

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Officer Decision Record

Decision Maker:	Jonathan Woods – Countryside Strategic Manager
Date:	31 March 2025
Title:	Application for a Public Path Diversion Order – Havant Footpath 49 and Creation of Footpath rights linking Footpaths 49 to 45
Reference:	PPO 5257
Contact name:	Tara Potheary – Countryside Access Development Officer
Email:	tara.potheary@hants.gov.uk

1. The decision:

That the application should be accepted and authority given for the making of a Public Path Diversion Order under the provisions of Section 119 of the Highways Act 1980. The diversion route will have a width of 2.5 metres as shown between Points A and B on the attached plan.

That the Orders be confirmed as an unopposed Orders if no objections or representations are received, on the basis that the Council is satisfied that the relevant legal tests are satisfied; or, if objections or representations to the Orders are received that they be submitted to the Secretary of State with a request that the Orders be confirmed, subject to any additional evidence that comes to light as a result of this process.

2. Reason(s) for the decision:

The application has been made in the interests of the public, by the King Charles III England Coast Path Project Manager for Hampshire, under Sections 119 and 26 of the Highways Act 1980. The application has been prompted by a long-running closure of Footpath 49 following a seawall breach at Southmoor, which has had a significant impact on the area. The breach, which occurred in September 2020, has led to the transformation of coastal grazing marsh into mudflat and salt marsh. This area now experiences regular inundation during spring tides and storm events, making it challenging to traverse except at low tide and with appropriate footwear.

Having considered the application and supporting evidence, and having had regard to consultation responses, it is considered that there are sufficient grounds to make an Order to divert part of Havant Footpath 49 and to make an Order to create a public footpath connecting Havant Footpath 49 to Havant Footpath 45.

3. Other options considered and rejected:

N/A

4. Conflicts of interest:

None

5. Dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service:

N/A

6. Supporting information:

- Officer Report
- Location plan

Approved by:

Date: 31 March 2025

Jonathan Woods – Countryside Strategic Manager

On behalf of the Director of Universal Services

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Corporate Strategy

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

Document

Location

Application Reference: PPO 5257
Havant Borough

*Countryside Access Team
Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 8UD*

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1 Equalities Impact Assessment: N/A

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder: N/A

3. Climate Change:

How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption? N/A

How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts? N/A

Hampshire County Council declared a climate change emergency on 17 June 2019 and a Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan has since been adopted. The County Council utilises two decision-making tools to assess the carbon emissions and resilience impacts of its projects and decisions. These tools provide a clear, robust, and transparent way of assessing how projects, policies and initiatives contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets of being carbon neutral and resilient to the impacts of a 2°C temperature rise by 2050. This process ensures that climate change considerations are built into everything the Authority does.

The legislative framework for Public Path Orders does not enable the decision maker to take into account any environmental concerns relating to an application and a climate change impact assessment has therefore not been carried out in relation to this application. The Countryside Access Team strives to reduce their environmental impact wherever possible.

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Jonathan Woods <i>Countryside Strategic Manager</i>
Date:	31 March 2025
Title:	Application for a Public Path Diversion Order – Havant Footpath 49 and Creation of Footpath rights linking Footpaths 49 to 45
Reference	PPO 5257

Contact name: Tara Pothecary Countryside Access Development Officer

Email: tara.pothecary@hants.gov.uk

Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to assist the Countryside Strategic Manager in determining whether to accept an application to divert part of Havant Footpath 49 as well as the creation of public footpaths rights.

Recommendation(s)

2. That the application should be accepted and authority given for the making of a Public Path Diversion Order under the provisions of Section 119 of the Highways Act 1980. The diversion route will have a width of 2.5 metres as shown between Points A and B on the attached plan.
3. It is also proposed that an order be made to create public footpath rights under the provisions of Section 26 of the Highways Act 1980, as shown between Points B and C on the attached plan, with a 2.5 metre width. This path is currently a permissive route and part of the approved route of the King Charles III English Coastal Path.
4. That the Orders be confirmed as an unopposed Orders if no objections or representations are received, on the basis that the Council is satisfied that the relevant legal tests are satisfied; or, if objections or representations to the Orders are received that they be submitted to the Secretary of State with a request that the Orders be confirmed, subject to any additional evidence that comes to light as a result of this process.

