

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.116

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 116

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 P B Young, CBE.

PW

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

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF HAVANT 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 Havant 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 Havant 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. Havant 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 12 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 29 October 1974 the Havant 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. We noted that the Council had refrained from suggesting names for the wards proposed by them. They told us that they thought this should be deferred until the number and boundaries of the wards proposed by us were known.

6. We considered the draft scheme together with the comments which had been made. These comments included not only detailed criticisms of the draft scheme but also more fundamental objections based on the belief that the borough should be divided into a larger number of wards with a larger Council. However, although ideas had been submitted showing how this might be achieved, they were in outline only and we did not feel justified in adopting them as the basis of our draft proposals. We noted that the Council's draft scheme offered a generally even standard of representation but that there were weaknesses in Hayling Island, which would be somewhat generously represented, and Emsworth where the ratio of electors to the number of councillors would be rather high compared to the average for the district. We considered whether the boundaries of the wards concerned could be altered to bring their electorates closer to the average for the borough as a whole but without breaking the system of 3 member wards which the Council had proposed. However, in both areas we were confronted by strong geographical considerations which made it difficult to alter the wards in a manner which would be logical in local terms and we decided that no changes should be made. We reviewed the Council's proposals for the rest of the borough in the light of the comments which had been made but decided that there were no alterations which ought to be made. We thus concluded that the Council's proposals generally offered a reasonable basis for the future representation of

the borough, in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our own guidelines and we decided that they should form the basis of our draft proposals. We decided, however, to delay the issue of the draft proposals until the Council had been invited to suggest names for the various wards which they had proposed.

7. In due course, the Council advised us that they preferred not to recommend names for the wards at that stage. We thereupon chose names ourselves and formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

8. On 4 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 map, which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 6 June 1975.

9. The Havant Borough Council informed us that they no longer supported the scheme which we had adopted as our draft proposals. 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.

10. We received a number of letters in support of our draft proposals, although in some instances it was suggested that the names which we had proposed should be reconsidered. There were, however, objections to our proposal to divide Hayling Island into two wards and to the proposed reduction in the number of councillors representing the Leigh Park area of the borough. One of the minority groups on

the Council reiterated ideas which they had put forward for the division of the borough into 17 three member wards. A local elector, who had earlier submitted an outline plan for sixteen wards each returning 3 members, now sent us outline proposals for 15 wards. This scheme preserved the wards which we had suggested for the Waterloo, Cowplain, Hart Plain and Purbrook areas of the borough but suggested a different pattern of wards for the rest of the borough. From a local political party we received outline ideas for a 16 ward scheme.

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

12. In view of the holding objection from the county council we decided to place on the Agenda the question of compatibility between the future electoral arrangements for the borough and the county. By that time, each of the district councils had produced their forecasts of electorates in five years' time and we had received independent forecasts prepared by the officers of the County Council. From these figures it had been possible to form a view about whether, in the light of the County Council's declared intention to continue with 97 members, a redistribution of county councillors between the districts would be necessary. In the case of Havant the figures suggested that the borough would be entitled to 8 county electoral divisions, one more than at present. In view of this, and the fact that the Borough Council no longer supported the 14 ward scheme which they had put to us, we invited the Borough Council to consider whether a scheme based on 16 wards, or some other multiple of eight, should be prepared for consideration at the local meeting alongside our draft proposals.

13. To assist the discussion at the meeting we asked the County Council to send a representative to the meeting and we circulated details of the statistical information which had become available.

14. In preparing the Agenda we thought it right to invite those who had submitted outline alternative schemes to work them out in more detail. In view of this, and the invitation to the Borough Council to consider whether to prepare an alternative scheme, we decided to leave a longer period than usual between the notice of the local meeting and the date on which it was to be held. At the same time we asked the Council, should they decide to submit an alternative scheme, to make it available for inspection by the public about two weeks before the meeting and to give notice of the fact in the local press. Likewise, we asked anyone else submitting detailed alternative schemes to deposit them with the Council two weeks before the meeting so that anyone interested could inspect them.

15. Before the meeting we heard from the Borough Council that they did not favour any increase in the present number of Borough Councillors, which is 42, and that they did not favour a 16 ward solution of the problem. From the minority group on the Council which had earlier advocated the division of the borough into 17 wards we received a detailed alternative scheme for 16 wards. It was said that the scheme had been prepared by the Council's officers for consideration by the Council but that it had been rejected. The local elector who had earlier submitted outline schemes for 15 and 16 wards now submitted detailed plans for a 16 ward scheme. Both these alternative schemes were made available to the Borough Council who were asked to place them on deposit for inspection by the public before the meeting. From two borough councillors, a local ratepayers association and two local residents we received letters expressing strong opposition to the idea of the division of the borough into 16 wards.

16. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at Havant on 17 September 1975. A copy (without enclosures) of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

17. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that we should adopt our draft 14 ward scheme subject to an adjustment to the boundary between the proposed Emsworth and Town wards and to the renaming of three of the wards. The Assistant Commissioner added that if we preferred a sixteen ward scheme he recommended that the scheme proposed by Councillor Collins (ie the scheme prepared by the Council's officers) should be adopted as a draft and further comments invited on it as quickly as possible.

18. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report. Having studied the options we concluded that in terms of the district electoral arrangements it would be appropriate to confirm our draft proposals but with the modifications which the Assistant Commissioner had recommended. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.

19. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached maps. 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 maps.

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 Havant Borough

Council and will be available for 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 of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the maps, 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)

6 November 1975

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND.BOROUGH OF HAVANT - ELECTORAL REVIEW.

REPORT OF A LOCAL MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, EAST STREET, HAVANT
ON WEDNESDAY, 17th SEPTEMBER, 1975.

Mr. Chairman, Mauam and Gentlemen,

On 14th July, 1975 pursuant to Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972; I was appointed by the Secretary of State to be an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local enquiry or carry out any consultations or investigations with respect to the review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the electoral arrangements for the Borough of Havant.

In accordance with your instructions I attended at the Town Hall, East Street, Havant at 10.30 a.m., on Wednesday, 17th September 1975 and held a local meeting on which I have the honour to report as follows:-

1. Attendances. Thirty-two persons recorded their attendance on the Attendance Sheet annexed to this report as Appendix 1. Havant Borough Council were represented by Mr.J. Forder, the Borough Secretary, and Hampshire County Council by Mr.M. Crewe, Assistant County Secretary.

2. Preliminary Point. Mrs.A. Marsh of 15 Laburnum Road, Waterlooville, raised a point of order, submitting that as the meeting had been called to consider draft proposals relating to fourteen wards, any discussion of a sixteen ward scheme was not within the competence of the meeting. At the request of Mrs. Marsh I record that I rejected her submission.

3. Inspections. These were carried out on Thursday, 18th September. I am indebted to the officers of the Havant Borough Council for supplying me with guides and indeed for all the arrangements which they made for me. I visited all the wards of the Borough and at various times was accompanied by the following persons:

Purbrook	Councillor Mrs.G.V.M. Blackett.
Waterlooville	Mrs.A. Marsh. Councillor Mrs.M. Butler.
Hayling Island	Councillor J.V. Derben.
Bedhampton	Councillor R.J. Fairhead.
Leigh Park	Councillor Mrs.B. Bell. Councillor Mrs.E.J. Robinson.
Emsworth	Mr.H.W. Warren.

THE WARD BOUNDARY PROPOSALS.

4. On 29th October, 1974 the Borough Council submitted a fourteen ward scheme and after considering this together with various representations which had been made the Commission adopted it as its own draft.

5. Subsequently in April, 1975 the Borough Council decided that it no longer supported the scheme it had proposed, but put forward no alternative.

6. Subsequently also, the Boundary Commission received forecasts of the 1979 numbers of electors in all the districts of Hampshire prepared by the individual District Councils and also a separate forecast prepared by Hampshire County Council. Assuming that the County Council would continue to have ninety-seven members, Havant would have an entitlement of 7.96 members under the District Council forecast and 7.65 under the County Council forecast. There was therefore a probability that the number of County Councillors for the Borough would be increased from seven to eight. Although fourteen Borough wards were clearly compatible with seven County Council seats, eight County seats could more conveniently be distributed among sixteen Borough wards. Sixteen ward solutions had in fact been put forward in outline by the Havant and Waterloo Constituency Labour Party and in greater detail by Mrs. I.M.T. Handscombe.

Following a discussion between officers of the Boundary Commission and officers of the Council, the Havant Council considered the possibility of a division of the Borough into sixteen three-member wards, but on 30th July, 1975 resolved that they did not favour any increase in the present number of Borough Councillors (forty-two) and did not favour a sixteen ward solution of the problem.

REPRESENTATIONS.

7. Havant Borough Council no longer supported the fourteen ward plan which it had originally put forward. However, it was unable to propound any alternative and in particular did not support any sixteen ward solution. If the Borough were to have eight County Councillors the officers saw no difficulty in allotting these to fourteen wards. The wards over the Hill, i.e., one, two, three, four and nine in the Commission's draft would have thirtyseven per cent of the Borough electorate and could be prerepresented by three County Councillors. Hayling ward with twelve per cent of the electors could have one County Councillor and the remaining seven Havant/Lmsworth wards with fifty-one per cent of the electorate could have four.

