



COMMONS REGISTRATION ACT 1965

Reference Nos 214/D/158-160

In the Matter of Bed of River Test
from north of the Railway Viaduct to
High Water Mark, in Eling & Totton
Parish and in Nursling and Rowhams
Parish, New Forest District, Hampshire

DECISION

These three disputes relate to the registration at Entry No 1 in the Land Section of Register Unit No VG200 in the Register of Town or Village Greens maintained by the Hampshire County Council are occasioned by Objection No OB 299 made by Mr Ronald Scott Laurence Bowker, Mr Eric Nelson Knowles and Mr Richard Henn Collins and noted in the Register on 5 November 1970, by Objection No OB 307 made by the New Forest Rural District Council and noted in the Register on 25 November 1970, and by Objection No OB 647 made by British Railways Board and noted in the Register on 4 January 1972.

I held a hearing for the purpose of inquiring into the disputes at Winchester on 21 and 22 March 1979. At the hearing (1) Mr Norman William Humphris on whose application the registration was made, attended in person; (2) Mr R S L Bowker, Mr E N Knowles and Mr R Henn Collins (the Objectors) and Mr Godfrey Nelson Knowles of 31 Southgate Street, Winchester (since the objection he has become a trustee in the place of Mr E N Knowles) were all represented by Mr W R Stewart-Smith of Counsel on the instructions of Faithful & Bowker, Solicitors of Winchester; (3) New Forest District Council (as successors of the said RDC) were represented by Mr F W N Slinger their Chief Assistant Solicitor; and (4) British Railways Board were represented by Mr D Ransome, chief draftsman in the office of the Estate Surveyor and Manager of their Southern Region Property Board.

In the 1965 Act "land" is defined as including land covered by water, see section 22(1). The land ("the Unit Land") in this Register Unit is so covered and comprises (perhaps a little more or less) the bed of the River Test from north of the Viaduct, which at or near the River mouth carries the railway from Southampton to Brockenhurst and beyond, up to the High Water Mark of Medium Tides ("HWMMT"). The Unit Land therefore includes; the water area between the said Viaduct and the Bridge (the New Bridges: recently rebuilt and realigned) which carries the A35 road over the River; the water area between the New Bridge and the old bridge ("the Red Bridge, at one time used by vehicles, but now terminating near the east bank of the River) a little to the north; the comparatively very large water area "the Open Water Area" extending (if some islands be neglected) for about $\frac{1}{3}$ of a mile north of the Red Bridge; the two main streams ("the East Stream" and "the West Stream") which join the Open Area at its northeast and northwest corners; and numerous smaller water areas (creeks) which extend up to HWMMT and are situated between the East Stream and West Stream. The Unit Land does or may include banks and lands surrounded by the said water areas (low lying and liable to flood) and other water areas (eg those west of and off the Open Area). Exceptionally the Unit Land does not include the land ("the VG4 Land") covered by water which is east of the middle line of the East Stream extending from the Viaduct to a point about $\frac{1}{2}$ a mile due north of it; this VG4 Land is the part of the River bed in the city of Southampton and includes some nearby land on the east between the River and the railway to Salisbury.



The grounds of Objection No OB 647 (British Railways) are: "The land shown by red verge on plan No 58451, forming part of the operational land of the railway, was not village green at the date of registration"; the said plan shows a strip nowhere more than about 10 yds wide north of and adjoining the viaduct. Mr Humphris said that he agreed that the objection should succeed. Nobody at the hearing was suggesting otherwise, I said that whatever might be the result the other disputes, my decision would be that the land shown on this plan would be removed from the register; it was thereupon agreed that Mr Ransome was no longer concerned with these proceedings.

The grounds of Objection No OB 399 (Bowker, Knowles and Henn Collins) are "The land contained in the above mentioned Register unit which is in our ownership and is edged coloured green on the plan annexed was not a Town or Village Green at the date of registration"; this plan shows all the Unit Land except some of that south of the Red Bridge. The grounds of Objection No OB 307 are: the land was not Town or Village Green at the date of Registration because (in effect) it was not within the words of the below quoted definition in the 1965 Act.

At the beginning of the hearing Mr Humphris applied for an adjournment on the grounds that the Unit Land and the VG4 Land ought to be dealt with at the same time; I refused this application.

In support of the registration oral evidence was given by Mr Humphris, Dr L V Velecky and Mr M Roberts, in the course of which were produced the documents specified in Parts I and II of the Schedule hereto; the statement (NWH/4) and letter (NWH/5) were put in as written evidence by Mr and Mrs Hunt and Mr A R Smith. Against the registration oral evidence was given by Mr L Kirby, Mr R S L Bowker, Mr D Paterson, Mr R Henn Collins, Mr J W Potter and Mr V F Foot, in the course of which were produced documents specified in Part III of the Schedule hereto; the 1960 declarations (RSB/6 and 7) were put in as written evidence by Mr L C Cawke and Mr K B Potter (both now deceased). On the day after the hearing I inspected the Unit Land accompanied by Mr C Gwynne Evans who is the Estate Manager of the Individual Objectors ("The Barker Mill Trustees") and by Mr Humphris.

I have since the hearing looked at the papers of the Commons Commissioners relating to the VG4 Land. The registration was made on the application of Mr Humphris; the only dispute relating to it, is occasioned by Objection No 4 made by Mr Bowker, Mr E N Knowles and Mr Henn Collins and the grounds are the same as those of Objection No 299. Formally the proceedings are the same except that under the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971, the City of Southampton Council are in relation to the VG4 Land entitled to be heard instead of the Parish Council of Eling and Totton (they being the Councils concerned with the Unit Land). In his letter (LCV/1) to Dr Velecky, the City Solicitor said: "The Council have resolved to support Mr Humphris in his claim. I know that some Councillors remember swimming in the Test at this point in their youth. When the case is to be heard I expect the council will instruct me to publish advertisements requesting evidence from the members of the public in Southampton ...". The possibility that as a result of action by the City Council there may be more evidence about the River Test at the VG4 hearing than was given at the hearing before me, is not in my opinion a sufficient reason for my deferring my decision about the Unit Land. The circumstance that a decision in relation to the Unit Land as between Mr Humphris and the Barker-Mill Trustees may prejudice some of the questions which will necessarily arise in relation to the VG4 Land is not enough; the City Council will not be adversely affected by these



proceedings or by any decision I give in relation to the Unit Land, because they can under VG4 proceeding call other evidence, or appeal against any matter of law dealt with in this decision.

Mr Humphris who has been concerned with operations known as "Canute" and "Blue Belt", and who in this matter is supported by Dr Velecky as Secretary since 1974 of the Southampton Commons and Parks Protection Society, when opening his case said that if all the objectors were agreed that over the tidal waters covered by this registration, there is a right of public navigation, the right to fish from boats, and the right to swim, he would withdraw his application. The evidence given by Mr Humphris and those who supported him was consistent with these opening words as identifying the activities with which I need be concerned. But I am only concerned with these activities so far as they can bring the Unit Land within the definition of a town or village green in Section 22 of the 1965 Act, of which the relevant words are: "land ... on which the inhabitants of any locality have a customary right to indulge in lawful sports or pastimes or on which the inhabitants of any locality have indulged in such sports and pastimes as of right for not less than 20 years". I am not concerned with the right of public navigation as such; but I accept that boating for pleasure is a sport or pastime within the above quoted definition.

The only pleasure boating (otherwise than for fishing) mentioned by Mr Humphris was in canoes; with which he included light inflatable boats and small sailing boats with a moveable mast (other sailing boats could not get under the Railway Viaduct). Mr Hunt (confirmed by Mrs Hunt) said (in effect):- from 1946 to 1952 he owned a boat (11 ft dinghy) which he moored and used for pleasure; it was one of about 18 similarly moored and used; some of these remained in use and similarly moored until the late 1950s and possibly a little later. Mr A R Smith mentioned seeing people boating whilst he was swimming near the Red Bridge. Mr Humphris said that he had during the evening of 2 July 1964 taken a canoe over the Unit Land and explored the creeks but with no intention of exploring above the tidal limits. Dr Velecky had seen people boating. Mr Roberts (born in 1938) who as below mentioned spoke more about swimming had seen "a few canoes"; the boats he remembered were moored between the Red Bridge and the New Bridge "they stopped there because they could go to the pub and have a beer".