Executive Summary

5. The application has been made in the interests of the public, by the King Charles III England Coast Path Project Manager for Hampshire, under Sections 119 and 26 of the Highways Act 1980. The application has been prompted by a long-running closure of Footpath 49 following a seawall breach at Southmoor, which has had a significant impact on the area. The breach, which occurred in

September 2020, has led to the transformation of coastal grazing marsh into mudflat and salt marsh. This area now experiences regular inundation during spring tides and storm events, making it challenging to traverse except at low tide and with appropriate footwear.

6. Having considered the application and supporting evidence, and having had regard to consultation responses, it is considered that there are sufficient grounds to make an Order to divert part of Havant Footpath 49 and to make an Order to create a public footpath connecting Havant Footpath 49 to Havant Footpath 45.

Legal framework for the decision

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 - Section 119: Diversion of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways (PART)

- (1) Where it appears to a council as respects a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway in their area (other than one that is a trunk road or a special road) that, in the interests of the owner, lessee or occupier of land crossed by the path or way or of the public, it is expedient that the line of the path or way, or part of that line, should be diverted (whether on to land of the same or] of another owner, lessee or occupier), the council may, subject to subsection (2) below, by order made by them and submitted to and confirmed by the Secretary of State, or confirmed as an unopposed order,—
 - (a) create, as from such date as may be specified in the order, any such new footpath, bridleway or restricted byway as appears to the council requisite for effecting the diversion, and
 - (b) extinguish, as from such date as may be specified in the order or determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (3) below, the public right of way over so much of the path or way as appears to the council requisite as aforesaid.

An order under this section is referred to in this Act as a “public path diversion order”.

- (2) A public path diversion order shall not alter a point of termination of the path or way—
 - (a) if that point is not on a highway, or
 - (b) (where it is on a highway) otherwise than to another point which is on the same highway, or a highway connected with it, and which is substantially as convenient to the public.
- (3) Where it appears to the council that work requires to be done to bring the new site of the footpath, bridleway or restricted byway into a fit condition for use by the public, the council shall—
 - (a) specify a date under subsection (1)(a) above, and
 - (b) provide that so much of the order as extinguishes (in accordance with subsection (1)(b) above) a public right of way is not to come into force until the local highway authority for the new path or way certify that the work has been carried out.
- (4) A right of way created by a public path diversion order may be either unconditional or (whether or not the right of way extinguished by the order was subject to limitations or conditions of any description) subject to such limitations or conditions as may be specified in the order.
- (5) Before determining to make a public path diversion order on the representations of an owner, lessee or occupier of land crossed by the path or way, the council may require him] to enter into an agreement with them to defray, or to make such contribution as may be specified in the agreement towards,—

- (a) any compensation which may become payable under section 28...as applied by section 121(2)..., or
 - (b) where the council are the highway authority for the path or way in question, any expenses which they may incur in bringing the new site of the path or way into fit condition for use for the public...
- (6) The Secretary of State shall not confirm a public path diversion order, and a council shall not confirm such an order as an unopposed order, unless he or, as the case may be, they are satisfied that the diversion to be effected by it is expedient as mentioned in subsection (1) above, and further that the path or way will not be substantially less convenient to the public in consequence of the diversion and that it is expedient to confirm the order having regard to the effect which—
- (a) the diversion would have on public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole,
 - (b) the coming into operation of the order would have as respects other land served by the existing public right of way, and
 - (c) any new public right of way created by the order would have as respects the land over which the right is so created and any land held with it,
- so, however, that for the purposes of paragraphs (b) and (c) above the Secretary of State or, as the case may be, the council shall take into account the provisions as to compensation referred to in subsection (5)(a) above.

