

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 230

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO.230

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton GCB KBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Professor Michael Chisholm

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Sir Andrew Wheatley CBE

To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

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

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Camden in accordance with the requirements of section 50(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that London borough.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 10 June 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Camden Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the London Boroughs Association, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Camden Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them

following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 4 March 1976 Camden Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 24 wards each returning 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 58 members.

5. We examined the Council's draft scheme together with alternative and different schemes for the borough submitted by both a local political committee and a local political association; we also took into account comments by another political association on many of the proposals in the Council's draft scheme.

6. We noted that there was disagreement between the Borough Council and the local political committee about the number of electors in the borough in five years' time and their distribution throughout the borough. We concluded, nevertheless, that for the purposes of our draft proposals we should accept the Council's forecast and we decided that the Council's draft scheme provided a satisfactory basis for the future representation of the borough in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and with our guidelines. We considered that none of the comments produced a case for modification of the draft scheme, which we decided we should adopt as our draft proposals, subject to a boundary realignment between the proposed Hampstead Town and Highgate wards recommended by the Ordnance Survey. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

7. On 2 August 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 11 October 1976.

8. Camden Borough Council informed us that they preferred the boundary between the proposed Hampstead Town and Highgate wards included in their own draft scheme to the line adopted in our draft proposals. A local society wrote in similar terms.

9. The political association which had previously submitted an alternative scheme reaffirmed that scheme. The local political committee mentioned in paragraph 5 above submitted proposals for a revised scheme of wards. A constituency association of the committee supported the suggested revised scheme. Mr Geoffrey Finsberg, MP, said he wished to make representations at a local meeting. Three local residents registered objections affecting the proposed Hampstead Town, South End, Bloomsbury and King's Cross wards.

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

11. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at Camden on 17 and 24 March 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

12. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the proposed size of council should be increased by one to 59 members, with modifications affecting fifteen proposed wards; a minor modification to a further ward; and reversion to the line established in the draft scheme between the proposed Hampstead Town and Highgate wards. He also suggested that the proposed Regent's Park, Somers Town and St Pancras wards should be replaced by the present 4-member Regent's Park and 3-member St Pancras wards but that, if this were unacceptable, our draft proposals for the area should be confirmed.

13. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We decided to confirm our draft proposals for the Regent's Park, Somers Town and St Pancras wards but concluded that the other changes recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.

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

PUBLICATION

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

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

30 June 1977

TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
IN THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

1. GENERAL

I have to report that on the 17th and 24th March, 1977, I held the local meeting to hear representations about the Commission's draft proposals for the future electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Camden. The meeting took place at the Town Hall, Euston Road, London N. W. 1.

2. The names and addresses of those who attended the first day of the meeting on the 17th March, and the second day on the 24th March, are set out in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively to this report. As will be seen, the Camden Borough Council were represented by Sir Ashley Bramall, of Counsel, and the Camden Conservative Committee by Mr. S. Cripps, of Counsel.

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

4. The Commission's draft proposals were identical to the Borough Council's draft scheme, apart from one technical boundary adjustment recommended by the Ordnance Survey.

5. The Borough Council made only one comment on the Commission's draft proposals, which was to object to the technical boundary adjustment: this also evoked objections from several other bodies and persons. There was, however, a number of other objections to the draft proposals: the most important was that of the Camden Conservative Committee, representing the Conservative Associations for the three parliamentary constituencies covering the borough. The Conservatives disputed fundamentally the Council's forecast of the future electorate of the Borough, and also disagreed with many of the proposed ward boundaries: they produced their own figures and an alternative scheme of wards. The Hampstead Liberals also produced

an alternative scheme, using the Borough Council's forecast figures, and raised some questions of principle about boundaries: at the meeting they confined their objection largely to the Hampstead constituency, although earlier they had made comments on the arrangements in the other two constituencies. There was, in addition, one general objection to the draft proposals and a number which dealt with the boundaries of individual wards.

6. Sir Ashley Bramall, on behalf of the Borough Council, indicated at the outset that they thought there was no case for re-warding the Borough at all, as the present wards, which were only settled in 1970, were satisfactory. As it seemed there had to be change in order to avoid four-member wards and to improve the balance of electorates, the Borough Council had sought to alter the existing boundaries as little as possible: they had also treated the Borough and constituency boundaries as sacrosanct. They had avoided proposing one-member wards, had aimed at natural and well-marked ward boundaries and had paid particular attention to easy access to polling places. On figures, the Borough Council had sought to give equal weight to the existing and projected electorates, and had tended to take the median: they also considered that the figures supported their proposal for 58 Councillors.

7. Mr. Cripps, on behalf of the Camden Conservative Committee, agreed broadly with the guidelines put forward by Sir Ashley, except that he would seek to dispute the figures of projected electorate and did not accept that the Borough Council's detailed proposals did always follow their own principles. The Conservatives also considered that 59 Councillors would provide a fairer balance between the areas of the three parliamentary constituencies.

8. OBJECTION OF MR. FINSBERG

Mr. Geoffrey Finsberg, Member of Parliament for the Hampstead constituency, made a strong general objection to any change at all in the existing wards, which were acceptable to everyone. In his view the review of ward boundaries fixed only in 1970 was due to an inflexible official attitude to the number of members per ward and to the size of ward electorates. Further changes now would only confuse the electorate, and any of the

schemes under consideration was at most a second best, although on balance he preferred the Conservatives' scheme, as this made less changes. Mr. Finsberg concluded by asking that I should recommend no change.

9. At this point Mr. Cripps, on behalf of the Conservatives, Sir Ashley Bramall and Mr. R. Shaw, the leader of the Borough Council, all associated themselves with Mr. Finsberg's plea. I indicated, however, that there could be no question of my recommending the retention of the existing wards in their entirety.

10. THE HAMPSTEAD - HIGHGATE BOUNDARY

The technical boundary adjustment made at the instance of the Ordnance Survey was in the section of the boundary between the Hampstead Town and Highgate wards, running South from the Borough boundary and between Hampstead Heath and Parliament Hill Fields: this division between wards otherwise remains unaltered under any of the various proposals. This section of boundary is shown on the Ordnance Survey map as being marked by boundary stones, and follows a gentle curve. The Ordnance Survey have stated, however, that it is apparent on inspection that only part of the boundary is marked by stones: other sections follow a fence, in part dilapidated, and a decaying hedge, while on the Southern section there are a number of marked stones which are not on the actual boundary and could be confusing. For these reasons, the Ordnance Survey suggest that a new boundary should be drawn in a straight line from Dairy Cottage on the northern Borough boundary southeastwards to grid reference TQ 2745886120.

11. The Heath and Old Hampstead Society had written to object to the new boundary, for which they contended that there was no good reason. At the meeting the Town Clerk, Mr. Cripps and Sir Ashley Bramall all opposed the suggested new boundary and agreed that the existing boundary, which is also the Constituency boundary, was quite satisfactory as it affects no properties and is of long standing.

12. I inspected the disputed boundary. It runs entirely through the permanent open spaces of Hampstead Heath and Parliament Hill fields: even though sections may be a little obscure, it looks a generally sensible boundary on the ground. On the other hand the straight line proposed by the

Ordnance Survey goes across country and straight through a wood, one end not being visible from the other. It is thus a technical boundary which could only be plotted on the ground by a surveyor with instruments.

13. Conclusion and Recommendations

In the light of the arguments adduced and of my inspection, I am quite satisfied that, whatever the purist merits of the suggested straight line, the existing boundary is quite adequate for practical purposes and would be more readily understood by laymen. If it were ever necessary to plot the boundary with precision on the ground, which I am sure it will not be, the line is sufficiently clearly shown on the larger scale Ordnance Survey maps to enable this to be done.

14. I accordingly recommend that the Commission's draft proposals should be amended to show the boundary between the Hampstead Town and Highgate wards following the existing boundary between the present wards, as originally proposed by the Borough Council, in place of the straight line appearing in the draft proposals.

15. ELECTORATE PROJECTIONS

As the Commission's letter convening the local meeting indicated, the Council's forecasts for the future electorate of the Borough were challenged in their entirety. In the event, several hours were spent on examining these forecasts. I was particularly assisted by Miss E. Pope, the Principal Assistant Planner in the Borough Council's Department of Planning and Communications and by Mr. K. J. Avery, a qualified and experienced statistician (who is also a member of the Borough Council) on behalf of the Camden Conservative Committee.

16. It would inordinately lengthen this report if I were to attempt to set down all the arguments and written submissions on figures which were advanced before me and I will therefore confine myself to the principal points, not necessarily in the order in which they emerged. It became apparent during this discussion that the factors affecting the size of the future electorate of parts of Camden are wholly exceptional, and that accurate forecasting is difficult, if not impossible. This was epitomised by Mr. Cripps who referred

to the estimates in the report (which I did not see) of the Commissioner who conducted the previous electoral review in the Borough in 1970: I was told that on the basis of detailed statistical evidence, this report estimated that the electorate of the Borough in 1975 would be 169,183: in fact the electorate in that year totalled 145,835, a difference of over 23,000, or 14 per cent below the estimate. This drop cannot have been due to the fall in the birth rate because all the 1975 electors were born long before 1970. Mr. Avery considered that the causes were probably accelerating trends of depopulation and changes in the occupation of property: he added that, although the actual figures varied so much from the estimates, the method used (in which he had played some part) had proved reasonably accurate in relative terms. The fact remains that the estimate of the 1975 electorate made in 1970 proved to be wildly inaccurate in total.

