

Notice of Meeting

Council

A Meeting of the Test Valley Borough Council will be held on

Date: Wednesday, 05 September 2018

Time: 16:00

Venue: Crosfield Hall, Broadwater Road, Romsey, Hampshire, SO51 8GL

when your attendance is required to consider the business set out in the agenda.



Head of Legal and Democratic Services

For further information or enquiries please contact:

Caroline Lovelock - **01264 368014**

email clovelock@testvalley.gov.uk

Legal and Democratic Service

Test Valley Borough Council,

Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,

Andover, Hampshire,

SP10 3AJ

www.testvalley.gov.uk

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEME

If members of the public wish to address the meeting they should notify the Legal and Democratic Service at the Council's Beech Hurst office by noon on the working day before the meeting.

Council

Wednesday, 05 September 2018

AGENDA

- 1 Prayers
- 2 Apologies
- 3 Public Participation
- 4 Declarations of Interest
- 5 To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 27 June and 7 August 2018
- 6 Mayor's Announcements
- 7 To receive and adopt Committee reports 3 - 4
To receive and, where necessary, adopt reports of Committees
- 8 Questions on resolved items - Rule 11.1
- 9 Questions under Rule 11.2
- 10 Notice of Motion - Rule 12
- 11 Community Governance Review Consultation Petition
This petition relates to Issue SCR 62-63 in Annex 1 to the Community Governance Report
- 12 Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review - Final Recommendations 5 - 172
To agree final recommendations for the Community Governance Review.

ITEM 7 To receive and, where necessary, adopt the following reports of Committees:

To receive and, where necessary, adopt the following reports of Committees:

(Some reports may involve the disclosure of exempt information. If the Council wishes to debate them, for each individual case the Council will need to adopt a suitable motion).

7.1 To receive the minutes of the following meetings:

- 7.1.1 Planning Control Committee – 12 June 2018
- 7.1.2 General Purposes Committee – 20 June 2018
- 7.1.3 Cabinet – 20 June 2018
- 7.1.4 Northern Area Planning Committee – 21 June 2018
- 7.1.5 Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 25 June 2018
- 7.1.6 Southern Area Planning Committee – 26 June 2018
- 7.1.7 Northern Area Planning Committee – 12 July 2018
- 7.1.8 Southern Area Planning Committee – 17 July 2018
- 7.1.9 Cabinet – 18 July 2018
- 7.1.10 Southern Area Planning Committee – 19 July 2018
- 7.1.11 Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 25 July 2018
- 7.1.12 General Purposes Committee – 30 July 2018
- 7.1.13 Southern Area Planning Committee – 7 August 2018
- 7.1.14 Cabinet – 9 August 2018
- 7.1.15 Northern Area Planning Committee – 23 August 2018
- 7.1.16 Southern Area Planning Committee – 28 August 2018

(Note: in relation to 7.1.15 and 7.1.16 these minutes are not included in the minute book and will be presented at the next Council meeting but members are able to ask questions on resolved items.)

7.2 **To adopt recommendations from the following:**

7.2.1 Northern Area Planning Committee – 23 August 2018

Recommendations to follow (if any)

7.2.2 Southern Area Planning Committee – 28 August 2018

Recommendations to follow (if any)

ITEM 12

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Report of the Corporate Portfolio Holder

Recommended:

- 1. That the proposals set out in Annex 1 to the report be adopted by the Council as Final Recommendations for the purposes of the Community Governance Review.**
- 2. That, save as set out in the Final Recommendations, the existing parishes in Test Valley Borough, and the names, boundaries, council size, groupings and other parish governance arrangements in respect of those parishes, remain unchanged.**
- 3. That the Final Recommendations be published and arrangements be made by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to inform those persons who may have an interest in them.**
- 4. That the consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) be sought in respect of those Final Recommendations where required before a reorganisation order is made.**
- 5. That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive to decide, in respect of those Final Recommendations where such consent is not required, the extent to which such Final Recommendations are to be given effect.**
- 6. (a) That, following receipt of the necessary LGBCE consents, delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive to give effect to those Final Recommendations to which such consents relate.**
(b) That, in the event that any necessary LGBCE consent is not given, delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive (in consultation with the Community Governance Review Members' Group) to decide the extent to which the affected Final Recommendations are to be given effect.
- 7. That following the decisions in 5 and 6 above, details of those decisions and the reasons for them be published and arrangements be made by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to inform those persons who may have an interest in the review of the decisions and the reasons for the decisions.**
- 8. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be given delegated authority to prepare and make an order under Section 86 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007**

SUMMARY:

- In November 2017 Council approved the Terms of Reference for a Borough-wide Community Governance Review, to examine existing parish governance arrangements and make Final Recommendations for any appropriate changes.
- Following a First Consultation Stage, Draft Recommendations were agreed by full Council on 26 April 2018 and published for further consultation.
- 39 respondents made representations at this Second Consultation Stage. These representations have been reviewed and Final Recommendations agreed by the Community Governance Review Members Group. Annex 1 to the Report summarises the Issues which have been identified under the Review and sets out proposals for Final Recommendations arising from these.
- The next stage is for full Council to consider the proposals and approve Final Recommendations, which must then be published. In certain cases, the Consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England will be required.
- Once Consent has been obtained, a final decision is then required on the extent to which the Final Recommendations are to be given effect. It is recommended that this final decision be delegated to the Chief Executive (in consultation with the Members' Group (where any necessary Consent is not obtained), after which a formal Reorganisation Order will be made.
- It is planned that any Reorganisation Order will be in force for 1 April 2019, with elections to parish councils taking place in May 2019.
- This report and its annexes follow a similar format to the Draft Recommendations documents considered by full Council on 26 April 2018.
- Annex 2 sets out the various stages which will be undertaken during the Community Governance Review.
- Annex 3 is a glossary of terms which are used (Capitalised) throughout this Report.

1 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Following the review of Test Valley Borough in 2017 carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), the boundaries and names of the Council's Borough Wards were amended. The formal Order giving effect to the changes was made on 15 January 2018, although the changes will only come into force at the May 2019 election.

The changes made by the LGBCE and the Order lead to a number of anomalies between these new ward boundaries and the existing boundaries of parishes. At its meeting of 8 November 2017, full Council agreed to carry out a Community Governance Review (CGR) to consider what changes (if any) should be made to parish arrangements (including boundaries, parish councils, and electoral arrangements) within the Borough.

- 1.2 A First Consultation Process was carried out between November 2017 and January 2018, with the results being considered by the Community Governance Review Members’ Group. The Group proposed a series of Draft Recommendations for changes, which were considered and agreed at full Council on 26 April 2018.
- 1.3 Following that decision, the Draft recommendations were published and a Second Consultation Stage was held, ending on 6 July 2018.
- 1.4 The representations received have been reviewed and considered by the Community Governance Review Members Group, which met on 26 July. As per the last report, Annex 1 summarises all the Issues which have been identified under the Review, the representations received in respect of each Issue (at both First and Second Consultation Stages), the observations of the Community Governance Review Members Group which has considered these Issues, Electoral Arrangement Issues, and proposals for Final Recommendations arising from these.
- 1.5 The next stage is for full Council to consider the proposals and approve Final Recommendations, which must then be published, and brought to the attention of persons who may be interests in the Final Recommendations. The publication of these Final Recommendations will conclude the CGR.
- 1.6 However, it is not enough for the Council to simply adopt a set of Final Recommendations. The legislation requires the Council to take a second, separate, decision as to the extent to which the Final Recommendations are given effect. This second decision will take into account the need for Consent for some Final Recommendations (as such recommendations can only be implemented if that Consent is obtained). It is proposed that this decision to give effect to the Final Recommendations is delegated to the Chief Executive, on the basis that that authority will be exercised (so far as is possible) in line with full Council’s views.
- 1.7 The decision to give effect to the Final Recommendations is then implemented by the Council making a formal Reorganisation Order, setting out the changes to be made and the date they will take effect.
- 1.8 The table below sets out the various decisions and documents which are necessary to conclude the Review and implement its proposals:-

Decision	Decision-maker	Timescale	Notes
Agreement of Final Recommendations.	Full Council	5 September 2018	
Publication of Final Recommendations.		6 September 2018	Inform persons interested in Review.

Decision	Decision-maker	Timescale	Notes
LGBCE Consent.	LGBCE	September 2018	Only needed for changes to parish warding arrangements put in place by LGBCE 2017 Borough Review.
Determination of extent to which effect to be given to Final Recommendations (in line, so far as possible, with full Council's views).	Recommendation:- Chief Executive delegated authority (in consultation with CGR Members' Group where any necessary LGBCE Consent is not given).	End September 2018 (after LGBCE Consent decision).	
Publish decision to give effect and reasons.		End September 2018.	Inform persons interested in Review.
Make formal re-organisation order.	Recommendation:- Head of Legal and Democratic Services	End September 2018	Deposit Order and make available for inspection. Notify specified persons.
Application for any Related Alterations.	LGBCE	October 2018	Used to bring parish/borough ward/county division boundaries onto same line (where appropriate).
Publication of Electoral Register.	Chief Executive (as Electoral Registration Officer).	December 2018	
Re-organisation Order comes into		1 April 2019	Must be in place for 1

Decision	Decision-maker	Timescale	Notes
force.			April to allow parishes to prepare budget for 2019/20 financial year.
Elections to parish councils (where required).		2 May 2019	

Consent of LGBCE

- 1.9 The LGBCE 2017 Borough Review made changes to Borough ward boundaries, which will come into effect at the May 2019 elections. In some cases, these new Borough ward boundaries cut across existing parishes (or parish wards) or County electoral divisions. Where this occurs, the Order which implemented the 2017 Borough Review creates parish wards (by dividing the parish along the Borough ward boundary lines). This is because under the relevant legislation governing a review carried out by the LGBCE, no parish (or parish ward) can be divided by a borough ward or county division boundary. It should be noted that the same rules do not apply to a Community Governance Review, which could include Final Recommendations resulting in a parish having a Borough Ward boundary running through it, but *without* the need for that parish to be warded to reflect that.
- 1.10 In Test Valley’s case, the Order included changes to the existing wards of Andover Town and Romsey Town, and the division of the (previously unwarded) Romsey Extra Parish into seven parish wards. The proposed Final Recommendations set out in Annex 1 include changes to these arrangements in Andover Town (reducing the number of wards from nine to six) and Romsey Extra (removing the seven wards and restoration of a single unwarded parish council), as well as related changes in other parishes.
- 1.11 If these proposed Final Recommendations are agreed, it will be necessary to apply to the LGBCE for its agreement (referred to in this report as “Consent”) to the changes to these “Protected Electoral Arrangements”. The Review is implemented by the making by the Borough Council of a formal Reorganisation Order, and such an Order can only include provision to change these Protected Electoral Arrangements (including the proposed changes to warding arrangements in Andover and Romsey Extra) if Consent is obtained from the LGBCE.
- 1.12 Once Consent has been obtained, a further decision of the Council is required, as to the extent to which the Final Recommendations are to be given effect. It is recommended that delegated authority is given to the Chief Executive to make this formal decision, so that the Reorganisation Order can then be made.

- 1.13 Where Consent is not given in a timely manner for some (or even all) of the changes to these Protected Electoral Arrangements, it is recommended that the Chief Executive's delegated authority is exercised in consultation with the Community Governance Review Members' Group, to review the outcome of the outcome for Consent, and then determine (in the light of this) the extent to which the Final Recommendations are to be given effect. This would allow the remainder of the Review proposals to be progressed and implemented, rather than being halted completely because Consent has been withheld for a particular Issue.
- 1.14 The decision as to the extent to which the Final Recommendations are brought into effect must be published and interested persons informed of the decision and the reasons leading to that decision.

Reorganisation Order

- 1.15 A Reorganisation Order, made by the Borough Council, is the legal instrument which brings into legal force the changes which are to be made. A model template will be used to draft this Order.
- 1.16 The Reorganisation Order will set out the changes, and the date these come into force. For administrative and financial purposes, Reorganisation Orders implementing CGRs should take effect from 1 April following the date on which it is made. Existing parish councillors for parishes which are affected by the Order remain as parish councillors until the May 2019 elections, when parish councillors will be elected to the parish councils (as affected by the changes implemented by the Order).
- 1.17 Once the Reorganisation Order has been made, it must be placed on deposit and made available for public inspection. In addition, various government departments and other parties must be notified and provided with a copy.

Related Alterations

- 1.18 One of the results of the CGR is likely to be revisions to parish boundaries, and this may result in parish, Borough Ward and County Division boundaries not being aligned together. In these cases, the LGBCE can be asked to make a "Related Alteration" Order, to amend those Borough Ward/County Division boundaries, so as to re-align these boundaries.
- 1.19 An application to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration can only be submitted once the Reorganisation Order has been made. Because of the potential for Related Alterations to change electoral areas (and therefore the number of electors within such areas), the LGBCE will want to have figures to allow it to ascertain the effect on Electoral Variance. Electoral Variance is the percentage difference between the actual number of electors per councillor for that Ward (or Division, in the case of a County Division boundary), and the average electors per councillor across the whole council (Borough/County as applicable).

- 1.20 In carrying out its own reviews (such as the 2017 Electoral Review) the LGBCE's objective is to produce 0% Electoral Variance in all wards/divisions.. It seeks to ensure (so far as possible) that the actual Electoral Variance on all wards does not exceed +/- 10%, and that in no case is the Electoral Variance more than 20%. Related Alteration applications that bring about Electoral Variances which exceed 10% may be possible in appropriate circumstances (which might include for example changes which aid electoral representation by bringing all electors in a village into a single ward), but Related Alterations leading to Electoral Variances of more than 20% are very unlikely to be accepted by the LGBCE.
- 1.21 A Related Alteration Application can only be accepted or rejected by the LGBCE – it cannot approve an application with modifications.
- 1.22 Hampshire County Council has been consulted on the Community Governance Review, both generally and on the specific proposed Related Alterations affecting County Division boundaries. In response, the Chief Executive of the County Council indicated that County Councillors seek to avoid any divergence between County Divisions and parish boundaries. The County Council would therefore **support** a solution that retains Coterminosity at County/parish level in Test Valley.
- 1.23 Aside from electoral representation issues, Related Alterations which align electoral area boundaries simplify electoral administration, by reducing the number of polling districts needed, and avoiding voter confusion. However, the rejection of a Related Alteration application by the LGBCE will not prevent the changes in the Reorganisation Order coming into effect.

2 Outcome of Second Consultation Stage and Proposed Final Recommendations.

- 2.1 This report set out the results of the Second Consultation Stage, and in the light of this identifies proposals for parish arrangements (including both changes to, and retention of, existing arrangements), which are set out as proposed Final Recommendations.
- 2.2 The previous report set out 80 "Issues" which were identified either out of the representations made at First Consultation Stage, or by officers as a result of related analysis. Each Issue was given a "FCR" reference. All these Issues (together with the three new Issues identified as part of the Second Consultation Stage) are considered in Annex 1, with the references now being "SCR" to indicate that they relate to the Second Consultation Stage of the process. The Issues range from small boundary changes between parishes, and groupings of some parishes with others, through to changes to warding arrangements and amalgamations of parishes and parish councils.
- 2.3 The Second Consultation Stage ran from 4 May to 6 July 2018. 39 respondents make representations at this Second Consultation Stage. Some Issues received no further representations, and others were supported by Second Consultation Stage respondents. In ten cases, representations opposing the Draft Recommendations were submitted. Three new proposals were received (SCR19 Charlton, SCR29 Ampert, and SCR 82 Lockerley).

- 2.4 Throughout this report, and in Annex 1 and the Maps accompanying that Annex, boundaries shown are:-
- a) The current parish/town boundaries (which are the subject of this Review);
 - b) The Borough Wards and boundaries as set by the LGBCE 2017 Boundary Review – **these come into effect at the 2019 Borough Election**;
 - c) Those Parish ward boundaries (also set by the LGBCE 2017 Boundary Review), **which come into effect at the 2019 Borough Election**;
 - d) The County Electoral Division boundaries as set by the LGBCE 2016 Boundary Review of Hampshire County Council (which came into effect on the County elections in May 2017).
- 2.5 The format of Annex 1 broadly follows that of the 26 April report. Where LGBCE Consent or an application for the Related Alteration is required/appropriate, this is indicated at the start of each Issue. The Respondent Refs and details for each Issue are shown, firstly for the First Consultation Stage, and secondly in respect of those who responded to the Second Consultation Stage. Second Consultation respondents are identified as being either in support or against the Draft Recommendations (from the First Stage). Respondents to the Second Consultation who already commented at First Consultation Stage are indicated with “(S)” next to their reference number.
- 2.6 The Agreed Draft Recommendation for the Issue in question (which was agreed by full Council on 26 April) is set out, followed by a Summary of Representations (First Stage), which were considered in April. The next section sets out summary of the representations received at Second Stage (again for or against the Draft Recommendation).
- 2.7 The observations of the Members Group on the Issue (taking into account both First and Second Stage representations and the CGR principles) are then set out.
- 2.8 Where relevant, Annex 1 includes electorate figures (current and five year projections) and Electoral Variances. These will be relevant in considering council size, electoral arrangements (such as warding, etc.). The LGBCE will require such figures where Consent or a Related Alteration is sought. The current figures used are as at January 2018 (which comprises the data which is closest to the start of the CGR which can be analysed to reflect the changes introduced by the 2017 Borough Electoral Review). The five year projections are 2022 figures, prepared in conjunction with the 2017 Review, and where polling districts have been split, the 2022 figure has been apportioned on the same split basis as the January 2018 split figures.
- 2.9 The final section sets out the proposed Final Recommendation for the Issue (as agreed by the Members Group), including a need to seek Consent and/or recommendations for Related Alterations.
- 2.10 Annex 4 provides electoral data (as at 31 October 2017 and five year projection to 2022) and other information about the existing parish councils in the Borough.

3 Corporate Objectives and Priorities

- 3.1 The conduct of a Community Governance Review is one of the Council's Corporate Action Plan projects.
- 3.2 The CGR will seek to ensure that community governance in Test Valley reflects the identities and interests of local communities, and is effective and convenient.

4 Consultations/Communications

- 4.1 As noted above, the first period of consultation ran for 11 weeks from 13 November 2017 to 29 January 2018. The consultation invited respondents to submit proposals on changes to existing parish arrangements within Test Valley. All parish councils were sent details of the Review and invited to participate. In areas where there was neither a parish council nor a chair of a parish meeting, individual letters were sent to the residents of those areas.
- 4.2 Borough and County Councillors, community and residents' associations, and associations representing businesses and parish councils were also contacted, as was Hampshire County Council. A dedicated page on the Council's website was set up to allow individuals to find out information about the CGR and to participate themselves, and news releases and social media were also used to publicise the CGR.
- 4.3 109 responses were received during the First Consultation period. In addition, five responses were received after the consultation period had ended, three of which made the same proposals as other respondents, with two making new proposals. Officers wrote to the latter respondents following publication of the Draft Recommendations, inviting them to review the Draft Recommendations and resubmit their representations in the light of these.
- 4.4 The representations received within the First Consultation period were analysed and assessed by officers, and were also considered by the Community Governance Review Members Group. The First Consultation was "open" insofar as it sought views on parish governance arrangements across the Borough generally, rather than views on specific proposals. The representations were wide-ranging, and included proposals to abolish specific parish/town councils, adjust boundaries between parishes (moving areas and properties from one parish to another), amalgamating parishes and parish councils, and "grouping" parishes.
- 4.5 The outcome of the consultation led to a series of "Issues" being identified. These were then considered in a report to full Council on 26 April 2018, which results in a set of Draft Recommendations being agreed.
- 4.6 The Draft Recommendations were then published and a Second Consultation Period ran from 4 May to 6 July 2018. The same consultation process was followed. Where practicable, residents in areas which were affected by a Draft Recommendation were sent a letter referring to the Community Governance Review. Those who had made representations were also contacted to advise them that Draft Recommendations had been published.

5 Resource Implications

- 5.1 The costs of carrying out the CGR are primarily officer time in inviting representations, considering the representations, formulating appropriate Draft and Final Recommendations, and making a Reorganisation Order to implement the Final Recommendations.
- 5.2 As noted in the previous report, one additional cost that has been identified relates to an enhancement to the Council's Council Tax software. This is required to ensure that any properties that are moved from one parish to another as a result of the CGR are transferred at the appropriate time, so as to ensure correct Council Tax billing for the 2019/20 Financial Year (such bills being issued in March 2019).
- 5.3 The cost of the enhancement is £4,500 plus support and maintenance costs of £1,150. The cost was met from within the existing Revenues budget in 2017/18. The software will be tested in summer/autumn 2018, so that the changes can be implemented once the Reorganisation Order has been made.

6 Polling Districts and other Electoral Registration Issues

- 6.1 The Borough is divided into polling districts, which are then used to administer electoral registration and elections. Each parish must be in a separate polling district, unless special circumstances apply (e.g. if a parish only has a small number of electors and it would not be practicable for the parish to have its own polling district). Proper division into polling districts is required to ensure that electors are able to vote in the correct parish/ward/division at elections.
- 6.2 The Borough Council is required to carry out a review of Polling Districts every five years. A full review is programmed for late 2019. However, in order to properly administer the 2019 Borough Elections, an interim review will be needed before May 2019, in order to reflect any changes which arise out of the CGR.
- 6.3 As noted above, legislation prescribes that save in special circumstances, each parish must have its own polling district. Further sub-division and creation of additional polling districts will be required as a consequence of changes from the 2017 Borough Electoral Review, and any changes arising from the CGR (particularly if proposals for Related Alterations are not accepted). The division into polling districts is essentially an administrative exercise following directly on from Final Recommendations approved by Members as part of the CGR, and therefore full Council agreed on 26 April 2018 that the Chief Executive be given delegated authority (in consultation with the Corporate Portfolio Holder) to carry out this exercise once the Final Recommendations have been adopted.
- 6.4 Some of the Draft Recommendations set out in the previous Report will (if carried into Final Recommendations and given effect by a Reorganisation Order) also address some instances where properties lie on an electoral boundary. In any event, where properties do lie across parish/electoral boundaries, there are rules prescribing for Council Tax and parish precept purposes which area these properties are deemed to lie within (essentially this is determined by reference to the area where the greater part of the dwelling house on the property lies).

- 6.5 As part of the CGR, a data matching exercise was carried out across the Council's Council Tax, Electoral Registration, and Property databases. In the vast majority of cases, the records were entirely consistent, but a very small number of cases were identified where corrections were required in accordance with the rules referred to at paragraph 6.4 above. Electors and Council Tax payers affected by these cases were written to once the Second Consultation Stage was under way, confirming what changes have been made, and referring them to the CGR process, so they could participate in that consultation if they wish.

7 Legal Implications

- 7.1 Guidance on undertaking CGRs was issued in 2010 jointly by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the LGBCE. This report takes account of that Guidance, which is available at the following link:-

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-governance-reviews-guidance>

- 7.2 In undertaking a CGR, the Borough Council has a number of statutory duties, set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act). Under Section 93(3) of the Act, the Council must consult local government electors for the area under review (i.e. all local government electors in the Borough in this case) and any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the Borough Council to have an interest in the Review. This was complied with as set out in Section 3 above.

- 7.3 Under Section 93(4) of the Act, **the Borough Council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review:-**
- a) **reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and**
 - b) **is effective and convenient.**

These are therefore the key tests that must be applied when considering representations and proposals as part of the CGR.

- 7.4 Under Section 93(5) of the Act, the Council must take account of other arrangements (other than e.g. parish councils) that have already been made, or could be made, for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in the area under review. The DCLG/LGBCE Guidance refers to various examples of "alternative" arrangements, such as area committees, area forums and residents' associations, although it recognises that parish councils are distinct from such bodies in that they are a democratically-elected tier of local government. Possible alternative arrangements are particularly relevant where there is no existing parish council, or where there are concerns about the effectiveness of an existing parish council (as in such situations other arrangements may be able to provide better overall governance in accordance with the Section 93(4) tests set out in paragraph 7.3 above).

- 7.5 Government guidance confirms that the Government is seeking to help create cohesive, attractive and economically vibrant local communities, building on the Government's 'Sustainable Communities' strategy. Central to this concept is community cohesion. The impact of community governance on community cohesion is an issue to be taken into account when taking decisions about community governance arrangements.
- 7.6 Finally, Section 93(6) requires the Council to take into account any representations received in connection with the CGR. It is reasonable to set a time period for representations to be made, in order to allow them to be properly considered. Where late representations were received after the close of the First Consultation period, officers wrote to these respondents after publication of the Draft Recommendations, inviting them to review the Draft Recommendations and resubmit their representations in the light of these.
- 7.7 In respect of the Second Consultation Stage, one letter (signed by several residents) was received after the close of the Second Consultation period, in respect of Issue 28. This is noted in Annex 1 under that Issue.

8 Next Steps

- 8.1 Having started the CGR, the Council must now decide Final Recommendations on each of the Issues identified from the CGR.
- 8.2 Proposed Final Recommendations are set out in Annex 1, which have been prepared by the CGR Members Group taking into account the representations that were received in the First and Second Consultation Periods. It is considered that these are appropriate proposals to deal with the Issues which are raised.

9 Equality Issues

- 9.1 There are no specific equality issues which arise from this report.

10 Other Issues

- 10.1 Community Safety – none.
- 10.2 Environmental Health Issues – none.
- 10.3 Sustainability and Addressing a Changing Climate – none.
- 10.4 Property Issues – this report will not affect any TVBC property. Assets belonging to parish councils may be affected by the CGR, although this will normally only be the case where significant changes to parishes are proposed, e.g. where parish councils are merged together. It is not believed that there are any asset issues which would arise under the proposed Final Recommendations.
- 10.5 Wards/Communities Affected – the CGR will not affect Borough Wards (although as noted above the Final Recommendations can include recommendations to the LGBCE to make Related Alterations to bring Borough Ward boundaries into line with revised parish boundaries). A central test for the CGR is community identity and interest.

11 Conclusion

- 11.1 This Report sets out the Issues which have been raised as a result of the First and Second consultation processes of the Community Governance Review. The proposed Final Recommendations set out in Annex 1 are appropriate responses to these representations, which have regard to the statutory matters, and will allow the CGR to be concluded.
- 11.2 Agreement of the Final Recommendations will therefore allow the Council to formally conclude the CGR, and then (having sought LGBCE Consent where required) determine the extent to which these Final Recommendations are given effect, and for a formal Reorganisation Order to be made. That Order will then determine the governance arrangements for parishes across the Borough.

12 List of Annexes

- Annex 1 - Summary of Issues
- Maps showing Proposed Changes (separate pack)
- Annex 2 - Timetable
- Annex 3 - Glossary of Terms
- Annex 4 - Electoral Data

<u>Background Papers (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)</u>			
Representations from respondents to First and Second Consultation period			
<u>Confidentiality</u>			
It is considered that this report does not contain exempt information within the meaning of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and can be made public.			
No of Annexes:	4	File Ref:	N/A
(Portfolio: Corporate) Councillor Flood			
Author:	Howard Bone	Ext:	8467
Report to:	Council	Date:	5 September 2018

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Vernham Dean #, Facombe, Tangle, Charlton +, Fyfield, Kimpton, Shipton Bellinger, Thruxton, Monxton, Wherwell, Bullington, Chilbolton, Leckford, Over Wallop * \$, Nether Wallop \$, Broughton, Houghton, Little Somborne, Ashley, East Tytherley *, East Dean* , Lockerley *, Mottisfont *, Bossington, Sherfield English *, and Chilworth #+.	Issue Ref:	SCR 1, 3, 5, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33,34,35, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52.
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR FCR 32.1, 41.2, 42.1, 43.1, 44.1, 46 Over Wallop Parish Council, East Tytherley Parish Council, East Dean Parish Council, Lockerley Parish Council, Mottisfont Parish Council, Sherfield English Parish Council.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	No Change.		
Summary of Issue	No changes to existing boundaries and governance arrangements should be made		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<p>That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, groupings or other parish governance arrangements in respect of the following parishes:-</p> <p>Facombe, Tangle, Charlton, Fyfield, Kimpton, Shipton Bellinger, Thruxton, Wherwell, Bullington, Chilbolton, Leckford, Broughton, Houghton, Little Somborne, Ashley, East Tytherley, East Dean, Lockerley, Mottisfont, Bossington, and Sherfield English.</p> <p>Note: Vernham Dean is considered under Issue FCR4 and Chilworth under Issue FCR76.</p>		

	Note: Over Wallop and Nether Wallop is considered under Issue FCR80
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In respect of these Parishes, either no representations were received, or those representations that were received were all to the effect that the boundaries and existing governance arrangements should remain as existing and no changes made.</p> <p>Parishes marked * submitted a representation formally requesting that no changes be made to the existing arrangements.</p> <p># In respect of Vernham Dean, there is a related Issue FCR 4 relating to the village of Upton. For Chilworth, there is a related Issue FCR 76 relating to Fleming Court.</p> <p>+ In respect of Charlton and Chilworth, representations were received after the close of the first consultation period. The Parish Councils will be invited to review the Draft Recommendations when they are published and resubmit their representations if appropriate.</p> <p>\$ In respect of Over Wallop and Nether Wallop, no changes were proposed by the parish councils, but following work by officers, a minor change to the boundary between these two Parishes is proposed under Issue FCR80.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>+ In respect of Charlton, the representation submitted late in the First Consultation Stage was resubmitted at the Second Consultation Stage and is consider under Issue SCR19.</p> <p>+ In respect of Chilworth, after further consideration and correspondence with officers, no proposals for change were submitted at the Second Consultation Stage.</p> <p>No other representations to the other Issues were received at Second Consultation Stage.</p>
Members Group Observations	There is no evidence to suggest that any change to either the boundaries or the existing governance arrangements is justified in respect of these parishes.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	As no changes to boundaries or governance arrangements are proposed, there are no electoral arrangement issues arising.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, groupings or other parish governance arrangements in respect of the following parishes:-

	<p>Facombe, Tangle, Fyfield, Kimpton, Shipton Bellinger, Thrupton, Wherwell, Bullington, Chilbolton, Leckford, Broughton, Houghton, Little Somborne, Ashley, East Tytherley, East Dean, Lockerley, Mottisfont, Bossington, and Sherfield English.</p> <p>Note: Vernham Dean is considered under Issue SCR4 and Chilworth under Issue SCR76.</p> <p>Note: Over Wallop and Nether Wallop is considered under Issue SCR80</p> <p>Note: Charlton is considered under Issue SCR19.</p>
Map Reference	See Parish Map (North) and (South), SCR XI and XII.

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Linkenholt Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 2
LGBCE Implications		NONE	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 2.1 Steven Lugg, Chief Executive of Hampshire Association of Local Councils</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Grouping of Parishes		
Summary of Issue	Linkenholt is currently unrepresented at Parish meetings, giving no form of governance in the area.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the name, boundaries, and other parish governance arrangements in respect of Linkenholt Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>HALC representation to subsume the parish into a neighbouring parish, as the parish meeting has not met for some time. No parish within which Linkenholt could be subsumed is specifically named in the representation.</p> <p>Parish itself made no representation.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	In the absence of any evidence or information on current governance, the Members Group agreed that there should be no change proposed.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Linkenholt does not have parish council, and therefore the form of local governance is the statutory parish meeting.		
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the name, boundaries, and other parish governance arrangements in respect of Linkenholt Parish.		
Map Reference	SCR XI		

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Vernham Dean and Hurstbourne Tarrant Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR4
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 4.1 Hurstbourne Tarrant PC ---</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether Upton village should remain split between Vernham Dean and Hurstbourne Tarrant Parish Councils.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Vernham Dean and Hurstbourne Tarrant Parish Councils.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Hurstbourne Tarrant PC – Upton is divided between the two parishes. A village meeting was held in Upton, attended by 19 members of the Upton community, three representatives from Hurstbourne Tarrant PC, and two from Vernham Dean PC.</p> <p>It was explained that neither parish council was actively seeking a change. Various residents' concerns were discussed, and a vote of residents attending was then taken. Fourteen voted for the boundaries to remain as current, four to move to Hurstbourne Tarrant, and one to move to Vernham Dean.</p> <p>As a result, neither parish council are seeking any changes to the current parish boundaries.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	In view of the outcome of the residents' meeting and the representation received, no change should be proposed to the current boundary.		

Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Upton is within Bourne Valley Borough Ward and Andover North County Electoral Division. It is not affected by any Protected Electoral Arrangements arising from the 2017 Electoral Review.</p> <p>Therefore, no Consent would be required from the LGBCE if a boundary change were to be made, nor would there be a need for a Related Alteration.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Vernham Dean and Hurstbourne Tarrant Parish Councils.
Map Reference	SCR 4

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Enham Alamein, Smannell and Andover	Issue Ref:	SCR 6
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 6.1 Enham Alamein Parish Council 7.1 Smannell Parish Council 8.1 Andover Town Council</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 7.1(S) Smannell Parish Council 8.1 (S) Andover Town Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Transfer Augusta Park area (comprising East Anton Parish Ward (Enham Alamein Parish) and Augusta Park Parish Ward (Smannell Parish)) to Andover Town.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Enham Alamein Parish Council – suggest transfer of Olympic Park to Andover [Town].</p> <p>Smannell Parish Council – under the [2017 Review] Smannell Parish will be split into two parish wards. Smannell Parish has traditionally been a rural parish of 113 households in 6 small hamlets. Augusta Park will have over 2,750 dwellings when completed, which will fall within the new Augusta Park Parish Ward of Smannell Parish. The area comprises 15% of the Parish and is bordered by Andover Town to the south and west. The development forms an extension to Andover Town and is identified as such locally. The boundary between Enham Alamein and Smannell parishes runs illogically through the development. There is an Augusta Park Community Association, but the area has no say on Andover Town Council. There is a local gap and unlikely to be significant development in the remaining Smannell Parish Ward. There is concern that the voice of the residents in this Ward will no longer be properly heard.</p>		

	<p>Andover Town Council – Augusta Park lies to the north-east of Andover, and houses many former residents of Andover Town. The majority of residents of the development consider they live in Andover. They use Andover’s facilities for work, shopping, public transport and medical centre needs. The [2017 Review] determined that effective local governance saw Augusta Park/Roman Way/Cricketers Way as a single entity, and the same should apply to the parish ward and boundary.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support Draft Recommendations:- Smannell Parish Council - Support the draft recommendations.</p> <p>Andover Town Council – Grateful for the acceptance of the proposal from the three parishes. Support the proposal fully and note that the LGBCE consent will be sought.</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendations:- None</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>There is agreement between the three parish/town councils that this area should be moved from the two parish councils into Andover Town. The 2017 Review placed the area within an Andover Borough Ward (Andover Romans), declining a suggestion to include the whole of Enham Alamein and Smannell parishes in Andover Romans Ward. Given that the LGBCE had no power to amend parish boundaries, it had to create separate parish wards.</p> <p>The Group noted that the current size of each parish council was seven councillors, and retaining such a size would mean the parish council would have sufficient councillors to deal with parish business.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>As the proposal would alter electoral arrangements set in place by the LGBCE in the 2017 Review, LGBCE Consent would be required.</p> <p>If the proposal is accepted, there would not be any requirement to move Borough Ward/County Division boundaries, and therefore no Related Alterations would be required.</p> <p>Under the 2017 Review, Enham Alamein Parish Council has two Parish Wards: Enham (5 Councillors), and East Anton (2 Councillors). Smannell Parish Council also has two Wards, Augusta Park (6 Councillors) and Smannell (1).</p> <p>Prior to the 2017 Review, both Parish Councils had seven Councillors each. It would be possible (subject to LGBCE Consent) to provide for 5, 6 or 7 Councillors for the altered</p>

	<p>Enham Alamein Parish (a Parish Council must comprise at least 5 councillors).</p> <p>This Issue deals with the transfer of areas of the two Parish Councils to Andover Town Council. The electoral arrangement consequences for Andover Town are dealt with under Issue SCR 14.</p> <p>The tables below show the electorate numbers (Jan 2018 and five year projection to 2022) for the existing parishes.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="509 633 1393 1223"> <thead> <tr> <th>Existing Parish</th> <th>Parish Ward</th> <th>Jan 2018 Electorate</th> <th>2022 Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Enham Alamein</td> <td></td> <td>979</td> <td>969</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enham (M)</td> <td>631</td> <td>703</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East Anton</td> <td>348</td> <td>266</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Smannell</td> <td></td> <td>2353</td> <td>3465</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Augusta Park (Z)</td> <td>2122</td> <td>3237</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Smannell (Z)</td> <td>231</td> <td>228</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town (all wards)</td> <td></td> <td>30860</td> <td>33739</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town</td> <td>Romans</td> <td>2951</td> <td>3052</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town</td> <td>(other all wards)</td> <td>27909</td> <td>30687</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="509 1261 1393 1675"> <thead> <tr> <th>Proposed Parish</th> <th>Parish Ward</th> <th>Jan 2018 Electorate</th> <th>2022 Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Enham Alamein</td> <td></td> <td>631</td> <td>703</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Smannell</td> <td></td> <td>231</td> <td>228</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town (all wards)</td> <td></td> <td>33330</td> <td>37242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town</td> <td>Romans</td> <td>5421</td> <td>6555</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Town</td> <td>(other all wards)</td> <td>27909</td> <td>30687</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Existing Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate	Enham Alamein		979	969	Enham (M)	631	703	East Anton	348	266	Smannell		2353	3465	Augusta Park (Z)	2122	3237	Smannell (Z)	231	228	Andover Town (all wards)		30860	33739	Andover Town	Romans	2951	3052	Andover Town	(other all wards)	27909	30687	Proposed Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate	Enham Alamein		631	703	Smannell		231	228	Andover Town (all wards)		33330	37242	Andover Town	Romans	5421	6555	Andover Town	(other all wards)	27909	30687
Existing Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate																																																										
Enham Alamein		979	969																																																										
	Enham (M)	631	703																																																										
	East Anton	348	266																																																										
Smannell		2353	3465																																																										
	Augusta Park (Z)	2122	3237																																																										
	Smannell (Z)	231	228																																																										
Andover Town (all wards)		30860	33739																																																										
Andover Town	Romans	2951	3052																																																										
Andover Town	(other all wards)	27909	30687																																																										
Proposed Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate																																																										
Enham Alamein		631	703																																																										
Smannell		231	228																																																										
Andover Town (all wards)		33330	37242																																																										
Andover Town	Romans	5421	6555																																																										
Andover Town	(other all wards)	27909	30687																																																										
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lettered "A" on Map SCR 6 be transferred to Andover Town from Enham Alamein Parish • lettered "B" on Map SCR6 be transferred to Andover Town from Smannell Parish. 2. That Enham Alamein Parish Council be not warded and be comprised of seven Parish Councillors. 3. That Smannell Parish Council be not warded and be comprised of seven Parish Councillors. 																																																												

	<p>4. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed changes.</p>
Map Reference	<p>SCR 6 shows the proposals in the Final Recommendation.</p> <p>SCR 6A shows the existing parish boundaries between Andover Town, and Enham Alamein and Smannell Parishes.</p> <p>SCR 6B is an extract from the 2017 Review map, showing Borough Ward boundaries in red, Parish boundaries in blue, and new parish ward boundaries (consequent on the Borough Ward boundary changes) in yellow/red. It shows the Andover Romans Borough Ward comprising the Andover Town Romans (parish) Ward (H), East Anton Parish Ward of Enham Alamein Parish Council (L) and Augusta Park Parish Ward of Smannell Parish Council (Z). The proposal would be for areas L and Z on this map to be incorporated into Andover Town</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town and Abbots Ann Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 7
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA (HCC)
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 8.1 Andover TC 8.2 Liberal Democrats - Andover and District Branch 9.2 Cllr Graham Stallard 8.6 Andover resident 9.3-9.5 Abbots Ann residents</p> <p>Not in favour of transfer:- 9.1 Abbots Ann PC ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 8.1(S) Andover TC 9.2(S) Cllr Graham Stallard 9.11 Burghclere Down resident</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- 9.1(S) Abbots Ann PC 9.8 Burghclere Down resident 9.10 Burghclere Down resident 9.12 Burghclere Down resident</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer Burghclere Down from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "C" on Map SCR 7 be transferred from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town. 2. That LGCBE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for a Related Alteration to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary. 		

	[See SCR 14 and SCR 18 for recommendations regarding size of Andover Town Council/Abbotts Ann Parish Council].
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:-</p> <p>Andover Town Council – Burghclere Down lies to the south west of Andover and has poor links to Abbotts Ann, being separated by the A303 which is a clear southern boundary for Andover Town. The area is within Andover’s Millway Ward (Borough) which reflects the community identity link with the town. Facilities in Andover, including schools, shops and medical facilities, serve the community, and the only transport links are to Andover.</p> <p>Liberal Democrats - Andover and District Branch – support Andover Town Council’s proposals to include this highly urbanised contiguous area in the town boundary.</p> <p>Cllr Graham Stallard – The two communities have different identities and interests, and local governance is neither convenient nor effective. Residents cannot understand why Burghclere Down is in Abbotts Ann Parish. This confusion is demonstrated at elections when residents do not know the candidates or where they live, and expect to vote for Andover Town Council, not Abbotts Ann Parish Council. Prior to construction of the A303 the land was a green field in Abbotts Ann parish. The two communities are different in character – Abbotts Ann is a typical Test Valley village with its own community facilities (maintained by the Parish Council or similar), whereas Burghclere Down is a 20 year old suburban development attached to Andover with community facilities provided and maintained as others in Andover Town. The two communities are physically separated by the A303, and have little or no community integration. The Local Plan treats Burghclere Down as part of Andover, and there is a strategic gap between the two communities. The new Borough Ward arrangements proposed by TVBC and accepted by the LGBCE should now be implemented at parish level.</p> <p>Andover resident – Boundary of Abbotts Ann Parish should be A303, making Burghclere Down part of the town area and in the same parish.</p> <p>Abbotts Ann resident – Burghclere Down residents have shown little interest in their Parish Council, despite it making efforts to visit and engage Burghclere Down. There are significant differences between the two communities in terms of their character, make up and social interaction. Abbotts Ann is a rural and historic settlement, and the two communities are physically separated by the A303 which reinforces the distinction between the two communities. Burghclere Down is more akin to Andover’s outskirts, and would be better joined with Millway</p>

	<p>Ward with its own parish council. It would be retrograde to reduce the number of parish councillors for Abbots Ann from seven to four and introduce a guaranteed number for Burghclere Down. Given lack of interests shown in recent elections. The response rate to the survey (60 out of 2000, 3%) means this should not be used to make major decisions about future governance. Burghclere Down should therefore join Millway Ward.</p> <p>Abbots Ann resident – It would be sensible to align the parish and Borough ward boundaries. Burghclere Down is physically and socially part of Andover and it would not be appropriate for Burghclere Down residents to be eligible for affordable housing in Abbots Ann as they do not belong to the village. There should be more parish councillors given the workload.</p> <p>Abbots Ann resident – The result of the survey carried out (with responses from Burghclere Down outweighing those from Abbots Ann village) are not surprising given the way in which the survey was conducted. There was no letter drop in the village, and the results are therefore not truly representative. The parish boundary is a long-standing anomaly which should be resolved urgently. Burghclere Down residents have shown scant interest in Abbots Ann village and moving Burghclere Down to Andover [Town] is in both parties' better interests and long overdue. Abbots Ann Parish Council should retain seven parish councillors.</p> <p>Not in favour of transfer:- Abbots Ann PC – The Parish Council considers there should be overwhelming reasons for any change, and does not foresee any value in making changes to the current Abbots Ann parish boundary. The Parish Council consulted parishioners through a website, email, and door to door letter drop. 62 responses were received, 43 from Burghclere Down, and 19 from Abbots Ann. 64% (34 from Burghclere Down, 4 from Abbots Ann) wish to stay in Abbots Ann Parish, 20% (3/9 respectively) voted for moving to a “Millway Parish Council” and 15% (6/3) wished to move to Andover Town. The Parish Council does not believe that the recent Boundary Review (which produced wards in a previously unwarded parish) provides sufficient justification for a change. If Abbots Ann is to be warded, the number of Parish Councillors should increase to nine. A change to the boundary to move Burghclere Down from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town would be against the express wishes of those residents who expressed an opinion.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second</p>	<p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Abbots Ann PC - Against the proposed transfer of Burghclere Down into Andover. It is against the wishes of residents as</p>