(6A) The considerations to which—

- (a) the Secretary of State is to have regard in determining whether or not to confirm a public path diversion order, and
- (b) a council are to have regard in determining whether or not to confirm such an order as an unopposed order,

include any material provision of a rights of way improvement plan prepared by any local highway authority whose area includes land over which the order would create or extinguish a public right of way.

Section 26 Highways Act 1980

Compulsory powers for creation of footpaths [bridleways and restricted byways].

(1) Where it appears to a local authority...that there is need for a footpath [bridleway or restricted byway] over land in their area and they are satisfied that, having regard to—

(a) the extent to which the path or way would add to the convenience or enjoyment of a substantial section of the public, or to the convenience of persons resident in the area, and

(b) the effect which the creation of the path or way would have on the rights of persons interested in the land, account being taken of the provisions as to compensation contained in section 26 below, it is expedient that the path or way should be created, the authority...may by order...create a footpath [bridleway or restricted byway] over the land.

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

Section 28: Compensation for loss caused by public path creation order (PART – applied by Section 121)

- (1) Subject to the following provisions of this section, if, on a claim made in accordance with this section, it is shown that the value of an interest of a person in land is depreciated,

or that a person has suffered damage by being disturbed in his enjoyment of land, in consequence of the coming into operation of a public path creation order, the authority by whom the order was made shall pay to that person compensation equal to the amount of the depreciation or damage.

Section 29: Duty to have regard to agriculture, forestry and nature conservation (applied by Section 121)

- (1) In the exercise of their functions under this Part of this Act relating to the making of public path creation agreements and public path creation orders it shall be the duty of councils to have due regard to -
 - (a) the needs of agriculture and forestry, and
 - (b) the desirability of conserving flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features.
- (2) In this section, "agriculture" includes the breeding or keeping of horses.

Section 120: Exercise of powers of making public path extinguishment and diversion orders

- (2) The powers of making orders under sections 118 to 119D above are not exercisable by a council -
 - (a) with respect to any part of a highway which is within their area, without prior consultation with any other council in whose area that part of the highway is situated;
 - (b) with respect to any part of a highway which is outside their area, without the consent of every council in whose area it is; and
 - (c) with respect to any part of a highway in a National Park, without prior consultation with Natural England (if the National Park is in England)...

NATIONAL PARKS AND ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1949

5 National Parks

- (1) The provisions of this Part of this Act shall have effect for the purpose-
 - (a) of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas specified in the next following subsection; and
 - (b) of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of those areas by the public.

11A Duty of certain bodies and persons in relation to the purposes for which National Parks are designated

(1a) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in any National Park in England, a relevant authority other than a devolved Welsh authority must seek to further the purposes specified in section 5(1) and if it appears that there is a conflict between those purposes, must attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area comprised in the National Park.

RELEVANT CASE LAW

Hargrave & Anor v Stroud District Council (2001)

The court held that the test under Section 119(1), concerning the expediency of making an order in the interests of the landowner or the public, was a low threshold.

Young v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs & Anor (2002)

The judgment in *Young* confirmed that, in deciding whether to confirm an order under section 119, matter relating to convenience were distinct from enjoyment, and where the proposed diversion was considered expedient and not substantially less convenient, but would not be as enjoyable to the public, the Inspector must balance the interests of the applicant and the criteria set out in section 119(6) to determine whether it would be expedient to confirm the Order.

Ramblers Association v Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Weston and others (2012)

It was held that Section 119(6) contains three separate tests:

Test 1: whether the diversion is expedient in the interests of the owner, lessee or occupier of land crossed by the path or of the public.

Test 2: whether the proposed diversion is 'substantially less convenient to the public' in consequence of the diversion).