8. Hampshire County Council had resolved to review the County electoral arrangements on the basis that:

- (i) there would be no change in the number of Councillors elected to the Council and
- (ii) there would be no significant alteration in the present pattern of Electoral Divisions as between the urban and rural parts of the county.

The County Council officers had considered the 1979 projections of the numbers of electors made by the individual districts. These would give Havant an entitlement of 7.96 County Councillors. They had also made their own independent projection which would give Havant an entitlement of 7.64. In the opinion of the County Council a fourteen ward division was unlikely to be compatible with the County review. Although the County Council had made no decision all the indications were that Havant would be allotted eight members at the next review. There was no hope that the County review would be completed in time for the 1977 County elections. This meant that even if a sixteen ward system were adopted, there would inevitably be a discrepancy between the Borough and County electoral arrangements until the County Council elections in 1981.

9. Mrs. I.M.T. Handscombe supported the sixteen ward proposal which she had submitted to the Boundary Commission and which was displayed at the meeting. She felt that her scheme would accommodate Hayling Island, whether as one or two wards, whereas it was considerably over-represented in the fourteen ward scheme. As she

saw the situation, Havant and Emsworth needed the eight wards which already existed, but they should be altered in the Leigh Park area and also to export some voters from Emsworth to Havant Town and by way of adjustment to move other voters from Havant Town into the Bedhampton ward. Over the hill two additional wards were required to accommodate the increased number of electors. She accepted that it might well be possible to improve the boundaries of the wards which she proposed, but she insisted that sixteen wards were necessary.

10. Councillor Chadwick of Emsworth supported the proposal for fourteen wards. He saw the sixteen ward scheme as "nothing more than a carve-up of the Borough." He thought that the needs of the Borough should be paramount because Local Government could only be preserved by a proper representation of local communities. He pointed out that whereas it was the practice in the Borough for one Councillor from each ward to serve on every Committee, this could not obtain in the County. Accordingly, people in Havant with County Council problems tended to go to whoever of the County Councillors for the Borough served on the relevant County Council Committee, rather than to a County Councillor representing their own ward. If a sixteen ward system were forced on Havant as an administrative convenience, it would disregard local boundaries and be detrimental to the needs of the Borough.

11. County Councillor A. Slight representing the Havant Borough Constituency Labour Party read the submission dated 4th June, 1975 which his party had already made to the Boundary Commission. This supported the case for sixteen wards and found the Commission's draft fourteen ward scheme unacceptable because it gave uneven representation and with the anticipated increase in population would produce wards which were too large for proper representation by three Councillors.

12. Mr. S. Harrop of Havant, Midhurst and Petersfield Trades Council supported Councillor Slight.

X 13. Councillor R.J. Fairhead of Bedhampton who was also a member of the County Council thought there was likely to be extensive development even in the order parts of the Borough. Areas with special identities such as Bedhampton should be retained as single wards even at the expense of producing some inequality in numbers. He supported the concept of sixteen Borough wards to match up with eight County Council seats and disliked the idea of County Council representation overlapping parts of several wards. For all that he was fairly happy the proposed fourteen ward scheme.

14. Councillor Patrick Collins of Barncroft Ward said that although he was a Liberal his scheme was non-political - it was in fact the sixteen ward scheme which had been drawn up by the Officers of the Borough for discussion purposes. He adopted the scheme as his own and took responsibility for it. In his submission the scheme gave a reasonable measure of equality, gave sufficient additional Councillors to take account of the recent increases in the number of electors, would remain valid for at least ten years and, in relation to probable County electoral arrangements, was convenient for the man in the street and also eliminated unnecessary administrative work by officers. He thought that these administrative economies would largely offset the additional cost of six extra Councillors.

In his scheme it was immaterial whether Hayling was one six member or two three member wards but personally he would not wish to enforce the division of Hayling.

He thought that the fourteen ward scheme produced anomalies with too few electors in Hayling and too many in Emsworth, which the sixteen ward scheme would mitigate. He was concerned more with principles than with precise boundaries and thought it might well be desirable to alter some of the proposed wards.

15. Councillor N.S. Gordon-Rae of Waterloo Ward supported the proposed fourteen ward scheme and opposed sixteen wards. He thought the latter scheme would upset some members of the public and thought that the increases shown in the population projections might come more slowly than forecast. He pointed out that only eight members of the public were present at the meeting and doubted whether the compatibility of Borough wards and County Council seats was of any interest or relevance to members of the public.

16. Mrs. B.M. Harding representing the Havant and Bedhampton Ratepayers Association supported the fourteen ward scheme.

17. Mrs. A. Marsh of Waterlooville complained that her Ratepayers Association had been confronted with the sixteen ward proposal too late to give it any proper consideration. The first plan of the proposed wards she had seen was the one displayed at the meeting. She had never heard of Mrs. Handscombe's sixteen ward plan. She thought that the possibility of an eighth County Councillor was "pie in the air bait" to enhance the attractions of the sixteen ward scheme. This was politically motivated and prepared by the Council's Officers without authority. It provided too many Councillors - worst of all it would not be ready in time for the 1976 elections and it was vital that the under-representation of the Waterloo ward which had continued far too long should be corrected at that election. She was very satisfied with the Commission's fourteen ward scheme, but would prefer seven county councillors to eight. She considered that at present the Leigh Park area was very much over represented. She would like the proposed Stakes Hill ward to be known as Waterloo South and the proposed Waterloo Ward to be known as Waterloo North.

18. Councillor J.N. Carruthers of Lovedean, Cowplain and Waterlooville Ratepayers Association said that the over the hill area was the fastest growing area in the South of England. If no changes were made there would be an average of 8,300 electors per ward by 1979. He pointed out that following Local Government reorganisation the responsibilities of District Councillors had been reduced and a Council of forty-two members would be more than adequate for the Borough. It was the custom in Havant for one member from each ward to sit on each of the main Committees of the Council. An increase to sixteen wards would either put an end to this arrangement which had worked well or would increase the size of the Committees, which would then take longer to transact their business and be generally more expensive to run and less efficient. The opposition to the fourteen ward proposal was influenced by political considerations. He greatly favoured fourteen Wards but if there had to be sixteen wards it was essential to bring about the change in time for the 1976 elections.

19. Councillor Lt.Cdr. T.J.C. Williams R.N.(Retd.) of Purbrook Ward supported Councillor Carruthers in his preference for the fourteen ward scheme. He suggested that the name "Stakes" would be preferable for the proposed "Stakeshill" ward.

20. Mrs. M. O'Brien of Waterlooville supported the views of Mrs. Marsh. She complained that the electors over the hill had been seriously under-represented on the Council, particularly of late when several of their members had suffered long periods of illness. The voice of Waterlooville had not been heard and the area had suffered in consequence.

21. Councillor J.V. Derben of Hayling Island supported the fourteen ward proposal but was strongly of the opinion that Hayling Island should not be divided but should continue to be one six member ward. It was a tightly knit community and all the Councillors were actively involved in all aspects of the Island's affairs. To split the Island down the middle would be an artificial division which could only do harm. However if the Boundary Commission were determined to divide the Island he could not suggest any line that would be better than the one proposed.

22. Councillor A.J. Whistler of Hayling Island also representing the Hayling Island Residents Association supported Councillor Derben.

23. Councillor A.W. Morris of Hayling Island also supported Councillor Derben. He said that Hayling was one parochial community with all the local organisation operating throughout the Island. Development in any one part would affect the whole and to divide Hayling into two wards would produce divisions and disagreement where none existed at present.

24. Mr. H. Warren (Chairman) and Mr. P.J. Keen (Vice -Chairman) of Emsworth Ratepayers Association said that the Association had one thousand six hundred members with attendances of at least one hundred at their quarterly meetings. In the absence of a Parish Council their Association was the main focus of Local opinion. Interest in local affairs was keen with a forty to fifty per cent turnout at local elections. They considered that the sixteen ward proposal was a bad one and introduced for doubtful or uncertain reasons. Emsworth was a very clearly defined area cut off from Havant by a stretch of open country. They were far closer to Chichester than to Hampshire and ideally they would like to be in West Sussex. Whether or not this objective could be achieved they very much wished to keep their identity and strongly opposed the transfer of any part of Emsworth to an adjoining ward. They wished to see fewer County Councillors overall, but in any case the Borough Secretary had confirmed that it would be possible to make a sensible distribution of eight County Council seats among the fourteen Borough wards. They would far rather be under-represented on the Borough Council than divided. They wished to see the name of the Ward changed from Warblington to Emsworth.

25. Councillor Mrs. Betty Bell of Battins Ward was one of the Councillors for the Leigh Park area which would lose one ward in the proposed fourteen ward arrangement. She supported the sixteen ward proposal, and while she agreed that this might be more costly, she felt that democracy was a proper charge on the rates and that Leigh Park with its many problems needed fifteen Councillors to achieve proper representation.

26. Councillor Mrs. E.J. Robinson also of Battins Ward supported Councillor Mrs. Bell and the sixteen ward proposal. Case work was an even more important aspect of a Councillor's work than policy making, and she opposed the proposed reduction of the Leigh Park Councillors by three and the increase in the size of wards above the five thousand to five thousand five hundred electors which she thought was their right size. She thought that this loss of representation would bring about a breakdown in the local Government service in the Leigh Park area.

27. Councillor Mrs. G.V.M. Blackett of Purbrook Ward drew attention to the rapid development which was taking place in Purbrook and supported fourteen wards.

28. Councillor Mrs. M. Butler Ratepayers Party of Waterloo Ward opposed any increase in the number of Councillors which she thought would only reduce the number of useful functions available for each of them to perform. She had a very large number of electors in Waterloo but she looked after them properly and had few dissatisfied customers. She pointed out that the area of the proposed Cowplain Ward lying between London Road (A.3) and Milton Road was cut off from the rest of Cowplain by London Road and would be better included in Hartplain Ward. If sixteen wards were introduced now she was concerned that the Waterloo West ward (No.13) and Stakes Ward (No.14 on Councillor Collins' map) would currently be over-represented

because most of the 1979 projected houses had yet to be built. She supported the fourteen ward scheme and opposed the sixteen ward scheme because it was currently not necessary and had not been adequately publicised and discussed. She thought that at some time in the future sixteen wards might well be appropriate, but they should not be introduced now.

CONCLUSIONS:

29. The Borough of Havant has the same boundaries and wards as the former Havant and Waterloo Urban District Council. It is an area of very rapid growth which over the years has produced considerable electoral inequalities. There is a wide spread feeling, which seems to me to be justified, that these inequalities should be corrected in time for the 1976 municipal elections.

30. The Commission's draft fourteen ward scheme was originally devised by the Havant Borough Council but subsequently disowned by them. Disregarding for the moment Hayling Island and Emsworth, it produces a reasonably fair result immediately and an even better result on the 1979 projection. This it achieves by abolishing one of the Leigh Park wards and creating a new ward in Waterlooville.

31. The alternative to a fourteen ward scheme is a sixteen ward scheme of which there were three versions. The first was an outline proposal submitted by the Havant Borough Constituency Labour Party, the second was a more detailed scheme propounded by Mrs. I.T. Hanscombe and the third was the scheme prepared by the officers of the Council but adopted by the Liberal Party. All the advocates of sixteen wards agreed that their own scheme might well be improved and took no particular exception to the others. In view of this it seems to me that the scheme prepared by the officers which is the most detailed should be taken as the practical sixteen ward alternative to the fourteen ward scheme.

32. The sixteen ward scheme would avoid the necessity for reducing the wards in the Leigh Park area by one. It would also reduce the electoral advantage which Hayling Island would continue to receive under the fourteen ward scheme. Most important of all, in the event of Havant receiving eight County Council seats, it would enable these to be distributed very conveniently. I do not myself accept that the reduction in the number of electors per Councillor which it would bring about is necessarily an advantage. Even in the fourteen ward scheme the number of electors per Councillor is well below levels which exist in other districts without objection or difficulty.

33. On the other hand, the scheme could not reasonably be implemented without further discussion and it is far from certain that it could be completed in time for the 1976 elections. Even if it is ready then the County electoral review will not be complete in time for the 1977 County Council elections, and consequently the new wards would not harmonise with the County Council seats before 1981, by which time Havant will be almost half way to its next electoral review. I was assured that there would be no difficulty in arranging eight county seats among fourteen wards and in view of this it seems to me that the main advantage accruing from the sixteen ward scheme would be enjoyed for such a short period that in the circumstances it would be bought at too high a price. I do not consider that the additional expense of sixteen wards would be large enough to be a deciding factor.

34. Emsworth argued that it is a special case. It is a community distinctly separated from the rest of the Borough by open country and is most anxious to retain its identity, even at the expense of being under-represented. As there is common agreement here I think that this should be allowed in the fourteen ward proposals. I would, however, commend a proposal made by the Emsworth representatives that the sparsely populated

area of Warblington be included in ward No.11 and that the ward boundary be moved slightly eastwards to run along the Western backline of Selangor Avenue, then South along the drain to Conigar Point, then South to the Boundary of ward No.14.

35. If a sixteen ward scheme were adopted Emsworth would be too big and would either have to be reduced by transferring the Selangor Road/Victoria Road/Record Road area to the next ward as in the scheme I had before me, or made into two wards having less than three Councillors each. The first alternative would be very unwelcome to the residents and the second could not easily be accommodated in the long standing municipal arrangements of Havant, which provide for one member from each ward to be appointed to each of the main Committees. It would also make it more difficult to fit eight County seats to the Borough wards and thereby erode one of the principal advantages to be derived from a sixteen ward scheme.

36. Hayling Island is connected to the rest of the Borough by a single roadbridge. A strong sense of community exists and for many years the Island has been a single ward returning six Councillors. As the population of the rest of the area has gone up the representation of the Island has become increasingly generous and one would normally expect the ward boundary to be changed to take account of this. However, there appears to be no practicable way of doing this and none was suggested to me. Moreover, all the advocates of the fourteen ward scheme appeared to accept the present boundaries of the ward as immutable and the consequent disparity of numbers as incapable of correction. With sixteen wards, it was pointed out to me, this problem would disappear. The only way to remedy the situation if fourteen wards are adopted would be to reduce the representation to five members. However, it seemed to be the general feeling of the meeting that it would be better to accept this inequality rather than upset the longstanding arrangements based on three member wards.