During my inspection, Mr Humphris pointed out to me the various places where it would be possible for members of the public to launch boats such as he had described. Although as mentioned below there was evidence against there ever having been any boats in any significant numbers (apart from those used on behalf of the owners or their tenants for cutting reeds etc) and although it would often have been dangerous for boats to have been anywhere near the Red Bridge (the stream and tide are so fast), from its obvious attraction for small boats and from the information put before me I infer that at all relevant times the Unit Land has been used by members of the public for boating for pleasure to some extent. So ~~whether the extent of such use and the circumstances were such that I can properly conclude the use was such as to bring the Unit Land within the above quoted definition.~~ whether the extent of such use and the circumstances were such that I can properly conclude the use was such as to bring the Unit Land within the above quoted definition. No documents in support of the existence of the right were produced. At common law 20 years use as of right is prima facie evidence of a customary right having existed from time immemorial, so I need not in this decision deal separately with the two branches of the definition above quoted. The substantial question in these proceedings is therefore whether the said use was "as of right" within the legal meaning of these words.

must be relevant



The only particularised ground of objection is that the Unit Land is in "our ownership" (ie of the Barker-Mill Trustees). I need not bother about the comparatively very small area between the Red Bridge and the Viaduct for which there is no ownership claim; no-one suggested that this area has any significance. Unless the contrary is proved the Unit Land being tidal is presumed to be in the ownership of the Crown, but this presumption may be rebutted; see Halsbury Laws of England (1962) Volume 39 paragraphs 509 and 559.

The title of the Barker-Mill Trustees is by the documents specified in Part III of the Schedule regularly deduced. The Unit Land is in the documents of 1926, 1945, 1965 expressed to be conveyed under various parcel numbers as "(part of) River Test (Tidal)" or "Spear Beds". The Unit Land is included in the lands delineated on the plans.

The Barker-Mill Estate of which the Unit Land is part contains (according to the 1965 conveyance) altogether about 1,387 acres. The owners (or their tenants) have used the Unit Land for fishing; for this purpose it and the non-tidal part of the river in their ownership has been treated as two fisheries; the east part ("the Nursling Fishery", so called by Mr Potter) which includes the East Stream the greater part of the Open Area down to the Red Bridge and most of the creeks up to but not including the West Stream; the West Part ("Great Testwood Fishery" named after the nearby house so called) comprises the West Stream and the remainder of the Open Area. The Nursling Fishery has been included in the Estate owned by the Barton-Mill family for many years (the 1926 deed refers to a settlement of 1860) of which Mr P C V Barker-Mill became owner in 1931 as successor of Mrs M V Barker-Mill. The Nursling Fishery was let to Mr J W Potter in 1915 to his death in 1913, then to his son Mr K B Potter who died in 1962/63 and then to his son Mr K W Potter (the witness, born in 1935).

In the 1966 letter (RSLB/5) the Crown Estate Office say that the Crown Commissioners agree that the presumption that the Crown is the owner of the area shown by pink colour on the enclosed plan must be regarded as having been rebutted; the enclosed plan includes all the Unit Land.

Mr Potter said he could remember catching his first salmon when he was 10 years old; he regularly fished every Saturday during the season (17 January to 2 October). Mr Henn Collin said generally that the Great Testwood Fishery although in hand at present, had been let and described how he had fished in both Fisheries. Mr Potter mentioned he had the shooting rights "duck and wild fowl generally, ~~with~~ and ~~the~~ an odd escaped pheasant".

I find that the Barker-Mill Trustees are now and they and their predecessors in title in accordance with the documents produced have for many years been by themselves or their tenants in possession of the Unit Land and that such possession extends not only to the part most agreeable for fishing and to the parts of which they have cleared the reeds, but also, the Open Area (notwithstanding its more public appearance and easier accessibility to the public) right up to the Red Bridge. As to any questions with which I am concerned (except those hereinafter particularly mentioned) I consider that the Nursling Fishery and Great Testwood Fishery may be treated as one. I conclude that the Barker Mill Trustees are the owners of all the Unit Land (with the possible insignificant exception of part of that south of the Red Bridge) and that any presumption there may be of Crown ownership has been rebutted.



The circumstance that they are the owners does not of itself show that the Unit Land is not or could not be subject to a customary recreational right. But the circumstance that the Unit Land has been expressed to be conveyed without reference to any such right and that the owners or their tenants have done things inconsistent with its existence is some evidence against the existence of any such customary right and in particular against any use relied on being "as of right".

Mr Potter said that he employed two keepers who were instructed to keep canoes off the water; his own personal recollection of boats was that they were there very seldom; he had never seen boats moored as described by Mr and Mrs Hunt. In the course of this evidence Mr Humphris made it clear that I should understand any reference in his evidence to moorings as meaning that the chain attached to the bows of the boat had its other end secured to the bank (not to an anchored floating buoy in the stream away from the bank). Mr Foot who had been employed by the Potters as keeper since 1942 (except for 3 years in the Army 1945-48) said that he had seen boats on and off during the last 10 or 20 years, not regularly, only on odd occasions and had warned them off as had his predecessor and uncle Mr Cawte.

Mr Kirby who is a fishery bailiff employed by the Southern Water Authority and has been concerned with the River Test since the autumn of 1977 and Mr Paterson who is the Area Fisheries Inspector with the Hampshire Division of the Southern Water Authority since January 1976 explained what they did to prevent people taking salmon and sea trout illegally, contrary to the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975; he instanced as illegal fishing (an offence under the Act) the use of large weighted triple hooks to foul hook salmon.

Much of the evidence briefly summarised above was directed to recent events and must I think therefore to some extent be irrelevant because I am primarily concerned with the years before 1965 Act came into force and not with happenings (except so far as they can be related back) after July 1970 when the registration was made; and I infer from the apparently recent developments in Totton, Eling and Redbridge which I saw during my inspection that poaching and illegal fishing in this area has since 1970 been a more troublesome matter than formerly. Nevertheless at all relevant times, pleasure boats however innocent those in them may be are a menace to fish and fishing because no-one from a distance can tell for certain (although an experienced person such as Mr Paterson might have a very good idea) whether those in the boat may not intend to catch salmon illegally and/or contrary to the rights of the Fishery owners. So even after making all allowances for changes which have occurred since 1965, I consider that I can and should give full weight to the 1960 declaration of Mr Cawte that from 1900 onwards he has "always turned away anyone ... boating ... in any part of the said River ..." (meaning the Nursling Fishery), and from it conclude that boats have at all relevant times been turned away from all the Unit Land.

Mr Humphris drew attention both at the hearing and during my inspection to the possibility of boating, particularly from the following places which he pointed out; (1) Bells Crossing; (2) Bone Mill Crossing; (3) through a gate across the railway nearly opposite Mr Hunts house (25 Test Lane); (4) The slipway nearly opposite the public house on the east side of the River a little to the north of the New Bridge approachable by a small tunnel about 10 ft wide and 5 ft high under the Salisbury railway; (5) the gently sloping bank of West Stream near a bridge about 250 yds along the private road which starts near the Salmon Leap Public House; (6) at or near the iron bridge not far from the sluices and open area of water higher up the West Stream



and near Testwood Fishing Lodge; (7) the abutments of and the slopes near the Red Bridge; and (8) from under the Railway Viaduct (the boats having been put in the sea somewhere on the south).

I understood from Mr Humphris that access (3) was that referred to by Mr and Mrs Hunt in their statement; when I saw it such access was practically impossible because of a wire mesh fence (apparently erected by British Rail to protect the railway) of a very substantial kind. While I agree with Mr Humphris that the other access points are and always have been possible for a healthy young man (two would be needed for some) none of them except possibly (5) could be regarded as inviting except for the experienced, and (7) and (8) would I think in many states of the tide and River be dangerous. (5) and (6) are off a private road and are uninviting for this reason. It may be that some of those who put a boat on the Unit Land from these points, particularly (8) would not be conscious of doing anything wrong; as explained in *Beckett v Lyons* 1967 1 Ch 449 this is not enough to make their acts "as of right".

Under the 1965 Act any use relied on must be as of right for "the inhabitants of a locality". Although in relation to swimming it might be possible in some way to define the immediate neighbourhood as a "locality", in my opinion in relation to boating, on the use relied on by Mr Humphris no such definition is possible in a way allowable by law. In the absence of any convenient boat park at any of the access points, except possibly for (3) before the fence, all such boats would have to be brought on top of, or by trailer behind, a motor car; or rowed or sailed up from Southampton Water; and these boats might have come from anywhere. At one stage Mr Humphris suggested the area of the District Council as a possible "locality"; a customary right associated with such a large area would be unreasonable and not recognised by law.

I can therefore attach no importance to the evidence of Dr Velecky and Mr Humphris that they had seen boats on the Unit Land. Mr Humphris was the only person at the hearing who had recreationally been in a boat on the Unit Land (the 1964 occasion when he had been warned off by Mr Foot and had never attempted to go there again). As regards access (3) it would be possible to moor (in the sense above stated) as described by Mr and Mrs Hunt because there is a bank there between the railway and the water; but from their statement I have no clear idea as to how the boats described were used and it may be they were taken under the Viaduct and out to Southampton Water not on the Unit Land either at all or to any appreciable extent. The present obstruction to this access by the said railway fence is inconsistent with such access ever forming any part of a recreational right; although this fence may have been erected after 1959, if the right had existed in respect of any locality which included the bank, there would have been some protest when the fence was erected and of this there was no evidence given. Further the bank itself is (as appears from the said documents of title) within the ownership of the Barton-Mill Trustees. Whatever may have been the reason for Mr and Mrs Hunt's inability to give evidence before me, ~~they~~ looked ~~and~~ at access (3) and viewed it when standing on the Red Bridge, I am not prepared in their absence to give their statement any weight against what I regard as the probability of the situation.

For the above reasons I am of the opinion there is no recreational right on the Unit Land for pleasure boating.

As regards fishing from boats, I did not understand Mr Humphris to contend that there was a recreational right to fish for salmon or sea trout; in his questions to witnesses he mentioned only mullet and flat fish. The considerations against any such right are far stronger than those above discussed in relation to pleasure boating without any intention of fishing. I need only say that I find no such right exists.



Pleasure boating and fishing from boats are the only recreational uses of the Unit Land which could sensibly be described to the entirety. On appearance alone I am against any right for the inhabitants of any locality to swim over all the Unit Land. But because I accept that swimming is a sport and pastime within the above quoted 1965 Act definition, and because I could I suppose confirm the registration so far as it relates only to the swimming areas, I will deal with the swimming claim about which there was evidence.

Mr Humphris during my inspection suggested that swimming was most likely at the said access points (1) to (7). The temptation for any person (particularly a young person on a hot day) to swim at all or any of these points is obvious; once in the water (particularly around the Red Bridge) there are various possibilities; mention was made that swimmers sometimes swam onto a bank (Nine Elms Bank) on which there used at one time to be elm trees and which would be an attractive place (generally quite inaccessible) on which to lie in the sun on a summer day. Mr Cawte in his 1960 declaration said he always turned away anyone found ... bathing in any part of the said river ...". Mr Foot indicated that although he did this whenever the swimmers interfered with the fishing there were occasions when he did not bother. Some bathers at some places and on some occasions would not interfere with the fishing and no useful purpose would be served by attempting to stop them. This sort of activity for the reasons given in Beckett/Lyons:supra provide no evidence of the existence of a customary or other right as now claimed.

In my opinion the present appearance of the access points stated by Mr Humphris is strongly against the existence of any customary right of swimming. There is nothing on or near the Red Bridge (7) from which there is access to the Open Water Area arranged for swimming; although an approach on foot is possible and many venturesome young people would be happy to make an attempt, the structure of the bridge and the present appearance of the surrounding land is inconsistent with a right of bathing for the inhabitants of any locality (however defined) having existed there from time immemorial. Access (4) is inappropriate. Access (3) (as above stated) is fenced off and my observations in relation to boats are equally applicable to swimming. Access (1) and (2) although attractive to a person who knew about them and who could get near there in a motor car or on a bicycle could not be sensibly associated with any locality. Access (5) and (6) are off a private road. There was no evidence that any of the bathing described was organised or in any way regular; the access points are apparently quite unadapted for bathing. In my view the evidence as regards bathing falls far short of establishing a customary recreational right of bathing in any water anywhere near these points.

From the considerations set out above, I refuse to confirm the registration.

Mr Stewart-Smith asked for costs. In my opinion Mr Humphris is not at risk merely by making a registration. I have not overlooked that his 1964 letter was answered by Mr Henn Collins when he verbally told Mr Humphris that in his view the Unit Land was private land; the circumstance that the land is privately owned is not necessarily inconsistent with it being a town or village green properly registrable as such. The 1965 Act and the Regulations made under it contemplate I think that there shall, after a registration and an objection to it, be a discussion period during which the persons concerned may exchange views; while it may be that the Barton-Mill Trustees concluded that any discussion was unlikely to be productive, there was no evidence that it was ever brought to the attention of Mr Humphris that the Trustees would be involved in trouble and expense such as was taken for or on their behalf at the hearing. By reason of the registration and objection, a hearing of some kind was unavoidable; Mr Humphris himself did nothing at the hearing to prolong it unduly. On these considerations I do not think it fit to make any order as to costs.



