

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 422

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

MEMBERS

Lady J K Ackner

Mr J T Brockbank

Mr R R Thornton CBE DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

The Rt Hon Michael Heseltine MP
Secretary of State for the Environment

1. In a letter dated 11 November 1980 East Hampshire District Council requested us to review the boundary between the parish of Horndean in the district of East Hampshire and the unparished area of Lovedean in the borough of Havant, both districts being within the County of Hampshire. The request arose out of East Hampshire District Council's parish boundary review. The Council sought several minor changes which involved the transfer between the two districts of 45 properties and three groups of garages in whole or in part, where they are presently divided by the existing boundary.
2. During the parish review, Horndean Parish Council had made representations to East Hampshire District Council for adjustments to the boundary between the parish and the Borough of Havant in the Lovedean area where it crossed properties, and the Parish Council favoured the suggestions made by East Hampshire District Council. Havant Borough Council were prepared to agree to a limited boundary adjustment involving 18 properties and one block of garages where the house structures themselves were crossed by the present boundary and where, in consequence, rates were being paid to both authorities. Hampshire County Council had no objections to East Hampshire District's proposals.
3. We considered the District Council's request as required by 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.
4. We noted that the changes proposed had initially been suggested by Horndean Parish Council and that other local authorities were aware of East Hampshire District Council's intention to ask for a review. Havant Borough Council favoured a more restricted alteration in the boundary, but although there was no indication of the wishes of local residents, we were satisfied that the review could be justified on the grounds that it would produce a better and more identifiable boundary.
5. As a result we decided that we should undertake a review, and that the circumstances were sufficiently exceptional to enable us to shorten the normal procedure by publishing draft proposals incorporating the changes sought by East Hampshire District Council at the same time as we announced our intention to carry out a review.
6. On 21 May 1981 we issued a consultation letter announcing the start of the review and giving details of our draft proposals. The letter was addressed jointly to East Hampshire District Council and Havant Borough Council; copies were sent to

Hampshire County Council, Horndean Parish Council, 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, Hampshire Association of Parish Councils, and to the editors both of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. The two district authorities were asked to publish a notice about the review and draft proposals, to place copies of the notice on display at places where public notices were customarily displayed, and to place copies of the draft proposals on deposit at their main offices for a period of six weeks. Comments on the review and on the draft proposals were invited by 24 July 1981.

7. Our draft proposals were accepted by Hampshire County Council and by the owners of one of the properties affected. They were opposed by the owners of seven of the properties affected, by Horndean Parish Council, a local councillor and, in part by Havant Borough Council. Alternative proposals were put forward by five of the objectors, including Havant Borough Council

8. We have considered our draft proposals in the light of the comments received and the alternative proposals put forward. We finally concluded that it would be virtually impossible to propose a boundary which would satisfy everyone concerned, and we have decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

9. In the light of more up to date mapping information Ordnance Survey have for technical reasons, suggested certain minor amendments which we have decided to incorporate in our final proposals.

10. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 1 and 2 to this report. Schedule 1 specifies the proposed changes in local authority areas and Schedule 2 specifies the consequential adjustments to the existing electoral arrangements. The proposed boundary is illustrated on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

11. Separate letters are being sent with copies of the report and of the map to East Hampshire District Council and Havant Borough 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 a small sketch plan, are being sent to those who received the consultation letter or made comments on our draft proposals.

L.S.

Signed:

J M ACKNER

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

R R THORNTON

LESLIE GRIMSHAW (SECRETARY)

19 January 1982

PROPOSALS FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARY BETWEEN
THE DISTRICT OF EAST HAMPSHIRE AND THE BOROUGH OF HAVANT IN THE COUNTY OF HAMPSHIRE

It is proposed that the following area be transferred from the District of East Hampshire to the Borough of Havant:-

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

Proposal 1a:

Commencing at the point where the existing District boundary meets the eastern boundary of No. 148 Greenfield Crescent, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of No. 150 Greenfield Crescent to the northern boundary of the last-mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary and in prolongation thereof to Greenfield Crescent, thence northwards along said crescent to the road known as Elderberry Way, thence westwards along said road to Mapletree Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to a point opposite the southern boundary of No. 3 Mapletree Avenue, thence westwards to and generally westwards along said southern boundary to the northeastern boundary of No. 13 Elderberry Way, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and the northeastern boundary of No. 11 Elderberry Way to the northern boundary of No. 9 Elderberry Way, thence westwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of No. 7 Elderberry Way to the northeastern boundary of No. 5 Elderberry Way, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary and the northeastern boundaries of No. 3 Elderberry Way and No. 78 Hazleton Way to the eastern boundary of No. 80 Hazleton Way, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the last mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary to its westernmost point, thence due west from said point, across Hazleton Way, to the eastern boundary of No. 89 Hazleton Way, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of No. 91 Hazleton Way to