<p>Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>shown by the survey for the first round of consultation. Believe that it will create electoral inequality with Andover Town Council having over 30% of the electorate of Test Valley. Such a council with its limited parish powers and responsibilities will not be able to adequately represent the unique circumstances of the Burghclere Down residents. The council will be so vast as to make the difference between representation of TVBC and ATC non-existent. The number of electors per councillor for Burghclere Down (2,200 electors per councillor) will be completely out of proportion to other parish councils (e.g. Abbots Ann 150 electors per councillor) and therefore deliver reduced representation.</p> <p>By contrast the over-whelming opinion of Burghclere Down residents was that despite the differences between the village setting of Abbots Ann and the more suburban setting of Burghclere Down, residents would be better represented being a large part of a parish than being an tiny part of a vast town council that would not be able to meet the Governments expectation of a cohesive community.</p> <p>Burghclere Down Resident – Has resided in Burghclere Down for 15 years and happy to stay a part of Abbots Ann, feels that their voice is better heard there and does not see any advantage or disadvantage of moving Councils.</p> <p>Burghclere Down Resident - Resident with partner in Burghclere Down, wish to stay with Abbots Ann parish.</p> <p>Burghclere Down resident - As resident of Burghclere Down, should remain under Abbots Ann Parish Council. Fear that by joining a larger parish (Andover Town) [Burghclere Down] would be lost in the numbers. [Abbots Ann] parish council meets regularly on estate, putting them within reach of all residents. Understand that council tax would increase dramatically if boundaries were to be moved, but unable to see any extra benefits from this monetary increase or the move.</p> <p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council - Thank TVBC for accepting the proposal and note that LGBCE consent will be sought. Fully support the proposal. Also support the realignment of county boundary to include this area within Andover South County Division.</p> <p>Cllr Graham Stallard - Fully supportive of the parish boundary changes recommended for Anna Ward. Changes fit the criteria well relating to identities and interests and effective, convenient local governance. Should there be further responses suggesting otherwise urge the Panel to examine first round response.</p>
----------------------------	---

	<p>Burghclere Down resident - Resident of Burghclere Down. Born and brought up in Upper Clatford, where lived up until early 20's and then in 2002, now as a family, put in for a transfer and were lucky enough to receive a new house on the Burghclere Down estate, where have been ever since. Know how it feels to be part of a rural community and does not feel part of the Abbots Ann community, neither class estate as anything but being in Andover, certainly does not add Abbots Ann into address when writing or being asked. It would make more sense, geographically, to use the A303 as the boundary line and bring the estate into an Andover ward and would be in favour of this.</p>												
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>The division of Abbots Ann Parish by the A303 creates a physical barrier between two separate and distinct communities, which have different characters and social characteristics. Burghclere Down is urban in nature and contiguous with Andover, and it should therefore become part of Andover Town. Although the survey carried out by Abbots Ann Parish Council indicates some support for remaining within Abbots Ann, it is not conclusive as to the identities and interests of the community. The Council publicised the Community Governance Review on social media and the local press printed an article on the Andover issues. Letters were also sent to community groups. The lack of any significant level of response from Burghclere Down residents to the Draft Recommendations (despite this coverage) would suggest that the proposals are acceptable to the majority of residents. Residents seem to identify with the town and are often surprised to learn they are in Abbots Ann Parish. It would therefore make sense for consent and related alterations to be sought in order to make the governance of the area wholly within Andover for parish, borough and county level.</p>												
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>A transfer of Burghclere Down would change the Protected Electoral Arrangements for Abbots Ann Parish and Andover Town, and would therefore require LGBCE Consent.</p> <p>Current and five year projected electorate figures are as follows:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="475 1626 1366 1924"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parish Ward</th> <th>Current January 2018 (1 Dec 2017 in brackets)</th> <th>Five year projection (2022)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Abbots Ann Parish Ward SC</td> <td>1088 (1087)</td> <td>1064</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burghclere Down Parish Ward VK</td> <td>848 (844)</td> <td>840</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1936 (1931)</td> <td>1904</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Burghclere Down is already in Andover Millway Borough Ward, and therefore transferring Burghclere Down from Abbots Ann</p>	Parish Ward	Current January 2018 (1 Dec 2017 in brackets)	Five year projection (2022)	Abbots Ann Parish Ward SC	1088 (1087)	1064	Burghclere Down Parish Ward VK	848 (844)	840	Total	1936 (1931)	1904
Parish Ward	Current January 2018 (1 Dec 2017 in brackets)	Five year projection (2022)											
Abbots Ann Parish Ward SC	1088 (1087)	1064											
Burghclere Down Parish Ward VK	848 (844)	840											
Total	1936 (1931)	1904											

	<p>Parish to Andover Town would not affect this. However, it is currently in Test Valley Central County Electoral Division, whereas the remainder of Andover Millway Ward is within Andover South County Electoral Division. Therefore it is proposed to recommend a Related Alteration to the LGBCE to move Burghclere Down from Test Valley Central to Andover South Electoral Division, thereby making the boundaries coterminous.</p> <p>The table below shows the impact of this Related Alteration:-</p> <p>Burghclere Down FCR 7</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="475 633 1398 1093"> <thead> <tr> <th>Division</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Andover South</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>+844</td> <td>+840</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>11.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Test Valley Central</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td>15.1%</td> <td>-844</td> <td>-840</td> <td>-0.4%</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Figures for the numbers of electors per parish ward of Andover Town Council (if this proposal is agreed) are set out under SCR14.</p> <p>This Issue deals with the transfer of Burghclere Down from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town. The electoral arrangements for Andover Town are dealt with under Issue SCR 14. Issue SCR18 considers the number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Abbots Ann Parish Council.</p>	Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	Andover South	4.5%	5.4%	+844	+840	10.8%	11.4%	Test Valley Central	5.9%	15.1%	-844	-840	-0.4%	9.1%
Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																
Andover South	4.5%	5.4%	+844	+840	10.8%	11.4%																
Test Valley Central	5.9%	15.1%	-844	-840	-0.4%	9.1%																
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "C" on Map SCR 7 be transferred from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town. 2. That LGCBE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for a Related Alteration to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary. <p>[See SCR 14 and SCR 18 for recommendations regarding size of Andover Town Council/Abbots Ann Parish Council].</p>																					
Map Reference	SCR7																					

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town and Abbots Ann Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 8
LGBCE Implications		RA	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 8.1 Andover TC ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation 8.1(S) Andover TC</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation 9.1(S) Abbots Ann Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>FCR Whether to transfer Marlborough Town Ward from Andover Town to Abbots Ann Parish.</p> <p>SCR Whether Marlborough area should remain in Anna Borough Ward or be moved into Andover Millway Borough Ward.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “D” on Map FCR 8 remains within Andover Town. [See Draft recommendation FCR14 for Electoral Arrangement proposals.]		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Andover Town Council – The military estate, Andover Business Park and surrounding areas on Monxton Road are south and west of the A303 and relate more to the surrounding semi-rural area than the town. The area is designated in Anna Ward in the [2017 Borough Electoral Review]. Being a mainly military community, it has minimal links with the town. As the proposed southern boundary between Andover and Millway wards is the A303 it is logical that this area be transferred from Andover Town to Abbots Ann Parish</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council- Note that proposal means Marlborough Ward area will stay in Andover and accept the proposal. However believe that this should change to include the area in both borough and town Millway Wards. Do not want a separate Marlborough parish.</p>		

	<p>[Note: the Andover Town warding arrangements are considered under Issue SCR14. This Issue will consider whether a Related Alteration should be sought to move the area from Anna Borough Ward into Andover Millway Borough Ward.]</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Abbotts Ann Parish Council – The [Council report] noted that the A303 provides a physical barrier between Area D and Andover town. Indeed the physical barrier of the A303 was one of the major reasons cited for recommending moving Area C (Burghclere Down) from Abbotts Ann Parish into Andover Town Council. However this issue is diminished in the proposal here. It also suggested that this area is well connected to Andover town by roads and footpaths! However this is the major 100 acre roundabout spanning a 4 lane trunk dual carriageway. This hardly stands up to scrutiny – the area’s and dislocated with no possible opportunity to social cohesion. (sic.)</p> <p>The report also suggests that the Andover Business Park is better suited to an urban Town Council, although the parts of the business park in Monxton Parish and Penton Mewsey are not in-scope to move. This point lacks credibility.</p> <p>The interests and identity of the low density housing and business park placed as it is in open countryside is best served by being part of Abbotts Ann Parish Council.</p> <p>The Parish Council recommends that the A303 be the southern limit of Andover Town Council – and that area D resides with Abbotts Ann Parish Council.</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>Although the A303 physically divides the town from the Marlborough area, it is nevertheless well linked by road and footpaths to the Town. It is part of the urban area of Andover, with more interaction with the town, and does not fit in to the rural area of Abbotts Ann. A business park is more likely to identify with a town than a rural parish. There has been no response from residents in the area</p> <p>It is noted that the 2017 Borough Electoral Review placed this area in Anna Borough Ward, but in carrying out that Review, the LGBCE was obliged to take into account the need for electoral equality.</p> <p>In summary, it is proposed that the Marlborough Town Ward area should remain within Andover Town and not be transferred to Abbotts Ann Parish.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>This area is within Andover Town, but was created as a separate Town Ward by the 2017 Review, because the Borough Ward boundaries proposed by the LGBCE cut across the Andover Town area. The 2017 Review therefore provides for this area to be a separate Town ward (Marlborough, represented by one</p>

Councillor).

Andover Town Council propose separately (Issue SCR 14) to have six Town wards, based on the boundaries of the new Borough Wards in Andover. This was on the assumption that the new Marlborough (Town) Ward would be transferred to Abbots Ann. It would however be possible to implement Andover Town Council's proposed six Town Wards, but with the addition (retention) of Marlborough Ward with one Town Councillor representing the area. Alternatively, Marlborough Town Ward area could be combined with an adjacent Town Ward such as Millway). This aspect is considered further under Issue SCR 14.

The area is contained within an Andover Town ward (Marlborough), a Borough ward (Anna), and a County Division (Andover South). This Issue SCR8 is primarily concerned about the question of whether or not Marlborough should remain part of Andover Town, and concludes that it should so remain. Retaining the area in Andover Town does not affect the warding arrangements put in place by the LGBC, and therefore keeping the Marlborough area in Andover Town will not require Consent.

SCR 14 considers whether there should be any changes to Town warding arrangements (including this area), and also deals with the necessary Consent which would be required if any changes to warding arrangements are to be proposed.

Andover Town Council have proposed that the area should be within Andover Millway Borough Ward, rather than Anna Borough Ward. A Related Alteration would be needed in order to achieve this.

Current and five year projected electorate figures are as follows:-

Parish Ward	Current Jan 2018 (Dec 2017 in brackets)	Five Year (projected)
Marlborough (currently Andover Town)	233 (233)	249
Abbots Ann (Abbots Ann Parish) SC	1088 (1087)	1064
Burghclere Down Parish Ward VK	848 (844)	840
Total (Marlborough + Abbots Ann Wards)	1321 (1320)	1313
Total (Marlborough + Abbots Ann+ Burghclere Down Wards)	2169 (2164)	2153

	<p>Related Alteration</p> <p>Andover Town Council has proposed that Marlborough area is moved from Anna Borough Ward into Andover Borough Millway Ward. This would require an application to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration. To such an application for this, the LGBCE will wish to see Electoral Variance figures. These are set out in the table below, which shows the figures for these two Borough Wards if Marlborough is moved as proposed.</p> <p>If agreed, the proposal would result in 249 (233) electors moving from Anna to Andover Millway.</p> <p>Members will recall that the LGBCE aim to have 2022 variances (between the actual electors/councillor for that Ward, and the average electors per councillors across the whole council) of 0, and no variances greater than 10%. This change brings the 2022 variance figures for Anna Ward more into balance, without significantly affecting Andover Millway. On that basis, it would be expected that this change should be acceptable to LGBCE.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="475 936 1401 1323"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anna</td> <td>18.1%</td> <td>7.5%</td> <td>-233</td> <td>-249</td> <td>12.9%</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Millway</td> <td>2.1%</td> <td>-1.6%</td> <td>+233</td> <td>+249</td> <td>5.6%</td> <td>1.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	Anna	18.1%	7.5%	-233	-249	12.9%	2.3%	Andover Millway	2.1%	-1.6%	+233	+249	5.6%	1.8%
Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																
Anna	18.1%	7.5%	-233	-249	12.9%	2.3%																
Andover Millway	2.1%	-1.6%	+233	+249	5.6%	1.8%																
<p>Proposed Final Recommendation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “D” on Map SCR 8 remains within Andover Town. 2. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to move the Marlborough Town Ward area (lettered “D” on Map SCR8) from Anna Borough Ward to Andover Millway Ward. 																					
<p>Map Reference</p>	<p>SCR8</p>																					

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town and Abbots Ann Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 9
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 8.1 Andover Town Council</p> <p>----</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation 8.1 (S) Andover Town Council</p> <p>9.1(S) Abbots Ann Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer land south of A303 and west of Salisbury Road from Andover Town to Abbots Ann Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “E” on Map FCR 9 be transferred from Andover Town to Abbots Ann Parish. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundary. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Andover Town Council – the Town Council believes the southern boundary of Andover Town should where possible follow the A303. This is an anomaly that should be addressed.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council - Support the recommendation and the principle that parish, borough and county boundaries be coterminous. Fully support the applications to the LGBCE for consent.</p>		

	[Abbotts Ann Parish Council - Assert that the Andover Town Council should not sprawl across the A303.]
Members Group Observations	This land is isolated from the town by the A303, although it is linked by the A343 Salisbury Road. However, it has a rural character and therefore is more identifiable with the rural Abbotts Ann Parish than the urban Andover Town area.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Andover Town, and is part of Millway (Andover Town) Ward and Andover Millway (Borough) Ward. It falls within Andover South County Division. Moving the area into Abbotts Ann would require the Consent of the LGBCE (as such a proposal would change Electoral Arrangements set under the 2017 Borough Electoral Review).</p> <p>In addition, it would be sensible to recommend Related Alterations to the LGBCE, in order to align the County Electoral Division and Borough Ward boundaries on the new Town boundary formed if the Draft Recommendation is acted upon. This would then ensure that the Town, Division and Borough Ward boundaries are all coterminous.</p> <p>There are no electors in the area in question, and so the proposal does not affect the distribution of electors between the Town and Parish Councils.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "E" on Map SCR 9 be transferred from Andover Town to Abbotts Ann Parish. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundary.
Map Reference	SCR 9

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Upper Clatford Parish and Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 10
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 8.1 Andover TC 8.3 Upper Clatford Resident</p> <p>----</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 8.1(S) Andover Town Council</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- 8.3(S) Upper Clatford Resident 22.3 Upper Clatford Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer Andover Manor from Upper Clatford Parish to Andover Town.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “F” on Map FCR 10 be transferred from Upper Clatford Parish to Andover Town. 2. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundary. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Andover Town Council – Andover Manor lies south of the A303 but north of the A303 slip road and west of Winchester Road (A3057). Residents here have always identified with Andover for usage of shops, medical facilities and transport. The boundary should follow the slip road to the A303.</p>		

	<p>Upper Clatford Resident – I consider myself to be a resident of Andover, not Upper Clatford. I shop and socialise in Andover, use medical facilities in Andover and have easy transport routes into Andover by foot and road. I live within the slip road of the A303 and would ask that under the community governance review that my property is considered to be part of Andover parish.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council – Fully support the resident’s wish to be transferred to Andover and the application for consent regarding the transfer.</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Upper Clatford Resident – The same resident as during the first consultation would like to reconsider their original proposal and withdraw it. Further email from the respondent clarified this was to maintain a straight boundary between the parishes and they are still able to take part in Andover activities apart from voting in Winton ward.</p> <p>Upper Clatford Parish Council – Do not believe that the area shaded ‘F’ on the map should be moved from Upper Clatford into Andover Town. It is on the South side of the A303 and contradicts logic of FCR 11. Further understand that the householder no longer wishes to be in Andover Town/Parish.</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>This property is located within the slip road of the A303, South of the main A303 carriageway. The evidence provided highlights the individual no longer wishes to change parish. The Group therefore see it as convenient and effective governance to maintain the existing boundary of the A303.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>This area is within Upper Clatford Parish but is part of Andover Winton Borough Ward. It falls within Andover South County Division.</p> <p>Moving the area from Upper Clatford to Andover Town would require the Consent of the LGBCE (as such a proposal would change Electoral Arrangements set under the 2017 Borough Electoral Review).</p> <p>In addition, it would be sensible to recommend Related Alterations to the LGBCE, in order to align the County Electoral Division and Borough Ward boundaries on the new Town boundary formed if the Draft Recommendation is acted upon. This would then ensure that the Town, Division and Borough Ward boundaries are all coterminous.</p>

	<p>There is one elector in the area in question, and so the proposal does not have a significant effect on the distribution of electors between the Town and Parish Councils. However, there will be no boundaries affected by the final recommendation therefore no consent or related alterations will be required.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<p>That no recommendation be made in regard of Issue SCR 10, with Andover Manor to remain in Upper Clatford Parish.</p>
Map Reference	<p>SCR 10</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Goodworth Clatford Parish, Upper Clatford Parish and Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR11
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer 8.1 Andover TC ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 22.3 Upper Clatford PC</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer two areas from Andover Town to Upper Clatford, one area from Upper Clatford to Andover Town, and one area from Goodworth Clatford to Andover Town.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “G1” and “G2” on Map FCR 11 be transferred from Andover Town to Upper Clatford Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered “G3” be transferred from Goodworth Clatford Parish to Andover Town. 3. That the area of land lettered “G4” be transferred from Upper Clatford Parish to Andover Town. 4. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed changes. 5. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, application recommendation be made to LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundary. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Andover Town Council – the boundary between the parishes of Andover Town, Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford along the southern part of the A303 is not clearly defined. It is suggested that this needs further clarification so that all</p>		

	parishes are clear where the boundary line lies.
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	Support Draft Recommendation:- Upper Clatford PC - Understand the logic and do not object except on historic grounds
Members Group Observations	The A303 forms a physical and logical barrier between the urban Andover area, and the rural parishes to the south. For the most part, the current boundaries in this area do not follow any clear physical features. It would be in the interests of effective governance for these boundaries to be regularised along the line of the A303, which is a clearly defined and permanent feature.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Areas G1 and G2 on the map are within Andover Town, and part of Winton (Andover Town) Ward, Andover Winton (Borough) Ward and Andover South Electoral Division (County). Area G3 is within Goodworth Clatford Parish, Anna Ward (Borough), and Test Valley Central Division. Area G4 is within Upper Clatford Parish, Anna Ward (Borough), and Test Valley Central Division. Moving these areas would require the Consent of the LGBCE (as such a proposal would change Electoral Arrangements set under the 2017 Borough Electoral Review).</p> <p>In addition, it would be sensible to recommend Related Alterations to the LGBCE, in order to align the County Electoral Division and Borough Ward boundaries on the new Town boundary formed if the Draft Recommendation is acted upon. This would then ensure that the Town, Parish, Borough Ward and County Division boundaries are all coterminous.</p> <p>There are no electors in the areas in question, and so the proposal does not have any effect on the distribution of electors between the Town and Parish Councils.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "G1" and "G2" on Map SCR 11 be transferred from Andover Town to Upper Clatford Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered "G3" on Map SCR 11 be transferred from Goodworth Clatford Parish to Andover Town. 3. That the area of land lettered "G4" on Map SCR 11 be transferred from Upper Clatford Parish to Andover Town. 4. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed

	changes. 5. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, application recommendation be made to LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundaries.
Map Reference	SCR 11

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 12
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer 8.1 Andover Town Council ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation 8.1(S) Andover Town Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Town Ward Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to move nine properties in Western Road, Andover from Andover Millway Town and Borough Wards to Andover Winton Town and Borough Wards.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “H” on Map FCR 12 be transferred from Andover Millway Ward to Andover Winton Ward. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alterations to align the Borough Ward boundary with the new Town Ward boundary 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Andover Town Council – A small number of properties on the southern side of Western Road are allocated to Millway Ward. The logical boundary between the two wards is Western Road, with these properties lying in Winton Ward.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council – Grateful for accepting of their proposal and note that LGBCE consent will be sought.</p>		
Members Group Observations	Historically, the Borough Ward boundary has always dipped south to include these properties, rather than continuing the		

	<p>line from Bridge Street and along Western Road. Although some of the properties have vehicular access via Salisbury Road (rather than Western Road) others do have access and frontage along Western Road.</p> <p>Western Road makes a natural dividing feature between the wards, and it would be reasonable therefore to move these properties from Millway Town Ward and Andover Millway Borough Ward into Winton Town Ward and Andover Winton Borough Ward.</p>																									
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>These properties are within Town Wards set by the LGBCE in the 2017 Electoral Review. A proposal to move the boundaries would therefore require the Consent of the LGBCE. If Consent were to be granted, the Town Ward boundaries could be moved.</p> <p>Under the proposed change, the properties would remain within the Andover South County Electoral Division.</p> <p>In addition, it would be sensible to recommend Related Alterations to the LGBCE, in order to align the Borough Ward boundary on the new Town Ward boundary formed if the Draft Recommendation is acted upon. This would then ensure that the Town and Borough Ward boundaries are coterminous.</p> <p>There are currently 7 electors in the properties in question. The table below sets out the current and five year projections for Andover Millway and Andover Winton Wards, before and after the proposed changes.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="501 1330 1401 1742"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Current Jan 2018</th> <th>Five year projection (2022)</th> <th>Electoral Variance 2017</th> <th>Electoral Variance 2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Andover Millway (no change)</td> <td>6822</td> <td>7128</td> <td>2.1%</td> <td>-1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Millway (after change)</td> <td>6815</td> <td>7121</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>-1.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Winton (no change)</td> <td>5010</td> <td>4976</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>12.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Winton (after change)</td> <td>5017</td> <td>4983</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>3.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note:- Electoral Variance Figures DO NOT include other proposed changes to Andover Millway Ward (SCR8). It will be noted that the impact of the proposed change on Electoral Variance for this Issue is negligible.</p> <p>Given the number of electors involved, the proposed change would not have a significant effect on the relative numbers of</p>	Ward	Current Jan 2018	Five year projection (2022)	Electoral Variance 2017	Electoral Variance 2022	Andover Millway (no change)	6822	7128	2.1%	-1.5%	Andover Millway (after change)	6815	7121	2.0%	-1.6%	Andover Winton (no change)	5010	4976	12.5%	12.6%	Andover Winton (after change)	5017	4983	3.2%	3.3%
Ward	Current Jan 2018	Five year projection (2022)	Electoral Variance 2017	Electoral Variance 2022																						
Andover Millway (no change)	6822	7128	2.1%	-1.5%																						
Andover Millway (after change)	6815	7121	2.0%	-1.6%																						
Andover Winton (no change)	5010	4976	12.5%	12.6%																						
Andover Winton (after change)	5017	4983	3.2%	3.3%																						

	electors in the respective wards.
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "H" on Map SCR 12 be transferred from Millway Ward (Andover Town) to Winton Ward (Andover Town). 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed changes. 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alterations to align the Borough Ward boundary with the new Town Ward boundary.
Map Reference	SCR 12