However, in view of there being a possibility of another inquiry in relation to the VG4 Land, I record that it does not necessarily follow that I or any other Commissioner dealing with such Land will treat my above decision as to costs as applicable to such sharing. Accordingly those who are or may be concerned with such a hearing and are as such concerned to make or resist a cost claim should bear in mind that except in the circumstances in which provision is made by regulation 31 of the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971, a hearing of some kind is unavoidable; they should therefore consider such regulation carefully.

I am required by regulation 30(1) of the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971 to explain that a person aggrieved by this decision as being erroneous in point of law may, within 6 weeks from the date on which notice of the decision is sent to him, require me to state a case for the decision of the High Court.

SCHEDULE

(documents produced)

Part I: by Mr Humphris

NWH/1		OS map (1/10,560) showing tidal water coloured red.
NWH/2	1974	OS Map (1/50,000): Sheet 196: The Solent.
NWH/3	5 July 1964	Copy letter from Mr Humphris to Mr R Henn-Collins care of Rawlence and Squarey.
NWH/4	21 March 1979	Statement signed by Mr Nicol Wallace-Hunt of Tide Ways, 25 Test Lane, Redbridge, with supplemental statement by Mrs Lilia Frances Hunt.
NWH/5	21 March 1979	Letter to Mr Humphris from Mr Alan Reginald Smith of 37 Compton Road, Totton.
	May 1967	Guide to Canoeing in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire, Oxfordshire, Isle of Wight, compiled and produced by Central Council of Physical Recreation (Southern Region) Reading.
	12 August 1973	Marine Planning and Management - the next few steps; from Hydrographic Journal by Norman Humphris FRICS MIOB, Honorary Secretary of Operation Canute.
	7 March 1975	Operation Canute - an outline of the first ten years: from Surveyor, by Norman Humphris FRICS MIOB.

Part II: by Dr Velecky

LCV/1	21 September 1976	Letter from Southampton City Secretary to Dr Velecky.
-------	-------------------	---



Part III: by Mr R S L Bowker

- RSLB/1 27 March 1965 Conveyance by Mr P C V Barker-Mill (as Settlor) to Messrs R S L Bowker, E N Knowles and R Henn Collins of the Mill Estate and of the remaining parts of the Great Testwood Estate and of the lands purchased by the Settlor from the Compton Estate, all containing 1,387 a. 2r.4p delineated on plans annexed and described in the Schedule.
- RSCB/2 18 January 1937 Conveyance by Mrs M J Maitland-Hart to Mr P C V Barker-Mill.
- RSLB/3 31 July 1926 Vesting deed by Rev C T Edwards and Mrs W B Simonds in favour of Mrs Marianne Vaudrey Barker-Mill made pursuant to a settlement of 10 October 1860.
- RSLB/4 OS map; tidal water coloured blue.
- RSLB/5 20 September 1966 Letter from Crown Estate Officer to Rawlence & Squarey having annexed OS map (1/2.500) showing tidal waters coloured pink.
- RSLB/6 10 June 1960 Statutory declaration by Mr L C Cawte.
- RSLB/7 10 May 1960 Statutory declaration by Mr K B Potter.
- 21 April 1931 Conveyance by Mrs M V Barker-Mill to Mr P V C Barker-Mill of the land in the said Vesting Deed of 31 July 1926.
- 18 January 1932 Subsidiary vesting deed in favour of Mr P C V Barker-Mill of the land known as Testwood Park as described in 1st Schedule.
- 18 November 1935 Deed of discharge relating to the settled land comprised in the vesting deed of 31 July 1926 and 18 January 1932.
- 25 January 1945 Conveyance by Messrs V L Compton and C D Webb as Trustees of the will of H F Compton who died 11 April 1943 to Mr P C V Barker-Mill of land adjacent to Redbridge causeway containing 45a 2r 25p.
- 22 February 1973 Appointment of Mr G N Knowles as a trustee in the place of Mr E N Knowles who retired.



Part IV: by Mr Slinger

DC/1 30 November 1970

Map showing site of Special Scientific Interest notified under Section 23 of National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (Lower Test Valley).

DC/2

Totton District Plan: see page 39 paragraphs 8.30 et seq, particularly paragraph 8.35.

Dated this 10th day of August 1979.

a. a. Boden Fuller

Commons Commissioner