the northern boundary of the last-mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary and continuing northwards along the eastern boundary of No 42 Spring Vale and northwestwards along the northern boundary of the last-mentioned property to the northernmost point of the said property, thence northwestwards in a straight line from said point, across the road known as Spring Vale, to the southernmost point of No 45 Spring Vale, thence northwards along the eastern boundary of said property to the northern boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 22 Verbena Crescent, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of No 24 Verbena Crescent to the northern boundary of the last-mentioned property, thence westwards along said northern boundary to its westernmost point, thence northwestwards in a straight line from said point, across Verbena Crescent, to the southeastern corner of No 25 Verbena Crescent thence westwards along the southern boundary of said property to the western boundary of said property, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said western boundary and continuing northeastwards along the southeastern boundaries of Nos 26 and 28 Rosemary Way to the northeastern boundary of the last-mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to its northernmost point, thence northwestwards in a straight line from said point, across Rosemary Way, to the southernmost corner of No 39 Rosemary Way, thence northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of said property to rejoin the existing District boundary at the southernmost corner of No 159 Portsmouth Road.

Proposal 1b:

Commencing at the point where the existing District boundary meets the eastern boundary of No 29 Keydell Close, thence southwestwards along said eastern boundary and northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of said property to its westernmost point, thence southwestwards in a straight

line from said point to the northeastern corner of No 18 Lovedean Lane, thence northwestwards along the northern boundary of said property and the northern boundaries of Nos 20 to 42 Lovedean Lane to the northernmost corner of the last-mentioned property, thence due west from said corner to Parklands Avenue, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along said avenue and Bevan Road to rejoin the existing District boundary.

Proposal 1c:

Commencing on the existing District boundary and the eastern boundary of No 14 Herriott Close at NG Ref: 6906112304, as shown on OS 1:1250 Microfilm (A1) SU 6912 SW, date of publication July 1981, thence northwards along the eastern boundary of No 14 Herriott Close to the southwestern boundary of No 16 Herriott Close, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary and northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of the last-mentioned property to the northeastern boundary of said property, thence northwestwards along said northeastern boundary to rejoin the existing District boundary at the western boundary of No 13 Roselands.

Proposal 1d:

Commencing at the point on the western boundary of the property known as Tamarisk, where the existing District boundary meets the southwestern boundary of the property known as Lane End, thence northwestwards along said southwestern boundary and northeastwards along the northwestern boundary of said property to the southwestern boundary of the property known as Killindini, thence northwestwards along said southwestern boundary to rejoin the existing District boundary.

Proposal 1e:

Commencing at the point where the existing District boundary crosses the road known as Rose Hill, thence northwestwards along said road to a point

opposite the southeastern boundary of No.11 Rose Hill, thence northeastwards to and along said southeastern boundary and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said property to a point in line with the southeastern boundary of No.3. Rose Hill, thence northeastwards to and along said southeastern boundary to the northeastern boundary of No.5. Rose Hill, thence southeastwards along said northeastern boundary to rejoin the existing District boundary.

PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS CONSEQUENT UPON THE
PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE DISTRICT OF EAST HAMPSHIRE
AND THE BOROUGH OF HAVANT IN THE COUNTY OF HAMPSHIRE

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

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

Proposal a: that the boundary between the Horndean-Hazleton Ward of East
Hampshire District and the Cowplain Ward of the Borough of Havant shall be realigned
as described in Proposal 1a in Schedule 1.

Proposal b: that the boundary between the Horndean-Kings Ward of East Hampshire
District and the Cowplain Ward of the Borough of Havant shall be realigned from
the point where the existing boundary meets the proposed boundary described in
Proposal 1b of Schedule 1, thence southwestwards, generally northwestwards, generally
northwards and northwestwards along said proposed boundary to the existing boundary
between the Horndean-Kings Ward of East Hampshire District and the Hart Plain Ward of
the Borough of Havant.

Proposal c: that the boundary between the Horndean-Kings Ward of East Hampshire
District and the Hart Plain Ward of the Borough of Havant shall be realigned as
described in Proposal 1c, Proposal 1d and Proposal 1e in Schedule 1.

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

Proposal a: that the boundary between Catherington ED and Cowplain and Hart Plain ED shall be realigned as described in Proposal 1a, Proposal 1b, Proposal 1c, Proposal 1d and Proposal 1e in Schedule 1.

PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT

BOROUGH OF HAVANT



--- EXISTING DISTRICT BOUNDARY
— PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARY

