

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 450

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 450

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Mr G J Ellerton CMG MBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Sir Wilfred Burns CB CRE

MEMBERS

Lady Ackner

Mr T Brockbank DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

The Rt Hon Patrick Jenkin MP
Secretary of State for the Environment

1. On 4 October 1979, Winchester City Council requested us to review parts of the boundary between the City and the District of East Hampshire, and between the City and the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane in the following parishes:-

- (a) Hambledon (Winchester)/Horndean (East Hampshire)
- (b) West Meon (")/Froxfield (")
- (c) Denmead (")/Horndean (")
- (d) West Meon (")/East Meon (")
- (e) Old Arlesford (")/Medstead (")
- (f) Micheldever (")/Woodmancott (Basingstoke and Deane)

2. On 9 October 1980, Test Valley Borough Council requested us to review the boundary between the Borough and the City of Winchester in the vicinity of the parishes of Kings Somborne and Crawley.

3. Winchester City Council quoted various reasons in favour of the boundary changes: historical association, desire to tidy up irregular boundaries, suggestions made by parishes and changes in affinity between parishes. Test Valley Borough Council said that their request reflected the wishes of the residents concerned and the pattern of community life in the area.

4. In view of the inter-relationship of the two requests, we decided to consider them concurrently under section 48(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, having regard to the Department of the Environment Circular 33/78 and to our own report No 287.

5. We noted that the other local authorities concerned had been informed of the councils' intentions to ask for reviews, and we had also received direct other correspondence relating to the requests. We were aware that East Hampshire District Council supported the suggested alterations to Winchester City Council's boundary in Hambledon/Horndean, West Meon/Froxfield and Old Arlesford/Medstead parishes, but opposed those in Denmead/Horndean and West Meon/East Meon parishes. Horndean Parish Council supported the alterations in their boundary with the parishes of Hambledon and Denmead; but East Meon Parish Council had strong objections to the alterations in the East Meon/West Meon area. Hampshire County Council supported the City Council's wishes with regard to the West Meon/Froxfield area but had reservations about the Denmead/Horndean and West Meon/East Meon areas. They had no observations to offer on the remainder.

6. We were also aware that Winchester City Council had no strong views on Test Valley Borough Council's wishes with regard to the borough boundary in Kings Somborne/Crawley parishes, but that Crawley Parish Council did not consider that there was sufficient justification for alterations in the area. Hampshire County Council remained of the view that there was no need for a review of this area at this stage.

7. We concluded that we should undertake the reviews requested and in a joint consultation letter issued on 26 March 1981 both authorities were invited to publish and submit detailed schemes in accordance with the guidelines laid down in our Report No 287. The letter was addressed jointly to Winchester City Council, and Test Valley Borough Council; copies were sent to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council, Hampshire County Council, the parish councils in the districts of Winchester, Basingstoke and Deane, East Hampshire and Test Valley, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties, the Hampshire Area Health Authority, the Southern Water Authority, the South East Regional Office of the Department of the Environment, and to both local newspapers circulating in the area and the local government press. The two councils were asked to put copies of a notice announcing the start of the review and the invitation to submit detailed schemes on display at places where public notices were customarily displayed and notices were inserted in the local press. A period of eight weeks after the publication of the schemes was allowed for comments.

8. Winchester City Council published their scheme on 18 December 1981 in the local press and by public notice. The scheme now contained changes affecting parts of the City boundary other than those which were the subject of the original request. The City Council had, however, consulted the various authorities concerned (East Hampshire District Council, Eastleigh Borough Council and Havant Borough Council) and the new changes were advertised before submission to us.

