

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 103

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 103

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR IN THE COUNTY OF HAMPSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rushmoor in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and of Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that borough.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 3 June 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Rushmoor Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Hampshire County Council, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and to 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. Rushmoor 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 Report No 6 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 a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Borough Council had exercised an option for a system of elections by thirds.

5. On 30 October 1974 the Rushmoor Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 14 wards each returning 3 members to form a Council of 42, the same number as at present.

6. From the correspondence which we had received about the scheme, and that which had been forwarded to us by the Borough Council with their scheme, we noted that the Council's proposals had attracted a good deal of opposition. There were detailed alternative proposals from a local political association for the division of the Borough into 13 wards each returning 3 councillors. A number of other political bodies submitted detailed proposals for a scheme which would provide for 15 three member wards. This scheme was supported by a local elector who had written both to us and to the Borough Council. Letters from two local political associations criticised the effect of the draft scheme on the Cove and Aldershot South areas of the Borough. Both associations expressed a preference for the 13 ward alternative scheme which had been submitted. Two petitions received by the Borough Council pointed out that the Farnborough and Aldershot areas of the borough were divided by the Basingstoke Canal and suggested that the division should be maintained by the use of the Canal as a ward boundary. Finally there was a letter from a resident of Farnborough proposing that the borough be divided into 7 wards each returning 2 councillors. To this end the letter included suggestions for the modification of the draft scheme to provide seven wards.

7. We considered the draft scheme together with the comments and alternative schemes which had been submitted. We thought that a council of 14 was too small for the proper representation of the people of the Borough and we resolved, therefore, to reject the proposals which had been submitted for a 7 ward scheme.

We noted that there was little to choose between the 14 ward draft scheme and the 13 and 15 ward alternative schemes in terms of equality of representation. All three schemes offered a very high standard. The promoters of both the alternative schemes alleged that the Council's draft scheme was deficient in that, in their view, it did not observe natural boundaries and that it cut across local ties and communities. On the limited information available to us, and in the absence of detailed criticism of the alternative schemes, we found it impossible properly to assess the schemes from the latter standpoint. It was clear to us that a local meeting was inevitable in this case and we thought that this was the best place for the relative merits of the various proposals to be argued and clarified. With this in mind we thought it appropriate to adopt the Council's draft scheme as the basis of our draft proposals and so provide what appeared to be a politically neutral basis for discussion at the meeting.

8. In a number of instances the Ordnance Survey had recommended minor adjustments to the alignments of the boundaries proposed by the Council in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground. We decided to adopt these minor modifications and to formulate our draft proposals accordingly.

9. On 11 April 1975, 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 maps, 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 that any comments should reach us by 13 June 1975.

10. We received no response from Rushmoor Borough Council. Hampshire County Council, who were in the process of reviewing their policy for the review of the county electoral arrangements which is to commence when the electoral arrangements for the districts in the county have been settled, entered a holding objection.

11. The local political association which had earlier submitted a 13 ward scheme now submitted a scheme for 12 wards. This submission was supported by the Aldershot South ward association of the same political body. Eight letters were received pressing the case for the 15 ward scheme which had been submitted earlier.

12. In view of these comments, and as envisaged before we issued our draft proposals, 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, you appointed Mr Thomas Foord as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

13. In preparing the Agenda for the meeting we noted that much of the controversy surrounding the various schemes now centred on the degree to which the schemes would be compatible with the future county electoral arrangements. There seemed to be a good deal of support for the idea that it would be desirable to form county electoral divisions from whole wards but there were differences of view as to whether, in consequence of the future review of the county electoral arrangements, the borough would be divided into four electoral divisions as at present or whether it could expect an extra seat to be allocated. The proponents of the 12 ward scheme thought it unlikely that more than 4 seats would be allocated. The supporters of the 15 ward scheme thought that the Borough had a strong case for five seats on the County Council. In view of the controversy we asked that the County Council should send a representative to the local meeting. To assist the