37. The Hayling representatives laid great stress on their wish to remain a single double yoked six member ward rather than be split into two separate wards. They were able to point to many years of successful operation of this arrangement and they were fearful that the proposed division into two wards, each five miles long and in one place only one quarter mile across, would cause difficulties of representation and tend unnecessarily to set one part of the community against the other. I accept that their record is good and their fears are genuine, though possibly misplaced, and see no reason to doubt that Hayling Island could happily continue as a single six member ward. But I was unable to elicit any special circumstances which would justify a departure from the general policy of the Boundary Commission set out in paragraph 31 of Report No.6. I therefore recommend that Hayling Island be divided into two wards.

WARD NAMES:

38. Two suggestions were made relating to Ward No.4 which takes in parts of Waterlooville and Purbrook. I recommend that this ward be known as Stakes.

39. It was suggested that Leigh Park is well known as an area extending beyond the confines of the proposed ward and that, accordingly, the name might be misleading. As much of the present battings Ward will be incorporated in Ward No.7 it seems that this name is equally appropriate and I recommend that it be adopted.

40. Similarly it was represented to me without objection that it would be desirable to call ward No.11 "St. Faiths Ward" and I so recommend.

41. There was considerable support for the proposal to change the name of the existing Warblington ward to Emsworth.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

42. I recommend that the Commission adopt their draft 14 ward scheme subject to the minor amendment of the boundary between wards 11 and 12 set out in paragraph 35.

43. If the Boundary Commission prefer a sixteen ward scheme I recommend that the scheme proposed by Councillor Collins be adopted as a draft and further comments invited on it as quickly as possible.

44. I recommend that Hayling Island be divided into two wards.

45. I recommend the following ward names:

1. Hart Plain
2. Cowplain
3. Waterloo
4. Stakes
5. Barncroft
6. Warren Park.
7. Battins
8. Bondfields
9. Furbrook
10. Bedhampton
11. St. Faiths
12. Emsworth
13. Hayling West
14. Hayling East

Your obedient servant,



GORDON GUEST
Assistant Commissioner.

6 High Street,
Southampton

October 1975.

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

HART PLAIN WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of the District meets the northern boundary of No 52a Lovedean Lane; thence southwestwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of No 54a Lovedean Lane to Lovedean Lane; thence westwards along said lane to Aerial Road; thence southwestwards along said road and Milton Road to Silvester Road; thence southeastwards along said road to London Road (A.3); thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 229 London Road; thence northwestwards to and along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 8 Oakmont Drive; thence southwestwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said eastern and southern boundaries and southern and western boundaries of No 6 Oakmont Drive to the northern boundary of No 8 Queens Road; thence northwestwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundaries of Nos 24, 30, 34, 36 and 46 Queens Road to the southern boundary of Cowplain Secondary School and the Cowplain County Infants School; thence northwestwards, southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to Grid Reference SU6829510528; thence northwestwards in a straight line to the southeastern corner of No 8 Homer Close; thence westwards along the southern boundaries of Nos 8 to 10 Homer Close and No 200 Milton Road to Milton Road; thence northwards along the said road to Sunnymead Drive; thence generally southwestwards along said Drive and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of the District; thence northwestwards and following the District boundary to the point of commencement.

COWPLAIN WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Hart Plain Ward meets the northern boundary of the District; thence generally south-eastwards along said northern boundary to the proposed A3 Motorway; thence southwestwards along said proposed motorway to Park Lane; thence northwestwards along said lane to a point opposite the southern boundary of No 11 Lavant Close; thence southwestwards to and along the southern boundaries of Nos 11 to 13 Lavant Close and Nos 21 to 11 Goodwood Close to the southeastern corner of the Queen's Enclosure; thence generally southwestwards along the southern boundary of said Enclosure to London Road; thence northeastwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Hart Plain Ward; thence northwestwards and following said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

WATERLOO WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the District meets the southern boundary of Hart Plain Ward; thence northeastwards and following the southern boundaries of Hart Plain Ward and Cowplain Ward to the proposed A3 Motorway; thence southwestwards along said proposed motorway to Hulbert Road; thence generally northwestwards along said road to London Road; thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the footpath that leads from Plant Farm Cottages to Plant Farm; thence northwestwards along said footpath to the western boundary of the District; thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