Test 3: whether it is expedient to confirm the Order having regard to the effect :

- (a) of the diversion on the public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole;
- (b) of the Order on other land served by the existing public right of way; and
- (c) of any new public right of way on the land over which it is to be created and any land held with it.

Any material provisions of a rights of way improvement plan must also be taken into account.

Open Spaces Society v Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2021)

It was argued by the OSS (the appellant) that at confirmation stage, the Inspector could only have regard to the specific matters referred to in section 119(6) of the 1980 Act and could not balance those considerations against the interests of the landowner. However, the Court of Appeal confirmed that when considering a public path diversion order, an Inspector was legally permitted to consider factors beyond those specified in section 119(6), such as privacy and/or security.

**Description of the existing and proposed diversion route and creation
(refer to the map at Appendix 1)**

7. The current alignment of Havant Footpath 49 commences at a junction with Havant Footpaths 45 and 51 (Point D on the plan) and proceeds north-eastwards across coastal grazing marsh to Point B.
8. The proposed diversion route commences at a junction with Havant Footpath 51 (Point A on the plan) and proceeds westwards, northwards, north-westwards and south-westwards along the top of the coastal grazing marsh to a junction with Point B. It will have a width of 2.5 metres.
9. The footpath to be created commences at a junction with Footpath 49 at Point B, and proceeds south-westwards to a junction with Footpath 45.

Issues to be decided

10. Before making an order under Section 119, the County Council must be satisfied that two preliminary tests are met. Firstly, the Order must be 'expedient' in the interests of either the public or the landowner (the courts have held that this is a low threshold).
11. Secondly, the termination point of the proposed diversion must either terminate at a point on the same highway, or a highway connected with it, and the resulting diversion must be substantially as convenient to the public. The termination point of a highway which does not terminate on highway may not be altered under Section 119.
12. Assuming the first two tests are met, then prior to confirmation a third test must be considered, which involves a consideration of the matters set out in Section 119(6)(a) – (c) and then a weighing of the outcome of that consideration against the outcome of the first two tests in order to reach an overall conclusion as to expediency. The expediency test is not confined to these factors, as confirmed by the Court of Appeal in *Open Spaces Society v DEFRA (2021)*, and the County Council must “...have regard to the effect of the matters specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) (and any material provision of a rights of way improvement plan) and may have regard to any other relevant matter, including if appropriate the interests of the owner or occupier of the land over which the path currently passes, or the wider public interest.” The term ‘expedient’ suggests a broad judgment is required, and it is up to the decision-maker to balance the various considerations.
13. A proposed diversion might be as convenient as the existing path, but less enjoyable to use, perhaps as a result of being less scenic. In such cases, the County Council must consider the benefit to the landowner or public against the loss of public enjoyment (along with other relevant factors) in order to determine the expediency of confirming the Order.
14. Where a proposed diversion offers enhanced public enjoyment but is significantly *less* convenient (perhaps on account of being less accessible or much longer) the Order should not be confirmed, as this would run contrary to the provisions of Section 119(6). The issue of convenience is distinct from the question of expediency (as per *Young*). It should be noted that the convenience tests cited in subsections (2) (substantially as convenient’) and (6) (not ‘substantially *less* convenient’) are different, in that the latter provides for a greater degree of inconvenience than the former.
15. In instances where the existing path is obstructed, it is the Planning Inspectorate’s view that when considering orders made under Section 119 the convenience of the existing route should be assessed as if it were unobstructed and maintained to a suitable standard for its users.
16. If an application is approved and an Order made, then the width of the diverted route, together with any limitations to use that are to be included must also be recorded. Authority for the inclusion of those particulars in the Order to change the definitive map and statement should also be given.
17. Where a Public Path Order is made, the statutory process allows for objections to be made in response to it. In these circumstances, the County Council cannot itself confirm the Order, which would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for determination. Alternatively, if upon a review of the objections it considers it

can no longer support the Order, the County Council may decide not to pursue the matter further and rescind the Order.