meeting, we also circulated data - showing, for a county council of the present size of 97 members, the electorates and county councillor entitlements of the various districts in the county, both now and in five years time. The latter figures were based on the forecasts which had been submitted by each of the districts in the county in connection with the reviews of their electoral arrangements. We understood that the county council had prepared similar data using forecasts of their own but that the results suggested that the distribution of seats would be the same. Both sets of figures showed that Rushmoor was entitled now to 5 seats and that, although its share of the total electorate of the County was likely to fall over the next five years, this would be a very slow process and that the numerical entitlement to 5 seats was likely to remain.

14. Before the meeting, we received a letter from another political association enclosing details of a 15 ward scheme which proved to be identical to the one already under consideration. The body which had submitted the 12 ward scheme sent us details of some revisions to that scheme. We heard also from the Aldershot South ward association of the same political body who, while they continued to support the 12 ward scheme, sent us details of a 10 ward scheme which had been prepared by the Council's officers. This was offered as an alternative to the 15 ward scheme should it be decided that a scheme based on a multiple of 5 wards ought to be adopted. The association were anxious that there should be no increase in the size of the Council. Copies of all these submissions were sent to the Assistant Commissioner in time for the meeting.

15. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at Farnborough on 16 September 1975 and thereafter visited the areas which were the subject of dispute. A copy (without enclosures) of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

16. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be amended to provide for the Borough of Rushmoor to be divided into 15 wards each returning 3 councillors with ward boundaries as described in Table 1 to his Report

and shown on a map which accompanied it, but subject to any alterations which may be made on the advice of the Ordnance Survey in the interests of good boundaries. We noted that the recommended scheme was based on the 15 ward scheme which had been submitted to us, but with a number of modifications.

17. We consulted the Ordnance Survey who reported that they had no observations to offer on the proposed boundaries.

18. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report. We concluded that the scheme recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted and we resolved to formulate our final proposals accordingly.

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

PUBLICATION

20. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the maps are being sent to Rushmoor Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description prepared by the Ordnance Survey of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the map, is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH (Secretary)

October 1975

THOMAS FOORD
 LL.B (HONS.), F.C.I.S., L.M.R.T.P.I.
 SOLICITOR

WORTHING 200768

75 FIRST AVENUE,
 WORTHING,
 SUSSEX,
 BN14 9NP

23rd September 1975.

Your ref: LGBC/D/17/3

D.R. Smith Esq.,
 Secretary,
 Local Government Boundary
 Commission for England,
 20 Albert Embankment,
 London, SE1 7TJ.

Dear Sir,

REVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR
 THE BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR

I have pleasure in submitting my report on the local meeting held at the Town Hall, Farnborough, on the 16th September 1975, to consider the future electoral arrangements for the Borough of Rushmoor, following the representations which had been made on the draft proposals for the borough published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. The local meeting was well attended, and a list of the persons present and the interests they represent is attached.

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals provide for the future division of the Borough into 14 Wards returning a total of 42 Councillors, as follows:

<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>
FERNHILL	3	ST. MARKS	3
GRANGE	3	QUEENS	3
ST. JOHNS	3	ALEXANDRA	3
MAYFIELD	3	MANOR	3
VICTORIA	3	BELLE VUE	3
PARK	3	NEWPORT	3
WESTHEATH	3	HERON WOOD	3

The draft proposals substantially follow the 14 ward draft scheme submitted by Rushmoor Borough Council, subject to some comparatively minor alterations made to improve the boundaries of the wards.

Prior to the publication of the draft proposals the Boundary Commission and the Borough Council had received a considerable number of alternative submissions and suggestions from several interested bodies and individuals. These included inter alia a number of similar 15 ward schemes, a 13 ward scheme, a suggestion that the borough should be divided into 7 wards returning 14 Councillors, and two petitions.

