

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 542

Review of Non-Metropolitan Counties

THE COUNTY OF KENT:

BOUNDARIES WITH

ESSEX AND SURREY

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO.

542

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Mr G J Ellerton CMG MBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J G Powell FRICS FSVA

MEMBERS

Lady Ackner

Mr G R Prentice

Professor G E Cherry

Mr K J L Newell

Mr B Scholes OBE

THE RT. HON. NICHOLAS RIDLEY MP

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

REVIEW OF NON-METROPOLITAN COUNTIES

THE COUNTY OF KENT: BOUNDARIES WITH ESSEX AND WITH SURREY

COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

1. This Report concerns the boundaries between the Counties of Kent and Essex and the Counties of Kent and Surrey. Kent's boundaries with East Sussex and Greater London are being considered separately in the reviews of those areas.
2. On 2 September 1986 we wrote to Kent County Council announcing our intention to undertake a review under section 48(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 for the purpose of considering whether to make proposals in relation to the county as authorised by section 47 of the Act. Copies of the letter were sent to the principal local authorities and all the parishes in the County of Kent and the surrounding counties of Essex, East Sussex, and Surrey, the Members of Parliament with a constituency interest, the headquarters of the main political parties, the various government departments which might have an interest, the Thames, North-East; Thames, South-East; and Thames, South-West Regional Health

authorities, British Telecom, the Eastern, London, Southern and South-Eastern Electricity Boards, the North-Thames, Southern and South-Eastern Gas Boards, the Anglian, Southern and Thames Water Authorities, the English Tourist Board, Port Authorities in the counties, the Editors of the Municipal Journal and Local Government Chronicle, local T.V. and radio stations serving the area, and the National and County Associations of Local Councils.

3. The County Councils were requested, in co-operation as necessary with other County Councils and with the District Councils concerned, to assist us in giving publicity to the start of the review by publishing a notice for two successive weeks in appropriate local newspapers to give the widest possible publicity in the areas concerned. The County Councils were asked, in particular, to use their best endeavours to ensure that the issue of the consultation letter was drawn to the attention of those concerned with services such as the police and administration of justice, in respect of which they have a statutory function.

4. A period of six months from the date of the letter was allowed for all local authorities, including those in the surrounding counties, and any person or body interested in the review, to submit to us their views in detail on whether changes in the county boundary were desirable and, if so, what those changes should be and how they would serve the interests of effective and convenient local government.

THE SUBMISSION MADE TO US AND OUR INTERIM DECISIONS

The boundary between the Counties of Kent and Surrey

5. In response to our letter we received a submission from Sevenoaks District Council in the County of Kent suggesting two very minor changes to its boundary with the district of Tandridge in the County of Surrey, concerning the parishes of Westerham and Limpsfield and Westerham and Tatsfield where the boundary cuts across the gardens of the properties of Brambledown and Greystones respectively. Neither Kent County Council nor Surrey County Council wished to make any recommendation for alteration to its boundaries and doubted whether the changes sought by Sevenoaks District Council would be worth pursuing since the present alignments apparently caused no difficulties. No other local authority wished to propose any alteration to the existing boundary.

6. Having considered the representations received, and with regard to the guidelines set out in Circular 12/84 issued by your Department, we concluded that the changes proposed by Sevenoaks District Council could not be justified in the terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore reached an interim decision to make no proposals for changes to the boundary between Kent and Surrey.

The boundary between the Counties of Kent and Essex

7. None of the representations we received in respect of this boundary suggested any change to the status quo. We therefore had no difficulty in reaching an interim decision to make no proposals for change between the boundary of Kent and Essex.

OUR INTERIM DECISION

8. Our interim decision was published on the 27 August 1987. Copies were sent to all those who had received a copy of our letter dated 2 September 1986 and those who had made representations to us. Essex, Kent and Surrey County Councils were asked jointly to arrange publication of notices giving details of our interim decision and to place copies of them on display at places where public notices are customarily displayed. They were also asked to place copies of our interim decision letter on deposit for inspection at their main offices for a period of eight weeks. Comments were invited by 14 October 1987.

RESPONSE TO OUR INTERIM DECISION

9. We received six representations in response to our interim decision letter. The County Councils of Essex, Kent and Surrey, together with Sevenoaks District Council, Thannington Without Parish Council and the South Eastern Gas Board, had no comments to offer.

OUR FINAL DECISION

10. As required by section 60(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, we have considered the representations made to us. We noted that all of the representations supported our interim decision to propose no change to the boundary between the Counties of Kent and Surrey and Kent and Essex. The total response was very small, however, despite the wide publicity given to our interim decision. We deduced from this that our decision had been generally favoured. We have therefore concluded that in the interests of effective and convenient local government it is right to confirm our interim decision to make no proposals as our final decision.

PUBLICATION

11. A separate letter enclosing copies of this report is being sent to Essex, Kent and Surrey County Councils, asking them, as necessary, to deposit copies of this report at their main offices for inspection over a six-month period. The County Councils are also asked to co-operate in putting notices to this effect on public notice boards and in the local press. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received our interim decision letter and to those who made comments.

Signed: G J ELLERTON (Chairman)

J G POWELL (Deputy Chairman)

JOAN ACKNER

G E CHERRY

K J L NEWELL

G R PRENTICE

BRIAN SCHOLES

S T GARRISH

Secretary

12 November 1987