17. I was presented with several detailed tables of figures prepared by various parties and showing very different results. The basic tables were those on which the Borough Council's draft scheme (and thus the Commission's draft proposals) were based, and the corresponding figures relating to the Conservatives' alternative scheme. (The Liberal's suggestions largely used the Borough Council's figures). Both these tables contained the actual 1976 figures and the respective estimates of those for 1981, although the Conservatives submitted a later table giving 1982 estimates on the basis of the 1977 electorate, to which I refer later. It was difficult to compare these figures in detail because in all but two cases they related to wards with different boundaries, but it was apparent in general that there were wide differences between them. This is best illustrated by taking the respective totals for each of the three parliamentary constituencies: the Borough Council's figures for each constituency were:-

	<u>1976 Electorate</u>	<u>1981 Electorate</u>
Hampstead	63,136	58,711
St. Pancras North	40,668	43,860
Holborn and St. Pancras South	<u>38,892</u>	<u>40,528</u>
	142,696	143,099
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

The Conservatives corresponding figures were:-

Hampstead	63,136	62,250
St. Pancras North	40,668	40,550
Holborn and St. Pancras South	38,892	38,200
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	142,696	141,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>

These tables show that, while the Borough Council anticipated a substantial fall in the Hampstead constituency and a rise in the other two, the Conservatives estimated that the totals in all three constituencies would remain almost static. Within these totals are concealed some even more striking differences, of which the most important is a quite different view of the rate of decline in electorate in the general area of Hampstead.

18. By the time of the local meeting the 1977 electorate figures were available. I was presented with a variety of tables relating these figures to the existing wards and to both the Borough Council's and Conservatives' proposed wards. The most interesting feature of the 1977 figures was that, unlike those for each of the past seven years (except 1975), they showed an increase in the electorate for the Borough as a whole and for each constituency: the increase for the Borough was from 142,696 in 1976 to 143,921 in 1977.

19. Mr. P. H. Vince, on behalf of the Liberals, commented that the 1977 figures showed, in relation to existing wards, trends different from those in the Borough Council's five year forecast, based on the 1976 figures. He said that in the case of thirteen wards the changes in electorate were in the opposite direction to the Borough Council's forecast for 1981, and that only in five cases were the figures in line and in proportion to these forecasts.

20. The Conservatives produced their five year forecasts, going to 1982, based on the trends revealed in the 1977 figures: their totals for each constituency and for the whole Borough were:-

	<u>1977 Electorate</u>	<u>1982 Electorate</u>
Hampstead	63,671	63,500
St. Pancras North	40,736	41,850
Holborn and St. Pancras South	39,513	40,100
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	143,920	145,450
	<hr/>	<hr/>

It will be seen that there is an increase in each constituency over their first estimates, and an increase for the Borough as a whole in 1982 of 4,450 over their original estimate for 1981. The Borough Council did not produce any revision of their forecasts in the light of the 1977 figures.

21. There was a lengthy discussion in an effort to ascertain the reasons for the wide divergence between the forecasts of the Borough Council and the Conservatives. Miss Pope began by explaining her methodology: briefly she had used an equation which gave the estimated 1981 electorate by multiplying the 1971 electorate over the population then 18 or over by the projected population over 18 in 1981. The 1971 census of population was the base and this was demographically projected; institutional population was added and adjustments were made to allow for known development. The whole process was described in detail in a lengthy memorandum P.C. 7401 (Revised) which was produced by the Council's Planning and Communications Department. This document referred to a recent Greater London Council projection, which was said to have been produced on a different basis and which certainly arrived at a quite different result: in relation to population, as distinct from electorate, the higher of two 1981 projections given by the G.L.C. was no less than 27,000 below Camden's own corresponding figure. (These were the figures quoted in the Camden report: my copy of G.L.C. Memorandum RM 455 from which the G.L.C. figures were said to have been taken gave rather higher figures than Camden quoted).

22. Miss Pope went on to explain that she had merely furnished projections of the 1981 electorate of the existing wards: these had been handed to the Electoral Services Group of the Town Clerk's Department, who had then applied them to the new wards and made further adjustments for known prospective development to ensure that it was allowed for correctly in each of the appropriate new wards. In answer to questions by Mr. Avery, Miss Pope agreed that she had used the same demographic factors, such as fertility, for the whole Borough but that in fact average factors of this kind might well not apply in some wards. Miss Pope also stated that she had made her estimates in 1974 and had not subsequently adjusted them in the light of the actual

electorates in the three following years.

23. Mr. Avery then described his method of predicting the 1981 or 1982 electorate. In essence this involved examining the electorate in each of the existing wards individually and reaching a conclusion as to the likely change over a five year period. For this purpose Mr. Avery took first the actual and percentage change (a decline in all but two cases) between the years 1972 and 1977 (this was an up-dating of an earlier exercise covering the years 1971 - 1976). He then projected this trend for five years but at a slightly slower rate in all cases; in some cases he assumed the decline would continue at two thirds the previous rate and in others at one third. The rate selected depended on a number of factors, including the dominant type of property (e.g. well maintained blocks of flats or less well-appointed or multi-occupied terrace property). Mr. Avery then made a number of adjustments to allow for new development (a schedule of which had been supplied to him by the Town Clerk), the likely occupation of the large number of unoccupied mansion flats (empty from the effects of landlord and tenant legislation) in parts of the Borough and the likely nature of the future occupation of some of the larger houses. In the light of all these factors, of which the foregoing is necessarily only a brief resume, Mr. Avery had produced his forecasts of the electorates of the existing wards and their adaptation to the Conservatives' proposed wards. The totals on a constituency and Borough basis have already been summarised in paragraphs 17 and 20.

24. When asked to explain why his estimates for 1982, based on the 1977 electorate, were significantly higher than the earlier ones for 1981, Mr. Avery said that this was a direct consequence of the rise in the electorate between 1976 and 1977. This showed that the expected depopulation was not taking place at the generally anticipated rate.

25. Miss Pope and Mr. Avery agreed, after a private discussion, that the principal reasons why their forecasts were so different was that Miss Pope had used the same demographic factors throughout the Borough, whereas Mr. Avery had used a method which took account of the types of population and occupation in different areas: there was, for instance, the ever-changing

pattern of the occupation of the larger houses, varying from single families to multi-occupation and division into self-contained flats. This applied particularly in the Hampstead area where there was also an increasing number of bed-sitters. There were, of course, other differences between their methods.

26. At the conclusion of the discussion, Mr. Vince, for the Liberals, suggested that in view of the unusual factors making prediction of future electorates in Camden particularly difficult, it would be wiser to work largely on the existing electorates except in cases, such as Gospel Oak, where there are known to be inevitable major changes due to development.

27. Conclusion and Recommendation

This lengthy discussion on electorate projections emphasised the wisdom of a phrase in the Camden population memorandum, PC 7401 (Revised) which stated: "Population projections are notorious for their inaccuracy...". Certainly the varying methods and results, which had been described to me, coupled with the proof by events of the serious inaccuracy of the estimates made in 1970, left me with no real confidence in any of the projections which were submitted to me. The Borough Council's projections clearly made no adequate allowance for the very varying conditions in different parts of the Borough and were, in any case, based on figures produced in 1974, which had not been adjusted in the light of the actual electorates in the three subsequent years. The Conservatives' figures, on the other hand sought to reflect these differences scientifically and to take full account of trends in recent years: but even they depended on what was fundamentally a subjective judgment as to the rate of population change in each part of the Borough.

28. On the whole, I preferred the Conservatives' figures, especially in relation to the Hampstead area, as representing the more likely outcome of events. Nevertheless, I felt that even these should be treated with some reserve, not least because of the considerable change which Mr. Avery had felt bound to make in his later tables because of the actual figures of the 1977 electorate.

29. It is only right that I should add that Miss Pope and Mr. Avery had clearly taken immense trouble to produce, by different statistical methods, realistic forecasts of future electorates. While either of these methods might have worked with reasonable accuracy in many places, the peculiar circumstances of Camden militated against them doing so satisfactorily there.

30. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that, in Camden, it would be much safer to rely, as Mr. Vince suggested, mainly on the existing electorates, taking only rather guarded account of likely changes in the next five years, except in those wards where known and definite changes will take place. I recommend accordingly, and will refer specifically where necessary to the application of this principle to individual wards.

31. SIZE OF THE COUNCIL

Although the Commission take the view that existing parliamentary constituency boundaries are irrelevant in the fixing of new ward boundaries, it is, I think, accepted that they may well be used as a convenient guide when a borough contains more than one constituency. In Camden there is the additional feature that the constituency boundaries tend to demarcate broadly the widely differing parts of the Borough. The Council, the Conservatives and the Liberals have all used these boundaries as, so to speak, sub-divisions of the Borough for the purpose of settling ward boundaries and determining the total number of members to be allocated to each area.

32. It is therefore, helpful to consider the size of the Council in this context. The 1976 and 1977 electorates divided between constituencies, and the various forecasts by the Borough Council and the Conservatives, are given in paragraphs 18 and 20. The Conservatives submitted an elaborate table (C.12) showing the possible division of seats between constituencies and their proposed wards on the basis of a council with from 55 to 61 members. This showed that the most equitable distribution of seats between constituencies, on the basis of the 1977 electorate, would be achieved with a Council of 59 members (as against the Commission's 58), and that the distribution remained sound on the Conservative's 1982 figures. The entitlements on this basis are as follows:

	<u>No. of Councillors</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1982</u>
Hampstead	26	26.1	25.76
St. Pancras North	17	16.7	16.97
Holborn and St. Pancras South	16	16.2	16.2

This compares with the Borough Council's figures for a council of 58 in the context of the actual 1976 figures and their estimate for 1981, as follows:

	<u>No. of Councillors</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1981</u>
Hampstead	25	25.67	23.80
St. Pancras North	17	16.53	17.77
Holborn and St. Pancras South	16	15.81	16.43

On this basis Hampstead would have been under-represented on the 1976 figures but, as I have already indicated, I am not happy with the Council's 1981 estimates and so am inclined not to accept the apparent over-representation in 1981.

33. Recommendations

Bearing in mind my conclusion that reliance should be placed, in the main, on the 1977 figures, I recommend that the Council should have 59 members, divided as indicated above, and I think the likelihood is that these entitlements will not prove far out in the next few years.

34. WARDS AND WARD BOUNDARIES GENERALLY.

After the prolonged discussion on electorate predictions, the local meeting considered the detailed boundaries of proposed wards. The Conservatives advanced a full alternative scheme which differed from the draft proposals in relation to every ward except Chalk Farm and Holborn; in addition, the Liberals made a number of suggestions for change in the Hampstead constituency, withdrawing their suggestions in respect of the other two constituencies. The arguments advanced by the Borough Council and the Conservatives for their respective proposals was based in part on figures and in part on the suitability of the boundaries proposed. Inevitably proposals for change in one or two wards had a chain reaction on other wards and this has made it particularly difficult to produce a generally satisfactory solution.