18. Although the tests set out in Section 119(6) are only applied at confirmation stage, given that the County Council has discretion in whether or not to make an Order, it is to take them into account when deciding whether or not to make the Order.
19. 11. Section 26 of the Highways Act 1980 allows for the creation of rights of way if the authority is satisfied that there is a need for the new path or way, having regard to the extent to which it would add to the convenience or enjoyment of the public, and any rights of persons interested in the land, taking into account the provisions for compensation set out in section 28.

Background to the Application

20. The application was submitted in November 2024 by the King Charles III England Coast Path (KCIIECP) Project Manager for Hampshire.
21. On the 6th of March 2024 the Secretary of State approved a route of the (KCIIECP) at Southmoor following the line of Footpath 49, on account of Footpath 45 having been temporarily closed since the seawall breach in 2019, which made this route unsuitable for a National Trail.
22. On progressing with the establishment phase of the KCIIECP project it became apparent to the officers involved that there was some concern from a nature conservation aspect about the installation of infrastructure (a raised boardwalk) on the line of Footpath 49. A working group made up of officers from the County Council (Rights of Way and Access and KCIIECP), Natural England (KCIIECP establishment and Nature Conservation), Coastal Partners (Environment Manager), Environment Agency, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (landowners) and Havant Borough Council (coastal engineer) was set up to assess the feasibility of options. Options identified included a diversion of Footpath 49 and a 'roll-back' of the KCIIECP to reduce the potential disturbance and damage to the SPA/SSSI/RAMSAR sites and species.
23. The roll-back of the KCIIECP has been approved by Natural England and work is progressing on the establishment of the National Trail on the proposed diverted route of the public footpath. The proposed diversion will ensure that public access will be consolidated on a single route.
24. Coastal Access rights would usually commence with the opening of the KCIIECP seaward of the route but at Southmoor, Natural England have confirmed that a restriction under either section 25a (salt marsh/mud flat and therefore land unsuitable for access) or section 26 (nature conservation) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 will be placed on the land between the line of the KCIIECP and the sea, thus prohibiting public access to this area. Educational signage to enforce these restrictions will be put in place.
25. That part of the path is closed to the public as it is impassable except at low tide and even then, the user may find it very boggy under foot. This is due to a breach of the seawall at Southmoor which has significantly impacted the area, turning what was coastal grazing marsh into mudflat and salt marsh.

Consultations

26. The following people and organisations have been consulted on this application: Havant Borough Council, The Ramblers and The Open Spaces Society. Additionally, the County Council Member for Havant Borough, Councillor Bowerman has been made aware of the application. Where responses were provided, these are set out below.

Name of consultee

27. Havant Borough Council have raised no objections to the proposal subject, they did make comments in relation to ecological impacts and appropriate measures to manage and mitigate any impacts. These may include restrictions to access by people and dogs to SPA and supporting habitat and potentially the timing of works to ensure that any noisy works are carried out outside the overwintering period for Brent Geese and Waders.

28. The Ramblers responded to say that the “*SEHants Ramblers Group are content with this diversion and creation*”.

Consideration of the legal tests

Whether it is expedient in the interests of the owners that the line of the path or way, or part of that line should be diverted

29. Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust welcomes the diversion which will mean better management of the newly created salt marsh/mud flat.

Whether the point of termination of the alternative path would be on the same highway, or a highway connected with it, and would be substantially as convenient to the public

The proposed diversion route would terminate on the same highway, Footpath 51 to the east, 153 metres north of the current terminus. The proposed creation will also provide a connection from the diverted section of Footpath 49 to Footpath 45 to the south. The net result is not considered to be substantially less convenient to the user.

The effect which the diversion would have on public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole

30. As this part of the path is not usable due to the breach, and in light of the fact there is a temporary closure of the affected section of the path, it is considered that the diversion will have a positive impact upon public enjoyment of the path as a whole.