After the Boundary Commission's draft proposals had been published letters were received by the Commission objecting to the proposals on several grounds and re-iterating support for the 15 ward scheme and alternative schemes. In addition two new alternative schemes were submitted, a 12 ward scheme and a 10 ward scheme, and another body submitted a 15 ward scheme, which proved on examination to be close to the 15 ward schemes previously submitted with some boundary alterations. The Hampshire County Council lodged a "holding" objection.

At the local meeting, because of the number of possible schemes which had been submitted it was decided to concentrate at first on broad principles, leaving the detailed criticism of individual schemes and boundaries until later in the meeting. In terms of equality of representation the schemes submitted offered a very high standard and the authors are to be congratulated on them. In the circumstances it was decided to use the Commission's draft proposals, embodying the 14 ward scheme submitted by the Borough Council, as "neutral" ground for the purpose of discussion.

It was also considered advisable in considering the future electoral arrangements for the borough to have regard to the likely representation of the area on the Hampshire County Council.

Mr. Crewe, Assistant County Secretary of the Hampshire County Council, was present at the meeting and from the factual information he supplied of the forecast electorates in 1979 of the Hampshire Districts, it is clear that the Borough of Rushmoor will have an entitlement of 5 seats. Although it was argued at the meeting by the proponents of the 12 ward scheme that one must look only at the present and immediately foreseeable county representation of 4, the overwhelming feeling of the meeting was that it would

not be in the best interests of the borough to be underrepresented at County level.

It was also generally felt that it was desirable, if not a requirement, that the new wards should be capable of being incorporated, without being divided, into appropriate county electoral divisions. It was accepted that if this was not achieved it could give rise to confusion for the electors, problems in drawing up the register of electors and difficulties for local political organisations. Mr. Crewe, for the County Council, said that the County Council had lodged the holding objection to the 14 ward scheme because the wards proposed could not be assimilated as whole wards within either 4 or 5 County Electoral Divisions.

The Chief Executive of Rushmoor pointed out that as each of the proposed 14 wards contained two polling stations the scheme could be made compatible with 4 County Electoral Divisions, but he readily conceded that the scheme did not fit with the borough's entitlement to 5 county seats.

Discussion then ensued on the number of councillors required to service the borough adequately. There are 43 councillors at present. The original proponents of the 15 ward scheme argued strongly for their scheme of 15 - 3 member wards, giving a council of 45. They pointed out that before local government re-organisation the two previous local authorities of Farnborough and Aldershot, which are now incorporated in the borough, together had 59 members. The Borough of Rushmoor is growing and there is a need to increase the size of the council if minority and community interests are to be protected and the electorate adequately served. There was considerable support for this view.

On the other hand there was a feeling that the present council of 43 was too large and should be reduced, or at least not increased. The proponents of the 12 ward scheme felt that 36 members was the optimum number. The authors of the 10 ward (30 councillors) scheme stated in their submission that they had every hope that support for the scheme would be forthcoming at the Meeting. In fact there was no significant support for this scheme at the Meeting, and it was strongly opposed by a number of bodies.

In the afternoon the relative merits of the ward boundaries proposed in the several schemes were considered. It was agreed by the meeting that discussion could most usefully be based on the 10, 12, 14 and 15 ward schemes.

The detailed criticism of particular boundaries was generally constructive and proved most useful in formulating my recommendations. The suggestions were mainly concerned with improving the boundaries by following natural features, and with maintaining existing community interests so far as possible.

Considerable concern was expressed at the meeting that the draft proposals divided the clearly identifiable community of Cove between three wards. Another major criticism was that for the purposes of electoral equality the boundary between the proposed Fernhill and Mayfield Wards had been set south of the motorway to include a large number of electors who were physically separated from the rest of Fernhill Ward by the motorway, which is the natural boundary.

As well as these and other substantial changes many minor detailed boundary changes were proposed. A number related solely to the particular scheme under discussion, but many were of general concern.