35. As I have already indicated, both the Borough Council and the Conservatives said they wished to disturb the existing patterns as little as possible, and were opposed to wards crossing constituency boundaries (although one suggestion doing this was advanced by the Conservatives at a late stage). Both also accepted generally that the pattern of main north-south and east-west roads provided a suitable boundary framework between wards, as now, although the Borough Council favoured more exceptions than the Conservatives. Beyond this, however, there was a vast area of disagreement on details which were discussed, exhaustively. In the event, the discussion resulted in a measure of agreement about some of the contentious issues; I shall deal briefly with the arguments in these cases, and concentrate on those issues which remained unresolved between the parties. Finally, on general matters, the picture was further confused because the Conservatives proposed different names for some of their new wards: both parties, however, said they attached little importance to this and accepted that the appropriate name would normally follow from the shape of the ward eventually adopted.

36. KILBURN, BECKFORD, WEST END, PRIORY AND SWISS COTTAGE

The area to the west of Finchley Road at present comprises the Kilburn, West End, Priory and Swiss Cottage Wards, with part of the latter continuing on the north-east side of Finchley Road. Of these wards, West End and Swiss Cottage return four members each and the others three each. The Commission's draft proposals produce the necessary division by creating a new Beckford Ward, reducing the size of Swiss Cottage and altering the boundaries of the remainder, including the addition to the new Beckford Ward of the northern end of Kilburn. The Conservative scheme proposes a different solution: they would leave the Kilburn Ward untouched, divide West End ward in two within its present very clear outer boundaries but with an east-west instead of a north-south dividing line, and provide rather different boundaries for the Priory and Swiss Cottage wards, including severing the part of the latter which lies to the east of Finchley Road.

37. The outcome of a lengthy discussion was that the Borough Council accepted the Conservative solution for Kilburn and West End Wards, leaving only the problem of the precise ^{size} and boundaries of Priory and Swiss Cottage wards.

A large number of possibilities and arguments were canvassed before me but, in view of the agreement, it is only necessary to mention some of these, and also certain variants proposed by the Liberals. In the first place it transpired that, in the list of future developments supplied to all parties by the Borough Council, a scheme called Central Hampstead I, involving an electorate of 534, had been wrongly included in Swiss Cottage instead of West End. Secondly, two features of the draft proposals boundaries of their West End and Kilburn Wards were unsatisfactory on boundary-making principles. The north-south boundary between Beckford and West End comes down Dennington Park Road to meet the railway in Sumatra Road, but in fact there is a continuous terrace of houses backing on to the railway on the south side of Sumatra Road and the suggested boundary passes through this terrace between two adjacent front doors. Again, the eastern boundary of the Borough Council's Kilburn Ward continues north from Broadhurst Gardens over a long footbridge crossing the Metropolitan Railway near West Hampstead Station. The Borough Council agreed that both these sections of boundary were unsatisfactory.

38. On figures, West End ward was one of those where the Borough Council forecast a substantial drop in electorate by 1981 which would by then be insufficient to justify four councillors. The Conservatives forecast a much smaller fall by 1981 and, in their revised estimates, a rise of about 100 by 1982. The addition of the 534 potential electors from Swiss Cottage improved the position on any view of the estimates. The Conservatives' West End ward (the southern half of the existing ward) had 4801 electors in 1977, giving an entitlement of 1.99; their adjusted 1982 estimate of 5584 gives an entitlement of 2.26, which gives a fair margin for over-estimation. The Conservatives' northern half of the existing ward (which they call Fortune Green) had 4548 electors in 1977 and an entitlement of 1.86; the 1982 estimate of 4050 brings this down to 1.81, which is a little on the low side, but no one suggested any more satisfactory dividing line which would balance the figures.

39. The Liberals preferred a solution which would leave West End as it is but without its present south-east corner and returning three members, at one stage this was supported by the Borough Council but there were a number of difficulties. Mrs. F. Rea, who was unable to stay for the discussion, wrote a long subsequent letter objecting to the Conservative line along Mill Lane and West End Lane on the ground that it severed the community centred on West End Green, where there were a school, shops and the fire station. The Conservatives contended that there were distinct communities north and south of this line. I shall have more to say on this point later.

40. It was in the context of these various considerations that Sir Ashley Bramall, on behalf of the Borough Council, finally indicated acceptance of the Conservative solution of leaving the Kilburn ward untouched and dividing the existing West End ward into two two-member wards, one to be called West End and the other Fortune Green.

41. This left the problem of Priory and Swiss Cottage wards. Everyone seemed to agree that the combined area of these two wards to the west of Finchley Road merited five members, with roughly one more member for the part of Swiss Cottage ward at present on the east of Finchley Road. There, however, the common ground ended and a variety of solutions and modifications were advanced and discussed. The acceptance by the Borough Council of the changes in Kilburn and West End meant that the draft proposals for Priory and Swiss Cottage wards required considerable modification. But the Borough Council and the Liberals did not like the Conservative solution put forward in their alternative scheme: this was for a three-member Swiss Cottage ward and a two-member Priory Ward, both entirely to the west of Finchley Road. Both considered that Swiss Cottage ward should still include an area to the east of Finchley Road, though on different alignments, and the Borough Council considered that the Conservatives' Priory Ward would be under-represented. Much discussion also took place about the relative size, and therefore boundaries, of the two wards.

42. It is perhaps unnecessary to describe all the possible solutions which

were discussed but only to mention the principal ones. The Liberal solution for Swiss Cottage involved not only an area to the east of Finchley Road in the Arkwright Road - Fitzjohns Avenue triangle but also an area to the south running down Avenue Road to the Borough boundary; in addition, they advocated back-garden boundaries in Goldhurst Terrace and Fairfax Road. This solution was not favoured by anyone else.

43. The Borough Council favoured a three-member Priory ward, and would like the northern boundary running along Cranfield Gardens. Mr. Vince, on behalf of the Liberals, favoured a two-member Priory ward. Problems arose about numbers and Mr. Vince put forward the idea that, if the northern boundary ran along Abbey Road and Belsize Road (or the adjoining railway), the boundary should be taken behind the two point blocks, Casterbridge and Snowman House, at the junction of the two roads: he advocated this partly on grounds of numbers and partly because these two blocks form part of the Abbey Estate to the South.

44. In an effort to meet the Borough Council's criticisms about numbers, Mr. Avery put forward a last minute alternative for the northern boundary of Priory ward; this showed a line running from the eastern boundary of the ward at Quex Road, along Abbey Road, then along the railway behind Belsize Road and continuing to join Finchley Road opposite Adelaide Road. This line would give a Swiss Cottage ward with 8336 electorates in 1977, an entitlement of 3.42: in 1982 the figures would be 8100 and 3.29. Priory would be 4279 and 1.75 in 1977 and 5000 and 2.03 in 1982. Although this went a long way to meet the criticisms, it was not acceptable to the Borough Council. On the other hand, it was not dissimilar except at the eastern end by Hilgrove Road, to the Liberal solution.

45. Inspection

I carried out an extensive inspection before the local meeting of the whole area lying to the west of Finchley Road. I again visited the area after the meeting and toured the particularly controversial sections on foot. I was satisfied that the general principles of the agreement between the parties about leaving Kilburn and the outer boundaries of West End untouched was sound: the boundaries are particularly clearly defined by railways and main roads.

46. I also paid special attention to the Conservative boundary running along Mill Lane and through West End Green, as well as to the point blocks at the junction of Abbey Road and Belsize Road. I accept that the line running through West End Green is divisive, but on the ground the situation is not nearly so acute as appeared from the objections. Almost all the shops and other facilities are south of the Conservatives' line and, in addition, the character of many of the properties to the north of the line, which appear to be largish houses in multiple occupation, does not give the area the impression of a particularly closely-knit community.

47. I looked carefully at the two point blocks, Casterbridge and Snowman House. They are clearly part of the general new development South of Abbey Road and beyond the railway. They also stand on a very clearly defined plot with a large old wall running behind them from Abbey Road to Belsize Road. Although it is, so to speak, a back garden boundary, this wall is nonetheless a very clearly defined boundary which would give rise to no technical difficulties.

48. Finally, I looked at the section of Finchley Road dividing the two parts of the present Swiss Cottage ward and the corresponding ward in the draft proposals. The Borough Council had argued that, as a shopping centre, this section of Finchley Road was more of a focus for the areas on both sides, rather than a barrier. This is, in a sense, true, but Finchley Road is such a wide and extremely busy traffic artery that it is essentially a barrier between areas and, as such, an ideal ward boundary.

49. Conclusions and Recommendations

I have no doubt that it is right to leave Kilburn ward and the outer boundaries of West End ward untouched for the reasons which have emerged earlier. The Conservatives' east-west boundary between the new West End and Fortune Green wards is less than ideal; but there is no other possible boundary which is anything like so good and the local ties between one side and the other in the West End Green area are not, in my view, so strong as to justify rejecting the line. It may, perhaps, be said that it seems unlikely that the local ties between one area and another in these closely built-up neighbourhoods are so strong as to make it unthinkable to split them for

for electoral purposes. After all the ward boundaries are in no sense a hindrance to people crossing the line for shopping and many other purposes. I therefore feel that the Conservatives' schemes for dividing West End ward into the new West End and Fortune Green wards is the best solution in the circumstances, and the relevant figures appear to be within reasonable tolerances in the light of the problems about forecasting ahead, with which I have dealt earlier.

50. The problems of Priory and Swiss Cottage wards, in the context of the last paragraph are not easy. On balance I have decided that Priory ward should return two members and Swiss Cottage three, and that the latter should be confined to the area west of Finchley Road. This is partly because I regard Finchley Road as a natural clear boundary between wards, but also because the area to the east divides readily into two wards in order to complete the picture of twenty-six members for the Hampstead constituency. The boundaries of Priory ward are a problem, but I consider that Mr. Avery's last minute alternative, with the variation suggested by Mr. Vince in relation to Casterbridge and Snowman House, provides the best solution. The two point blocks have an electorate of 375; if this is added to Mr. Avery's suggested Priory Ward, it gives a 1977 figure of 4654 and an entitlement of 1.9: In 1982, on the Conservative figures, this gives 5375 and an entitlement of 2.18. Correspondingly, the Swiss Cottage electorate would become 7961 in 1977, with an entitlement of 3.26 and, by 1982, 7725 with an entitlement of 3.1. These figures seem reasonable.