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 13
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 8.1 Andover Town Council -----</p> <p>SCR 8.1(S) Andover Town Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Town Ward boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>FCR Whether Andover Downlands area should be included in Andover Town.</p> <p>SCR Whether County Electoral Division boundary should be moved south so as to include all of Andover Downlands area in Andover North County Electoral Division.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	[To be considered as part of Issue FCR14, Andover Town warding arrangements.]		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Andover Town Council – The recent Borough Boundary Review has identified the new communities of Picket Twenty and Picket Piece linking community connections with Andover Down. This area making up the sixth ward for the Borough. For effective local governance Andover Town Council feel that this should be reflected within parish ward boundaries.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	Andover Town Council - Fully support the proposal that Picket Twenty and Picket Piece form one parish ward identical to the Borough Ward of Andover Downlands. Note this will mean the town/borough ward will be split between two different county divisions and request consideration be given to the transfer of Picket Piece to the Andover North County Division so all that three boundaries (parish, borough and county) are aligned. This is consistent with the other changes proposed for the southern boundary of Andover parish and allows Andover to be represented by three rather than four County Councillors.		
Members Group Observations	The second representation from Andover Town Council has clarified that it is seeking a related alteration to have the area covered by the Andover Downlands Borough Ward to be wholly		

	<p>within the Andover North County Electoral Division. At present, the Borough Ward is split into two Electoral Divisions (the boundary being shown as a pink line on Map SCR13A). The northern part is within Andover North Division, with the southern part (Picket Piece and Picket Twenty) being in Test Valley Central Division.</p> <p>Having this area in the same County Electoral Division would be effective and convenient. However, the impact of the proposed related alteration on the surrounding County Electoral Divisions and electoral variances needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>If the proposal for a Related Alteration were to be accepted, it would bring Test Valley Central more into balance in terms of electoral variance. However, it would also result in Andover North having an electoral variance of +24%, Such a variance level is unlikely to be acceptable to the LGBCE, and would have an adverse impact on the CGR Principles in terms of effective governance.</p> <p>If the proposals for a related alteration to bring Burghclere Down into Andover South (from Test Valley Central) are taken into account, the high variance for Andover North remains, but Test Valley Central is -14.4%, which is also in excess of 10% and is unlikely to be acceptable to the LGBCE.</p> <p>It is therefore not recommended that a Related Alteration is sought in response to this proposal.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>As noted above, under the 2017 Borough Electoral Review, the LGBCE created an Andover Downlands Borough Ward which covers this area. As that Ward was divided by a boundary between two County Electoral Divisions, it therefore created two Town Wards within the area, Downlands and Picket Piece.</p> <p>A proposal that the whole of this area of Andover be one Town Ward, coterminous with the Borough Ward, would require the Consent of the LGBCE as this would be changing Electoral Arrangements set by the LGBCE in the previous five years.</p> <p>If consent were to be granted, the Town Wards could be revised as per the proposal.</p> <p>In respect of the proposal to seek a related alteration to the County Electoral Division Boundary, the LGBCE will consider the impact of the proposed change on electoral variance. The tables below set out the current position, and the impact of the proposed related alteration. The first table deals with the impact of this related alteration alone, with the second including the implications on Test Valley Central Division if Burghclere Down is moved from Test Valley Central Division to Andover South</p>

Division (refer to SCR7).						
Moving Picket Piece/Picket 20 from Test Valley Central into Andover North SCR 13						
Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)
Andover North	-8%	0.8%	1921	3287	6.3%	24.3%
Test Valley Central	5.9%	15.1%	-1921	-3287	-8.4%	-8.4%
Combined SCR7 and SCR13						
Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)
Andover South	4.5%	5.4%	+844	+840	10.8%	11.4%
Andover North	-8%	0.8%	1921	3287	6.3%	24.3%
Test Valley Central	5.9%	15.1%	-1921	-3287	-14.6	-14.4%
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no related alteration application be made in respect of the County Division boundary through Andover Downlands Borough Ward.					
Map Reference	SCR13A					

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 14																								
LGBCE Implications	Consent																										
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 8.1 Andover Town Council 8.2 Liberal Democrats - Andover and District Branch 8.4 Andover resident (comment on governance arrangements) ---- SCR Support Draft Recommendation 8.1(S) Andover Town Council</p>																										
Nature of Issue	Warding arrangements for Andover Town Council.																										
Summary of Issue	Whether Andover Town Wards should reflect Borough Wards. Decrease number of Councillors from 19 to 16 (3 each for Millway, Harroway, Romans and St Mary's, and 2 each for Winton and Downlands).																										
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Millway Town Ward (as shown on Map FCR 13-14) be extended to include the area of Andover Town shown labelled as "Marlborough Parish Ward" on Map FCR 13-14. That Andover Town be warded into six Town Wards, on the same boundaries as the six Borough Wards shown on map FCR13-14 and as listed in the table below:- <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Borough Ward Name</th> <th>Town Ward Name</th> <th>Number of Town Councillors to be elected</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Andover Downlands</td> <td>Downlands</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Harroway</td> <td>Harroway</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Millway</td> <td>Millway</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Romans</td> <td>Romans</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover St Mary's</td> <td>St Mary's</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andover Winton</td> <td>Winton</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> That LGBCE consent is sought for the proposed changes. 			Borough Ward Name	Town Ward Name	Number of Town Councillors to be elected	Andover Downlands	Downlands	2	Andover Harroway	Harroway	3	Andover Millway	Millway	3	Andover Romans	Romans	3	Andover St Mary's	St Mary's	3	Andover Winton	Winton	2	Total		16
Borough Ward Name	Town Ward Name	Number of Town Councillors to be elected																									
Andover Downlands	Downlands	2																									
Andover Harroway	Harroway	3																									
Andover Millway	Millway	3																									
Andover Romans	Romans	3																									
Andover St Mary's	St Mary's	3																									
Andover Winton	Winton	2																									
Total		16																									
Summary of Representations	Andover Town Council – To ensure Andover [Town] reflects the identity and interests of the community and to be both effective																										

<p>(First Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>and convenient, the Town Council wards should mirror the Borough Council's wards which encompasses all the urban development in Andover.</p> <p>Liberal Democrats - Andover and District Branch - Town Wards should be same as Borough Wards, and there should be the same number of Town Councillors as there are Borough Councillors for each ward.</p> <p>Andover resident – Should be more discussion on proposal other than new boundaries in Andover [Town] area; should the changes go forward, what does it mean for governance in the town, will there be smaller councils for the proposed wards? Would object if smaller councils are proposed, as dividing a town and its finances would be potentially damaging to infrastructure, facilities and services. Is in favour of representing local people more equally.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Andover Town Council - Wish for Andover Town to be warded into six Town wards, on the same boundaries as the six Borough wards shown on map FCR 13-14. Fully support the proposed warding arrangements and number of councillors for those wards. The ward names and number of councillors should be as follows - Downlands (2), Harroway (3), Millway (3), Romans (3), St Mary's (3) Winton (2).</p> <p>[See also separate representation under SCR8, where the Town Council request a related alteration to move the Borough Ward boundary so that what is currently Marlborough Ward moves from Anna Borough Ward to Andover Millway Borough (and town) Wards.]</p> <p>[See also SCR12, which considers moving four properties in Western Road Andover from Millway (Andover Town) Ward to Winton (Andover Town) Ward, with a Related Alteration to align Borough Ward boundary with the revised Town Ward boundary.]</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>On the basis that Marlborough Ward is to be retained within the Town area (Issue SCR8 refers), it is necessary to decide whether Andover Town is to be warded (as it is at present, and will be under the 2017 Electoral Review). If it is to be warded, a decision is required on the boundaries and names of those wards, and the number of Town Councillors to be elected to each.</p> <p>Andover Town is warded at present, and Andover Town has indicated it wishes that the Town Council should continue to be warded. Other than representations proposing abolition of the Town Council, no representations have been received to contradict this proposal. There is no evidence before the Council that warding would not be appropriate.</p> <p>Having Borough and Town wards which are coterminous and similarly named (as proposed by Andover Town Council) will reinforce the community identities and interests which were</p>

	<p>reflected in the outcome of the Borough Ward Review. It will also make governance effective and convenient, with clear and common ward lines and similar names.</p> <p>If Marlborough is to be retained within the Andover Town area, a decision will be required on whether a separate ward is created for this area (in addition to the six Town Wards which will reflect the Borough Ward boundaries), or whether the Marlborough area is merged into one of the six Town Wards.</p> <p>Given the fact that the electorate for Marlborough is 233 at December 2017 figures, and is not expected to rise significantly, it would be logical to include the Marlborough Town Ward area within an expanded Millway Town Ward. Andover Town Council wish to reduce the number of Town Councillors from the 19 member council size figure set by the 2017 Electoral Review, and under its proposals the Town Council would comprise 16 members. Including the Marlborough Ward area within Millway Town Ward would retain that same council size figure, according with Andover Town’s proposed figure.</p> <p>Reducing the number of town councillors will also assist meeting the CGR “effective governance” principle, given the potential difficulties with recruiting fully to the number of seats produced as a result of the 2017 Review.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>The parish (Town) warding arrangements were put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review. Under its proposals, six new Borough Wards were created covering the Andover Town area, as shown on Map SCR14. Broadly, these new Borough Wards corresponded with the existing Andover Town Area, with the following exceptions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of Andover Romans is in Smannell and Enham Alamein Parishes; • Part of Andover Millway (Burghclere Down) is in Abbots Ann Parish; • Part of Anna Borough Ward is in Andover Town (Marlborough Town Ward)

Borough Ward Name	No. of TVBC Cllrs	Parish/Town	Parish/Town Ward	Number of Parish Cllrs
Andover Downlands	2	Andover Town	C Downlands G Picket Piece	2 1
Andover Harroway	3	Andover Town	D Harroway	4
Andover Millway	3	(i) Andover Town (ii) <i>Abbotts Ann Parish</i>	(i) F Millway (ii) <i>B Burghclere Down</i>	3 3
Andover Romans	3	(i) Andover Town (ii) <i>Enham Alamein Parish</i> (iii) <i>Smannell Parish</i>	(i) H Romans (ii) <i>L East Anton</i> (iii) <i>Z Augusta Park</i>	1 2 6
Andover St Mary's	3	Andover Town	I St Mary's East J St Mary's West	2 2
Andover Winton	2	Andover Town	K Winton	3
Sub Total	16			
Anna	2	(i) Andover Town (ii) <i>Abbotts Ann Parish</i>	(i) E Marlborough (ii) <i>Abbotts Ann</i>	1 3
Summary (Andover Area)				
Andover Town			19	19
Enham Alamein			2	2
Smannell			6	6
Abbotts Ann			3	3
Total (Parish/Town Councillors representing Andover area)			30	30

The table above summarises the position as it stands after the 2017 Review, but before any changes which are proposed as part of the current CGR process.

Andover Town has proposed that it should be warded into six wards, and that these six wards should reflect the same boundaries as the Borough Ward boundaries. The number of Town Councillors for each Town Ward would be the same as the number of Borough Councillors for the corresponding Borough Ward, giving a total of 16 Town Councillors (reduced from the current figure of 19 Town Councillors).

Under the proposed changes, Burghclere Down would be transferred to Andover Town, and East Anton and Augusta Park would also be transferred to Andover Town. These changes accord with Andover Town's proposal.

Andover Town Council also proposed (at First Consultation Stage), that the area comprised in the new Marlborough Town Ward (which is currently within Andover Town area) should be transferred to Abbots Ann Parish. Marlborough Ward includes Andover Business Park, the military estate and Monxton Road. This was considered under Issue FCR8. Full Council on 26 April 2018 decided not to accept this proposal, so that Marlborough Ward would remain within Andover Town area. In its Second Consultation response, Andover Town Council accepted this.

The following table shows the number of Town/Parish Councillors for each of the wards in the Andover area, based on the incorporation into the Town of Burghclere Down and East Anton/Augusta Park, together with the number of local government electors (Jan 2018 and five year projection) for these wards. It also shows Marlborough Town Ward as a separate line, to allow Members to consider options accordingly.

CGR Proposed Town/Parish Ward	2017 Electoral Review Proposals	Town/parish Councillors (proposed)	Electorate (January 2018)	Five Year projection
	C Downlands	2	1870	3287
	G Picket Piece	1	981	1498
Downlands		2	2851	4785
	D Harroway	4	7526	7709
Harroway		3	7526	7709
	(i) F Millway	3	5974	6298
	(ii) B Burghclere Down	3	848	840
Millway		3	6822	7138
	(i) H Romans	1	2951	3052
	(ii) L East Anton	2	348	266
	(iii) Z Augusta Park	6	2122	3237
Romans		3	5421	6555
	I St Mary's East	2	3448	3484
	J St Mary's West	2	2867	3196
St Mary's		3	6315	6680
	K Winton	3	5010	4976
Winton		2	5010	4976
	Sub-total	16		
	Marlborough	1		
Marlborough		1	233	249
GRAND TOTAL (INCLUDING MARLBOROUGH)		17		

* Note – figures do NOT include changes arising from SCR12.

From this table, it can be seen that the Wards are broadly comparable in terms of electors per Town Councillor, other than Downlands (2851 between 2 Councillors) and Marlborough (233 electors for one Councillor).

Given the low numbers of electors in Marlborough, and that this figure is unlikely to rise significantly in the next five years, it would be logical to include Marlborough Ward with an adjacent ward (Millway).

Unless the 2017 warding arrangements are retained, any other proposal would alter electoral arrangements set in place by the LGBCE in the 2017 Review, and the Consent of the LGBCE would therefore be required.

The number of Councillors proposed by Andover Town Council for each of the proposed Town Wards reflects the current and five year projections for the electorate in each area, and will reduce the possibility of seats being unfilled.

Proposed Final Recommendation

1. That Millway Parish Ward (as shown on Map SCR 13-14) be extended to include the area of Andover Town shown labelled as "Marlborough Parish Ward" on Map SCR 13-14.
2. That Andover Town be warded into six Town Wards, on the same boundaries (subject to Final Recommendation SCR12) as the six Borough Wards shown on map SCR13-14 (save that Andover Millway shall include the areas shown as "Marlborough Parish Ward" as above) and as listed in the table below:-

Borough Ward Name	Town Ward Name	Number of Town Councillors to be elected
Andover Downlands	Downlands	2
Andover Harroway	Harroway	3
Andover Millway	Millway	3
Andover Romans	Romans	3
Andover St Mary's	St Mary's	3
Andover Winton	Winton	2
Total		16

3. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed changes.

[See also SCR 8 for Related Alteration to move area shown as "Marlborough Parish Ward" from Anna Borough Ward to Andover Millway Borough Ward.]

[See also SCR 12 for Related Alteration to move four properties in Western Road Andover from Andover Millway Ward to Andover Winton Ward.]

Map Reference

SCR 13-14

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 15
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 8.5 Andover resident ----</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Whether Andover Town Council should be given all responsibilities of a Parish Council.		
Summary of Issue	Respondent understands that the Andover Town Council does not have all the responsibilities of a town or parish council as detailed in the list at https://www.localgov.co.uk . Asks that the CGR should recommend that all the responsibilities of a parish council be transferred to ATC or that the future of the ATC itself be reviewed.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 15.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	See Summary of Issue above.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	<p>The website referred to by the respondent lists the following powers as being under the remit of parish/town councils, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Allotments · Burial Grounds, Cemeteries, Churchyards and Crematoria · Bus Shelters · Community Centres, Conference Centres, Halls, Public Buildings · Drainage – of ditches and ponds · Entertainment and the Arts · Footpaths · Highways – lighting, parking places, right to enter into discussions about new roads and road widening, consent of parish council required for diversion or discontinuation of highway, traffic signs and other notices, tree planting 		

	<p>and verge maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Land – acquisition and sale of · Litter - provision of litter-bins and support for any anti-litter campaigns · Public conveniences – provision and maintenance of public toilets · Recreation – provision of recreation grounds, public walkways, pleasure grounds, open spaces, village greens, gymnasiums, playing fields, holiday camps and boating ponds · Rights of Way – footpath and bridleway maintenance · Seats (public) · Signs – danger signs, place names and bus stops signs · Tourism – financial contributions to any local tourist organisations allowed · Traffic Calming · War Memorials <p>These are statutory powers vested in all parish/town councils. They are not devolved down by district/borough/county councils, who often have concurrent powers to those listed above, and may already be exercising these (e.g. provision of cemeteries and recreation facilities).</p> <p>In the case of Andover, a Special Expenses Levy was charged prior to the Town Council being created, to cover the cost of functions that might otherwise have been carried out by a parish/town council. Since the creation of the Town Council, the Levy has been reduced to reflect the transfer of responsibility for allotments which have been taken on by the Town Council. The current Levy covers the cost of services such as maintenance of play areas, parks and open spaces in the Town area, which are still provided in the Town by the Borough Council.</p> <p>A CGR cannot therefore recommend the transfer of these powers to a Town Council, as the Town Council already has these powers vested in it. It is for the Town Council to decide which of these powers it wishes to exercise, and to what extent, taking account of local circumstances and its finances. Where facilities are already in existence and in the ownership of the Borough Council, the Borough and Town Councils could agree to the transfer of these facilities and their ongoing maintenance, but this would be outside of the CGR process.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Not applicable.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 15.
Map Reference	Not applicable

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Andover Town	Issue Ref:	SCR 16
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR For abolition 8.6 – 8.9 Andover residents ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Whether Andover Town Council should be abolished.		
Summary of Issue	Respondents consider that Andover Town Council should be abolished, for the reasons set out in their representations.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 16.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Andover Resident – Does not understand why Andover Town Council (ATC) was set up, and does not believe proper elections have taken place since the initial election. Why is there still a “Andover Special Expenses” on [Council Tax] bills?</p> <p>Andover Resident – Wholeheartedly agree with abolition of ATC. Voted against it originally, have seen nothing to change view. Does very little, office often closed, added another layer of bureaucracy with associated costs.</p> <p>Local Resident – Have noticed severe decline in management of allotments since ATC took them over. Rent has doubled but service received has drastically reduced. Most Councillors are co-opted, and ATC runs only allotments, Christmas lights and making recommendations which are often ignored. ATC should therefore be dissolved and duties taken back by TVBC.</p> <p>Local Resident – Less than 14% of eligible electors voted for a town council to be formed. Questionable therefore whether decision to create ATC reflects identities and interests of the community. Nine out of nineteen seats were co-opted, many of whom appear to have joined to promote own personal interests. ATC has very limited responsibilities, primarily</p>		

	<p>allotments, which is its only self-generated income. Charges doubled when ATC took over, and questionable whether allotment charges reflect the identity of the community. Vacant plots are not advertised, and there is no-one who is horticulturally qualified on the Allotments Committee. The ATC office is only open three days a week, and for limited hours. ATC should be disbanded because it is an extra layer of government, whose tasks could be more efficiently and economically carried out by TVBC.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.
Members Group Observations	<p>The Parish Council was created in 2010. Management of allotments in the town was subsequently transferred to it, thereby ensuring that the allotments are managed by the most local representatives of the community who are accountable to residents at Town Council elections.</p> <p>The Government has demonstrated a commitment to parish councils as an established and valued form of neighbourhood democracy. Government guidance on CGRs makes it clear that a decision to abolish a parish/town council should not be taken lightly, as this would cut across this commitment. It would expect that local support for abolition would be demonstrated over at least a period of two terms of office (eight years), and that such support was properly informed. The Guidance also expects a CGR to consider what arrangements would be in place to engage with the community following abolition.</p> <p>No evidence has been produced to indicate widespread support for the proposal, or alternative arrangements which already exist or could be put in place. As the proposal to abolish was made during the first consultation period, the Town Council has not had an opportunity to counter the representations.</p> <p>Although the representations indicated dissatisfaction with the Town Council, particularly in respect to allotment management, it is considered that the level and nature of the representations are not sufficient to justify a recommendation to abolish the Town Council.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Not applicable.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 16.
Map Reference	Not applicable

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Abbotts Ann/Upper Clatford Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR17
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 9.4 Abbotts Ann resident ---- SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 9.1(S) Abbotts Ann Parish Council 22.3 Upper Clatford Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer land east of A343 from Abbotts Ann Parish to Upper Clatford Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 17.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Abbotts Ann resident – It would make more sense for that part of the parish to the east of the A343 to be in the parish of Upper Clatford.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Abbotts Ann Parish Council – Agree no changes should be made in regard to FCR 17.</p> <p>Upper Clatford Parish Council – FCR17 disagree with this and prior to this agreed with Abbotts Ann Parish Council that there would not be a transfer*</p> <p>*N.B. This is a misinterpretation of the draft recommendation as no change was recommended.</p>		
Members Group Observations	<p>No clear map or other details to ascertain land proposed to be transferred. Map FCR17 shows all the land which is in Abbotts Ann Parish and which is sited on the east of the A343, including Gilberts Mead and Little Ann Bridge, although it is not clear from the representation whether this is intended to be included in the proposal also.</p> <p>No evidence to support the proposed transfer was submitted,</p>		

	<p>nor was there either support or opposition from the two Parish Councils. The Group also considered that there was no public mood for a transfer of this land.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Abbots Ann Parish Ward, which was created under the 2017 Electoral Review. Moving the area into Upper Clatford Parish would therefore require the Consent of the LGBCE (as such a proposal would change Electoral Arrangements set under the 2017 Borough Electoral Review).</p> <p>Both Abbots Ann and Upper Clatford parishes are within Anna Ward and Test Valley Central Electoral Division, so no Related Alteration would be required, but the proposal could only go forward if LGBCE Consent was forthcoming.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<p>That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 17.</p>
Map Reference	<p>SCR 17</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Abbotts Ann Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 18
LGBCE Implications		Consent	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 9.1 Abbotts Ann Parish Council 9.4 Abbotts Ann Resident 9.5 Abbotts Ann Resident ---- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Council size		
Summary of Issue	<p>The number of Parish Councillors which should be elected to Abbotts Ann. Currently there are 7 Parish Councillors (representing the existing parish area which includes Burghclere Down to the north of the A303 (see SCR 7). The proposals range from keeping 7 Parish Councillors (after transfer of Burghclere Down to Andover Town), to an increase of an unspecified number.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That (subject to the proposal to transfer Burghclere Down from Abbotts Ann Parish to Andover Town being accepted) the Abbotts Ann Parish be not warded and that number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Abbotts Ann Parish Council be set as 7. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed non-warding and size of Abbotts Ann Parish Council. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Abbotts Ann Parish Council – Increase number to 9 Parish Councillors.</p> <p>Abbotts Ann Resident – Give consideration to increasing the number of Parish Councillors, due to potential for heavy workload which not always easy for current councillors to undertake; additional councillors would enable the work to be expedited more swiftly and efficiently.</p> <p>Abbotts Ann Resident – The size of the parish council was increased to 7 in the 1970's. [Under the 2017 parish warding</p>		

	of the Parish Council] it is perverse to reduce the village representation from 7 parish councillors to 4 – having three representing Burghclere Down is wholly undemocratic. 7 parish councillors should be retained [for the Abbots Ann “village” Ward] if Burghclere Down is transferred to Andover Town.
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.
Members Group Observations	<p>The 2017 Electoral Review warded Abbots Ann into two Parish Wards, Abbots Ann (to be represented by 4 Parish Councillors) and Burghclere Down (3 parish councillors). If Burghclere Down is to be transferred to Andover Town (Issue SCR7 refers) a Recommendation will need to be made in respect of the number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Abbots Ann Parish (within the boundaries as proposed by the other Draft Recommendations). As a Parish Council cannot have fewer than five Councillors, a Recommendation on the size of Abbots Ann Parish Council would have to propose at least five Parish Councillors.</p> <p>The representations received indicate that even if Burghclere Down is transferred from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town, a council size of 7 Parish Councillors would be appropriate.</p> <p>Three of the last four elections were uncontested. If the proposal to transfer Burghclere Down is accepted, no increase is necessary, and the council size should remain at 7.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	The size of the Parish Council and the number of Parish Councillors for each of the two parish wards were set by the LGBCE as part of the 2017 Electoral Review. Changing the number of Councillors for a ward (as well as changing the parish area as proposed under Issue SCR7) will therefore require the Consent of the LGBCE.
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That (subject to the proposal to transfer Burghclere Down from Abbots Ann Parish to Andover Town being accepted) the Abbots Ann Parish be not warded and that number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Abbots Ann Parish Council be set as 7. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed non-warding and size of Abbots Ann Parish Council.
Map Reference	Not applicable

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Charlton Tangley and Andover Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 19
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR None [Note: late representation received, and invited to resubmit at Second Consultation Stage]</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SCR In favour of transfer:- 10.1& 10.2 Charlton Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move areas PP on Map SCR19A from Andover Town to Charlton Parish (boundary to be moved to coincide with main road by Saxon [Way]) 2. Move area RR on Map SCR19B from Tangley Parish to Charlton Parish (boundary to the North of Charlton Parish to be extended to the road instead of cutting across a field). 		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	[No representation was made therefore the draft recommendation was for no change.]		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	No representation was made within the time frame of the first consultation.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:-</p> <p>Charlton Parish Council –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move boundary line east to coincide with road centre line by Saxon Fields [Saxon Way - to create a clear boundary line – see SCR19A]. 2. Extend northern boundary to road that travels to Saw Mill rather than cutting across field [tidy up boundary to edge of field, rather than cutting it in half – see SCR19B]. 		