9. The scheme as submitted proposed the following boundary changes:-

- (i) the transfer of the "Bat and Ball" Inn from the parish of Horndean (East Hampshire) to the parish of Hambledon (Winchester);
- (ii) the transfer of the "Old Wheatshaf" area from the parish of West Meon (Winchester) to the parish of Froxfield (East Hampshire) and the transfer of part of this area from the parish of Froxfield (East Hampshire) to West Meon (Winchester) to improve the district boundary at the junction of Froxfield, East Meon and West Meon;

- (iii) the transfer of Westbury House and Westbury Park from East Meon (East Hampshire) to West Meon (Winchester);
- (iv) the transfer of part of the parish of Horndean (East Hampshire) to the parish of Denmead (Winchester);
- (v) the inclusion of Heath Green House, at present divided between the parishes of Medstead (East Hampshire) and Old Alresford (Winchester) in the parish of Medstead (East Hampshire);
- (vi) the transfer of the whole of the populated area of Woodmancott Parish (Basingstoke and Deane) to the parish of Micheldever (Winchester);
- (vii) the transfer of parts of the Borough of Havant to the Parish of Southwick and Widley (Winchester);
- (viii) the transfer of two properties in the parish of Hursley (Winchester) to the Borough of Eastleigh;
- (ix) the transfer of land and property at Otterbourne Hill to the parish of Otterbourne (Winchester) from Eastleigh Borough;
- (x) the transfer of certain land at Allbrook from the parish of Otterbourne (Winchester) to Eastleigh Borough;
- (xi) the inclusion in East Hampshire of the whole of Armsworth Hill Farm, part of which is in the parish of Old Alresford (Winchester) and part in the parish of Wild (East Hampshire).

10. Test Valley Borough Council published their scheme on 20 November 1981 also in the local press and by public notice. Their scheme proposed that part of the Parish of Crawley within the City of Winchester, known as Rookley, be transferred to the Parish of Kings Somborne within the Borough of Test Valley.

RESPONSE TO SCHEMES

a. WINCHESTER/BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE/EAST HAMPSHIRE/EASTLEIGH/HAVANT

11. Representations were received from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, from East Hampshire District Council, from Eastleigh and Havant Borough Councils, and from Winchester City Council; from Denmead and Southwick and Widley Parish Councils; from the Southwick and Roche Court Estates Company; and from two private individuals.

12. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council supported the transfer of the populated area of the parish of Woodmancott to the parish of Micheldever.

13. East Hampshire District Council supported the transfers of the "Bat and Ball" Inn from the parish of Horndean to the parish of Hambledon, the "Old Wheatsheaf" area from the parish of West Meon to the parish of Froxfield and part of this area from the parish of Froxfield to West Meon to improve the district boundary at the junction of Froxfield, East Meon and West Meon. They also supported the inclusion of Heath Green House in the parish of Medstead and the inclusion of the whole of Armsworth Hill Farm in East Hampshire. The District Council were, however, opposed to the transfer of Westbury House and Westbury Park from East Meon to West Meon and of part of the parish of Horndean to the parish of Denmead.
14. Eastleigh Borough Council were not prepared to agree to a suggestion put forward by Otterbourne Parish Council for the transfer of an additional area from Eastleigh to their parish.
15. Havant Borough Council were strongly opposed to the recommendation that the Winchester/Havant boundary be amended so that land to the west of the A3 be included in the parish of Southwick and Widley. Instead, they suggested an alternative boundary line which "would allow for the possibility of the further natural development of the Waterlooville centre area", although they admitted that development of the land would depend on the results of studies, consultation and consideration of public representation.
16. Winchester City Council also saw no good reason to alter this boundary further as suggested by Otterbourne Parish Council and wished the recommendation in their scheme to stand.
17. Denmead Parish Council supported the City Council's recommendation about the Winchester/Havant boundary, as did the Southwick and Roche Court Estates Company, the owners of the land.
18. Southwick and Widley Parish Council strongly objected to Havant Borough Council's counter-suggestion as they considered that in moving the boundary east to the A3 the intention of Hampshire County Council's South Hampshire Structure Plan policy on countryside would be better fulfilled and confirmed.

b. TEST VALLEY/WINCHESTER

19. Representations were received from the County Council, Crawley Parish Council and a private individual.
20. Hampshire County Council were of the opinion that there was no need for a review at this stage. Crawley Parish Council felt that there was not sufficient justification for the boundary change as proposed in the draft scheme. However, if it were decided that the boundary should be changed they would prefer an alternative boundary line, a view apparently shared by the County Council member for the area, Councillor Wilson.