51. I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals should be varied to provide that:-

(1) Kilburn ward should be co-terminous with the existing Kilburn ward and should return three members;

(2) West End ward, as it at present exists, should be divided into two new two-member wards, to be known as Fortune Green (to the north) and West End, the dividing line, running east-west along Mill Lane and West End Lane;

(3) The remainder of the area to the west of Finchley Road should be divided into two wards, Swiss Cottage returning three members

and Priory returning two, and that they should be divided along a line running along Abbey Road, to the railway and thence on this line to Finchley Road, but that where Abbey Road cross Belsize Road, the boundary should run along the wall behind the two point blocks known as Casterbridge and Snowman House.

52. BELSIZE AND ADELAIDE WARDS

The area comprising the proposed Belsize and Adelaide wards in the Commission's draft proposals is one of the most controversial on numbers. The Borough Council forecast a massive drop in the electorate by 1981 (over 2000 compared with 1976), but the 1977 figures in fact showed a rise since 1976 of 113 in the proposed Belsize ward and of 66 in Adelaide. This would give Belsize, with 8863 electors, an entitlement of 3.60 this year which, as Mr. Cripps pointed out, was a substantial under-representation. The Conservatives, of course, forecast a drop of only a few hundred by 1981 or 1982.

53. I have already dealt very fully with the problems of estimating future electorates and the different approaches of the Borough Council and the Conservatives. It seemed nonetheless to be desirable to draw attention to the figures in this particular area as they illustrate strikingly the Conservatives' contention that the Borough Council's estimates are unreliable and that there should be one more member in this area than is allowed for in the draft proposals.

54. The draft proposals provide for a three-member Belsize ward and a northern boundary of the new Adelaide ward designed to produce a balance between the two on the Borough Council's figures. The Conservatives propose dividing the area, including the part of Swiss Cottage ward east of Finchley Road into two wards, Belsize and Fitzjohns, of three and two members respectively. Their proposals also involve taking the northern boundary of the area slightly further north to Prince Arthur Road and slightly further South to Steels Road. On 1977 figures, this would give a Belsize ward of 7317, with an entitlement of 3.00, and a Fitzjohn's ward of 4680 with an entitlement of 1.92. On the Conservatives' 1982 figures the entitlements would be 2.86 and 1.83. The

Conservatives figures for their Adelaide ward would give entitlements of 2.97 in 1977 and 2.96 in 1982.

55. Sir Ashley Bramall maintained the Borough Council view that the Swiss Cottage ward should extend over Finchley Road, as in the draft proposals, and that the remainder of the area should form one new Belsize ward returning three members. Commenting on the Conservative proposals, if there were to be two wards in this area, he criticised the Conservatives' dividing line down Belsize Lane and Ornan Lane as splitting a community. Mr. Vince, for the Liberals, also disliked the Conservatives' dividing line. On the other hand, Mr. R. King, the Borough Councillor for Swiss Cottage, favoured the Conservatives proposal and thought that Belsize Lane was a good natural split between two types of development and two original development estates.

56. The boundaries of the proposed Adelaide ward led to two items of discussion: Mr. Vince, for the Liberals, argued in favour of excluding the triangle north of Adelaide Road, to which I have referred earlier, and of a northern boundary along Eton Avenue, Lambolle Place, Belsize Park Gardens and Belsize Grove: no one else favoured this line. Sir Ashley Bramall and Mr. Cripps agreed that the choice between the Borough Council's and the Conservatives' line for the northern boundary of Adelaide ward was entirely a question of numbers.

57. I inspected this area and particularly the boundary proposed by the Conservatives for the division between their Belsize and Fitzjohns wards. While this obviously splits a close-knit residential area, it did not seem to be any less desirable than any boundary in such an area.

58. Conclusions and Recommendations

In the context of what I have said earlier about the forecasts of future electorates, and of the actual 1977 figures compared with those of 1976, I am satisfied that the Conservatives are right in contending that this area should be divided into three wards, Belsize, Fitzjohns and Adelaide and that, in the light of the figures which I set out in paragraph 53, the boundaries should be those proposed by the Conservatives. While the boundary they propose between their Belsize and Fitzjohns ward may not

be perfect, I cannot suggest any improvement.

59. I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals should be varied to provide that:

(1) Belsize ward and the part of Swiss Cottage ward east of Finchley Road should be divided along College Crescent, Belsize Lane and Ornan Road to provide, to the north, a Fitzjohns ward returning two members, and to the south, a Belsize ward returning three members.

(2) The northern boundary of the proposed wards described in the previous paragraph should follow the northern boundaries of the Swiss Cottage and Belsize wards in the draft proposals, except that the eastern extremity should go along Ellerdale Road and Prince Arthur Road instead of Shepperds Walk.

(3) The northern boundary of Adelaide ward should, at its eastern extremity, follow Primrose Hill Road and Steeles Road, instead of Englands Lane.

60. HAMPSTEAD TOWN AND SOUTH END

The Commission's draft proposals divide the remainder of the Hampstead constituency into two three-member wards, Hampstead Town and South End. The alternative scheme of the Conservatives divides the area into three two-member wards, which they call Hampstead Town, South End and Frognall. Although the Borough Council forecast a greater fall in electorate by 1981 than the Conservatives, the entitlements in both schemes are within acceptable tolerances: the Conservatives, with their smaller estimated fall in electorate naturally produce slightly better entitlements. The relevant figures are:

Draft Proposals

	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>1976 Entitlement</u>	<u>1981 Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Hampstead Town	7785	3.16	6935	2.81
South End	7499	3.05	6635	2.69

Conservatives

	1977		1982	
	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Hampstead Town	4714	1.93	4450	1.81
South End	5137	2.11	5050	2.05
Froggall	5053	2.07	5100	2.07

61. While, therefore, there was no fundamental disagreement on figures in this area, the possible divisions into two or three wards, and the boundaries to be fixed proved highly contentious. In the first place, the Borough Council proposed a reduction in the area of the present Hampstead ward in order to give it only three members instead of the present four. This reduction was to be achieved by moving the south-eastern boundary from Downshire Hill to a line running along Gayton Road and Well Walk, and then down East Heath Road to Downshire Hill: the other boundary would remain Rossbyn Hill and High Street. This proposal would introduce a large re-entrant into the present area of the ward, the other boundaries of which were unchanged.

62. There was strong opposition from several quarters to the Borough Council's suggestion which is, of course, part of the draft proposals. Mr. Peter Ratzer, who lives in the area and is a member of the Borough Council, wrote to say that Gayton Road/Well Walk was not a natural boundary, that it would split a homogeneous area which was focused on Hampstead Town and did not look south to South Green, and that accordingly it was a wholly inappropriate line to select. Mr. Ratzer suggested, as a second best to the present boundary, a line running along Pilgrims Lane. Mrs. Knight, a former Borough Councillor, said that it would be unfortunate to split the area to the south of Gayton Road from the town, as there was a strong community of interest. She said that the present Downshire Hill boundary did not cause such an acute division.

63. The two individual objections, which I have quoted, epitomised the Conservative case against the Borough Council's proposed new boundary line: Mr. Cripps amplified this and put forward the Conservative alternative which would take the southern boundary of Hampstead Town ward along

Pond Street to South End Green and then up South End Road. This would produce a smaller two-member South End Ward, and, as already mentioned, the Conservatives would also split Hampstead Town into two, creating a new Frognall ward to the west of Hollybush Hill and Branch Hill.

64. The Conservative proposal was, however, strongly attacked by Sir Ashley Bramall, on behalf of the Borough Council. While not disputing that there was a problem, he contended that the Conservative intrusion southward was more harmful than the converse proposal of the Borough Council. He suggested that it would bisect the South End community north and south of South End Green. In support of the Borough Council's line, Sir Ashley said that the South End Green shopping centre was used by, for instance, those who live in Keats Grove.

65. Sir Ashley Bramall also opposed the Conservative line up Hollybush Hill/Branch Hill which would be the boundary of their Frognall Ward. He said that this too cut off part of the area focussing on Hampstead Town. Mrs. Knight intervened, however, to say that people to the west of that line regard themselves as living in Frognall. Sir Ashley, conceded that, if a Frognall ward was to be created, this was the only practicable boundary.

66. There was a great deal of further discussion of the South End problem and various alternative lines were canvassed, including one by Mr. Vince with a boundary going along Gayton Road, preferably along the back gardens, and then down Willow Road. At the adjourned meeting, Mr. Avery produced yet another solution of a far more drastic kind: this brought still more of the area to the south into the Town ward, making that a three member ward. This scheme also involved a major amendment to Grafton ward by transferring (across the constituency boundary) the area of the Maitland Park estate and its surroundings.

67. Mr. Avery's latest scheme evoked strenuous opposition from Sir Ashley Bramall and the leader of the Council, Mr. Shaw. They stressed that the constituency boundaries had great practical significance to political parties. Furthermore this area had in fact been moved into Grafton ward in 1970 in response to strong local representations that that was where

the community interest lay: the parliamentary boundary had subsequently been altered to coincide with the new ward boundary. Finally, Mr. Shaw stressed that the area looked towards Kentish Town and not to Hampstead: he knew because it was the ward he represented on the Borough Council.

68. It was generally agreed that the Impressions of the situation on the ground were all-important in reaching a decision on these contentious boundaries, and, although I had inspected the area before the meeting, I was asked by the parties to do so again in the light of the discussion. I accordingly paid a further visit and carried out a detailed inspection on foot of the South Green/Keats Grove area and also the neighbourhood of Hollybush Hill/Branch Hill.

69. While the western end of Downshire Hill contains properties which are not perhaps of the same age or character as the more typical areas of Hampstead Town - or Village as many call it, to the east and south there are areas and houses which are clearly parts of the old Hampstead. I certainly formed the view that bisecting this area north of the railway would be unsatisfactory and would separate localities which, visually at least, had the strong local ties of which I had heard. Incidentally, both the Borough Council and the Conservatives suggest a similar, but not identical, small boundary change north-east of Downshire Hill: the purpose of this is obviously to transfer to South End ward (either version) a few of the houses in South Hill Park which anomalously fall into the Town ward under the existing boundary. Inspection shows that this minor change is clearly desirable and, of the two, the Conservative line is marginally the better.

70. On the map, the case against the Conservative line coming along Pond/^{Lane} and turning north by South End Green is clearly strong. On inspection, however, the situation is very different: the great majority of the shops and other facilities, except the station, are on the west side of South End Road and would not therefore be cut off from the areas to the north which they are said to serve. Again, the properties in Fleet Road, Constantine Road and other areas to the east and south-east of South End Green

are of a very different type from those to the north-west, and do not give the impression of there being much, if any, community of interest between the two areas. South Hill Park is in any case physically rather detached from the rest of the area.

71. The line up Hollybush and Branch Hills, continuing up to West Heath Road is an obviously good boundary when viewed on the ground. It is true that there are a few older houses of the type found in the heart of Hampstead lying to the west of this line, but I can well imagine that Mrs Knight is correct in suggesting that people living in this area regard themselves as being in Frognall rather than Hampstead proper.

72. Conclusions and Recommendations

As in so many cases, the arguments in favour of either the Borough Council's or the Conservatives' proposed divisions of this area each have merit, but I am satisfied that the Conservative proposals are the better, as creating three well-balanced wards and causing less severance of local ties than the other. In particular, the proposed Borough Council re-entrant into the area of the present Town ward would not only create an odd and irregular boundary but would, I think, clearly sever local ties between the communities on either side of Gayton Road. In contrast, I did not feel that the line along Pond Street, turning north by South End Green, was sufficiently divisive of communities to be rejected.

73. I considered carefully the sundry variants which were put before me, including Mr. Avery's last minute proposal for combining part of the Grafton ward with the rump of South End ward (which he would then have renamed Haverstock). I did not think that any of these had superior merits to the main Conservative proposals.

74. It follows that if the Hampstead Town ward is to be brought as far south as South End Green, the ward would be too large to remain undivided, as it would merit well over three members. The proposed severance of the new Frognall ward is the obvious solution to this problem and, as I said earlier, Sir Ashley Bramall had recognised that any division of the Town ward must be on the line running up Branch and Hollybush Hills. I

found this line to be quite satisfactory.

75. Finally, I would add a special word about the Liberal contribution to the discussion about not only these wards but the others in the Hampstead constituency with which I have dealt earlier. The Liberals had put in a complete alternative scheme for the wards in this constituency (Mr. Vince withdrew the corresponding suggestions for the other two constituencies). I of course considered this carefully but it had, as a whole, certain fundamental drawbacks. It was largely based on the Borough Council's figures, about which I have expressed strong reservations; it had some strange sections of boundary including a number of back-garden lines; and it produced entitlements which often went outside the tolerances acceptable to the Commission. While, therefore, I did not feel that this scheme provided a viable alternative to either of the other two, Mr. Vince, the Liberal spokesman, made most valuable contributions to the discussion and put forward some useful suggestions on particular issues, of some of which I was able to take advantage.

76. I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals should be varied to provide that:

- (1) Hampstead Town Ward should be divided along the line of Hollybush and Branch Hills to provide two two-member wards, the one to the west being named Frognall;
- (2) The southern boundary of Hampstead Town ward should be moved south to run along Pond Street from Rosslyn Hill to South End Green and then up South End and East Heath Roads.
- (3) The reduced area of South End ward should return two, instead of three, members.

77. CHALK FARM

All parties agreed the Chalk Farm Ward included in the draft proposals, which is identical to the existing ward, constituted a good two-member ward with clear and satisfactory boundaries. There was the usual divergence of view on future figures, though it was not of fundamental

importance in this case. The Conservatives forecast a higher electorate in 1981 than the Borough Council and an even higher one in 1982: the difference arose because the Conservatives considered there would be no depopulation to counteract the planned new development, whereas the Borough Council estimated a net drop of 365 in the electorate by 1981 (it had risen by 235 between 1976 and 1977). However, the resulting entitlements were largely within the usual tolerances, although the Conservative entitlement of 2.33 in 1982 would, if correct, produce a slight under-representation. I recommend no change in the draft proposals.

78. CAMDEN AND CAVERSHAM

The draft proposals and the Conservatives' alternative scheme both provide for two two-member wards within the boundaries of the existing four-member Camden ward, except that the draft proposals exclude the Peckwater Estate, by Kentish Town Station, which goes north to St. John's ward. On the other hand, the Conservatives simply divide the ward in two down the line of the Camden Road, whereas the draft proposals follow the Camden Road for three quarters of its length in the ward, but then include in the southern division a "nose" of development around Camden Road Station. Both schemes call the southern new ward "Camden", but the draft proposals call the other half "Caversham", whereas the Conservatives call it "Kentish Town".

79. In presenting the Conservative case, Mr. Cripps advocated the merits of simply splitting the existing ward down the excellent, as he saw it, boundary of Camden Road. He also indicated that the Conservatives would accept the name "Caversham" for the northern half of the ward, and it will be convenient so to refer to it hereafter. Sir Ashley Bramall and Mr. Pollard, a member of the Borough Council, indicated that they would accept, and indeed prefer, the Conservative solution if the figures were found to be acceptable to the Commission. Sir Ashley specifically referred to the Peckwater Estate which he said could be brought back into the ward; this meant that both parties agreed that it would be best to retain the outer boundaries of the old ward.

80. As always, however, there were divergencies, in this case wide, between the electorate forecasts of the two parties; the Borough Council forecast a rise of 798 in the electorate of their Camden ward by 1981, whereas the Conservatives estimated that the electorate of theirs would fall by 108. Similarly the Council expected a rise of 386 over the same period in their Caversham ward, while the Conservatives contemplated a drop of 583 in theirs. The present electorate of the Peckwater Estate is 717 and that of the area around Camden Road station to the north-west of Camden Road is 536.

81. Without setting out all the figures in detail, it can be said that two numerical problems arise on the Conservative scheme, which, as I have said, was acceptable to the Borough Council if the figures worked out. First, the Borough Council's view of the electorate forecasts would mean that the 1981 entitlement for Caversham would be 2.57, using the Conservatives' 59 seat divisor of 2390 for that year. Secondly, the Conservatives' view of the forecasts would mean that the entitlement for Camden would be 1.62 in 1982. The first figure would give Caversham a degree of under-representation, and the second would mean that Camden would be rather over-represented. The factors leading to the two views were therefore discussed at some length. Dealing first with Caversham, the Borough Council have obviously assumed that there will be no further depopulation and the electorate will go up. The Town Clerk stated, however, that no further development is planned in Caversham and that it is, therefore, likely that depopulation will continue. Mr. Avery estimated a fall of 300 by 1982 (less than his 1981 fall), which would bring the entitlement down to 2.21. Without seeking to choose a precise figure, it, therefore, seems reasonable to assume that, in the event Caversham would not be substantially over-represented by 1981 or 1982, as it is not seriously now, with a 1977 entitlement of 2.35.

82. In the case of Camden, Mr. Avery seems to have discounted to some extent the development figures supplied by the Town Clerk, and also estimated a high rate of depopulation. The Town Clerk stated that there

will be very substantial development in Camden after 1981 (on, I believe, former railway land) and that this would in any case soon correct any short-term deficiency. Again, therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the over-representation of Camden would not be serious in 1981 or 1982, and would in any event soon be cured.

83. I visited the area but this revealed nothing remarkable beyond the obvious excellence of Camden Road as a boundary.

84. Conclusions and Recommendation

I agree with the general view that, if the figures can be accepted, the Conservative solution of simply dividing the existing Camden ward down Camden Road is the best. As I have indicated the entitlements are unlikely to be much, if at all, outside the usual tolerances and I am quite satisfied that the excellence of the boundaries, as compared with those of the draft proposals, outweigh the disadvantages of any slight unevenness in the electorates.

85. I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals should be varied by simply dividing the existing Camden ward into two two-member wards along the line of Camden Road, the wards to be known as Caversham and Camden, and that as part of this arrangement the Peckwater Estate should be transferred from the St. Johns to the Caversham ward.

86. HIGHGATE

The Highgate ward was yet another area of considerable contention. The draft proposals adopted the boundaries of the existing ward, except that with St. Johns which they move south from Gordon House Road to the railway. This would give a three-member ward. The Conservatives, on the other hand, would move the existing boundary north to Croftdown Road and York Road to make a two-member ward: they would also move the Gospel Oak boundary north to a path across Parliament Hill Fields joining West Hill near the Convent School. The Conservatives suggested that the draft proposals' boundary would increase the electorate to an unacceptably high level, and that their boundary is more sensible. They also criticised the section of the southern boundary, which follows the railway line

through a tunnel under Acland Burghley School, as being contrary to boundary-making principles. As usual, there was some disagreement on figures but it was narrower than usual in this case: both parties seem to agree that there will be some depopulation, as well as some increase in electorate due to development. Although the Conservatives criticised the draft proposals as producing an unacceptably high level of electorate with the new development taking place, the Borough Council forecast a net increase of 293 from 1976 to 1981 in their slightly extended ward, against the Conservatives' forecast increase of 274 in the existing ward between 1977 and 1982. The entitlement of 3.30 in 1981 on the Borough Council's figures is much the same as the result would be on the Conservatives' figures with their 1982 divisor for a council of 59. It should be added that the electorate of the existing ward actually fell by 254 between 1975 and 1977. The figures do not, therefore, appear to support the Conservatives' criticism of the size of the electorate.

87. It was, however, the proposed boundaries which evoked the major disagreement. Sir Ashley Bramall said that the Conservative line had no justification on a community basis. Mrs. Cox, a member of the Borough Council who lives in Grove Terrace, elaborating this criticism, said there was a strong community from Swains Lane south to the railway, they used the same shopping area in York Rise and their children attended the same primary school. The proposed Conservative boundary would also cut through the areas of two tenants associations in the Croftdown Road area. Mrs. Cox added that the present boundary along Gordon Road was itself most unsatisfactory.