	<p>Tangley have been consulted and are in agreement with the proposal.</p> <p>Both proposals are for convenience.</p> <p>[NOTE: Cllr Carr, the Ward Councillor, has confirmed he supports the proposals.]</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>The proposals will assist effective and convenient local governance within the area, by making a clearer and more logical boundary line between parishes.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>The two areas shown PP on Map SCR19A are currently in Andover Town (Harroway Ward). It therefore falls within a ward created by the LGBCE following the 2017 Borough Review, and as this part of the Protected Electoral Arrangements, LGBCE consent will be required.</p> <p>The areas shown PP on Map SCR19A are within Andover Harroway Borough Ward. It would be sensible to include these areas within Charlton and the Pentons Borough Ward (even though there are no electors in the areas) to retain coterminosity of boundaries. Accordingly, it would be appropriate to seek a Related Alteration Order from LGBCE to move the areas from Andover Harroway to Charlton and The Pentons Borough Ward.</p> <p>The areas are within Andover West County Electoral Division, so no related alteration application would be required for areas LL.</p> <p>The area shown RR on Map SCR19B is currently in Tangley Parish, Bourne Valley Borough Ward and Andover North County Electoral Division. It would be sensible to include this area within Charlton and the Pentons Borough Ward and Andover West County Electoral Division (even though there are no electors in the areas) to retain coterminosity of boundaries. Accordingly, it would be appropriate to seek Related Alterations from the LGBCE to achieve this.</p> <p>There is no need for LGBCE Consent for the transfer of the area RR shown on MapSCR19B, as it does not relate to any Protected Electoral Arrangements.</p> <p>There are no electors in any of the areas, and therefore the proposed changes will not have any effect on Electoral Variance.</p>
<p>Proposed Final Recommendation</p>	<p><u>Area PP (SCR19A)</u></p>

	<p>1. That the areas of land lettered “PP” on Map SCR 19A be transferred from Andover Town to Charlton Parish.</p> <p>2. That LGCBE Consent be sought to the proposed changes.</p> <p>3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary.</p> <p><u>Area RR (SCR19B)</u></p> <p>4. That the areas of land lettered “RR” on Map SCR 19B be transferred from Tangley Parish to Charlton Parish.</p> <p>5. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed change, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for Related Alterations to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary.</p> <p>6. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed change, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for Related Alterations to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary.</p>
Map Reference	SCR19A and SCR 19B

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Penton Mewsey and Penton Grafton Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 20 and 21
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 11.1 Penton Mewsey Parish Council 12.1 Penton Grafton Parish Council ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	SCR 20 – Alteration of Parish Boundary. SCR 21 – Amalgamation of two Parishes into one with a single parish council.		
Summary of Issue	<p>SCR 20 – Whether to transfer part of Penton Grafton to Penton Mewsey, so that the whole Penton settlement is in Penton Mewsey Parish. This would move the boundary westwards, along the line shown on Map FCR20, thereby placing the settlement into Penton Mewsey Parish.</p> <p>SCR 21 – Whether Penton Grafton should absorb Penton Mewsey Parish, creating a new “Penton, Weyhill and Clanville” Parish, under a new single parish council. This would effectively combine the two parishes (as shown on Map FCR21) into a single parish.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements, in respect of Penton Grafton and Penton Mewsey Parishes.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>FCR 20 Penton Mewsey Parish Council – The Pentons comprise the village of Penton Mewsey and the built part of Penton Grafton to the east. Both element are indistinguishable, as shown by the joint Village Design Statement, the Pentons Conservation Area, and the Local Plan. The Pentons also share various facilities including a church, public house and village hall.</p> <p>A number of detailed points are made, including properties lying in one parish but accessing via the other, rights of way issues (including standard of upkeep and contributions</p>		

	<p>towards maintenance), contributions by Penton Mewsey to facilities in Penton Grafton such as the churchyard and Penton Village Hall, cross-boundary drainage issues, and additional administration costs due to both Parish Councils having to be consulted and involved in cross-boundary projects. It points out that the Village Hall is used by the whole community and both Parish Councils have previously contributed to equipment and maintenance, but in recent years only Penton Mewsey has made contributions.</p> <p>FCR21 Penton Grafton Parish Council – Penton Grafton Parish Council has responded to Penton Mewsey’s submission, and dealt with the detailed points which were raised. Penton Grafton point out that it contributes a proportionate amount to the upkeep of the recreation ground, and questions the true extent that the other facilities are shared. It points out that many properties in villages are accessed via neighbouring parishes, and disputes the claims regarding upkeep and contributions to maintenance of rights of way. Penton Grafton consider that in fact its contributions to the recreation facilities are disproportionately high, and its parishioners are not welcomed to events held there. It points out that it does not feel obliged to subsidise the Village Hall, as it has its own hall which is self-funding and does not require contributions. In conclusion, Penton Grafton are unanimously against Penton Mewsey’s proposed boundary alteration, which will rob Penton Grafton of its historical identity. Penton Grafton is larger both in terms of area and population, with its own village hall, shop and pub. If the proposed boundary change were to be made, a new name for Penton Grafton Parish would be required, creating problems and expense for the Penton Grafton Cottage Charity, with similar issues arising in respect of the Fairground Craft Centre which is owned by Penton Grafton Parish Council.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.
Members Group Observations	<p>The Members Group noted that the area of land which Penton Mewsey were proposing should be transferred to its Parish extended beyond the built settlement areas (red line on map FCR20), whilst the built settlement was confined to areas J1 and J2 on Map SCR20.</p> <p>The Group understood that there was no agreement between the respective Parish Councils involved, and it therefore decided that it would not be appropriate to make any recommendations on this Issue.</p>

Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Penton Mewsey and Penton Grafton are both within Charlton and The Pentons Borough Ward, and Andover West County Electoral Division. Neither was affected by parish warding arrangements put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore LGBCE Consent will not be required.</p> <p>As no other electoral boundaries will be affected, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements, in respect of Penton Grafton and Penton Mewsey Parishes
Map Reference	SCR 20, SCR21

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Appleshaw and Penton Grafton Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 22
LGBCE Implications		RA	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 13.1 Appleshaw PC 12.1 Penton Grafton PC ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Transfer 9 Ragged Appleshaw properties from Penton Grafton Parish to Appleshaw Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the boundary between Penton Grafton and Appleshaw Parishes be amended as shown on Map FCR22 and the area of land lettered “K” on the Map be transferred to Appleshaw Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Appleshaw Parish Council – Some of the nine affected properties lie on the boundary, others are wholly within Penton Grafton Parish, but all nine are clearly part of the Appleshaw community. The anomaly stems from when Ragged Appleshaw was called “Back Street” and contained only one or two dwellings on the west side of the road. The Local Plan recognises these properties as part of the village.</p> <p>The fact that the nine properties are in a different Borough Ward to the rest of Appleshaw compounds the anomaly, as these electors will be voting for different representatives than the other electors in the village. In addition, the electors from the nine properties cannot vote in the Appleshaw Village Hall polling station.</p> <p>Penton Grafton Parish Council – Penton Grafton have agreed with Appleshaw Parish Council to the proposed realignment of the boundary between the two parish areas.</p>		
Summary of	No representations were made.		

Representations (Second Consultation Stage)																						
Members Group Observations	There is clearly a shared identity and interest between Appleshaw village and these nine properties. The respective parish councils are in agreement, and the proposed change will regularise and remove a historic anomaly.																					
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Appleshaw Parish is in Bellinger Borough Ward, whereas Penton Grafton (including these nine properties) is part of Charlton and The Pentons. Both parishes are within Andover West Electoral Division.</p> <p>Neither was affected by parish warding arrangements put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore LGBCE Consent will not be required.</p> <p>However, in order to ensure that the nine properties fall within Bellinger Ward, a Related Alteration should be recommended to the LGBCE to alter the Borough Ward boundary so that this and the Parish boundary is coterminous.</p> <p>The following table sets out the Electoral Variance implications for this Related Alteration:-</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Division</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bellinger</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>+7</td> <td>+7</td> <td>16.0%</td> <td>10.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Charlton and The Pentons</td> <td>13.7%</td> <td>9.7%</td> <td>-7</td> <td>-7</td> <td>13.4%</td> <td>9.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	Bellinger	15.6%	10.6%	+7	+7	16.0%	10.9%	Charlton and The Pentons	13.7%	9.7%	-7	-7	13.4%	9.4%
Division	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																
Bellinger	15.6%	10.6%	+7	+7	16.0%	10.9%																
Charlton and The Pentons	13.7%	9.7%	-7	-7	13.4%	9.4%																
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the boundary between Penton Grafton and Appleshaw Parishes be amended as shown on Map SCR22 and the area of land lettered "K" on the Map be transferred to Appleshaw Parish. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGCBE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary. 																					
Map Reference	SCR 22																					

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	Grateley and Quarley Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 27
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 8.1 Quarley Parish Council --- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer Portway Farm Cottages from Quarley Parish to Grateley Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “L” on Map FCR 27 be transferred from Quarley Parish to Grateley Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Quarley Parish Council – The boundary between the two parishes passes through these two properties. The residents live closer to Grateley than Quarley, and consider themselves Grateley residents. They support the proposal. It is therefore proposed to move the boundary so as to include these dwellings in Grateley Parish.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	The boundary line should be realigned to avoid passing through dwellings. On the evidence it is reasonable to transfer these dwellings to Grateley Parish.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Anna Borough Ward and Andover West County Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p> <p>The change would have no significant effect on the distribution</p>		

	of electors between the two parishes.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "L" on Map SCR 27 be transferred from Quarley Parish to Grateley Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 27

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Quarley and Amport Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 28
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 19.1 Quarley Parish Council</p> <p>Against transfer:- None -----</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation 19.1(S) Quarley Parish Council</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation 18.1 Amport Parish Council</p> <p>[Note: a letter signed by several Quarley residents in favour of transfer was received, but this as after the closing date of the consultation period.]</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>Whether to transfer :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The part of the Parish west of and including Lains Farm; 2. The part of the Parish east of and including Lains Farm Business Park <p>from Amport Parish to Quarley Parish</p> <p>[Note: Amport Parish Council has submitted a counter-proposal, considered under SCR29, that Quarley parish be abolished and absorbed into Amport.]</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “M” on Map FCR 28 -29 be transferred from Amport Parish to Quarley Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered “N” on Map FCR 28 - 29 be transferred from Amport Parish to Quarley Parish. 		
Summary of Representations	<p>In favour of transfer:- Quarley Parish Council – Part of Quarley’s Conservation Area</p>		

(First Consultation Stage)	<p>lies in Amport Parish. Any adjustments to this would currently require consultation with two parishes, who may not agree to the adjustments. Residents and landowners in the area proposed to be transferred have been consulted, with a range of views expressed, although there was more support for the proposal to change the boundaries than to leave the boundaries as existing. Reasons cited by residents responding to the consultation included the unfair distribution of planning gain money from the solar farm between Amport and Quarley parishes, the closer proximity of the areas to Quarley than Amport, and the administrative disadvantages of having Quarley Conservation Area in two parishes.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Relevant extracts from representations below.</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Amport Parish Council – Amport has discussed review and the efficacy of seeking changes to boundaries at a number of recent meetings. Hosted a meeting with Thruxton PC leadership team and shared the results with the Chairman of Quarley PC and believed the over-riding quality to assess the need for change was effective representation. Were therefore surprised by the decision to re-draw the parish boundary, moving area N and M across to Quarley Parish. Amport has regularly engaged with this area in many ways: considerable detailed and legal work regards planning matters at Lains Farm Solar Park and we are still working to resolve footpath 23, so what is the reason to seek change: is it just to square-off the map? Many residents identify with Amport, children attend the school, families frequent the Hawk Inn and we have engaged with this area with equanimity and energy, the representation is highly effective.</p> <p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Quarley Parish Council - Rebut proposal from Amport Parish to absorb Quarley into Amport Parish. Quarley PC applied the four criteria in its approach, identity, interest, efficiency and convenience. Previous chair of Amport PC suggested changing boundaries to add Area M to Quarley 10 years ago (last consultation). This is logical and reflects residents' views. Residents in that area attend Quarley events and the Church, and find it a nonsense to have to drive to Amport to vote. Would have been bizarre not to put in a proposal when Lains Farm is 4 minutes from the churchyard, the nodal point of village. Conservation is partly in both parishes causing inefficiency and difficulty. Quarley carried out extensive consultation, and majority of residents favoured a change for the reasons set out in the submission. Quarley is distant from Amport and has its own distinct identity. Quarley's proposal included the solar farm but not the eastern end of site 'N' TVBC added this with what Quarley see as justification with</p>

	<p>geographical separation of residents from Amport*. Amport cites its role in consulting residents of area M for planning, but if the area were in Quarley Parish, Quarley would consult the residents in the same way. Residents do not favour Amport's proposal of absorbing Quarley, feeling of derision and insult to residents. Consider TVBC has stuck to their criteria, support the proposals and should be implemented.</p> <p><i>[* NB. Site 'N' was included on the original Quarley proposal map received as part of the first round of consultation, TVBC did not add this as an extra section.]</i></p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Amport Parish Council Chairman - Note correspondence from the Quarley PC Chairman and wishes to review narrative. Quoting the original briefing from Chief Executive Roger Tetstall warned against the 'invisible predator' this was discussed with Thruxton PC at the January PC meeting, subsequently an approach was received from Quarley PC, but far too late for public discussion and so the otherwise agreed position was shared with the Quarley Chairman, but without notice a predatory application was posted, should such poor practice be rewarded or even considered?</p> <p>The reference to the previous questionnaire is hearsay, as a serving Cllr at the time, the situation was carefully tested and decided. Quarley is a charming village and sits well in the Amport PC area, is sure the 'not knowing' resident knows where Amport Primary School, the Hawk Inn and similar amenities are, this is a wider area and Quarley and the character of this community is in accord with many areas in the parish, Amport Village Green and East Cholderton for example. Believes the derision described would be calmed when the fairness of representation is considered.</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>At the First Consultation Stage, the Members Group noted that Amport had not apparently been consulted on the proposed changes, but that the current arrangement of boundaries means that Amport Parish extends along the north-western boundary of Quarley, leading to the issues referred to by residents. It was therefore originally proposed to transfer these two areas from Amport to Quarley, as (on the evidence before the Group at that time) this would reflect the community identities, and be more efficient and convenient for residents and local administration.</p> <p>The Members Group considered the representations from Amport and Quarley. It noted that there was clearly no agreement between the two parish councils over the areas which are the subject of this Issue. Both councils had put</p>

	<p>forward arguments in favour of their respective positions. Whilst amending the boundaries as suggested by Quarley would make sense geographically, that in itself was not sufficient to justify a transfer of these areas. In the absence of agreement between the parish councils and any clear overriding evidence in favour of a transfer, it was recommended that no change be made to the boundaries of either parish council.</p> <p>The Members Group considered the representations from Amport and Quarley, and noted that Amport had not accepted Quarley's proposal to take over part of Amport Parish [this Issue is considered separately under Issue SCR29.]</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Anna Borough Ward and Andover West County Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected if the two areas were transferred, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p> <p>If implemented, the proposed change would have no significant effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no Final Recommendation be made in respect of this Issue.
Map Reference	SCR 28

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Amport and Quarley Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 29
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR None -----</p> <p>SCR For Abolition (of Quarley Parish) 18.1 Amport Parish Council (two representations)</p> <p>Against Abolition (of Quarley Parish) 19.1 (S) Quarley Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Abolition of Parish and Parish Council		
Summary of Issue	<p>Issue FCR28 considered moving two areas from Amport Parish into Quarley Parish (areas “M” and “N” on map SCR28). The proposal was made by Quarley Parish Council, and accepted as a Draft Recommendation by the Council.</p> <p>In responding to the Second Consultation, Amport Parish rejected the evidence offered by Quarley in support of the proposal, and made a counter-proposal, that Quarley Parish should be abolished and absorbed into Amport Parish.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	See SCR 28		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	See SCR 28		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>For Abolition:- Amport Parish Council – Amport has discussed review and the efficacy of seeking changes to boundaries at a number of recent meetings. Hosted a meeting with Thruxton PC leadership team and shared the results with the Chairman of Quarley PC and believed the over-riding quality to assess the need for change was effective representation. Were therefore surprised by the decision to re-draw the parish boundary, moving area N and M across to Quarley Parish. Amport has regularly engaged with this area in many ways: considerable</p>		

detailed and legal work regards planning matters at Lains Farm Solar Park and we are still working to resolve footpath 23, so what is the reason to seek change: is it just to square-off the map? Many residents identify with Amport, children attend the school, families frequent the Hawk Inn and we have engaged with this area with equanimity and energy, the representation is highly effective. Amport PC meet more frequently, this is a highly proficient first level of governance, the Terms of Reference are scrutinised and tested and we are open to ideas and projects. Quarley is a small village, there are about 150 residents in the parish and a small PC only meet 4 times a year; therefore Amport PC believe that to promote effective governance, the Quarley Parish should be integrated into Amport Parish; thereby the Amport Parish boundary is re-drawn so Quarley Parish is placed within the boundaries of Amport. Quarley could have a member or two on the PC but regarding guiding principles believe Amport should take responsibility for the whole area, enhancing communications with TVBC Cllr and HCC.

Against Abolition:-

Quarley Parish Council - Rebut proposal from Amport Parish to absorb Quarley into Amport Parish. Quarley PC applied the four criteria in its approach, identity, interest, efficiency and convenience. Previous chair of Amport PC suggested changing boundaries to add Area M to Quarley 10 years ago (last consultation). This is logical and reflects residents' views. Residents in that area attend Quarley events and the Church, and find it a nonsense to have to drive to Amport to vote. Would have been bizarre not to put in a proposal when Lains Farm is 4 minutes from the churchyard, the nodal point of village. Conservation is partly in both parishes causing inefficiency and difficulty. Quarley carried out extensive consultation, and majority of residents favoured a change for the reasons set out in the submission. Quarley is distant from Amport and has its own distinct identity. Quarley's proposal included the solar farm but not the eastern end of site 'N' TVBC added this with what Quarley see as justification with geographical separation of residents from Amport*. Amport cites its role in consulting residents of area M for planning, but if the area were in Quarley Parish, Quarley would consult the residents in the same way. Residents do not favour Amport's proposal of absorbing Quarley, feeling of derision and insult to residents. Consider TVBC has stuck to their criteria, support the proposals and should be implemented.