The effect which the Order would have on land served by the existing right of way

31. This is considered to be negligible, as the path is not used to access any private property.

The effect which the Order would have on land over which the new right of way is created

32. The diversion will improve access and enhance the usability of the path and connecting routes. The diversion and creation of a new right of way will have a positive implication to the landscape and will reduce the potential disturbance and damage to the SPA/SSSI/RAMSAR sites and species.

Whether the diversion route will be substantially less convenient to the public

33. The diverted route is not considered to be less convenient to the public, which currently do not have access to the definitive line of the path. The diversion along with the creation route will provide a circular route around the salt marsh and surrounding lakes.

Whether the new path would add to the convenience and enjoyment of the public

34. It is considered that the creation of the additional link between Footpath 45 and 49 would be beneficial to the public, having regard to the sea wall breach that has affected accessibility on Footpath 45.

Conclusions

Whether it is expedient to confirm the Order

35. As part of Footpath 45 is currently closed following the sea wall breach, it is considered that the proposed diversion will provide a long-term solution, with the proposed creation also improving accessibility which will add to the public's enjoyment of the route. It is considered that the legal tests have been met.
36. In terms of whether it is expedient to make the diversion order in the first instance, it is considered that it would be in the interests of public and the landowner to divert part of Footpath 49 onto a route that will be easier to maintain and safeguard.
37. It is therefore recommended that the application is accepted, and that authority is given for the requested orders to be made under Section 26 and 119 of the Highways Act 1980.

REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Strategic Plan

This proposal does not link to the Strategic Plan but, nevertheless, requires a decision because: the County Council, in its capacity as 'surveying authority', has a legal duty to determine applications for Definitive Map Modification Orders made under s.53 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
Application Reference: PPO 5257 Havant	<i>Countryside Access Team Universal Services The Castle Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</i>

EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

1. Equality Duty

The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by or under the Act with regard to the protected characteristics as set out in section 4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (see above) and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

Hampshire County Council, in its capacity as 'surveying authority', has a legal duty to determine applications for Definitive Map Modification Orders made under s.53 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is not considered that there are any aspects of the County Council's duty under the Equality Act which will impact upon the determination of this Definitive Map Modification Order application.

3. Climate Change Impact Assessment:

Hampshire County Council declared a climate change emergency on 17 June 2019 and a Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan has since been adopted. The County Council utilises two decision-making tools to assess the carbon emissions and resilience impacts of its projects and decisions. These tools provide a clear, robust, and transparent way of assessing how projects, policies and initiatives contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets of being carbon neutral and resilient to the impacts of a 2°C temperature rise by 2050. This process ensures that climate change considerations are built into everything the Authority does.

The legislative framework for Definitive Map Modification Orders does not enable the decision maker to take into account any environmental concerns relating to an application and a climate change impact assessment has therefore not been carried out in relation to this application. The Countryside Access Team strives to reduce their environmental impact wherever possible.

471000

Location Map

Depot

315m

A

Playing Field

B

Pond

249m

318m

FB

D

NTL

Drain

th Moor

Pond

C
Groyne

Track

Path (um)

Shingle

Sand

Drain

Path (um)

Shingle Me





471000



Countryside Access Team
Universal Services, The Castle
Winchester, SO23 8UL

Diversion of part of Havant Footpath 49 and creation of a new footpath link

LEGEND 1:1,500

-  Footpath
-  Footpath to be deleted
-  Footpath to be Diverted
-  Footpath to be dedicated

© Crown copyright and database rights 2025 Ordnance Survey 100019180.
Use of this data is subject to terms and conditions. You are granted a non-exclusive, royalty free, revocable licence solely to view the Licensed Data for non-commercial purposes for the period during which HCC makes it available. You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute, sell or otherwise make available the Licensed Data to third parties in any form. Third party rights to enforce the terms of this licence shall be reserved to Ordnance Survey

105000

105000