STAKES WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the District meets the southern boundary of Waterloo Ward; thence eastwards and following said southern boundary to the proposed A3 Motorway; thence

southwestwards along said proposed motorway to Purbrook Way; thence westwards along said Way to Stakes Hill Road; thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the Playing Field which is situated to the north of Stakes Road; thence generally westwards to and along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of No 145 Stakes Road; thence generally northeastwards and westwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of the said property and continuing along the northern boundary of the property known as The Chase Gardens; thence southwestwards in a straight line to the rear boundary of No. 73 Kennedy Close; thence generally westwards along the rear boundaries of Nos. 73 to 1 Kennedy Close; thence southwards along the western boundaries of Nos. 1 and 2 Kennedy Close and No 105 Stakes Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 99 Stakes Road; thence generally westwards to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 99 to 85 Stakes Road and continuing generally westwards across Westbrook Grove to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 83a to 65 Stakes Road to Park Farm Road; thence northeastwards along the said road to a point opposite the rear boundary of No 63 Stakes Road; thence generally northwestwards to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 63 to 9 Stakes Road to Old Van Diemens Road; thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 7 Stakes Road; thence westwards to and along the said boundary to the western boundary of said property; thence generally northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 48 to 60 London Road; across Post Office Road and along the rear boundaries of Nos 62 to 74 London Road; thence northeastwards in a straight line to the rear boundary of No 1 Campbell Crescent; thence generally northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 9 Campbell Crescent and Deverell Hall, London Road to the footpath that leads to London Road adjacent to Deverell Hall; thence westwards along said footpath to London Road; thence northwards along said road to a

WARREN PARK WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Waterloo ward meets the eastern boundary of Cowplain ward; thence northeastwards along the said eastern boundary to the northern boundary of the District; thence southeastwards along said northern boundary to the Ride that is situated between Blendworth Common, Bell's Copse and Havant Thicket at NG Reference SU7090510772; thence southwestwards along said Ride to a point opposite the northeastern corner of Parcel No 7448 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU7009-7109 Edition of 1972; thence westwards and southeastwards to and along the eastern boundary of said parcel and in prolongation thereof to Swanmore Road; thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of the properties known as Bondsfields Cottages; thence northeastwards and southwards to and along the northern and eastern boundaries of said properties across Riders Lane to the northern boundary of No 20 Swanmore Road; thence southeastwards along said northern and rear boundaries of Nos 20 to 10 Swanmore Road and continuing generally southeastwards along the eastern and northern boundaries of Nos 8 and 9 Warsash Close, the rear boundaries of Nos 9 to 13 Warsash Close and the eastern boundary of Nos 333 and 335 Middle Park Way; thence southeastwards in a straight line across Middle Park Way to the western boundary of No 306 Middle Park Way; thence southeastwards along said western boundary and continuing in a straight line to the rear boundary of No 498 Dunsbury Way; thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 498 to 436 Dunsbury Way; thence southwestwards along the southern boundary of No 436 Dunsbury Way to Dunsbury Way; thence southeastwards along said way to Bramdean Drive; thence southwestwards along said drive to Riders Lane; thence southwards along said lane to Purbrook Way; thence eastwards along said way to the eastern tributary of the Hermitage Stream; thence southwestwards along said tributary to the eastern boundary of Barncroft Ward;

thence generally northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

BATTINS WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Warren Park ward meets the northern boundary of the District; thence generally southeastwards along said northern boundary to Petersfield Road; thence generally southwestwards along said road to New Road; thence westwards along said road to Barncroft Way; thence northwestwards along said way to the eastern boundary of Barncroft Ward; thence generally northwards along the eastern boundaries of Barncroft Ward and Warren Park Ward to the point of commencement.

BONDFIELDS WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Battins Ward meets the northern boundary of the District; thence generally southeastwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary and continuing southwestwards along the Petersfield-Havant railway to Grid Reference SU7267607100; thence northwestwards in a straight line to Crossland Drive; thence northwestwards along said drive to the eastern boundary of Battins Ward; thence northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

PURBROOK WARD

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of the District meets the southern boundary of Stakes Ward, thence generally southeastwards and eastwards along the said southern boundary to a point opposite the western boundary of Parcel No 0960 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU6807-6907 Edition of 1966; thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to Scratchface Lane; thence southeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the western boundary of Parcel No 2518; thence southwestwards along the western

boundary of Parcel Nos 2518, 0006 and 9877 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU6806-6906 Edition of 1969 to the southwestern corner of Parcel No 9877; thence in a straight line southwestwards to the southwestern corner of Parcel No 8856; thence southwards and southeastwards along the western boundaries of Parcel Nos 0950 and 0538 to the western boundary of the District; thence generally westwards and northeastwards along the said western boundary to the point of commencement.

BEDHAMPTON WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Purbrook Ward meets the southern boundary of Stakes Ward, thence generally north-eastwards and southeastwards along said southern boundary, the southern boundary of Barncroft Ward and the western boundary of Battins Ward to New Road; thence southwestwards along said road to Staunton Road; thence southwestwards along said road to the Havant to Portsmouth Railway; thence southwestwards along said railway to Jubilee Path; thence southeastwards along said path to a point opposite the western boundary of Parcel No 5624 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU 7006-7106 Edition of 1961; thence southwestwards to and along said western boundary to Hermitage Stream; thence southwestwards along said stream and Brockhampton Mill Lake to Storehouse Lake; thence generally southwards along said lake and continuing southeastwards and generally southwestwards along Broad Lake and Langstone Channel to the western boundary of the District; thence generally northwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Purbrook ward to the point of commencement.

ST FAITHS WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Battins Ward meets the southern boundary of Bondfields ward; thence eastwards and

northeastwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of Bondfields Ward to the northern boundary of the District, thence northeastwards along the said boundary to Horndean Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of parcel No 9079 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU 72/7307 edition of 1972, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the northwestern corner of said parcel, thence southeastwards in a straight line to the northeastern corner of parcel No 7944, thence generally southwards along the eastern boundary of said parcel to Southleigh Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of parcel No 0003, thence southwards to and along the said boundary to the southern boundary of parcel No 8215, thence westwards along said boundary to the drain that runs adjacent to the western boundaries of parcel nos 8700, 0081, 0064 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU 72/7306 Edition of 1964, thence southeastwards along said drain to the proposed m.27 road, thence southwestwards along said proposed road to a point being the prolongation northwards of the rear boundaries of Nos 1 to 25 Selangor Avenue, thence southwards along said prolongation and said rear boundaries to Havant Road, thence eastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of parcel No 3700 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU 72/7305 edition of 1974, thence southwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwards along the eastern boundary of parcel No 4673 to the southern boundary of said parcel, thence westwards along said boundary to the unnamed stream flowing to the tidal pond north of Conigar Point, thence generally southwards along said stream and the eastern edge of said pond, thence continuing southwards along the drain to Conigar Point, thence due southwards in a straight line to Sweare Deep, thence northwestwards along said Deep to New Cut, thence southwestwards along said Cut, Bridge Lake, and North Lake to the eastern boundary of Bedhampton Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said eastern boundary and the southern and eastern boundaries of Battins Ward to the point of commencement.

EMSWORTH WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of St Faiths Ward meets the northern boundary of the District, thence generally northeastwards and southwestwards along the northern and eastern boundaries of the District to Sweare

Deep, thence northwestwards along said Deep to the eastern boundary of St Faiths Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

HAYLING WEST WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the District meets the southern boundary of Bedhampton Ward; thence northeastwards and northwards along the southern and eastern boundaries of the said ward and continuing northeastwards along the southern boundary of St Faiths Ward to Langstone Bridge; thence southeastwards along said Bridge and Havant Road to Northney Road; thence eastwards along said road to the tract that runs to the east of the western boundary of Parcel No 2100 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plans SU7204-7304 and SU7203-7303 Editions of 1969; thence southwards along said track and continuing southwards along the footpath that leads to the property Top House, New Cut to a point where it meets the southern boundary of Parcel No 0062; thence southeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Parcel No 5843; thence southwards along said western boundary and the western boundary of Parcel No 4100 also as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU7202-7302 Edition of 1969 to the footpath that bounds the southern boundary of the said parcel; thence eastwards along said footpath to the track that leads to Northwood Farm; thence southwards along said track to the western boundary of Parcel No 5834; thence southwestwards along the western boundaries of Parcel Nos 5834, 6019, 5015 and continuing in a straight line to the eastern boundary of Parcel No 4000; thence southwestwards along said boundary and as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan SU7201-7301 Edition of 1969 to the western boundary of the property known as Albertville, Copse Lane; thence southwestwards along said boundary to Copse Lane; thence eastwards along said lane to a point opposite the western boundary of Parcel No 5483; thence southeastwards and eastwards to and along said boundary and the western and southern boundaries of Parcel Nos 5579 and 7476 to High Water; thence generally southeastwards along High Water to the western boundary of Parcel No 7349; thence southwestwards

along said boundary to High Water; thence generally northwestwards and southeastwards along High Water to the northern boundary of the Yachtbuilding Yard that is situated at the northeastern end of Mill Rythe Lane; thence westwards and southwestwards along said boundary and said lane to Havant Road; thence generally southwestwards along said road and continuing along Church Road, Elm Grove and Sea Grove Avenue and in prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of the District at Low Water; thence northwestwards and northwards along said District boundary to the point of commencement.

HAYLING EAST

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Hayling West ward meets the southern boundary of StFaiths Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said southern boundary and the southern boundary of Emsworth Ward to the eastern boundary of the District; thence generally southeastwards and westwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of the District to the eastern boundary of Hayling West ward; thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.