*[* NB. Site 'N' was included on the original Quarley proposal map received as part of the first round of consultation, TVBC did not add this as an extra section.]*

	<p>For Abolition:- Amport Parish Council Chairman - Note correspondence from the Quarley PC Chairman and wishes to review narrative. Quoting the original briefing from Chief Executive Roger Tetstall warned against the 'invisible predator' this was discussed with Thruxton PC at the January PC meeting, subsequently an approach was received from Quarley PC, but far too late for public discussion and so the otherwise agreed position was shared with the Quarley Chairman, but without notice a predatory application was posted, should such poor practice be rewarded or even considered?</p> <p>The reference to the previous questionnaire is hearsay, as a serving Cllr at the time, the situation was carefully tested and decided. Quarley is a charming village and sits well in the Amport PC area, is sure the 'not knowing' resident knows where Amport Primary School, the Hawk Inn and similar amenities are, this is a wider area and Quarley and the character of this community is in accord with many areas in the parish, Amport Village Green and East Cholderton for example. Believes the derision described would be calmed when the fairness of representation is considered. A comparison is interesting: Amport PC meet ten times a year, typically sitting for 2 hours at a time, this would be approximately 200 hours of the first level of governance; wonders if the residents of Quarley realise that by comparison their representation is about 10% of that, fair enough if you believe that it is about 10% of the size and only 10% of the work, but the comparison is stark. Interesting that if 2 councillors join Amport as envisaged, then representation will effectively double. When [Amport Chairman] sought to investigate the problem, looked at the Quarley website, it is woefully dated and the last set of recorded minutes were posted more than six months ago, nothing concerning this matter is in the public domain, was it even agreed and tested by the PC? In comparison http://amportvillage.co.uk/ is connected, updated and fit for purpose. [Amport Chairman] was certainly wondering why you would maintain a quaint notion that a few folk, meet occasionally and struggle with the workload, whereas the alternative would be a committed team, open to new members and projects, that represents the parish with experience, equanimity and commitment.</p> <p>Believes the need to integrate is overwhelming. Quarley does not sit in isolation, clearly agenda items such as highways travel beyond the parish boundary. Once integrated, a stronger position could be maintained in response to the HGVs that traverse the parish en-route to dumping spoil at Georgia Farm for example, a stronger voice would be heard in matters that clearly resonate outside the boundary, for</p>
--	--

	<p>communications, public transport, charity and schooling to highlight a few.</p> <p>Amport PC has representation from banking, law, accountancy, military service, publishing, marketing, travel, tourism, hospitality and so on. Council has considerable learned experience in rôle and relevant skills such as Health and Safety training and mental welfare support. An element of recognition from TVBC would be welcome and the realisation that residents of Quarley would be well served by integration, would be that opportunity.</p> <p>Importantly, a protracted debate could be entered into, or could simply understand the problem: to ensure fair representation which thereby promotes the identity of the area, enhances interest through improved, open and inclusive representation and with integration both efficiency and convenience of contact would be assured. This is not a personal issue, it is assessed without emotion and is an evaluation of best practice and suitability for the rôle.</p> <p>[Amport Parish] would welcome further discussion on this matter and commend this request for the integration of Quarley Parish into Amport Parish.</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>At the First Consultation Stage, the Members Group noted that Amport had not apparently been consulted on the changes proposed by Quarley, but that the current arrangement of boundaries means that Amport Parish extends along the north-western boundary of Quarley, leading to the issues referred to by residents. It was therefore originally proposed to transfer these two areas from Amport to Quarley, as (on the evidence before the Group at that time) this would reflect the community identities, and be more efficient and convenient for residents and local administration.</p> <p>It also noted that as part of its response, Amport had proposed that it takes over Quarley and that Quarley Parish Council be abolished.</p> <p>Abolition of a parish council is a significant step, and Government guidance states that a decision to abolish a parish council should not be taken lightly. Any failure on the part of Quarley to discuss their original proposal with Amport could not in itself justify a decision to abolish Quarley parish Council. There was no other evidence before the Members Group to justify the abolition – moreover, as this proposal only arose at the Second Consultation Stage, the public had not been consulted on the proposal.</p>

	<p>The Members Group therefore recommended that this proposal be rejected, and that Quarley Parish Council be retained.</p> <p>[The Issue of the area of Quarley Parish is considered separately under Issue SCR28.]</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Anna Borough Ward and Andover West County Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE would not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<p>That no Final Recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 29.</p>
Map Reference	<p>SCR 28-29, SCR29</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Longparish, Wherwell and Barton Stacey Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 32
LGBCE Implications		NONE	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 27.1 Barton Stacey Parish Council ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to redraw boundary so that Gavelacre, Longparish Road, South Harewood is primarily within Longparish Parish (with consequential amendments to transfer land to Wherwell Parish).		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “O” on Map FCR 32 be transferred from Barton Stacey Parish to Longparish Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered “OO” on Map FCR 32 be transferred from Barton Stacey Parish to Wherwell Parish. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Barton Stacey Parish Council – The boundary between the two parishes passes through the garden of Gavelacre, with the house and most of the garden being in Longparish, but a small part of the garden is in Barton Stacey. It is proposed that the boundary be moved so that the whole garden is in Longparish Parish.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	The boundary line should be realigned to avoid dividing properties between two parishes. On the evidence it is reasonable to transfer the part of the garden of Gavelacre which is in Barton Stacey Parish to Longparish Parish.		

	In order to have a logical boundary in the area, it is also proposed to transfer an adjacent area (labelled "OO" on CGR Map SCR32) to Wherwell Parish.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Harewood Borough Ward and Test Valley Central County Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p> <p>The change would have no effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "O" on Map SCR 32 be transferred from Barton Stacey Parish to Longparish Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered "OO" on Map SCR 32 be transferred from Barton Stacey Parish to Wherwell Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 32

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Longstock and Stockbridge Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 36-37
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR Against transfer:- 30.1 Longstock Parish Council 30.3-30.25 Longstock residents</p> <p>In favour of transfer:- 30.26 Longstock resident 31.2 Stockbridge resident ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to move Roman Road/Houghton Road/Salisbury Hill area from Longstock Parish to Stockbridge Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the existing boundary line between Longstock Parish and Stockbridge Parish not be altered.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Against transfer:- Longstock Parish Council – Longstock is in some ways an anomaly. Southern Part (houses at Windover crossroads, Houghton Road, Salisbury Hill and Roman Road) lies within the Settlement Boundary of Stockbridge, but is within the civil Parish of Longstock. Although many residents might feel more attuned to Stockbridge due to proximity of facilities, a survey of these residents found that 95% preferred to remain in Longstock Parish. Longstock and Stockbridge have different distinct characters and Longstock Parish Council has no desire to see any changes in the boundaries.</p> <p>Chairman of Longstock Parish Council – 61 houses comprised in the area affected were consulted and 99% wished to remain in Longstock. The river is the natural boundary and should remain so. Parish Council was unanimous that the boundary should not be altered.</p>		

	<p>Longstock resident – Longstock Parish Council is proactive and serve us well. Please keep arrangements as they are.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Parish boundary should be maintained as at present.</p> <p>Longstock resident – As a resident of Roman Road we are well served by Longstock Parish Council and wish to remain in that parish.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Please leave boundaries alone.</p> <p>Longstock resident – I am a resident of Houghton Road and wish to see things stay the same. Additional housing would be disastrous.</p> <p>Longstock residents – Support status quo. Longstock has a thriving social, cultural and self-administering identity, independent and distinct from the busy touristic/commercial hub of Stockbridge. We value Stockbridge for these facilities but believe Longstock’s intimacy and dedicated focus would be lost if the parishes were merged. Longstock Parish Council is best able to represent our interests. There is no need to change, and possibly damage existing good relationship between the neighbouring parishes.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Boundary is long-established, and coherence of identity is more important to Longstock than a “tidy-up” of the boundaries. Please do not change.</p> <p>Longstock resident – I hope a change to the southern part of Longstock Parish does not happen. Boundary has been in place for many years and history should be respected. Longstock Parish Council is well capable of representing all Parish residents. Please do not change the boundary</p> <p>Longstock resident – We live on Houghton Road, and feel strongly that we are part of Longstock and wish to remain so. Stockbridge and Longstock have distinct identities which co-exist harmoniously.</p> <p>Longstock resident – The two communities have distinct identities. Longstock should remain a diverse community, and not become a residential add-on to Stockbridge. The River Test is an ancient boundary and this should remain.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Strongly opposed to any border changes. The two communities have distinct identities and the long-standing boundaries should not be changed.</p>
--	--

	<p>Longstock resident – See no reason to change boundary along middle of River Test.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Roman Road should not be included in Stockbridge Parish. River Test is a natural boundary. Longstock is a rural area whereas Stockbridge is a small town. The Parish Council has served the community well.</p> <p>Longstock resident – No reason to alter status quo. Stockbridge and Longstock are different but complementary. Parish Council truly represents view of the local community. Longstock should maintain its present parish boundaries.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Strongly object to boundaries being moved, which are of historical value. A change would benefit only Stockbridge Parish Council, and will have a negative impact on Longstock. Parish Council is proactive and always listens to views.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Longstock Parish Council is active and effective in all affairs, particularly planning. Stockbridge Parish Council is less well served, demonstrated by their lack of objection to a specific planning application, and their failure to address parking issues (which other parishes have successfully done elsewhere). I prefer to remain in Longstock.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Lives in Roman Road in Longstock and wishes to remain as such. Parish Council represents people better than Stockbridge Parish Council (which seems to have little interest in Roman Road) could do. No advantages to a boundary move, only disadvantages.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Wishes to retain current boundaries. The two communities are very different, but always identifies with Longstock. River is a historic boundary.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Strong opposition to any changes. Has pride and sense of community being part of Longstock. School and other amenities should be preserved in Longstock Parish.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Identifies with rural parish of Longstock rather than small town of Stockbridge. River has always been natural boundary, which should not change.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Against any boundary change. Not aware of a majority (or any) of Longstock Parish residents requesting a boundary change. No questionnaire has been distributed to affected households to canvass opinion, which infringes EU Planning Framework Guidelines. Would presume most of affected residents would not consider there are</p>
--	--

	<p>significant net benefits to moving and would wish to remain part of Longstock. Parish boundary has always been the river, which has led to Longstock being a “long” settlement. A change would not improve effectiveness or convenience, and identities and interests of vast majority better served by retaining existing boundaries.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Object to proposed boundary amendments. Proposal suggests amalgamation of 18 parishes, which would remove all local representation if combined into one large parish, where views of local people would be overlooked.</p> <p>Longstock resident – Allowing powers to build up to 800 houses near by would make Stockbridge worse. Leave things as they are.</p> <p>In favour of transfer:- Longstock resident – Understand possibility of moving southern part of Longstock Parish to Stockbridge Parish, which would be sensible step as clear disconnect between central part of Longstock area and the southern part adjacent to Stockbridge High Street. Stronger community of interest between Stockbridge and that part of Longstock, than with the central Longstock area.</p> <p>Stockbridge resident – Understand that one aspect of the review concerns existing parish boundaries. Current parish boundary to west side of Stockbridge is anomalous. Properties to the west of the River Test are for all practical purposes part of Stockbridge, and inhabitants use Stockbridge’s facilities and amenities. Development in the area affects Stockbridge more than Longstock but Stockbridge is not consulted, precept goes to Longstock but facilities used are in Stockbridge, and housing contributes to housing for people working in Stockbridge, but in planning terms it is attributed to Longstock.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.
Members Group Observations	There is considerable local opposition to any suggestion that the existing boundary between Longstock and Stockbridge parishes should be changed. There are convenient links between the properties in the southern part of Longstock Parish and Stockbridge, and the village clearly serves Longstock in providing various local facilities and amenities. However, this does not outweigh the clear sense of community identity with Longstock Parish that residents in the

	<p>Roman Road/Houghton Road/Salisbury Hill area have.</p> <p>There are no grounds for altering the boundary between the two parishes, and no recommendation should therefore be made.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Mid Test Borough Ward and Test Valley Central County Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required if a boundary alteration were to be proposed.</p> <p>Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by such a change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the existing boundary line between Longstock Parish and Stockbridge Parish not be altered.
Map Reference	SCR 36-37

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Stockbridge Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 38
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR For abolition (of Stockbridge Parish Council) 31.1 Stockbridge resident ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Abolition of Parish Council (perceived ineffectiveness of Stockbridge Parish Council).		
Summary of Issue	Respondent considers that functions of the Parish Council can be better delivered by monthly surgeries or a community forum.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 38.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>For abolition (of Stockbridge Parish Council) Stockbridge Resident – Review is very necessary. Planning decisions appear to be exceptions rather than in accordance with rules. Community views (rather than those of individual Councillors) should be represented. The two conflicting sides over parking issues in Stockbridge (traders and residents) are not being properly addressed. No action taken on speeding on Winton Hill. No action taken on dog fouling in the village. To deal with these and other issues, weight of public opinion should be taken at monthly surgeries or community forum meetings and reviewed at Borough/County level. Make Borough Council more accountable by appointing liaison officers for communities, and centralise planning at County level.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	The Government has demonstrated a commitment to Parish Councils as an established and valued form of neighbourhood		

	<p>democracy. Government guidance on CGRs makes it clear that a decision to abolish a parish/town council should not be taken lightly, as this would cut across this commitment. It would expect that local support for abolition would be demonstrated over at least a period of two terms of office (eight years), and that such support was properly informed. The Guidance also expects a CGR to consider what arrangements would be in place to engage with the community following abolition. Such action would not meet with the criteria of effective and convenient local governance.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Not applicable.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 38.
Map Reference	Not applicable.

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	King's Somborne Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 44
LGBCE Implications			NONE
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 37.1 King's Somborne Parish Council 37.2 King's Somborne resident ---- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	<p>a) Concern about outcome of 2017 Borough Electoral Review. b) Resistance to groupings of Parish Councils into larger units.</p>		
Summary of Issue	See nature of issue above.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of King' Somborne Parish Council.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>King's Somborne Parish Council – Views of Parish Council have not changed since last submitted. Still have concern at introduction of Mid Test [Borough] Ward with three Borough Ward Councillors instead of one as currently represented. Do not agree with basing distribution of Councillors on numbers alone, due to spread of rural communities.</p> <p>King's Somborne resident – Find it impossible to respond to Review as no perceived weaknesses/problems are identified. Against any move to integrate some Parish Councils into larger units on basis of number of electors. Parish Councillors live locally and have unique insights into local affairs. Parish Councils can therefore respond rapidly and effectively to local community opinion. Enlargement or integration of smaller Parish Councils will damage communication between local communities and the Borough Council. If changes are made for financial reasons rather than to improve governance, this must be explicitly revealed.</p>		
Summary of	No representations were made.		

Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	
Members Group Observations	<p>The 2017 Electoral Review was carried out by the LGBCE, which was legally required to take account of the ratio of Councillors to electors. It would not be possible to use the CGR process to revert back to a small Borough Ward to cover King's Somborne with one Borough Councillor representing it.</p> <p>In carrying out the CGR, the Borough Council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance in the Borough reflects the identities and interests of the community and is effective and convenient. The size of a parish must be taken into account, but the Council is not bound to ensure that each parish councillors should represent, as nearly as may be, the same number of electors. Guidance however does point out that where parishes are warded, it is not in the interests of effective and convenient local government to have significant differences in levels of representation between different parish wards.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the CGR set out the scope of the Review, rather than specific changes that are being sought. There is therefore no intention at the outset to seek to merge or integrate small parish councils together (although that may well be an outcome of the 2017 Electoral Review in certain cases if the evidence suggests this would be appropriate).</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Not applicable.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of King' Somborne Parish Council.
Map Reference	Not applicable.

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Buckholt, West Tytherley and Frenchmoor Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 46
LGBCE Implications			NONE
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 39.1 West Tytherley and Frenchmoor Parish Council 2.1 Steven Lugg Chief Executive of Hampshire Association of Local Councils 40.2 Buckholt resident ----- SCR 39.1(S) West Tytherley and Frenchmoor Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Grouping of parishes as currently Buckholt does not have a Parish Council, hold Parish Council meetings or an annual Parish meeting.		
Summary of Issue	All representations were in favour of the joining of the parishes. West Tytherley and Frenchmoor as an existing grouped Parish Council and Buckholt as a parish meeting which does not occur.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the parishes of Buckholt, West Tytherley and Frenchmoor be grouped under a Common Parish Council. 2. That the name of the group be “the Group of West Tytherley, Frenchmoor and Buckholt, Parishes”. 3. That the name of the Common Parish Council be “The Common Parish Council of West Tytherley, Frenchmoor and Buckholt”. 4. That the Reorganisation Order make provision for the application to the parishes of the provisions of Sections 298 to 303 of the Charities Act 2011 and of the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 so as to preserve the separate rights of each parish. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation)	West Tytherley and Frenchmoor Parish Council voted unanimously to have Buckholt join the grouping. They suggested the new grouping be called ‘West Tytherley,		

Stage)	<p>Frenchmoor and Buckholt' Parish Council.</p> <p>HALC suggested that the CGR should subsume Buckholt into a neighbouring parish as long as there was no local opposition.</p> <p>A resident from Buckholt wished to join West Tytherley and Frenchmoor given their proximity and use of facilities within West Tytherley village. From their understanding they are not currently represented as solely Buckholt parish.</p>																				
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>West Tytherley and Frenchmoor Parish Council – Support the proposal to group Buckholt with West Tytherley and Frenchmoor</p>																				
Members Group Observations	<p>This was agreed to be a case of effective and convenient local governance, giving Buckholt a form of local governance where it does not currently have one. It also conforms to the idea of local identity given the representation from a Buckholt resident.</p>																				
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>No changes regarding Borough Ward level, all parishes in the new Mid-Test ward.</p> <p>The table below shows the electorate of each parish:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="496 1115 1406 1420"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Dec 2017 Electorate</th> <th>Jan 2018 Electorate</th> <th>2022 Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP</td> <td>Buckholt</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SX</td> <td>Frenchmoor</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>VB</td> <td>West Tytherley</td> <td>453</td> <td>447</td> <td>431</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Polling District	Parish	Dec 2017 Electorate	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate	SP	Buckholt	12	13	11	SX	Frenchmoor	30	30	33	VB	West Tytherley	453	447	431
Polling District	Parish	Dec 2017 Electorate	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate																	
SP	Buckholt	12	13	11																	
SX	Frenchmoor	30	30	33																	
VB	West Tytherley	453	447	431																	
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the parishes of Buckholt, West Tytherley and Frenchmoor be grouped under a Common Parish Council. 2. That the name of the group be “the Group of West Tytherley, Frenchmoor and Buckholt Parishes”. 3. That the name of the Common Parish Council be “The Common Parish Council of West Tytherley, Frenchmoor and Buckholt”. 4. That the year in which ordinary elections of councillors are to be held shall be 2019 and every fourth year thereafter. 																				

	<p>5. That none of the parishes shall be divided into wards for the purpose of electing councillors.</p> <p>6. That the number of councillors to be elected to the Common Parish Council by each parish be as follows:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="496 488 1123 860"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>No. of Councillors</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP</td> <td>Buckholt</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SX</td> <td>Frenchmoor</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>VB</td> <td>West Tytherley</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Polling District	Parish	No. of Councillors	SP	Buckholt	1	SX	Frenchmoor	1	VB	West Tytherley	6	Total		8
Polling District	Parish	No. of Councillors														
SP	Buckholt	1														
SX	Frenchmoor	1														
VB	West Tytherley	6														
Total		8														
Map Reference	SCR 46															

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish and Wellow Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 53
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 47.1 Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Moving the boundary to transfer Afton House from Wellow Parish into Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “P” on Map FCR 53 be transferred from Wellow Parish to Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council – The parish boundary has a kink around Afton House putting this dwelling into Wellow despite its neighbour being in Melchet Park and Plaitford, in accordance with wishes of residents.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	In accordance with the wishes of the residents, the boundary should be rationalised to transfer Afton House from Wellow Parish into Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Wellow and Melchet Park & Plaitford Parishes are both within Blackwater Borough Ward, and Romsey Rural County Electoral Division. Neither was affected by parish warding arrangements put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore LGBCE Consent will not be required.</p> <p>As no other electoral boundaries will be affected, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p>		

Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "P" on Map SCR 53 be transferred from Wellow Parish to Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 53

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Melchet Park and Plaitford and Sherfield English Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 54
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Moving the boundary to rationalise it around Melchet Pond.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “Q” on Map FCR 54 be transferred from Sherfield English Parish to Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	In favour of transfer:- Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council – Redraw the Parish boundary so that the 'dogleg' boundary into Melchet Pond is rationalised, giving Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish the entirety of the pond and ditch.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	In accordance with the wishes of the Parish Council the group recommended rationalising the boundary so the whole of the pond is moved into Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Melchet Park & Plaitford and Sherfield English Parishes are both within Blackwater Borough Ward, and Romsey Rural County Electoral Division. Neither was affected by parish warding arrangements put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review.</p> <p>As a result, LGBCE Consent to the proposed change will not be required.</p>		

	As both parishes are within the same Borough Ward/County Electoral Division, no Related Alteration recommendation will be required.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "Q" on Map FCR 54 be transferred from Sherfield English Parish to Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 54

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Awbridge Parish and Romsey Extra Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 55, 56
LGBCE Implications		Consent	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer 48.1 – Awbridge Parish Council ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>Redraw the boundary to have properties absorbed into Awbridge which are currently in Romsey Extra Parish.</p> <p>[Note: Issue FCR 58 deals with other land in the vicinity. Issue FCR 72 also considers different proposals for the land which is the subject of this Issue 55/56.]</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the areas of land lettered R and S on Map FCR55-56 be transferred to Awbridge Parish. 2. That the Consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be sought to the proposed changes. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Awbridge Parish Council – Wish to move the gardens of properties near Salisbury Lane/Danes Road into Awbridge, properties are in Awbridge and gardens partially in Romsey Extra.</p> <p>Move Stanbridge House into Awbridge from Romsey Extra in accordance with the wishes of the resident.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Romsey Extra Parish Council – Support the draft recommendation</p>		
Members Group	The Group considered that as the properties in Old Salisbury		

Observations	Lane were already in Awbridge, the gardens of these properties should be in the same parish as the main dwelling house. Given the transfer of Stanbridge House to Awbridge Parish was in accordance with the wishes of the resident and the two parish councils, this proposal should also be agreed making governance effective and convenient.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Awbridge Parish was not affected by parish ward arrangements put in place by the LGBCE as part of the 2017 Electoral Review. It is part of Blackwater Borough Ward and Romsey Rural County Electoral Division.</p> <p>Changes involving Romsey Extra (either adding areas to Romsey Extra or transferring areas within Romsey Extra to other parishes) will affect the parish warding arrangements, and therefore LGBCE Consent will be required to any such changes.</p> <p>As the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the proposed change, a Related Alteration will not be required.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the areas of land lettered R and S on Map SCR55-56 be transferred to Awbridge Parish. 2. That the Consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be sought to the proposed changes.
Map Reference	SCR 55-56

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Awbridge and Romsey Extra Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 57
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 48.1 Awbridge Parish Council ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 48.2 Resident 54.1 (S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer The Little House and Appletree Cottage from Romsey Extra to Awbridge.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “T” (The Little House and Appletree Cottage) on Map FCR 57 be transferred from Romsey Extra Parish to Awbridge Parish		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Awbridge Parish Council deem it sensible to move these properties into Awbridge.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Resident - Agrees his property should move to be in the community in which family are active. Romsey Extra PC – Support the draft recommendation.</p>		
Members Group Observations	The geographic features would suggest this area would relate more to Awbridge and this is supported by an idea of community identity and activity in the area.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Awbridge Parish was not affected by parish ward arrangements put in place by the LGBCE as part of the 2017 Electoral Review. It is part of Blackwater Borough Ward and Romsey Rural County Electoral Division.		