88. Sir Ashley Bramall accepted that the section of boundary through a tunnel required amendment and suggested that it should run along Churchill Road to Dartmouth Hill from the point where the railway entered the tunnel. He suggested that the railway was otherwise a good and strong boundary. He went on to argue that there was no community link between the area north of the railway and the north of St. John's ward, as the Conservatives suggested. He also contended that the Lissenden Gardens area had links with Highgate rather than Gospel Oak.

89. Mr. Cripps said, and the Borough Council agreed, that the real issue was whether Highgate should be a two or three member ward. He did not seek further to defend the Conservative line in the light of the criticism of it on community grounds.

90. I visited the area. No points were apparent which had not emerged in the discussion; the minor diversion of line from the tunnel to Churchill Road seemed sound.

91. Conclusions and Recommendation

The issues in this case were well aired, but it was apparent that the draft proposal line, with the resulting three member Highgate ward, had far more merit than the Conservative alternative, which was open to considerable objection on the grounds of severing local ties. The Conservative objection to the size of the proposed Highgate electorate did not appear to be supported by the facts or likely changes in the electorate.

92. I accordingly recommend that there should be no change in the provision in the draft proposals for a three-member Highgate ward, except for a minor change diverting the section of boundary beneath the Acland Burghley School to follow the adjoining Churchill Road to Dartmouth Park Hill.

93. CASTLEHAVEN, GOSPEL OAK, GRAFTON AND ST. JOHNS

The remaining area of the St. Pancras North constituency, comprising the existing Gospel Oak (2 members), Grafton (4 members) and St. Johns (3 members) wards, is best examined together. The draft proposals divide the area into four two-member wards, whereas the Conservative alternative produces three three-member wards; the latter total of nine members assumes that Highgate has been reduced in size and electorate to a two-member ward.

94. The figures for this area are unusually confusing and difficult to compare, as the division into wards is different, and it is also necessary to balance the varying estimates of depopulation against the known new development by 1981. There is considerable new development either taking place or immediately planned in all the wards, especially

Gospel Oak where there are expected to be 1192 additional electors in new development by 1981. Even the Conservatives expect no depopulation in Gospel Oak over the next five years, although they forecast depopulation of 300 to 350 electorate in each of the other two existing wards.

95. Although I had before me all the various and conflicting tables put in by the parties, there was in fact little or no discussion of the figures for this area, and no one criticised each other's proposals on the ground of numerical unevenness. I will make some general comments on the figures later.

96. The real argument in this area turned on convenience of boundaries, and community of interest. It must first be remembered that the Conservatives proposed moving the northern boundaries of Gospel Oak and St. John's wards well up into the larger Highgate ward proposed by the Borough Council, to which I have referred earlier. They then criticised the odd shapes produced by some of the Borough Council's boundaries, and advocated their own. They were particularly critical of a section of the Grafton/Castlehaven boundary near Arctic Road where the railway which it follows is, for a stretch, on a viaduct.

97. Sir Ashley Bramall stressed that the Borough Council had sought, where possible, to keep to existing boundaries and that their Gospel Oak Ward was virtually identical to the existing one. Railways, which were often existing boundaries, were clear and natural dividing lines for this purpose. Mr. Shaw, the leader of the Council, stressed that their Gospel Oak, Grafton and Castlehaven wards each covered largely self-contained communities which were, in turn quite different from St. Johns. There was much poor development in the area and a great deal of it was being redeveloped or rehabilitated.

98. I visited the area. Mr. Shaw's description of it was apt, but there were no features requiring special comment except the section of railway viaduct boundary. This could be altered to follow nearby roads, but the result would be far less satisfactory.

99. Conclusions and Recommendations

I carefully examined all the relevant figures. It would be futile to set them out in detail because of the difficulty of comparing them, as they relate to different divisions of the area. So far as I was able to judge, the entitlements on either scheme were within reasonable tolerances, whatever view one took of the estimates, although that for the Borough Council's Castlehaven ward at 1.81 in 1976 and 1981 on their calculations, might turn out to be slightly generous on the Conservatives' view of the figures. This would, however, be only marginal, as the differences between the two main sets of figures were far less dramatic here than elsewhere in the Borough. On both schemes, the current entitlements for Gospel Oak, at 1.81 for two members and 2.79 for three, are generous, but this will undoubtedly be cured by 1981 because of the massive development actually under construction in the area. Finally it must be remembered that the Borough Council and the Conservatives were in agreement on the total number of members for the area and did not dispute each other's division on numerical grounds.

100. The draft proposals seemed to me to provide a sensible division of this area into wards and, although some of the boundaries look rather odd, I think this is probably unavoidable. I was also impressed with Mr. Shaw's arguments on the community issue. Finally, the Conservative scheme would in any event require considerable recasting in the light of my recommendations about Highgate, and I do not consider that it was otherwise superior to the draft proposals.

101. I, therefore, recommend that there should be no change in the draft proposals for the Castlehaven, Gospel Oak, Grafton and St. John's wards beyond the small amendment to the latter taking out the Peckwater Estate, which I have already dealt with under Camden.

102. REGENTS PARK, ST. PANCRAS AND SOMERS TOWN

The Regents Park, St. Pancras and Somers Town wards in the draft proposals are the product of seeking to divide the existing four-member Regents Park and three-member St. Pancras wards so that no ward shall have more than three members. The draft proposal makes a division down Camden High Street

and Hampstead Road, with an east-west division on a winding line from St. Pancras Hospital to the railway north of Euston Station. The Conservative alternative retains the existing St. Pancras ward east of Eversholt Street and carves out a new Mornington ward bounded by Hampstead Road, Augustus Street and Park Village East. Both parties were very critical of the other's proposals: the Conservatives said that the St. Pancras ward should be maintained and that the Council's proposal also isolated the triangles between the railway and Camden High Street in the North, and that to the west of Euston Station in the south, from the rest of the wards in which they were included. The Borough Council thought the Conservatives' Mornington ward was entirely artificial, with Hampstead Road running through the middle and was not at all a tidy arrangement; in particular it cut off a part of the Council's Regents Park estate round Varndell Street from the rest of that estate and sought to marry the two unrelated triangles referred to above. The Conservatives considered that the boundary between the Council's St. Pancras and Somers Town wards was tortuous and unsatisfactory. Various possible re-arrangements of areas were canvassed before me to overcome the geographical problems but were admitted to be unacceptable on numerical grounds.

103. Both sides agreed that either solution was poor and felt strongly that the only satisfactory answer to the problem was to leave the two existing wards as they are, even though this meant retaining a four-member ward.

104. I inspected the area. It contains a great mixture of types of development and is dominated by the three main line stations, especially by Euston and its railway lines to the north. The triangle between Hampstead Road and Euston Station, to the west of the latter is completely separate in every way from the rest of Somers Town ward to the East of Eversholt Street. Similarly this triangle has no relation at all to the other triangle to the north between the railway and Camden High Street. This latter triangle has, however, two road connections (Mornington Street and Delancy Street) to the rest of Regents Park ward across the deep and

divisive railway cutting. Again, it is clear that a ward boundary in the Varndell Street area would have the undesirable effect of cutting up the Council's Regents Park Estate.

105. Conclusions and Recommendations

Figures were hardly discussed before me, except that Mr. Avery produced on the second day a modification of the Mornington ward boundary, bringing it down to Robert Street, which would strengthen the electorate of that ward by 300 and raise its 1982 entitlement of 1.74 to 1.87. It is, however, clear from the various tables and estimates that the viability of the Council's St. Pancras ward is doubtful: on their own figures its entitlement is 1.71 in 1976 and 1.70 in 1981. The 1977 electorate showed a drop of sixty over 1976, there is very little development planned there and Mr. Avery estimated a high rate of depopulation in the old St. Pancras ward. (The major future development in that area will be in the Council's Somers Town ward). It may well be, therefore that the Council's St. Pancras ward could be substantially over-represented by 1981.

106. Like both the parties, I regarded both solutions put forward as poor, largely for the reasons which each advanced in criticism of the other's scheme. While each scheme had attempted to overcome the geographical problems, neither had been very successful, and other possible geographical solutions are ruled out on numbers. Of the two, I found the Conservative solution the more unsatisfactory for the reasons advanced by the Borough Council and especially because of the complete lack of nexus between the two triangles north and south of the proposed Mornington ward.

107. In the exceptional geographical circumstances of this area, I am quite satisfied that, as both parties contended, the best solution is to leave things as they are and retain the existing four-member Regents Park ward and the three-member St. Pancras ward. The Commission may, therefore, consider that the circumstances are such that no other reasonable solution is possible in this isolated case.

108. I accordingly recommend that

(1) The draft proposals should be varied by the substitution for their proposed Regents Park, St. Pancras and Somers Town wards of a four-member Regents Park ward and a three member St. Pancras ward with the boundaries of the existing wards of those names;

(2) If the Commission are unable to accept the principle involved in the foregoing recommendation, the draft proposals for the Regents Park, St. Pancras and Somers Town wards should remain unchanged.

109. HOLBORN

Everyone agreed that the existing Holborn ward was satisfactory on boundaries and numbers, and I concur. I, therefore, recommend that the draft proposals for the Holborn ward should remain unchanged.

110. BLOOMSBURY, CORAM AND KINGS CROSS

The draft proposals provide for the existing four-member Kings Cross ward to be divided by an east-west line to form a smaller Kings Cross and a Coram ward: the new Kings Cross ward is, however, extended over into the existing Bloomsbury ward as far as Gower Street. The Conservative alternative is to leave Bloomsbury unaltered and to divide Kings Cross by a north-south line down Judd Street and Hunter Street and round Brunswick Square. The Conservatives suggested that Bloomsbury had excellent boundaries and that their figures showed that it was not too large in electorate: these figures gave a 1977 electorate of 7810 and a 1982 electorate of 7900 which, with the slightly different divisors, gave an entitlement of 3.20 in each year. The Conservatives were supported by a local resident, Miss A.J. Pracy.