It was suggested that the boundaries of the 12 ward scheme were better than those in the 10 ward scheme, in so far as communities were kept together in the Farnborough area, but that if the 12 ward scheme were adopted there would be strong objections from the Aldershot electorate as to the way the boundaries were drawn. On the 15 ward scheme attention was drawn to alternative boundaries which could be obtained between the proposed St. Johns and Mayfield Wards, and which would improve the boundary as originally drawn.

At the conclusion of the meeting I made a general inspection of the area to consider the major points of community interest which had been raised at the meeting and which I had been asked to inspect. With the agreement of the meeting I was accompanied on my inspection by Mr. J. Astin, Administrative Assistant of Rushmoor Borough Council, concerned with electoral registration. I returned to Rushmoor on Thursday, 18th September, to examine the detailed ward boundary matters to which my attention had been drawn, in relation to natural features, existing ward and polling district boundaries, and the need to achieve electoral equality so far as possible. Again I was assisted by Mr. Astin, and I would like to pay a tribute to him for his invaluable help to me.

CONCLUSIONS

(a) Number of Wards and Councillors

Having regard to the various submissions to the Council and to the Boundary Commission, the deliberations at the local meeting and my inspection of the area, I am satisfied that the future electoral arrangements for the Borough of Rushmoor should provide for 15 wards each returning three councillors. It was not possible to reach agreement on any of the schemes submitted, but I feel that a 15 ward scheme is an improvement on the 14 ward scheme envisaged in the Commission's draft proposals and will command more general acceptance for the following reasons.

(i) Due representation at County Council level is recognised as important, and it is desirable that the number of wards should relate to the probable future county electoral divisions.

(ii) While compatibility could be achieved with either a 15 ward or a 10 ward scheme, there was little support for the latter. It was strongly opposed at the meeting, and if adopted I am sure that it would perpetuate a sense of grievance among a considerable proportion of the electorate that their interests were not being properly represented on the council.

(iii) The present number of councillors is 43, and having regard to the past history of representation of the area and the anticipated growth of the Borough, I feel that a marginal increase of 2 councillors to 45 is acceptable. The scheme approved by the Borough Council provided for 42 members, and although there was some feeling that the present council is too large, I do not believe that any drastic change should be made.

(iv) It would be wrong to divide the clearly identifiable community of Cove in the manner proposed in the 14 ward scheme.

(b) Ward Boundaries

(i) A number of the suggestions at the local meeting for the alteration of particular ward boundaries related solely to the alternative schemes, and are not, therefore, relevant to the present proposals. Certain other changes suggested, while marginally desirable proved not to be practicable on examination, having regard to their effect

on numerical equality between wards.

(ii) As stated above I feel that the community of Cove should not be divided.

(iii) I agree that the boundary between Fernhill Ward and Mayfield Ward and the boundary between Fernhill Ward and Grange Ward should follow the motorway.

(iv) A better boundary could be achieved between St. John's Ward and Westheath Ward by following the Cove Brook from Mayfield Road to the Hawley Lake Stream, then along the stream in a westerly direction to Fernhill Road, then south along Fernhill Road to the railway. This meets the objection made at the local meeting to the splitting of the Council Estate at West Heath, and has the advantage that it follows the existing Ward and polling district boundaries. The alternative suggestion that the boundary should follow Fernhill Road would lead to an unacceptable inequality of electorate.

(v) The boundary as originally proposed between Cove Ward and Empress Ward follows the public footpath between Marrowbrook Lane and Elles Road. I feel that a more satisfactory boundary can be obtained at this point by following Marrowbrook Lane southwest to Cody Road and then southwards to Elles Road.

(vi) Subject to these alterations the boundaries follow those of the 15 ward scheme as submitted, but for ease of reference the descriptions of the proposed Ward Boundaries enclosed herewith have been re-written to incorporate these changes. The opportunity has been taken also to include the minor boundary alterations suggested by the Ordnance Survey to the 14 Ward scheme, where these boundaries coincide with the 15 ward scheme now proposed.