21. We considered both schemes and all the representations that had been made to us on them. We noted that the changes proposed were generally minor, very few electors were involved, and apart from consequential amendments to ward boundaries, no changes to existing electoral arrangements were proposed in either draft scheme. After some discussion we decided to adopt as our draft proposals the scheme put forward by Test Valley Borough Council and the scheme submitted by Winchester City Council except for the boundary change between the Parish of Southwick and Widley and the Borough of Havant, and the recommendation to include the whole of Armsworth Hill Farm in the District of East Hampshire.

22. Our draft proposals were published on 24 August 1982. Copies were sent to all those who had received our initial consultation letter or who had made representations to us, and to the local radio stations serving the area. Comments on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom details had been sent and by public notices from other members of the public and interested bodies.

RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

23. In response to the publication of our draft proposals we received comments from East Hampshire District Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Winchester City Council, Crawley, Denmead and East Meon Parish Councils and the North West Hampshire Liberals.

a. WINCHESTER/BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE/EAST HAMPSHIRE/EASTLEIGH/HAVANT

24. East Hampshire District Council objected strongly to the transfer of Westbury House and Westbury Park from East Meon to West Meon, as did East Meon Parish Council, and to the transfer of part of the Parish of Horndean to the Parish of Denmead.

25. Eastleigh Borough Council did not wish to raise any objections to the draft proposals so far as they affected the boundary between Eastleigh and Winchester.

26. Winchester City Council said that in the event of representations being received from Havant in respect of the transfer to Havant of any part of Winchester they would reserve their right to again raise the subject of their boundary alteration between the Parish of Southwick and Widley and the Borough of Havant on which the Commission made no proposals.

27. Denmead Parish Council considered that the proposed use of an unnamed road as the boundary between their parish and Horndean was undesirable as a small group of houses at Eastland Gate would be split between the two parishes and, more importantly, between two districts. They would have preferred the whole settlement to be incorporated into Denmead.

28. The North West Hampshire Liberals did not comment directly on any of the proposals but felt that local authority boundaries should be coterminous with Parliamentary constituencies.

b. TEST VALLEY/WINCHESTER

29. Winchester City Council had no comment to make on the proposed change.

30. Crawley Parish Council repeated their earlier comment that a boundary revision as proposed was not necessary, but if a change had to be made the new boundary should follow well-defined lines along highways and bridlepaths and not field boundaries which were liable to be changed or eliminated at the whim of the farmer.

31. We have reassessed our draft proposals in the light of the representations we received and the alternatives put forward. We noted that our proposals seemed to have been largely accepted and that of the seven representations received only four were objections. So far as the proposed boundary change between Winchester and Test Valley was concerned, Crawley Parish Council were still the only objector, and their views were unchanged from those expressed previously. Nevertheless, we reconsidered the alternative boundary lines put forward by the Parish Council and previously by Councillor Wilson but decided, in the light of observations made by the Ordnance Survey, to adhere to the alignment shown in our draft proposals. We therefore decided to confirm this as our final proposals.

32. The remaining objections referred to the boundary changes proposed between Winchester and East Hampshire. With regard to Westbury House and Westbury Park, we noted from the comments received that circumstances at Westbury House appeared to be different from those stated in the draft scheme. It appeared that the owners did not live in the area and the House was being used as a nursing home to which patients came from far and wide so that it no longer had particular ties with West Meon. It seemed also that both the House and the Park were part of the hamlet of Riplington in East Hampshire which would be divided if the House was transferred to West Meon. In addition, St Nicholas Chapel, a listed ancient monument adjacent to Westbury House was, and had been for a number of years, maintained by the inhabitants of East Meon Parish and had also received grants from East Hampshire District Council towards its upkeep and restoration. Consequently, in view of these arguments against the transfer of these areas to West Meon we decided to delete this change from our final proposals.