111. Sir Ashley Bramall conceded at once that the boundaries of Bloomsbury were excellent and that the argument for transferring part of it to Kings Cross depended entirely on numbers. While obviously the 1977

figures and entitlements were the same, the Borough Council's estimate for 1981 was 9036 giving an unacceptable entitlement of 3.66. Mr. Burns Windsor, a Borough Councillor, said that he would have left Bloomsbury unaltered but for the numbers problem.

112. The Borough Council's views of the Bloomsbury electorate projection were apparently based on a natural increase in population, plus the results of new development expected to produce 664 electors, of whom 500 would be in a new Y.M.C.A. hostel. The actual figures for the last three years have fluctuated: there was a fall of 450 between 1975 and 1976 and then a rise of 160 by 1977. Mr. Avery justified his lower forecast by his usual analysis, coupled with a statement showing that since 1971, there had been a steady increase in the number of flats used for short-term furnished lettings and in the proportion of foreign nationals. This meant that the ratio of population to qualified electors had been rising, thus adding to the justification for a lower long term forecast of electorate.

113. The discussion then turned to the division of Kings Cross on the assumption that Bloomsbury would be left untouched. The Conservatives supported their north-south line as being the best boundary and giving the best balance of electorate. Their Kings Cross ward would have a 1977 electorate of 4847, and an entitlement of 1.99, the 1982 figures being 4950 and 2.01: their Brunswick ward would have 4375 and 1.79 in 1977 and 4500 and 1.83 in 1982.

114. The Borough Council produced a revised division of Kings Cross with a line running west-east from Woburn Place along Tavistock Place and Sidmouth Street to Cubitt Street and Frederick Street. Their new Kings Cross Ward would have a 1977 electorate of 5563 and an entitlement of 2.28 and a 1981 electorate of 5154 and an entitlement of 2.09; the corresponding figures for the new Coram would be 3659 and 1.50 in 1977 and 3716 and 1.50 in 1981. The Borough Council supported this line as being preferable to that of the Conservatives, especially as the southern part of the existing Kings Cross ward looked upon Coram Fields as a focus.

115. I inspected the area. Both the proposed dividing lines in Kings Cross ward appeared reasonable. Equally, Bloomsbury should clearly retain its present boundaries if this is practicable on numbers.

116. Conclusions and Recommendations

For the reasons which I have dealt with fully in an earlier section of this report, I prefer the Conservative figures for Bloomsbury. In fact I think that even they may overstate the future total, as I regard it as doubtful whether the large new Y.M.C.A. hostel, with its necessarily changing occupancy, will produce as many as 500 qualified new electors. With an entitlement of 3.20 or less, the Bloomsbury figures are clearly acceptable by themselves; I do not feel that the fact of their being slightly above the basic entitlements, while those in the divided Kings Cross would be slightly below, outweighs the advantages of keeping the present Bloomsbury ward intact, especially as all parties favour this course.

117. If Bloomsbury is to remain intact, the question remains as to how the present Kings Cross should be divided. On the suitability of boundaries I think there is little to choose between the Council's and the Conservatives' lines. On figures, however, the Conservative proposal clearly produces a more even balance of electorate between the two new wards. I, therefore, favour their solution.

118. I accordingly recommend that the draft proposals should be varied by providing that:

(1) The boundaries of Bloomsbury ward should be those of the existing ward of that name.

(2) The area covered by the existing Kings Cross ward should be divided into two new wards by a line running from Euston Road down Judd Street and Hunter Street, round the southern side of Brunswick Square and down Lansdown Terrace to Guildford Street, the eastern ward being called Kings Cross and the western Brunswick.

119. ENTITLEMENTS

Throughout this report it has been necessary to give the entitlements of wards based on the present and projected electorates. These figures are calculated by dividing the number of electors in each ward by the average number of electors per councillor for the whole borough. This latter figure obviously varies in the calculations based on the current and forecast electorates respectively: it also varies according to the total number of members of a council which a scheme proposes. Where, as in the present case, there is more than one forecast of the total electorate, it varies again. Fortunately, in all the confusion of figures relating to Camden, balancing factors have produced a very small variation between the divisors for the most relevant tables. In general, therefore, the results are reasonably comparable.



Assistant Commissioner.

May, 1977

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Appendix 1

BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLANDELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS - LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDENPUBLIC INQUIRY - THURSDAY 17th MARCH 1977LIST OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Attendance List</u> <u>Address</u>	<u>Interest in Inquiry</u>
BURGESS, Wally	7 Spencer Rise, NW5	Borough Alderman
BURNS WINDSOR, David	18 Churston Mansions, Gray's Inn Road, WC1	Council Member
FORD, Richard	42 Countess Road, NW5	" "
GARDINER, Chris	5 Talacre Road, NW5	" "
KING, Ron	1-2 Baynes Mews, NW3	" "
POLLARD, Derek	299B West End Lane, NW6	" "
SHAW, Roy	82 Malden Road, NW5	" "
FINSBERG, Geoffrey	House of Commons, SW1	Member of Parliament
AVERY, K.J.	18 Rashleigh House, Thanet Street, WC1	CAMDEN Conservative Committee
ELLIS, L.M.A.	36 College Crescent, NW3	" "
WRIGHT, M.	26 Argyle Square, WC1	Conservative Party Agent
LIVINGSTONE, Ken	80 Trinity Rise, SW2	HAMPSTEAD Labour Party
BRAGGINS	52 Milton Grove, N16	Holborn & St. Pancras South and St. Pancras North Labour Party
REA, Felicity	84 Agamemnon Road, NW6	HAMPSTEAD Liberal Assoc.
VINCE, Philip, H.	Flat 5, Eton Avenue, NW3	" " "
CRIPPS, S.	1 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, EC	Counsel: Camden Conserva- tive Committee
LITMAN, N.L.	1 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, EC	Counsel: Camden Conserva- tive Committee
BRAMALL, Ashley (Sir)	3 Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, EC	Counsel: Camden Borough Council
TOBIN, J.J.	23 Great Castle Street, W.1.	Instructing Solicitor - Camden Conservative Committee
WILSON, B.H.	Town Hall	Town Clerk & Registration Officer

<u>Name</u>	<u>Attendance List</u> <u>Address</u>	<u>Interest in Inquiry</u>
BUNTING, G.H.	Town Hall	Town Clerk's Dept. Electoral Services Group
RINGSHAW, L.	" "	" " " "
DAVIS, M.J.	" "	" " " "
ROBBINS, D.I.	" "	Town Clerk's Dept. Project Co-ordination Office.
HAY, S	" "	Legal Section
POPE, E.	" "	Planning & Communications Department
McTEENAN, Joseph	Camden Journal	Reporter
LEBERYEN, Victor	Hampstead & Highgate Express	"
ROSENFELD, M.R.	19 Clifford Court, NW2	Elector
HUMPHREY, S.M.	Flat 6, 4 Belsize Grove	Elector
PRACY, A.J.	410 Endsleigh Court, WC1	Elector

LOCAL GOVERNMENTBOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLANDELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS - LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDENPUBLIC INQUIRY - THURSDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1977LIST OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Interest in Inquiry</u>
BRAMMALL, Ashley (Sir)	3 Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, EC1	Counsel: Camden Borough Council
CRIPPS, S.	1 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, EC1	Counsel: Camden Conservative Committee
SHAW, Roy	82 Malden Road, NW5	Council Member
POLLARD, Derek	299B West End Lane, NW6	" "
FORD, Richard	42 Countess Road, NW5	" "
COX, Jean	22 Grove Terrace, NW5	" "
BURNS WINDSOR, David	18 Churston Mansions, Gray's Inn Road, WC1	" "
CARRIER, John	37 Dartmouth Park Road, NW5	" "
TOBIN, Julian J.	23 Great Castle Street, W1	Instructing Solicitor - Camden Conservative Committee
AVERY, Kenneth J.	18 Rashleigh House, Thanet Street, WC1	Council Member
KING, Ron	1-2 Baynes Mews, NW3	" "
GREENGROSS, Alan	26/29 St. Cross Street, EC1	" "
BRAGGINS, John	52 Milton Grove, N16	Holborn & St. Pancras South and St. Pancras North Labour Party Agent
LIVINGSTONE, Ken	80 Trinity Rise, SW2	Hampstead Labour Party
WRIGHT, M. (Mrs.)	26 Argyle Square, WC1	Conservative Party Agent
KNIGHT, E. (Mrs.)	Flat 1, Redington Gardens, NW3	Camden Conservatives
MANSEL, C. (Miss)		Former Councillor
VINCE, Philip H.	Flat 5, 30 Eton Avenue, NW3	Hampstead Liberal Association
WILSON, Brian H.	Town Hall, NW1	Town Clerk & Registration Officer

BUNTING, George H.	Town Hall, NW1	Electoral Services Group
RINGSHAW, Leonard	" " "	" " "
GIBB, Christopher	" " "	" " "
TILEY, Rosalind	" " "	Legal Division
POPE, E. (Miss)	Old Town Hall, Holborn	Planning & Communications
THOMPSON, J.R.	" " " "	" " "
McTEENAN, Joseph	Camden Journal	Reporter
LEBERYEN, Victor	Hampstead & Highgate Express	"

MEMORANDUM OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS
FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ADELAIDE	3
BECKFORD	2
BELSIZE	3
BLOOMSBURY	3
CAMDEN	2
CASTLEHAVEN	2
CAVERSHAM	2
CHALK FARM	2
CORAM	2
GOSPEL OAK	2
GRAFTON	2
HAMPSTEAD TOWN	3
HIGHGATE	3
HOLBORN	2
KILBURN	3
KING'S CROSS	2
PRIORY	3
REGENT'S PARK	3
ST JOHN'S	2
ST PANCRAS	2
SOMERSTOWN	2
SOUTH END	3
SWISS COTTAGE	3
WEST END	2

The proposed ward boundaries are defined on a map which can be inspected at the Council's offices. A description of the proposed wards as defined on the map is at Annex A.