(vii) A 1: 25,000 Ordnance Survey Map, showing the boundaries of the wards proposed, and a Table of Electoral Equality are enclosed.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Boundary Commission's draft proposals be amended to provide for the Borough of Rushmoor to be divided into 15 wards, each returning 3 councillors, with ward boundaries as described in Table I attached hereto and shown on the enclosed map, subject to any

alterations which may be made on the advice of the Ordnance Survey in the interests of good boundaries.

I am grateful to the many organisations and individuals who, in the interests of the Borough of Rushmoor, have given so much of their time and effort to present their views on the future electoral arrangements for the Borough. My thanks are particularly due to the Chief Executive of Rushmoor and his staff and to Mr. Crewe of the County Council for their courtesy and assistance throughout the proceedings.

Yours faithfully,

James Ford.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
L. H. Smith	North Ward Councillor	18 Beech Road, Farnborough.
Mrs. P. E. Mosses	Councillor Farnborough North Ward	122 Alexandra Road Farnborough
Mike Roberts	Aldershot Constituency Co-operative Party	18 Churchill Avenue, Aldershot
Richard A. Bates	Hampshire County Labour Party	81 Bedford Place, Southampton
D. McAllister	Cove Residents Association	60 Fernhill Road, Farnborough
R. Hudson	South Farnborough	44 Cambridge Road West, Farnborough.
J. E. C. White	Councillor Labour Group	31 Coleman Road, Aldershot
S. W. Hobday	Councillor Farnborough North Ward	219 Sycamore Road, Farnborough.
G. Watkins	Rushmoor Council Labour Group and Aldershot Constituency Labour Party	4 Tay Close, Farnborough
D. J. Simpson	Aldershot Constituency Labour Party Representative	105 Queens Road, Aldershot
B. A. Collins (Mrs)	Rushmoor Conservative Central Council.	16 Rother Road, Cove
H. F. Griffiths (Mrs)	Rushmoor Councillor (S. Ward)	88 Alexandra Road, Farnborough
L. F. Colletts	North Farnborough Conservative Association	77 Avenue Road, Farnborough
R. Pullen	North Farnborough Conservative Association	27 Firgrove Court, Farnborough
W. A. Williams	North Farnborough Conservative Association	12 Cabrol Road, Farnborough
R. de B. Devereux	North Farnborough Conservative Association	41 Rectory Road, Farnborough
S. W. Coe	Aldershot Liberal Assn.	101 Grosvenor Road, Aldershot
R. D. M. Sharpe	Aldershot & Farnborough Liberal Association	48 Brighton Road, Aldershot
M. Nash	Aldershot & Farnborough Liberal Association	49 Ayling Lane, Aldershot

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
David Savage	Aldershot & N. E. Hants Conservative Association	34 Rectory Road, Farnborough.
S. Perceval-Maxwell	Secretary Aldershot & N. E. Hants Conservative Assn.	Aldershot Conservative Association
M. H. Garrod	Aldershot South Ward Conservative Association	41 Highfield Avenue, Aldershot
Carol P. Edgoose	Aldershot South Ward Conservative Association	1 Evelyn Avenue, Aldershot
W. E. Farthing	Aldershot South Ward	63A Cranmore Lane, Aldershot
W. S. James	Aldershot West Ward	"St. Annes" York Crescent, Aldershot.
M. E. Crewe	Assistant County Secretary Hampshire County Council	c/o The Castle, Winchester, Hants.
A. R. O'Dowd-Booth	Chief Executive, Rushmoor Borough Council	Town Hall, Farnborough
D. Hartley	Borough Secretary, Rushmoor Borough Council	The Town Hall, Farnborough
J. Astin	Admin. Assistant, Rushmoor Borough Council	The Town Hall, Farnborough
G. Bardgett	Farnborough News	