33. The other proposal which was causing concern was the transfer of several properties from the Parish of Horndean to the Parish of Denmead which it was suggested in the detailed scheme would create a buffer zone against development on the eastern side of Denmead. East Hampshire District Council felt that the majority of the affected

residents were very much against any change and that the creation of a buffer zone against development was not a valid reason for boundary amendments as the planning objectives could be achieved by more orthodox means. Denmead Parish Council, on the other hand, did not object to the proposal itself but to the actual boundary line which split a small group of houses at Eastland Gate between the two districts. We consulted Ordnance Survey who subsequently provided us with several possible alternative alignments for the boundary, but in the end we decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

34. We are satisfied that in the interests of effective and convenient local government the boundaries between Test Valley and Winchester, and Winchester, Basingstoke and Deane, East Hampshire and Eastleigh should be realigned as indicated in our draft proposals, subject to the amendments referred to in paragraph 30 above. We confirm these amended proposals as our final proposals.

35. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 1, 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 1 specifies the proposed changes in local authority areas and Schedules 2 and 3 specify the consequential adjustments to the existing electoral arrangements. The proposed boundaries are shown on the attached maps.

PUBLICATION

36. Separate letters are being sent with copies of the report and of the maps to Winchester City Council, Test Valley, Basingstoke and Deane, Eastleigh and Havant Borough Councils and East Hampshire District Council, asking them to place copies of this report on deposit at their main offices, and to put notices to this effect on public notice boards and in the local press. The text of the notices will refer to your power to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, after the expiry of six weeks from the date they are submitted to you; it will suggest that any comments on the proposals should therefore be addressed to you in writing, preferably within six weeks of the date of the letter. Copies of this report which includes small scale maps are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

SIGNED:

G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

WILFRED BURNS (Deputy Chairman)

JOAN ACKNER

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

L B GRIMSHAW

Secretary

May 1983

PRINCIPAL AREA BOUNDARY REVIEW

WINCHESTER/EAST HAMPSHIRE/EASTLEIGH/TEST VALLEY/BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE DISTRICTS

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

Schedule 1

1. Boundary realignments between City of Winchester and East Hampshire District.

Area A: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from

Old Alresford CP in City of Winchester to Medstead CP in East Hampshire District:

that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district

boundary meets the southern boundary of Parcel No 5516 as shown on OS 1:2500

Microfilm (A) SU 6337 date of publication 1977, thence westwards along said southern

boundary and northwards and northeastwards along the western and northern boundaries

of said parcel and in prolongation thereof to the existing district boundary, thence

southwards and southwestwards along said existing boundary to the point of

commencement.

Area B: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Medstead CP

in East Hampshire District to Old Alresford CP in City of Winchester: that area

bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary

meets the southern boundary of Parcel No 5813 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm

(A) SU 6337 date of publication 1977, thence southeastwards along said southern

boundary and in prolongation thereof to Heath Green Lane, thence southwards along

said lane to the road known as Chalky Hill, thence southwestwards along said road

to the unnamed accessway south of Parcel No 5400 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A)

SU 6336 date of publication 1977, thence westwards along said accessway to the

existing district boundary, thence northwards along said existing boundary to the

point of commencement.

Area C: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Westmeon CP in City of Winchester to Froxfield CP in East Hampshire District: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the A32 west of the property known as Old Wheatsheaf, thence northeastwards along said road to the point where it is crossed by the existing district boundary, thence generally southwestwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area D: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Froxfield CP in East Hampshire District to Westmeon CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the A32 at the westernmost point of area C, thence southwestwards along said road to the point where it is crossed by the existing district boundary, thence northwestwards, northeastwards and eastwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area E: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Westmeon CP in City of Winchester to Froxfield CP in East Hampshire District: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the A272 east of West Meon Hut (PH) thence westwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of Parcel No 1941 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) SU 6526 date of publication 1972, thence northwards and northwestwards along said western boundary to the A32, thence northeastwards along said road to the existing district boundary being the southernmost point of Area D, thence generally southwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area F: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Froxfield CP in East Hampshire District to Westmeon CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the A272 northeast of Great Headdon Copse, thence eastwards along said road to the western boundary of Eastmeon CP, thence southwards along said western boundary to the existing district boundary, thence westwards, northwards, westwards and eastwards

along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area G: Proposal withdrawn