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ADELAIDE	3
BELSIZE	3
BLOOMSBURY	3
BRUNSWICK	2
CAMDEN	2
CASTLEHAVEN	2
CAVERSHAM	2
CHALK FARM	2
FITZJOHNS	2
FORTUNE GREEN	2
FROGNALL	2
GOSPEL OAK	2
GRAFTON	2
HAMPSTEAD TOWN	2
HIGHGATE	3
HOLBORN	2
KILBURN	3
KING'S CROSS	2
PRIORY	2
REGENT'S PARK	3
ST JOHN'S	2
ST PANCRAS	2
SOMERS TOWN	2
SOUTH END	2
SWISS COTTAGE	3
WEST END	2

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

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

ST JOHN'S WARD

Commencing at the point where Churchill Road meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Leighton Road, thence westwards along said road to the London Midland Region railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway line to the Broad Street railway line, thence northwestwards along said railway line to the railway line that passes through Highgate Road Junction, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said railway line to the footbridge and path that leads to Churchill Road, thence northwestwards along said footbridge and path to Churchill Road, thence northeastwards along said road to the point of commencement.

CAVERSHAM WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of St John's Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary to Camden Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Kentish Town Road, thence northwards along said road to the southern boundary of St John's Ward, thence eastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CAMDEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of Caversham Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary to the Grand Union Canal (Regent's Canal), thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said canal to the southeastern boundary of Caversham Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SOMERS TOWN WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Camden Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards along said Borough boundary to Euston Road at King's Cross thence southwestwards along said road to Hampstead Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the path and unnamed road at the south of the flats known as Gillfoot, thence southeastwards to and along said path and unnamed road to Barnby Street, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said street to Evershott Street, thence northwestwards along said street to the southeastern carriage-way of Oakley Square, thence northeastwards and northwards along said square to Crowndale Road, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said road to St Pancras Way, thence northwards along said way to Camley Street, thence northeastwards along said street and in prolongation of that part of Camley Street to the northwest of University College Hospital to the southern boundary of Camden Ward, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

KING'S CROSS WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Somers Town Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along said Borough boundary to and continuing southwestwards along Calthorpe Street and Guilford Street to the road known as Lansdowne Terrace, thence northwestwards along said road to Brunswick Square, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said square to Hunter Street, thence northwestwards along said street and Judd Street to the southern boundary of Somers Town Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HOLBORN WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of King's Cross Ward meets the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said Borough boundary and generally southwestwards along the southern boundary of the Borough to the road known as Kingsway, thence northwestwards along said road, the road known as Southampton Row, and the northeastern carriageway of Russell Square to Guilford Street, thence northeastwards along said street to and continuing along the southern boundary of King's Cross Ward to the point of commencement.

BRUNSWICK WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of King's Cross Ward meets the northern boundary of Holborn Ward, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the northeastern carriageway of Russell Square, thence northwestwards along said square, Woburn Place, the northeastern carriageway of Tavistock Square, and Upper Woburn Place to the southern boundary of Somers Town Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the western boundary of King's Cross Ward, thence southeastwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BLOOMSBURY WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Holborn Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards and northwestwards along said Borough boundary to Euston Road, thence northeastwards along said road to and along the southern boundary of Somers Town Ward to the western boundary of Brunswick Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the western boundary of Holborn Ward to the point of commencement.

REGENT'S PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Bloomsbury Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwestwards along said Borough boundary to Prince Albert Road, thence eastwards and southeastwards along said road to the road known as Parkway, thence northeastwards along said road to Camden High Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Hampstead Road, thence southwards along said road to and continuing along the western boundary of Somers Town Ward to the northern boundary of Bloomsbury Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ST PANCRAS WARD

Commencing at the point where the northwestern boundary of Somers Town Ward meets the eastern boundary of Regent's Park Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to and northeastwards along Kentish Town Road to the southeastern boundary of Caversham Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the southwestern boundary of Camden Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the northwestern boundary of Somers Town Ward, thence generally southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CHALK FARM WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Regent's Park Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said Borough boundary to a point opposite the eastern boundary of Barrow Hill Reservoir, thence northwestwards to and along said boundary to the northernmost point of said reservoir, thence northeastwards in a straight line to NG Reference TQ 2771283976, being a point on the northern boundary of Primrose Hill Park, thence northeastwards in a straight line across Primrose Hill Road to Ainger Road,

thence northeastwards along said road to King Henry's Road, thence eastwards along said road to Regent's Park Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Chalk Farm Road, thence southeastwards along said road and Camden High Street to the northern boundary of Regent's Park Ward, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ADELAIDE WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Chalk Farm Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards along said Borough boundary to Finchley Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the western end of Eton Avenue, thence northeastwards to and along said avenue to Primrose Hill Road, thence southwards along said road to Fellows Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Steele's Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Haverstock Hill, thence southeastwards along said hill to the northwestern boundary of Chalk Farm Ward, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along the northwestern and western boundaries of said ward to the point of commencement.

PRIORY WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Adelaide Ward meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence southwestwards along said Borough boundary and northwestwards along the western boundary of the Borough to Quex Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Abbey Road, thence eastwards and southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 124 Abbey Road, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 259 Goldhurst Terrace, thence eastwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 257 to 229 Goldhurst Terrace to the western boundary of No 170 Belsize Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Belsize Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Abbey Road, thence southeastwards along said

road to the Queen's Park to Primrose Hill railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the western boundary of Adelaide Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

KILBURN WARD

Commencing at the point where the northwestern boundary of Priory Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards along said Borough boundary and northeastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to the Midland Railway line, thence southeastwards along said railway line to West End Lane, thence generally southwards along said lane to the northwestern boundary of Priory Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SWISS COTTAGE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Priory Ward meets the eastern boundary of Kilburn Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the Midland railway line, thence eastwards along said railway line to Finchley Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the western boundary of Adelaide Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Priory Ward, thence generally westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BELSIZE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Adelaide Ward meets the eastern boundary of Swiss Cottage Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to College Crescent, thence generally eastwards and northwards along said crescent to Belsize Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane and Ornan Road to Haverstock Hill, thence southeastwards along said hill to the northern boundary of Adelaide Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

GRAFTON WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Adelaide Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Belsize Ward, thence northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of Belsize Ward to Parkhill Road, thence northwards along said road to Tasker Road, thence northeastwards along said road to its eastern end thence northwards to the path adjacent to the northern boundary of The Priory Church that leads to Southampton Road, thence northeastwards, southeastwards and northeastwards along said path to Southampton Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Malden Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Queen's Crescent, thence northeastwards along said crescent to Gillies Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Arctic Street, thence northeastwards along said street to Broad Street railway line, thence southwards along said railway line to Prince of Wales Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Crogsland Road, thence southwards and southwestwards along said road to the northeastern boundary of Adelaide Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CASTLEHAVEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of St Pancras Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Chalk Farm Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to the eastern boundary of Grafton Ward, thence generally northwards, eastwards and northwards along said boundary and continuing northwards along the Broad Street railway line to the southern boundary of St John's Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the western boundary of Caversham Ward, thence southwards along said boundary and the western boundary of St Pancras Ward to the point of commencement.

GOSPEL OAK WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Castlehaven Ward meets the northern boundary of Grafton Ward, thence generally westwards along said northern boundary to Parkhill Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Fleet Road, thence northeastwards along said road and Mansfield Road to Roderick Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Savernake Road, thence westwards along said road to the footpath and footbridge, adjacent to Nos 4 and 10 Savernake Road, that leads to Parliament Hill, thence northwards along said footpath and footbridge to the railway line, thence eastwards along said railway line to the western boundary of St John's Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the western boundary of Castlehaven Ward to the point of commencement.

SOUTH END WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Grafton Ward meets the northeastern boundary of Belsize Ward, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and continuing northwestwards along Haverstock Hill and Rosslyn Hill to Pond Street, thence northeastwards along said street to South End Road, thence northwestwards along said road and East Heath Road to a point opposite the path that leads to the road known as South Hill Park, thence northeastwards to and along said path to a point opposite the rear boundaries of the properties situated on the northern side of South Hill Park, thence northeastwards to and along said rear boundaries and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of the properties situated on the northeastern side of South Hill Park to the northern boundary of No 77 Parliament Hill, thence eastwards along said northern boundary and the northern end of said road and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 70 to 66 Parliament Hill and Nos 39 to 1 Tanza Road, crossing the eastern end of Nassington Road and continuing southeastwards along the eastern boundary of No 57 Nassington Road to the northern

boundary of the railway, thence eastwards along said northern boundary to the footbridge, thence southwards along said footbridge to the western boundary of Gospel Oak Ward, thence generally southwards along said boundary and the western boundary of Grafton Ward to the point of commencement.

FITZJOHNS WARD

Commencing at the point where the southwestern boundary of South End Ward meets the northwestern boundary of Belsize Ward, thence southwards and westwards along said northwestern boundary to the eastern boundary of Swiss Cottage Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and continuing northwestwards along Finchley Road to Arkwright Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Ellerdale Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Prince Arthur Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Hampstead High Street, thence southeastwards along said street and Rosslyn Hill to the southwestern boundary of South End Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WEST END WARD

Commencing at the point where the southwestern boundary of Fitzjohns Ward meets the northern boundary of Swiss Cottage Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the northeastern boundary of Kilburn Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to Mill Lane, thence eastwards along said lane to West End Lane, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said lane to Finchley Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the southwestern boundary of Fitzjohns Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

FORTUNE GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Kilburn Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards and northeastwards along said Borough boundary to Finchley Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of West End Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Kilburn Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

FROGNALL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Fortune Green Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said Borough boundary to West Heath Road, thence westwards and southwestwards along said road and continuing southwestwards along Branch Hill to Frognal Rise, thence southwestwards along said rise, and Holly Hill crossing Heath Street to and along Hampstead High Street to the northwestern boundary of Fitzjohns Ward, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of West End Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Fortune Green Ward to the point of commencement.

HAMPSTEAD TOWN WARD

Commencing at the point where the northeastern boundary of Frognall Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said Borough boundary to NG Reference TQ 2674087329, thence southwards and southeastwards along the parish boundary as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plans TQ 2687, TQ 2686, and TQ 2786, Editions of 1953, 1954 and 1953, to the northwestern boundary of South End Ward, thence southwestwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Fitzjohns Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the northeastern boundary of Frognall Ward to the point of commencement.

HIGHGATE WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Hampstead Town Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence generally eastwards along said Borough boundary and southwards along the eastern boundary of the Borough to the northern boundary of St John's Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Gospel Oak Ward, thence westwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of South End Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Hampstead Town Ward to the point of commencement.