TABLE OF ELECTORAL EQUALITY

No.	Ward	Proposed No. of Councillors	Number of current electorate	No. of electors per Councillor	1979 Forecast	No. of electors per Councillor
1	FERNHILL	3	2,994	998	3,466	1,155
2	GRANGE	3	3,212	1,071	3,589	1,196
3	ST. JOHNS	3	3,258	1,086	3,280	1,093
4	MAYFIELD	3	1,783	594	3,341	1,114
5	WESTHEATH	3	3,561	1,187	3,755	1,252
6	EMPRESS	3	3,125	1,042	3,313	1,105
7	COVE	3	3,097	1,032	3,567	1,189
8	KNELLWOOD	3	2,894	952	3,562	1,187
9	ST. MARKS	3	3,483	1,161	3,675	1,225
10	QUEENS	3	3,444	1,148	3,444	1,148
11	ALEXANDRA	3	2,984	995	3,730	1,243
12	MANOR	3	3,410	1,137	3,538	1,179
13	NEWPORT	3	3,261	1,087	3,353	1,118
14	BELLEVUE	3	3,623	1,208	3,647	1,216
15	HERONWOOD	3	3,437	<u>1,146</u>	3,543	<u>1,181</u>
			Average	1,057	Average	1,173

BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ALEXANDRA	3
BELLEVUE	3
COVE	3
EMPRESS	3
FERNHILL	3
GRANGE	3
HERONWOOD	3
KNELLWOOD	3
MANOR	3
MAYFIELD	3
NEWPORT	3
QUEENS	3
ST JOHN'S	3
ST MARK'S	3
WESTHEATH	3

BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

Note: Where the 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.

FERNHILL WARD

Commencing at the point where the M3 motorway meets the western boundary of the District, thence northeastwards and following said boundary and the northern boundary of the District to the M3 motorway, thence southwestwards along said motorway to the point of commencement.

GRANGE WARD

Commencing at the point where the Waterloo to Basingstoke railway meets Farnborough Road (A325) thence northeastwards along said road to Prospect Avenue, thence westwards along said avenue to Cherrywood Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the footpath that leads to Cove Brook, thence northwestwards along said path to said brook, thence northeastwards along said brook to the southeastern boundary of Fernhill Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of the District, thence southeastwards and following said boundary and the eastern boundary of the District to the Waterloo to Basingstoke railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

MAYFIELD WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Grange Ward meets Prospect Road, thence southwards along said road to Mayfield Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Fernhill Road, thence northwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Fernhill Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the western boundary of Grange Ward, thence southwestwards and following said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

ST JOHNS WARD

Commencing at the point where the Waterloo-Basingstoke railway meets the western boundary of the District, thence northwards and following said District

boundary to the southeastern boundary of Fernhill Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the southwestern boundary of Mayfield Ward, thence southwards and following said ward boundary to Cove Brook, thence southwestwards and following said brook to the Hawley Lake stream, thence westwards along said stream to Fernhill Road, thence generally southwards along said road to the Waterloo to Basingstoke railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

WESTHEATH WARD

Commencing at the point where the Waterloo to Basingstoke railway meets the eastern boundary of St Johns Ward, thence northwards and following said ward boundary to the southwestern boundary of Mayfield Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward boundary to Prospect Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the Waterloo to Basingstoke railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

EMPRESS WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Grange Ward meets the eastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwards along said District boundary to Coleford Bridge Road, thence westwards along said road to Rectory Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Ashley Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Manor Road, thence southwards along said road to Waverley Road, thence generally westwards along said road to Avenue Road, thence northwards along said road to The Crescent, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said road to Oak Road, thence westwards along said road to Farnborough Road thence southwards along said road to the Town Centre relief road, thence westwards along said road and continuing along the proposed relief road to Elles Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Meadow Gate Road, thence northwards along the un-named road crossing Marrow Brook and leading to Marrowbrook Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to and southwestwards along Cove Road to Prospect Road, thence northeastwards

along said road to and continuing along the eastern boundaries of Westheath Ward and Mayfield Ward to the southern boundary of Grange Ward, thence eastwards and following said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