Area H: Proposal withdrawn

Area J: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Clanfield CP in East Hampshire District to Hambledon CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the northern boundary of Parcel No 6977 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) SU 6716 date of publication 1970, thence southeastwards along said northern boundary and southwards along the eastern boundary of said parcel to the eastern boundary of Parcel No 6768, thence southwards along said eastern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the unnamed road leading to Clanfield, thence westwards along said unnamed road to the existing district boundary, thence northwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area K: description of area of land proposed to be transferred from Horndean CP in East Hampshire District to Denmead CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the footpath leading to Broadway Lane east of Mill Copse, thence southeastwards along said footpath to Broadway Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to the unnamed road leading to Eastland Gate, thence eastwards along said road to the unnamed track adjacent to the southwestern boundary of Parcel No 0030 as shown on 1:2500 Microfilm (A) SU 6712 date of publication 1965 and OS 1:2500 Microfilm (B) SU 6812 date of publication 1975, thence southeastwards along said track to the existing district boundary, thence southwards, westwards and northeastwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

2. Boundary realignments between City of Winchester and Eastleigh Borough.

Area L: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Otterbourne CP in City of Winchester to Eastleigh Borough: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the Southampton to Winchester railway, southeast of Victoria Inn (PH), thence southwestwards along said railway to the existing district boundary, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area M: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the Southampton to Winchester railway being the easternmost corner of Area L, thence northeastwards along said railway to the existing district boundary, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area N: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the easternmost corner of the property adjacent to the eastern curtilage of no 300 Winchester Road being a point on the existing district boundary,

thence southwestwards along the southern boundary of said adjacent property and the southern curtilage of No 300 Winchester Road to the western curtilage of said property thence northwestward and northward along said western curtilage to a point where it meets the southern boundary of Winchester Road, thence northeastwards in a straight line to National Grid reference 4525222310 on OS 1:2500 microfilm (A1) date of publication Mar 1980 being on the existing district boundary, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Area P: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Hursley CP in City of Winchester to Eastleigh Borough: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets Hocombe Road, north of the property known as Beechcombe, thence northeastwards along said road to the existing district boundary, thence generally southwestwards and northwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

3. Boundary realignments between Test Valley Borough and City of Winchester.

Area Q: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Crawley CP in the City of Winchester to Kings Somborne CP in Test Valley Borough: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the northern boundary of Parcel No 5500 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) SU 3933 date of publication 1971, thence eastwards along said northern boundary to the track adjacent to the eastern boundary of the said parcel, thence southeastwards along said track to the existing district boundary, thence southwestwards and northeastwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

4. Boundary realignments between City of Winchester and Basingstoke and Deane Borough.

Area R: description of an area of land proposed to be transferred from Woodmancott CP in Basingstoke and Deane Borough to Micheldever CP in City of Winchester: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing district boundary meets the southern boundary of Popham CP, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary to the unnamed track leading from Bittley Copse to Woodmancott, thence southwestwards along said track to the track leading from Woodmancott to Woodmancott Down, thence southeastwards along said track to the track leading to the area named The Cowleys, thence southwards and southwestwards along said track to the track leading from Lone Farm to Lone Barn, thence southeastwards along said track to National Grid reference 5704340847 on OS 1:2500 microfilm (A) SU 5740 date of publication 1979, thence due south from said point to the northern boundary of Candovers CP, thence southwestwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the existing district boundary, thence generally northwards along said existing boundary to the point of commencement.

Schedule 2

Revised District electoral arrangements, consequent upon the proposals described in Schedule 1.

1. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 and the District of East Hampshire (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 shall be altered as described below.

Area A: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Bishops Sutton Ward in the City of Winchester to the Medstead Ward in East Hampshire District.

