another individual recommended the transfer to Kingston of West Barnes and the area surrounding Motspur Park Station. The Malden and District Chamber of Commerce and another individual submitted similar suggestions, recommending alignments to the New Malden Postal District boundary and the Pyl Brook respectively.
235. We considered that this stretch of the A3 produced a clear and definable line, and formed a substantial barrier to east-west movement. By contrast, we took the view that the suggestions referred to above from members of the public and the Malden and District Chamber of Commerce would result in a variety of arbitrary divisions through West Barnes. We therefore decided to adopt Kingston's suggestion, to align the boundary to the eastern side of this stretch of the A3.

Final Proposals

236. Our draft proposal was supported by Kingston and Dr Charles Goodson-Wickes MP. However, it was opposed by Merton and the Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents' Association, on the grounds that the A3 is straddled by patterns of community and service delivery to the south of Coombe Lane. The Residents' Association also contested our view that the A3 forms a considerable barrier to east-west movement in this area.

237. We gave careful consideration to the points made by Merton and the Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents' Association. However, we reaffirmed our view that the barrier effect of the A3 in this area was significant, and that the provision of services to residents on the Kingston side of the road could be more conveniently and effectively provided by that authority. We therefore confirmed as final our draft proposal to realign the boundary to follow the east side of the A3 between Coombe Lane and Albert Road.

ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES

238. We recognised that our draft proposals would, if implemented, necessitate a number of significant consequential changes to the electoral arrangements of local authorities affected by the review. Accordingly, we published details of our proposed changes to local authority electoral arrangements to accompany our draft proposals for change to local authority boundaries. These included incorporating Long Ditton into Kingston as a single member ward, resulting in a consequential reduction in the overall size of Elmbridge Borough Council by two
members; and reducing Kingston's Malden Manor Ward by one member. Our aim was to produce as little disruption as possible to the existing electoral arrangements of local authorities affected by this review.

239. However, our final proposals have only limited electoral consequences for the local authorities affected by this review, and do not, therefore, involve any redistribution of local councillors, or change in the total number of councillors currently allocated to the authorities in question. The details of our final proposals for change in electoral arrangements are described in Annex B to this report.

CONCLUSION

240. 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

241. A separate letter is being sent to the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, the London Boroughs of Merton, Richmond upon Thames, Sutton and Wandsworth, the Boroughs of Epsom and Ewell and Elmbridge, the District of Mole Valley, and to Surrey County Council asking them to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection for a period of six months. They are also being asked to put notices to that effect on public notice boards. Arrangements have been made for similar notices to be inserted in the local press. The text of the notice will explain that the Commission has fulfilled its statutory role in this matter and that it now falls to you to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, though not earlier than six weeks from the date our final 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 26 November 1991, and to 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
Secretary
16 July 1992
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

KINGSTON UPON THAMES LB

AFFECTING THE LONDON BOROUGHS OF MERTON, RICHMOND UPON
THAMES, SUTTON AND WANDSWORTH; AND WITH THE BOROUGHS OF
ELMBRIDGE AND EPSOM AND EWELL, AND THE DISTRICT OF
MOLE VALLEY, IN SURREY

FINAL PROPOSALS

Produced by Ordnance Survey for the
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Map of the Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Field, with areas labeled "Merton LB" and "String LB."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Malden Manor Ward</td>
<td>Sutton LB Worcester Park North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Malden Manor Ward</td>
<td>Sutton LB Worcester Park North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A B</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Malden Manor Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Cuddington Ward Epsom and Ewell North ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Greater London Sutton LB Worcester Park South Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Stoneleigh Ward Epsom and Ewell North East ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Stoneleigh Ward Epsom and Ewell North East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Sutton LB Worcester Park South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Nonsuch Ward Epsom and Ewell North East ED</td>
<td>Greater London Sutton LB Cheam West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ewell Court Ward Epsom and Ewell North ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DEG</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Tolworth East Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Cuddington Ward Epsom and Ewell North ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Greater London Epsom and Ewell Borough Cuddington Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Tolworth East Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Greater London Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HJM</td>
<td>Greater London Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OQ</td>
<td>Greater London Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GIK</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LNP</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington North Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Area Ref.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 cont</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ACEGIKMQSU</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BDFHJLPRTV</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BCDF</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Chessington South Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Epsom and Ewell Borough Ruxley Ward Epsom and Ewell West ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Tolworth West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Hook Ward</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Hook Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Claygate and Hinchley Wood ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Claygate and Hinchley Wood ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Claygate and Hinchley Wood ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Area Ref.</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Tolworth West Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>B C E</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Surbiton Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Surbiton Hill Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB St Mark's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Surbiton Hill Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB Surbiton Hill Ward</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey County Elmbridge Borough Long Ditton Ward The Dittons ED</td>
<td>Greater London Kingston upon Thames LB St Mark's Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Tudor Ward</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames LB Ham and Petersham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B D E F</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames LB Ham and Petersham Ward</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Tudor Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Coombe Ward</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames LB Ham and Petersham Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames LB Ham and Petersham Ward</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Coombe Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Cambridge Ward</td>
<td>Merton LB Raynes Park Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Merton LB Raynes Park Ward</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Cambridge Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Merton LB Raynes Park Ward</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Burlington Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Merton LB West Barnes Ward</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames LB Burlington Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES

Kingston's boundary with Sutton

Green Lane
Primary School Playing Fields
Realignment to the Beverley Brook
Paragraphs 86-101, Map 1

Caverleigh Way
Realignment to the centre of Caverleigh Way
Paragraphs 86-101, Map 2

Worcester Park Sports Ground
Realignment to unite the sports ground in Sutton
Paragraphs 86-101, Map 2

Kingston's boundary with Epsom and Ewell

The Avenue
Realignment to unite Forrester's Court and Purdey Court in Epsom and Ewell
Paragraphs 102-109, Map 3

Sutton's boundary with Epsom and Ewell

Worcester Park/Stoneleigh
Realignment to east side of London Road, south side of Sparrow Farm Road, west side of Woodstone Avenue, and to rear of properties on north side of Richlands Avenue
Paragraphs 110-117, Map 4
Kingston's boundary with Epsom and Ewell

Hogsmill River  Realignment to new centre course of Hogsmill River  Paragraphs 118-121, Maps 5-8
Chessington Road  Realignment to south side of Chessington Road  Paragraphs 122-125, Map 8

Kingston's boundary with Mole Valley

Area in the vicinity of the Star Public House  Realignment to transfer properties south of the Star Public House to Kingston, and to eliminate defacements  Paragraphs 126-136, Map 9

Kingston's boundary with Elmbridge

Long Ditton  Realignment to unite Surbiton Water Works Site, Victoria Recreation Ground, Surbiton High School Playing Field and Beechwood Close in Kingston. Realignment to eliminate a defacement south of Lovelace Road  Paragraphs 161-163, Maps 12-13
Paragraphs 164-168, Maps 10-11

Paragraphs 169-176, Map 10

Paragraphs 193-200, Map 14

Paragraphs 201-204, Map 14

Paragraphs 205-207, Map 14

Paragraphs 208-210, Map 14

Paragraphs 211-215, Map 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Road</td>
<td>Realignment to transfer recently constructed properties at the end of Park Road to Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park</td>
<td>Realignment to unite area of Richmond Park in Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Gate Lodge</td>
<td>Realignment to transfer Robin Hood Gate Lodge to Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingston's boundary with Merton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A3</td>
<td>Realignment to the A3 between Coombe Lane and Albert Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>