COVE WARD

Commencing at the point where Elles Road meets the western boundary of the District, thence southwestwards and northwards following said District boundary to the southern boundary of St Johns Ward, thence eastwards along said ward boundary and the southern boundary of Westheath Ward to the western boundary of Empress Ward, thence southwestwards and following said ward boundary to Elles Road, thence northwestwards and southwestwards following said road to the point of commencement.

KNELLWOOD WARD

Commencing at the point where the Basingstoke Canal meets the western boundary of the District, thence northeastwards and following said District boundary to the southern boundary of Cove Ward, thence northeastwards and following said ward boundary and the southern boundary of Empress Ward to the eastern boundary of the District, thence southeastwards and following said District boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of Whites Road, thence southwestwards along said prolongation and said road to Park Road, thence northwards along said road and Sycamore Road to Fellows Road, thence westwards along said road to Canterbury Road, thence northwards along said road to Cambridge Road, thence westwards along said road to Farnborough Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Government House Road, thence westwards along said road to Shoe Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Farnborough Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the Basingstoke Canal, thence generally northwestwards along said canal to the point of commencement.

ST MARKS WARD

Commencing at the point where Lynchford Road meets the southeastern boundary of Knellwood Ward, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwards along said District boundary to Lynchford Road, thence westwards along said road to the point of commencement.

QUEENS WARD

Commencing at the point where Farnborough Road meets the southern boundary of the District, thence southwestwards along said southern boundary and northwards along the western boundary of the District to the southern boundary of Knellwood Ward, thence southeastwards and following said ward boundary and eastwards along the southern boundary of St Marks Ward to the eastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwards along said boundary to the Waterloo to Alton railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to Church Lane East, thence westwards along said lane to Grosvenor Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Barrack Road, thence northwards along said road to Wellington Avenue, thence generally westwards along said avenue to Farnborough Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

ALEXANDRA WARD

Commencing at the point where Cranmore Lane meets the southern boundary of Queens Ward, thence generally northeastwards, eastwards and southwards and following said ward boundary to Church Lane West, thence westwards along said lane to Ayling Hill, thence northwestwards along said hill to Cranmore Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to the point of commencement.

MANOR WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the District meets the southern boundary of Queens Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward

boundary to the southern boundary of Alexandra Ward, thence eastwards along said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Queens Ward, thence southwards, eastwards and northeastwards along said boundary to High Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Church Hill, thence southwestwards along said hill to Church Lane East, thence southeastwards along said lane and continuing southward along Church Road, to Lower Farnham Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the southern boundary of the District, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

NEWPORT WARD

Commencing at the junction of Church Road and Lower Farnham Road on the eastern boundary of Manor Ward, thence northwards and following said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Queens Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to a point being the prolongation northwestwards of Holly Road, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and said road to Roberts Road, thence southwestwards, eastwards and southwards along said road to Haig Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Wilson Road, thence southwards along said road to Newport Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Lower Newport Road, thence southwestwards along said road and continuing along Lower Farnham Road to the point of commencement.

BELLE VUE WARD

Commencing at the junction of Lower Newport Road and Ash Road on the eastern boundary of Newport Ward, thence northwards and following said ward boundary to the southern boundary of Queens Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the District, thence southwards and following said District boundary to Ash Road, thence westwards along said road to the point of commencement.

HERON WOOD WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the District meets the eastern boundary of Manor Ward, thence northeastwards along said ward boundary and the southeastern boundary of Newport Ward to the southern boundary of Belle Vue Ward, thence eastwards along said ward boundary to the eastern boundary of the District, thence southwards and westwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of the District to the point of commencement.