Area B: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Medstead Ward in East Hampshire District to Bishops Sutton Ward in City of Winchester.

Area C: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Upper Meon Valley Ward of City of Winchester to the Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District.

Area D: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District to Upper Meon Valley Ward in City of Winchester.

Area E: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Upper Meon Valley Ward of City of Winchester to Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District.

Area F: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District to Upper Meon Valley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area J: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Clanfield and Buriton Ward of East Hampshire District to Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon Ward of City of Winchester.

Area K: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Horndean - Kings Ward of East Hampshire District to Denmead Ward of City of Winchester.

2. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 and the Borough of Eastleigh (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 shall be altered as described below.

Area L: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester to Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough.

Area M: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area N: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area P: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester to Hiltingbury West Ward of Eastleigh Borough.

3. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the District of Test Valley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 and the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 shall be altered as described below.

Area Q: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Sparsholt Ward of City of Winchester to Kings Somborne and Michelmersh Ward of Test Valley Borough.

4. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 and the District of Basingstoke (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 shall be altered as described below.

Area R: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from North Waltham Ward in Basingstoke and Deane Borough to Micheldever Ward in City of Winchester.

Schedule 3

Revised County electoral arrangements, consequent upon the proposals described in Schedule 1.

1. It is proposed that the County Electoral Divisions as defined in the County of Hampshire (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1981 shall be altered as described below.

Area D: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District to Upper Meon Valley Ward in City of Winchester.

Area E: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Upper Meon Valley Ward of City of Winchester to Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District.

Area F: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Froxfield and Steep Ward of East Hampshire District to Upper Meon Valley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area J: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Clanfield and Buriton Ward of East Hampshire District to Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon Ward of City of Winchester.

Area K: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Horndean - Kings Ward of East Hampshire District to Denmead Ward of City of Winchester.

2. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 and the Borough of Eastleigh (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 shall be altered as described below.

Area L: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester to Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough.

Area M: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area N: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Eastleigh North Ward of Eastleigh Borough to Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester.

Area P: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Otterbourne and Hursley Ward of City of Winchester to Hiltingbury West Ward of Eastleigh Borough.

3. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the District of Test Valley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 and the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 shall be altered as described below.

Area Q: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Sparsholt Ward of City of Winchester to Kings Somborne and Michelmersh Ward of Test Valley Borough.

4. It is proposed that the District Wards, as defined in the City of Winchester (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1976 and the District of Basingstoke (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1975 shall be altered as described below.

Area R: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from North Waltham Ward in Basingstoke and Deane Borough to Micheldever Ward in City of Winchester.

Schedule 3

Revised County electoral arrangements, consequent upon the proposals described in Schedule 1.

1. It is proposed that the County Electoral Divisions as defined in the County of Hampshire (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1981 shall be altered as described below.

Area A: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Itchen Valley ED to the Medstead and Selborne ED.

Area B: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Medstead and Selborne ED to the Itchen Valley ED.

Area C: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Meon Valley ED to the Petersfield ED.

Area D: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Petersfield ED to the Meon Valley ED.

Area E: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Meon Valley ED to the Petersfield ED.

Area F: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Petersfield ED to Meon Valley ED.

Area J: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Catherington ED to the Meon Valley ED.

Area K: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Catherington ED to Meon Valley ED.

Area L: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Downlands ED to the Eastleigh (North) ED.

Area M: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Eastleigh (North) ED to Downlands ED.

Area N: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Eastleigh (North) ED to Downlands ED.




Area P: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Downlands ED to Eastleigh (Chandlers Ford) ED.

Area Q: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from the Downlands ED to Stockbridge and Wellow ED.

Area R: as described in Schedule 1 shall be transferred from Candovers ED to Itchen Valley ED.


PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL



PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW



LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL



— EXISTING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- - - PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARY
..... EXISTING CP BOUNDARY

PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW



LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL



————— EXISTING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- - - - - PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARY
..... EXISTING CP BOUNDARY


PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL



PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL



— EXISTING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- - - PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARY
..... EXISTING CP BOUNDARY