	The area is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "T" (The Little House and Appletree Cottage) on Map SCR 57 be transferred from Romsey Extra Parish to Awbridge Parish
Map Reference	SCR 57

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Wellow and Romsey Extra Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 58
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 49.1 Wellow Parish Council ----- SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 54.1 (S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>Whether to redraw boundary around one property so the property is wholly in Romsey Extra.</p> <p>[Note: Issue FCR 55-56 deals with other land in the vicinity. Issue FCR 72 deals in part with land directly adjacent to this land.]</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “U” on Map FCR 58 be transferred from Wellow Parish to Romsey Extra Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Wellow Parish Council - Would like the boundary to be moved to stop at the property (Longdown Cottage) and follow the A27/Salisbury Road to re-join the existing boundary further along. Not in favour of taking in any of the Romsey Extra Parish bordering Wellow.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Romsey Extra Parish Council – Support the draft recommendation</p>		
Members Group Observations	Agreed with this rationalisation of the boundary, the house and garden are currently in separate parishes. The change fits with local identity and does not change the distribution of electors.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is within Blackwater Borough Ward and Romsey Rural Electoral Division. It is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. Similarly, as the Borough Ward and Electoral Divisions would not be affected by the change, a Related Alteration will not be required either.</p>		

	The change would have no effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "U" on Map SCR 58 be transferred from Wellow Parish to Romsey Extra Parish.
Map Reference	SCR58

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 59
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 50.1 Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish Council ---</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	No Change. Possible future change of Style of parish.		
Summary of Issue	No changes to existing boundaries and governance arrangements should be made.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the names, boundaries, council size, groupings or other parish governance arrangements at this stage to Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish Council - The boundaries and existing governance arrangements should remain as existing and no changes made. The Parish Council is considering whether to change the style of the Parish to Village and will consult with residents. [Subsequently clarified that Parish Council wish to remain unwarded.]</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that any change to either the boundaries or the existing governance arrangements are justified in respect of these parishes.</p> <p>The Group noted that the Parish had been warded under the 2017 Review, in accordance with the relevant legislation. However, in line with the Parish's wishes and proposed Final Recommendations on other similar Issues, it was appropriate for the Parish to be unwarded.</p>		
Electoral	Under the terms of the 2017 Review, the Parish was warded		

Arrangement Issues	<p>as it is dividing by the Borough Ward boundary between Blackwater and Ampfield and Braishfield Wards.</p> <p>Subject to obtaining LGBCE Consent, these warding arrangements can be removed as part of the Final Recommendations.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish be not warded. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed change. 3. That no other changes be made to the names, boundaries, council size, groupings or other parish governance arrangements to Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish.
Map Reference	SCR XII and 70A

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	Braishfield and Ampfield Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 60
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 51.1 Braishfield Parish Council</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer area north of Ampfield Woods from Ampfield Parish to Braishfield Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “V” on Map FCR 60 be transferred from Ampfield Parish to Braishfield Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Braishfield Parish Council – Following consultation with the Parish Councils of Ampfield, Michelmersh & Timsbury, and Romsey Extra, Braishfield Parish Council proposes that the area of land to the north of Ampfield Woods should be transferred from Ampfield Parish to Braishfield Parish.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	None		
Members Group Observations	There are no electors in the area in question, but the northern boundary of the woods would form a clear and strong physical demarcation of the boundary of the two Parishes. The geographic features would suggest this area would relate more to Braishfield.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	This area is within Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward, and Baddesley County Electoral Division. The area is not affected by parish warding provided for in the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore a transfer of the land would not require the Consent of the LGBCE. Similarly, as no Borough Ward or County Division boundaries are affected, there would not be a		

	<p>need to apply for a Related Alteration.</p> <p>There are no electors in the area, so the relative numbers of electors in each parish would not be affected.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "V" on Map SCR 60 be transferred from Ampfield Parish to Braishfield Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 60

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Ampfield Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 61
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 52.1 – Ampfield Parish Council ----</p> <p>SCR 52.1(S) - Ampfield Parish Council 52.5 Cllr Martin Hatley</p>		
Nature of Issue	Council size		
Summary of Issue	<p>The number of Parish Councillors which should be elected to Ampfield Parish Council. Currently there are 11 Parish Councillors, representing the existing parish area (although this would increase to include Crampmoor and properties on the Straight Mile if proposals FCR 62 and 63 were to be accepted). The proposal is to reduce this to 9 Parish Councillors.</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<p>That the number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Ampfield Parish Council be set as 9.</p>		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Ampfield Parish Council – Although there is a complement of 11 Parish Councillors, in practice it is some while since there have been more than 9. Taking account of similar, and some larger, Parish Councils, recommend that the appropriate number of Councillors should be set to 9.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Ampfield Parish Council - Response of Ampfield Parish to recommendation: That the number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Ampfield Parish Council be set as 9. Agree.</p> <p>Cllr Martin Hatley – Cllr Hatley confirms that, although widely publicised, it has been impossible to achieve the full number of parish councillors for some time in Ampfield.</p>		
Members Group Observations	<p>It would seem that the Parish Council has functioned satisfactorily for some years with 9 parish councillors. Although the area of the Parish would increase if proposals under SCRs 62 and 63 were to be accepted, the Parish Council were aware of these proposals when making their</p>		

	<p>submission. There are no rules on council size which must be followed, and historic research suggests that a typical parish council with this number of electors would comprise between 6 and 12 Parish Councillors. The conduct of Parish Council business does not normally require a large body of Councillors, and as Ampfield has experienced, a large council may find difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to put themselves forward to fill all the available seats.</p> <p>Given the number of electors and the experience of the Parish Council, it is considered that a parish council size of 9 for a parish of this size and nature is appropriate.</p>						
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>Ampfield Parish was not affected by parish warding arrangements put in place by the LGBCE as part of the 2017 Electoral Review. Changing the number of councillors for the Parish Council would not therefore require the Consent of the LGBCE.</p> <p>The current (January 2018) and five year projections for the number of local government electors in Ampfield is as follows:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="509 1095 1399 1232"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="509 1095 807 1171"></th> <th data-bbox="807 1095 1102 1171">Current (January 2018)</th> <th data-bbox="1102 1095 1399 1171">Five year projection (2022)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="509 1171 807 1232">Ampfield Parish</td> <td data-bbox="807 1171 1102 1232">1362</td> <td data-bbox="1102 1171 1399 1232">1382</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Current (January 2018)	Five year projection (2022)	Ampfield Parish	1362	1382
	Current (January 2018)	Five year projection (2022)					
Ampfield Parish	1362	1382					
<p>Proposed Final Recommendation</p>	<p>That the number of Parish Councillors to be elected to Ampfield Parish Council be set as 9.</p>						
<p>Map Reference</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>						

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	Ampfield and Romsey Extra Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 62-63
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In Support of Transfer 52.1 Ampfield Parish Council 52.4 Ampfield resident ---</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation 52.1(S) Ampfield Parish Council 52.5 Cllr Martin Hatley</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council 52.6 Romsey Extra resident 52.7 Petition signed by 72 Romsey Extra residents</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>FCR 62 - Extend western boundary of Ampfield to cover Straight Mile/Crampmoor (currently in Romsey Extra Parish) to mirror new TVBC ward boundary.</p> <p>FRC 63 - Extend western boundary of Ampfield further to include woodland (containing no electors).</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the areas of land:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lettered “W” on Map FCR 62-63 • lettered “X” on Map FCR 62-63 be transferred to Ampfield Parish from Romsey Extra Parish. 2. That Ampfield Parish Council be not warded. 3. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed changes. <p>That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division and Borough Ward boundary with the new Parish boundary.</p>		
Summary of	FCR 62 Ampfield Parish Council – In order to remove anomalies		

<p>Representations (First Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>between wards and parishes introduced by the LGBCE 2017 Electoral Review, recommend that the western boundary of Ampfield be extended to include parts of Crampmoor [area “W” on Map FCR62-63].</p> <p>Ampfield resident – Residents of Straight Mile, Ampfield. At present, part of Straight Mile falls within Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Extra Borough Ward, and part within Ampfield Parish and Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward. The 2017 Electoral Review final recommendations propose that the residential housing portion currently in Romsey Extra Borough Ward is placed in an Ampfield and Braishfield [Borough] ward. This makes sense, as the residential housing on the Straight Mile in both Parishes has the same character (houses in large plots in a woodland area), and also with some of the housing in Ampfield Parish. To remove an anomaly between Borough Ward and Parish boundary, the residential housing proportion of the Straight Mile [area “W” on Map FCR62] should be moved from Romsey Extra to Ampfield Parish.</p> <p>FCR 63 Ampfield Parish Council – Also believe that woodland to north of A3090 [Ganger Wood] is naturally part of Crampmoor and should move with the properties. Such a move has no impact on ward numbers as there are no properties involved. [area “X” on Map FCR62-63].</p> <p>Ampfield resident – Also sensible to move Ganger Wood from Romsey Extra to Ampfield Parish. [area “X” on Map FCR62-63]. No housing or electors, but does form important part of character of Straight Mile. Under the [2017 Electoral Review] Ganger Wood will be in Romsey Cupernham Borough Ward but Ampfield Parish. The LGBCE were not able to consider moving Ganger Wood into Ampfield Parish, as this would involve creating a parish ward solely comprised of Ganger Wood, with a parish councillor representing no electors. Once Ganger Wood has been moved into Ampfield Parish, the Borough Ward Boundary should also be moved to include Ganger Wood in Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Ampfield Parish Council – The Parish Council supports the transfer of the Straight Mile to Ampfield Parish and the other Draft Recommendations on this Issue.</p> <p>Cllr Martin Hatley - Area W from Romsey Extra to Ampfield to coincide with new Ampfield and Braishfield TVBC Ward Boundaries – to make the Parish and Borough Wards coterminous just makes common sense. At the earliest opportunity the County Division of North Baddesley should be adjusted so that it enjoys the same coterminosity. Most of this area already sees itself as part of Ampfield and has an Ampfield postal address.</p>

	<p>Area X similarly naturally is part of Ampfield.</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council – Object strongly.</p> <p>52.6 Romsey Extra resident - There are strong historical links between Romsey Extra Parish and Crampmoor since the early 1600's. The boundary change in the area would override long standing links and make little sense. Much of Crampmoor and a small part of Winchester Road, just west of the straight mile, was historically owned by Romsey Abbey for hundreds of years. Crampmoor has maintained its identity for many years as a small farming community due to its close relationship with the Abbey in Romsey. Some of the Abbey clergy built their houses in the area. The farming community in Crampmoor has declined and the Abbey no longer owns very much land at all in the area but the current local Crampmoor community still feel that the former historic linkages with the old manor of Romsey Extra (now the current parish) and with the Abbey itself are important links that are worth preserving and recognising today. No such traditional heritage to link to the parish of Ampfield. This view is strongly supported by a recent local petition.</p> <p>52.7 Petition signed by Romsey Extra residents – wish their area to stay in Romsey Extra Parish and to see the current boundary retained in its entirety. See no merit in any changes and were any to take place believe it would be contrary to the published reasons for the review. Quotes TVBC website for opportunity for change 'in response to these and other issues raised by local people.' As local residents, very much hope that the CGR Members' group will agree with petition and leave boundaries unchanged. [responses obtained from 48 out of 63 dwellings consulted within area shown highlighted on Map SCR62A – Crampmoor Lane, Winchester Road and Groveley Way. 72 out of 123 residents (59%) supported petition.]</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>There is evidence of identity with these properties and Ampfield Parish which justified the Draft Recommendation to move both areas from Romsey Extra in Ampfield at First Consultation Stage. It is noted that the LGBCE indicated that it would consider amending ward and Division boundaries if [all of Jermyns Lane and] Ganger Wood were to be included in Ampfield Parish, it would consider amending the relevant boundaries.</p> <p>The Second Consultation Stage had produced evidence in the form of a petition from residents in Crampmoor Lane, Graveley Way and Winchester Road Crampmoor, which indicated that 59% of residents in this area wished to remain in Romsey Extra Parish. The Members Group noted that only one of the signatories to the</p>

	<p>petition had submitted a separate representation in response to the Second Consultation Stage, and individual representations which articulate specific arguments on an issue would carry more weight than a petition which has been signed by a number of people. Nevertheless, the petition indicated strength of feeling in the area within which the petition was carried out, and that had to be taken into account in considering the community identity.</p> <p>The area covered by signatories of the petition is shown on Map SCR62A and therefore did not include electors in the "Straight Mile". Evidence suggested that electors on the Straight Mile consider themselves part of Ampfield, and the evidence from the petition suggested that Crampmoor electors consider themselves to be in Romsey Extra. Similarly, there was no evidence opposing the Draft Recommendation to move area marked X (Ganger Wood) on Map SCR62.</p> <p>The Members Group noted that both areas in the original proposal (areas W and X on Map FCR62-63) were included in Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward, and it would therefore be more effective and convenient if the boundaries of the Borough Ward, County Division and Parish were coterminous. This needed to be balanced against the feeling expressed in the petition by electors in the Crampmoor area. If the Crampmoor Area were to be retained within Romsey Extra Parish, it would be possible to seek a Related Alteration to amend Borough Ward and County Division boundaries to reflect revised parish boundaries.</p> <p>The Members Group concluded that the appropriate recommendations would be to move area X on Map SCR62B (also shown on Map FCR62) and also to move areas LL and MM on Map SCR62B to Ampfield Parish, leaving Crampmoor (the area WW on Map SCR62B, being the remainder of area W on Map FCR62) in Romsey Extra Parish.</p> <p>The Members Group considered the implications of this on the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries of these recommendations. The Draft Recommendation proposed that Related Alterations be sought to place areas X and W (Map FCR62-63) in the same parish, Borough Ward and County Division. If (in line with the Members Group's conclusions) area WW (Map SCR62B) was to remain in Romsey Extra Parish, it would be logical to ensure that this area should be moved to Romsey Tadburn Borough Ward, and that it should remain in Romsey Rural County Electoral Division. This would then be in line with the principle of securing coterminosity of boundaries.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Currently, areas LL, MM and WW, which are the three areas in Issue 62 (area W on Map FCR62-63), and area X, are all within Romsey Extra Parish.

	<p>Areas LL, MM and WW are within Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward, and area X is in Romsey Cupernham Ward.</p> <p>Areas LL, MM and WW are in Romsey Rural County Electoral Division, and area X is in Romsey Town Electoral Division.</p> <p>As the Borough Ward boundaries proposed in the 2017 Electoral Review cut across Romsey Extra Parish, the LGBCE therefore made arrangements to ward Romsey Extra Parish (to comply with the legal requirement which prevents a parish or parish ward being split by a borough ward or county division boundary). Prior to determining their final recommendations, the LGBCE received representations similar to those now being put forward, asking that properties on either side of Jermyns Lane, and Ganger Wood, be made part of Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward. The LGBCE considered that whilst some evidence of local identity for these areas had been provided, making these changes would have required the LGBCE to create a ward of 20 electors, which would be too small to be viable. It did however indicate that it would consider amending the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries if Jermyns Lane and Ganger Wood were to be included in Ampfield Parish following a CGR.</p> <p>As these proposals would alter Parish Warding electoral arrangements set in place by the LGBCE in the 2017 Review, Consent of the LGBCE would be required if they were to be implemented.</p> <p>If Consent is obtained and the proposals to transfer area “X” from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield Parish are implemented, it would be sensible to seek a Related Alteration Order, in order to align the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries with the realigned Parish boundary, transferring Ganger Wood to Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward and Baddesley County Electoral Division. As there are no electors currently in this area (or expected by 2022) this would have no effect on electoral variances.</p> <p>In respect of areas “LL” and “MM”, these would remain in Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward. However, as the boundary between Baddesley and Romsey Rural Electoral Divisions follows the current Parish boundary, moving these areas into Ampfield Parish would result in the majority of Ampfield Parish being within Baddesley Electoral Division, with just these two areas being in Romsey Rural Electoral Division. Accordingly, if Consent is obtained, it would be logical to then seek a Related Alteration to move these two areas into Baddesley County Electoral Division.</p> <p>Under the proposed Final Recommendation, Area WW on Map</p>
--	---

SCR62B would remain in Romsey Extra Parish. It is currently in Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward, but if the proposed Final Recommendation is accepted, it would be sensible to seek a Related Alteration to move this area from Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward into Romsey Tadburn Borough Ward.

In terms of County Electoral Divisions, area WW is currently in Romsey Rural County Electoral Division. The majority of Romsey Extra Parish is within Romsey Rural County Electoral Division, with only the north eastern sector (Ganger Farm/Woodley Area) being within Romsey Town Electoral Division.

Given the geographical location of boundaries in this location, and the identity of area WW with Romsey Extra, it would be logical to retain this area within Romsey Rural County Electoral Division, with the majority of the Romsey Extra Parish.

There are no electors in area X. There are 184 electors (185 in 2022) in area W, comprising 56 (56) in areas LL and MM, and 128 (129) in area WW.

The table below sets out the current and five year projections for the existing situation, and for if the proposed Final Recommendations (including SCR64, 18 electors, and SCR76, 7 electors) were to be implemented in full:-

Borough Wards

Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)
Ampfield and Braishfield	1.3%	-6.4%	-110 (-128 +18)	-111 (-129 +18)	-3.7%	-11.0%
Romsey Cupernham	-11.0%	-5.0%	-18	-18	-11.2%	-5.3%
Romsey Tadburn	2.0%	7.9%	+128	+129	4.8%	10.6%

County Divisions

Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)
Baddesley	-2.3%	-3.1%	+81 (+56 +7 +18)	+63 (+56 +7 +18)	-1.7%	-2.6%
Romsey Rural	5.2%	16.3%	- 63 (-56 -7)	-63	4.7%	15.9%
Romsey Town	-1.6%	1.6%	-18	-18	-1.7%	1.5%

Parish Figures:-

Existing			
Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate
Romsey Extra	All	3900	5910
Ampfield	Existing	1362	1382

Proposed Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate
Romsey Extra (Proposed)	All (including Crampmoor (area WW, (128)) but excluding areas LL, MM (56), and YY and ZZ (18))	3826	5836
Ampfield	(Existing parish)	1362	1382
	Areas LL and MM	56	56
(Issue SCR64)	Areas YY and ZZ	18	18
Ampfield (proposed) Total		1436	1456

Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the areas of land:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lettered “X” on Map SCR 62B • lettered “LL” and “MM” on Map SCR62B be transferred to Ampfield Parish from Romsey Extra Parish. 2. That the area of land lettered “WW” on Map SCR62B remain in Romsey Extra Parish. 3. That LGBCE consent be sought to the proposed changes. 4. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the Borough Ward boundary with the new parish boundaries (as shown on Map SCR62C). 5. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for Related Alterations to align the County Division with the new parish boundaries (as shown on Map SCR62D).
Map Reference	FCR 62-63, SCR62A, SCR 62B, SCR62C, SCR62D

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	Ampfield, Braishfield and Romsey Extra Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 64
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR Support of Transfer:- 52.1 Ampfield Parish Council ----- SCR Against Draft Recommendation 51.1(S) Braishfield Parish Council 52.1(S) Ampfield Parish Council 52.5 Cllr Martin Hatley 52.8-52.9 - Romsey Extra residents</p> <p>Support Draft Recommendation 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	<p>(1) Extend Ampfield Parish boundary to include properties at the eastern end of Jermyns Lane (other than Jermyns House itself) to transfer these properties from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield Parish.</p> <p>(2) Transfer Jermyns House from Romsey Extra Parish to Braishfield Parish (thereby co-locating with adjacent Sir Harold Hillier Arboretum).</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 64.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Ampfield Parish Council – Recommend extending Ampfield to include the small number of properties at the eastern end of Jermyns Lane. This goes beyond the [2017 Electoral Review ward boundary] changes, as believe the properties are naturally part of Ampfield community. Would not wish to extend as far as Jermyns House which recommend should be [transferred to be] part of Braishfield Parish in common with the Arboretum.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Braishfield Parish Council - Recommend that Jermyns House be transferred to Braishfield. Support the proposal of Ampfield Parish Council, that the small number of properties at the</p>		

	<p>Eastern end of Jermyns Lane be transferred to Ampfield.</p> <p>Ampfield Parish Council - Ampfield PC recommends that the Ampfield PC boundary be extended to include the small number of properties at the Eastern end of Jermyns Lane as originally proposed. Understand that the occupants of the 2 dwellings concerned also support such a change.</p> <p>Cllr Martin Hatley - It just historic nonsense that Area YY and Area ZZ should be in Romsey Extra. They naturally fall into Ampfield – as supported by the local residents, and both Parish Councils. There is an incredible sense of community belonging to Ampfield and not Romsey Extra. Jermyns House (to the west of YY) clearly should be within Braishfield PC as is most of the Sir Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum. Supported by both Ampfield and Braishfield PC's.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident (two) - wish to be included in Ampfield Parish Council area instead of Romsey Extra. Residents have strong affinity with Ampfield and St.Mark's Church for family weddings, baptisms and funerals. Grew up in Ampfield between 1947 and 1959. The Post Office considers the houses part of the Ampfield postcode area SO51 0QA.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident - wish to be included in Ampfield Parish Council area instead of Romsey Extra. Residents have strong affinity with Ampfield and St.Mark's Church for family weddings, baptisms and funerals. The Post Office considers the houses part of the Ampfield postcode area SO51 0QA.</p> <p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Romsey Extra Parish Council – Support.</p>
Members Group Observations	<p>Historically the area in question was known as Hilliers and Ampfield due to the land ownership so the proposal seems logical. It seems rational to use Jermyns Lane as a southern boundary for Braishfield parish, connecting Jermyns House to the Arboretum. Both Ampfield and Braishfield Parish Councils support the change with clear evidence of community identity directly from the residents at the end of Jermyns Lane wishing to be in Ampfield Parish.</p> <p>If this change was to be made then further to this boundaries at Borough Ward and County Division level should be made coterminous with the new parish boundary in the interest of effective and convenient governance.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Currently both areas are within Romsey Extra Parish (Woodley Parish Ward), Romsey Cupernham Borough Ward, and Romsey Extra County Electoral Division.</p> <p>The parish warding arrangements were put in place as a result</p>

	<p>of the 2017 Electoral Review, as the Borough Ward boundaries proposed by the LGBCE cut across Romsey Extra Parish. As noted under SCR 62-63, the LGBCE therefore made arrangements to ward Romsey Extra Parish (to comply with the legal requirement to the effect that in this situation, a parish must be warded, in such a way that the parish wards are not themselves split by a Borough Ward boundary). Prior to determining their final recommendations, the LGBCE received representations similar to those now being put forward, asking that properties on either side of Jermyns Lane, and Ganger Wood, be made part of Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward. The LGBCE considered that whilst some evidence of local identity for these areas had been provided, making these changes would have required the LGBCE to create a ward of 20 electors, which would be too small to be viable. It did however indicate that it would consider amending the borough ward and county division boundaries if Jermyns Lane and Ganger Wood were to be included in Ampfield Parish following a CGR.</p> <p>As these proposals would alter Parish Warding electoral arrangements set in place by the LGBCE in the 2017 Review, Consent of the LGBCE would be required.</p> <p>If Consent is obtained and the proposals are implemented, it would be sensible to seek a Related Alteration Order, in order to align the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries with the realigned Parish boundary.</p>
<p>Proposed Final Recommendation</p>	<p>Areas YY and ZZ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That areas YY and ZZ be transferred from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield Parish 2. That LGBCE consent is sought for the proposed changes 3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary. 4. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary. <p>Area NN</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. That area NN be transferred from Romsey Extra Parish

	<p>to Braishfield Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. That LGBCE consent is sought for the proposed changes 7. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary. 8. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary.
<p>Map Reference</p>	<p>SCR 64 and SCR 64A, SCR62B</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	North Baddesley/Ampfield	Issue Ref:	SCR 65
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 53.1 North Baddesley Parish Council ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer Emer Farm (area marked “AA” on Map FCR65) from North Baddesley Parish to Ampfield Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR65.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- North Baddesley Parish Council – Would like to propose that North Baddesley PC gives away the whole of Emer Farm to Ampfield PC (subsequently clarified that Emer Farm is closer to Ampfield than North Baddesley).</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	No clear evidence to support change.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is currently within North Baddesley Borough Ward, whilst the remainder of Ampfield Parish is in Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward. Both North Baddesley and Ampfield Parishes are within Baddesley County Electoral Division.</p> <p>If the proposed change were to be accepted, it would not affect parish warding arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore Consent of LGBCE would not be required. However, the Borough Ward boundary follows the existing boundary between the two Parishes, and therefore a Related Alteration application would be appropriate to maintain</p>		

	coterminosity if the proposed change were to be agreed.
Proposed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR65.
Map Reference	SCR 65

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	North Baddesley Parish and Ampfield Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 66
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 53.1 North Baddesley Parish Council ----- SCR Supports draft recommendation:- 58.2 Chilworth Parish Council (Cllr Alison Finlay)</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer Roundabouts Copse, Wren's farm and Castle Lane Farm (area shown marked "BB" on Map FCR66) from Chilworth Parish to North Baddesley Parish. [Note - It has been assumed that the proposal excludes "Doverhay" in Misslebrook Lane].		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 66.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- North Baddesley Parish Council – Would like to propose that North Baddesley PC takes Roundabouts Copse, Wren's farm and Castle Lane Farm from Chilworth Parish (subsequently clarified that this area is closer to North Baddesley than Chilworth).</p> <p>[Late representation – therefore not considered at First Consultation Stage Against transfer:- Chilworth Parish Council – wishes to retain the area in question, and also include houses which are located close to the traffic lights (Botley Road/A27).]</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	Following the late representation to the First Consultation Stage, Chilworth Parish Council were invited to resubmit their submission. The Parish Council subsequently confirmed that it did not wish to pursue the extension of the area which it had originally proposed in its late representation.		
Members Group Observations	No clear evidence to support change.		

Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is currently within Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams Borough Ward Chilworth Ward, whilst the remainder of North Baddesley is in the North Baddesley Ward. The area is within Romsey Extra County Electoral Division, whereas North Baddesley is in Baddesley County Electoral Division.</p> <p>If the proposed change were to be accepted, it would not affect parish warding arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore Consent of LG BCE would not be required. However, the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries follow the existing boundary between the two Parishes, and therefore a Related Alteration would be recommended to maintain coterminosity if the proposed change were to be agreed.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 66.
Map Reference	SCR 66

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish(es)	Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 67, 68, 68A, 68B, 69
LGBCE Implications		Consent	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>Issue 67 (Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra)</p> <p>FCR 55.5 Romsey and District Society 55.6-55.8 Romsey residents ----</p> <p>SCR 55.6(S) Romsey resident 54.28 Cllr Clive Collier</p> <p>Issues 68, 68A, 68B (Extend Romsey Town boundary into Romsey Extra Parish to mirror Borough Wards)</p> <p>FCR 55.2 Cllr Mark Cooper 55.3 Cllr John Parker 55.4 Liberal Democrats - Romsey Branch ----</p> <p>SCR 55.3(S) Town Cllr John Parker</p> <p>Issue 69 (Maintain Status Quo, Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish to remain separate and as existing)</p> <p>FCR 54.1 Romsey Extra PC 54.3 Cllr Roy Perry 54.4 Cllr Ian Hibberd 54.5 Cllr Alison Johnston 54.6 Cllr Teresa Hibberd 54.11 Jo Cottrell (Halterworth Primary School) 54.12 Joel Worrall (Stroud School) 54.13 Heather McIlroy (The Mountbatten School) 54.14-54.23 Romsey Extra residents -----</p> <p>SCR 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council 54.25 -55.26 Romsey Extra residents 54.27 Romsey Extra resident</p>		
Nature of Issue	FCR 67 – Amalgamation of two Parishes into one with a single Town/Parish Council.		

	<p>FCR 68/68B - Alteration of Parish Boundary. FCR 68A – Change of name of Parish Council.</p>
Summary of Issue	<p>SCR 67 - Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish should be merged into one parish (single parish covering all areas tinted pink and green on map FCR69-70).</p> <p>SCR 68 - Extend Romsey Town boundary into Romsey Extra Parish to mirror 2017 Borough Wards (Areas CC, DD and EE on map FCR68 added to existing Romsey Town area tinted grey on map FCR68. New extended Romsey Town would therefore cover all areas tinted green on map SCR68A/B.</p> <p>SCR 68A – Extended Romsey Town Council to be named "Town Council of Romsey and Romsey Extra" (with "Town Mayor of Romsey and Romsey Extra").</p> <p>FCR68B - Following extension of Romsey Town, remaining areas of Romsey Extra Parish be absorbed into neighbouring parishes following the 2017 Borough Ward boundaries.</p> <p>SCR 69 - Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish to remain as existing and separate parishes (as shown on Map SCR69-70 – Romsey Town tinted green, Romsey Extra tinted pink).</p> <p>Note: Issue SCR 70 deals with the question of removing warding for Romsey Extra Parish Council.</p>
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Issue FCR 67 (Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra) Romsey and District Society – The Town and Parish Councils provide a good service of support of their communities. Sensible to rationalise anomalies as a result of recent boundary changes. Majority of development will be in Romsey Extra, but will place pressure on Romsey Town. Consider merging the two councils so that needs of both areas can be considered together. However, need to ensure that Romsey Extra area does not receive a diminished service as a result.</p> <p>Romsey resident – Romsey Extra Parish is a historical anomaly that should be absorbed into Romsey Town Council. Most residents are unaware that there is a divide. Majority of recent development, facilities and major infrastructure is within Romsey Extra, but there is no centre or community in Romsey Extra, which relies on Romsey Town to provide a “civic function”. Many Town/Parish Councillors live outside the area they represent. Merging would reduce costs, simplify procedures, and allow CIL/Section 106 money to be spent for benefit of residents in both areas. Merging would also fit Government guidance to remove “doughnut” Councils.</p>

	<p>Romsey resident – In favour of expanding Romsey Town to include Romsey Extra. Most large housing development currently in Romsey Extra, but reliant on Romsey Town for community facilities, even though funding from developers does not go to Romsey Town Council. Romsey Extra is a historical anomaly which few residents are aware of.</p> <p>Romsey resident – Merge Romsey Infra with Romsey Extra.</p> <p>Issues 68, 68A, 68A (Extend Romsey Town boundary into Romsey Extra Parish to mirror Borough Wards)</p> <p>Cllr Mark Cooper – LGBCE recommendation that Town Council Ward boundaries should be coterminous with new Borough Ward boundaries should be followed. This would increase Romsey Town’s Council Tax Base from c. 5500 to 8332. Current precept generates £250,597, which could be increased to £388,000 if proposals accepted, allowing e.g. Town Hall to be repaired, young people’s activity subsidised, etc. (or reduce Band D rate to c. £28). 15% of CIL money is passed to Town/Parish level, but Romsey Town receives little from this source due to small scale of development in its area. Residents in Abbotswood and similar areas perceive themselves as living in “Romsey”, not Romsey Extra. New residents should pay their fair share of Town Council costs.</p> <p>Cllr John Parker – Resident of Romsey Extra for 40 years. Member of Romsey Town Council for three years, previously Romsey Extra Councillor for 29 years. Active member of various Romsey-related organisations. Residents identify with Romsey in its broadest sense – a large proportion are uncertain as to the dividing line between Town and Parish, and anomalies exist in e.g. Woodley and Whitenap areas. Romsey Town has expanded over the years to take in new built development. Community groups do not make a distinction between Town and Parish. Romsey Future and similar initiatives cover both areas. New housing takes place in Romsey Extra with residents looking to Romsey Town as their centre. Both Councils have had to work together on planning matters. CIL and Council Tax income from development in Romsey Extra does not benefit Romsey Town whilst putting additional pressure on it. A single Parish Council would be more efficient and clearer for the public. Under the 2017 Electoral Review, Romsey Extra Borough ward is abolished and town wards extended into Romsey Extra. This will increase confusion over boundaries and responsibilities. Coterminosity will also aid electoral registration and political party campaigning. Therefore, Romsey Town should be expanded to incorporate those parts of Romsey Extra which are within the new Borough Wards of Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn. Romsey Town should be warded on the same</p>
--	--

boundaries, each with the same number of Town Councillors (5 or greater). Balance of Romsey Extra should be absorbed by adjacent parishes following new Borough Ward boundary lines. Preserve historical connection by renaming Town Council as "Town Council of Romsey and Romsey Extra." With Mayor being designated "Town Mayor of Romsey and Romsey Extra".

Liberal Democrats - Romsey Branch – An enlarged Romsey Town Council based on three new Borough Wards would be most rational solution, with residual components of Romsey Extra Parish being shared amongst surrounding rural parishes. This would be better understood by residents. Town Council has historically expanded in line with development, built up areas have shared community interest and look to town for provision of a range of services. New development on urban edge will increase pressure on services in the town, which CIL payment should contribute towards. LGBCE's recommendation that there should be a new Town Council based on three new Borough Wards should not be lightly disregarded.

Issue 69 (Maintain Status Quo, Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish to remain separate and as existing)

Romsey Extra Parish Council – Romsey Extra Parish Council wishes to retain its present status as an independent Parish Council and retain its current boundaries (subject to minor revisions by agreement with other parishes).

Cllr Roy Perry – County Councillor for Romsey Rural Division, 12 parishes from Chilworth to West Tytherley. Parish Councils play an important and effective role. In Romsey Rural Division, parishes range from populous large parishes, down to very small parishes, but all have distinct qualities and help engage local residents. Quality of individuals involved is key to success of a parish council. Historical parishes maintain sense of local identity and community, which can be lost by other boundary changes at Borough/County level. A combined Romsey Town/Romsey Extra Parish would be large and more remote from its communities. There is a case for creating neighbourhood councils in Romsey Town. Romsey Extra Parish Council is more proactive in offering services to residents than Romsey Town Council. Town Council spends money primarily on Romsey Guildhall and allotments, and commenting on planning applications. It does not give grants or provide play/recreation facilities. In contrast, Romsey Extra spends less on administration, provides grants to youth and elderly groups, supports Woodley Village Hall and other community facilities. It has installed defibrillators, litter bins and speed limiter signs, and planting to enhance the

	<p>environment. This could be lost if a merger took place. Parish Councils are a valued part of Test Valley and should be cherished in their current form.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Hibberd – In favour of retaining Romsey Extra Parish Council. Parish has existed for over 800 years, and Parish Council dates from 1894. Has qualities that benefit its community, which should be retained and preserved. Unlike Romsey Town Council, Romsey Extra Parish Council is a Quality Parish Council and have a “rural topology focus”, with a thoroughly different character and outlook. The Parish has the sixth largest number of electors in Test Valley, whose views focus on rural/urban issues, which are different to town residents. The Parish Council carries out all its statutory responsibilities efficiently, with an up to date business plan, and committed clerk, Chairman and Members. Breaking up this efficient Council would be a retrograde step.</p> <p>Cllr Alison Johnston – Write as past Chair, and Member from 2003-2015, of Romsey Extra Parish Council, and Test Valley Borough Councillor for Romsey Extra Ward. Strongly support proposal to retain Romsey Extra Parish Council, to continue its excellent work. Do not believe that aligning with new Borough boundaries or bringing parish within Romsey Town would be in best interests of residents. Romsey Extra has largest proportion of new housing development in southern Test Valley, including 800 built/planned at Abbotswood and other developments progressing/at first stages of implementation. Such new developments bring challenges that need a single dedicated Parish Council, to ensure that new communities are well-designed and sustainable, and remain attractive places to live (assisted by Parish Council support for community facilities). The Parish Council can also play a role in determining new bus/cycle/walking routes and liaison with affected schools, manage the environmental impact of growth (e.g. protection of Fishlake Nature Reserve) and integrate new communities into existing ones. Romsey Extra has a rural nature whose special characteristics are not shared with towns, such as mobile coverage, access to shops and facilities, public transport, rural economy issues, and different planning consideration. Romsey Extra should therefore be retained as a separate Parish Council.</p> <p>Cllr Teresa Hibberd – Resident of Romsey Extra and Parish Councillor since 2003. Opposed to align new boundaries to new Borough Wards. If this occurs, many parts of the Parish would have to be adopted by other surrounding Parish Councils, who are unwilling to do so. Parish has existed for 100 years, and Parish Council in place since 1894. It has worked over the years, and should therefore not be changed.</p>
--	--

	<p>The Parish Council works diligently and is active. It provides information and receives feedback to/from residents, and has an up to date Business Plan. It is well respected and participates in local events. Abolition would lead to loss of knowledgeable parish councillors. Residents in the rural area would not be properly represented. The current boundaries should be retained as they are.</p> <p>Jo Cottrell (Headteacher of Halterworth Primary School) – Concern about proposed boundary changes and impact on relationship between School and Romsey Extra Parish Council, which has supported the purchase of books and equipment for pupils, as well as attending School events. A loss of involvement in the School would mean areas being developed will continue to attract investment, whilst the School fails to attract community fund monies. The School's catchment area has been reduced and funds redirected to North Baddesley schools – any changes will lead to the School being overlooked by an amalgamated Parish. Seek reassurance that Halterworth will continue to have support and civic involvement as at present.</p> <p>Joel Worrall (Headmaster of Stroud School) – Have regular interaction with Romsey Extra Parish Council, particularly its chairman. Council is efficiently run, with councillors who understand the parish and have a desire to improve it. Population will experience nearly a 50% rise in next two years. Combining Romsey Extra and Romsey Town areas would lose much of the personal approach we have experienced.</p> <p>Heather McIlroy (Executive Headteacher, The Mountbatten School) – In firm interests of the School for Romsey Extra Parish to remain separate from Romsey Town. Parish Council has been supportive of School in the past, and amalgamation would stretch resources reducing time available to support charitable causes and events. With significant building development planned for Romsey Extra, this is not the time to allow Romsey Extra to be “swallowed up” by Romsey Town.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Long term resident of Romsey Extra. Considerable growth of housing in Parish will increase the amount sought by the Parish Council by precept. This should not justify boundary changes, which should only be made to bring about more effective and efficient services. Oppose any changes to current Parish boundaries, particularly if this were to lead to the Parish being taken into the Town Council area.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Concerned to note changes being considered to existing Romsey Extra Parish. Parish Councillors are an established team which understands the</p>
--	---

	<p>communities' needs. The population of Romsey Extra continues to grow due to major housebuilding programs, increasing the Parish Council's workload. Their experience and contacts puts them in best position to manage the additional demands from this growing population. Request that the status quo is maintained.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Strongly object to any proposal to abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council, given Government's intent to promote localism and community involvement. Value input of Parish Councillors in dealing with problems, particularly when Town or Borough Councillors have conflicts of interest. Parish council provides a local tier of consultation and information. Most residents feel closer to Parish Councillors than Borough or Town Councillors. Parish Councils can also communicate community feelings to higher tiers of government.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Do not support merging of Romsey Extra Parish with Romsey Town. Romsey Extra has separate character and provides essential green/rural space around Romsey. Merger would remove representation of parish interests as new Councillors will be influenced by urban voters.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Totally against removing Romsey Extra Parish Council, as this will remove residents' voice on local matters. Romsey Town Council would be able to make adverse decisions without any opposition, to the detriment of Romsey Extra area. Parish Council has special relationships with local schools and provides financial assistance which is unlikely to continue. Parish Council also represents local views in planning matters. It also supports local groups, provides a defibrillator, helps with footpaths and has served to represent local views over many years. Local people should always be consulted (as the Parish Council currently do), unlike a recent example when trees were felled by Romsey Town Council without consulting residents.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Resident for 20 years, and Parish Council has served well during that time. Parish Council are local people familiar with the area, who take an interest in local organisations and matters. Romsey Extra has existed for over 1000 years and should not be swept aside lightly. It has the sixth largest number of electors in Test Valley, projected to rise to fourth largest. Should therefore remain as independent parish.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Parish Councils are essential tier of local government. Must reflect and represent local</p>
--	---

	<p>environment. Romsey Extra is mainly rural and different in character to urban Romsey Town. Different Councils are needed to serve different interests. With recent development, some dwellings are not represented by the most local parish council. Romsey Town and Romsey Extra should continue as separate councils, with some minor boundary changes.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – In the past, Romsey Town has not shown any understanding of the rural aspects of Romsey Extra or how these should be managed. Countryside around Romsey (including Romsey Extra) is being eroded. Should therefore retain Romsey Extra Parish Council as a voice for the Parish residents.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Romsey Extra Parish Council in current form provides governance which reflects the identities and interests of the community and is effective and convenient. No reason for any fundamental change other than minor boundary changes. Romsey Extra is one of the biggest parishes and has been effective in representing needs of a growing population, which should retain a Parish Council to reflect its needs.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Parish of Romsey Extra should remain in its current form, other than minor changes. History and tradition, which have worked through time, should not be swept away to modernise. Romsey Extra is a historic part of local administration, and is not, and never has been, part of the town of Romsey. Merging Romsey Infra with Romsey Extra would produce a population of 20,000, and it would be difficult for any Parish Council with that size of population to engender community identity and properly deal with local issues. Parish Council provides range of activities, and is not just an administrative body. The current arrangements have worked well in the past, and continue to do so. Borough Ward boundaries changes may change in a short period, and 1000 years of history should not be destroyed for such an alteration. Things of value should not be lost simply as a result of loud voices. Romsey Extra Parish has a clear identity and retaining this will be in the community's best interests.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Issue 67 (Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra) Against Draft Recommendation:- Romsey resident - Tinkering being suggested as opposed to real constructive change to benefit the area's residents by deliverance and a lower precept. Romsey Extra should be absorbed into Romsey infra. Previous [first consultation] argument has not been addressed in the slightest. Western boundary might be arguable but has not even been considered.</p>

Cllr Clive Collier – Appalled to read the recommendation of Members Group that the parish of Romsey Extra be retained despite the clear advice from the Boundary Commission that it should be absorbed into 7 adjacent parishes. Only to be expected that Romsey Extra Parish Council will campaign against it. A separate parish of Romsey Extra circling Romsey Town is historical and should be resolved sooner rather than later. If people cry 'history' then the facts will confirm that at one stage in time The Hundred, which is in the middle of the town, was once in the parish of Romsey Extra.

Urge Group to reconsider and follow the recommendations of the Boundary Commission regarding the rewording of Test Valley. Most residents won't care less but to retain the status quo will cause huge confusion in the minds of the majority of those who live in Romsey Extra. They will find themselves in a different ward for Test Valley yet still in that parish.

Polling district of VV substantiates these views. For many years VV has been in Abbey Ward for Test Valley yet in the parish of Romsey Extra. None of these residents understand why. If the final decision is that Romsey Extra is to remain, the VV should be moved into [Romsey Town] for voting purposes.

Issues 68, 68A, 68B (Extend Romsey Town boundary into Romsey Extra Parish to mirror Borough Wards)

Against Draft Recommendation:-

Town Cllr John Parker – updated version of original submission. Disappointed that TVBC did not recommend the expansion of Romsey Town Council to incorporate the new built areas of Romsey but understand the problem of doing this given the objections of Romsey Extra Parish Council and the failure of Romsey Town Council to get behind this proposal. Believe that the majority of residents of the built area of greater Romsey describe themselves as being residents of Romsey and not of either Romsey parish. Bringing all the built areas of Romsey under one authority would provide a unified local government voice for Romsey, a vital balance to Andover.

Bringing these areas together would provide a more equitable financial basis for the areas in that all the residents who use the facilities of the Town would contribute through their council tax. There would also be a pool of Community Infrastructure Levy for use across all of Romsey and especially those older areas that need improvement most. One local authority for Romsey would be more effective and more efficient. Wards of an expanded authority would be the same as new TVBC Wards, avoiding confusion for voters.

	<p>Issue 69 (Maintain Status Quo, Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish to remain separate and as existing)</p> <p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Romsey Extra Parish Council – Support.</p> <p>Romsey Extra residents (2) – fully endorse draft decision to make no significant changes, particularly not to amalgamate Romsey Extra with Romsey Town.</p> <p>Against Draft Recommendation:- Romsey Extra resident – does not wish any changes to be effected. Nothing in draft documentation that is worthy of change. Trust nothing changes in Romsey.</p>
Members Group Observations	<p>Three competing proposals have been put forward, with compelling evidence in support of all three. There is strong support for retention of Romsey Extra Parish Council in its current form from the Parish Council and Romsey Extra residents, although considerable development is being undertaken and planned in Romsey Extra area. It was noted that having debated the matter at length, Romsey Town Council had not made any representations against retaining the current governance arrangements in Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish.</p> <p>Given the evidence submitted, the existing governance arrangements should be maintained (subject to minor boundary changes set out under other Issues), but the Town and Parish Councils should be encouraged to work together on the use of CIL money and involvement in the Romsey Future project in order to provide the most effective local governance.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>Romsey Town area is wholly within and coterminous with Romsey Town County Electoral Division. Romsey Town Electoral Division also includes part of Romsey Extra Parish (the area to the east of the Town, north east of the “Straight Mile”. The remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is contained in Romsey Rural County Electoral Division.</p> <p>The 2017 Boundary Review revised the Borough Ward boundaries, extending outside Romsey Town area. There are three Borough Wards, Romsey Cupernham (covering areas Q, S and Y on Map SCR68 A/B), Romsey Abbey (covering areas P and T) and Romsey Tadburn (covering areas R and V). The new Borough Ward boundaries are edged red on map FCR70A.</p>

	<p>These Borough Wards therefore cover areas currently in Romsey Town (P, Q and R) as well as areas in Romsey Extra (S, T, V, W, X, and Y). The remainder of Romsey Extra (the uncoloured area on Map SCR 68A/B) near the Straight Mile will be in the Ampfield and Braishfield Borough Ward (but see Issue SCR 62-63 for proposals on this).</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<p>That (subject to other Final Recommendations) no change be made to the existing boundaries and governance structures of Romsey Town and Romsey Extra.</p>
Map Reference	<p>SCR 67 – shows boundaries of Romsey (Town), Romsey Extra and surrounding parishes. Merging Romsey Town and Romsey Extra would result in a single parish covering both these areas.</p> <p>SCR 68 – extending Romsey Town to include all the area within the new Borough Wards would involve transferring areas labelled “CC”, “DD” and “EE” from Romsey Extra Parish to Romsey Town, leaving the remainder of Romsey Extra (to be under a revised Romsey Extra Parish Council, or (Issue 68B) transferred to adjacent parishes.</p> <p>SCR 68A/B – shows the Town Wards (as set out under the 2017 Boundary Review) labelled P, Q and R, and the new Romsey Extra Parish Wards (labelled S, T, V, W and X).</p>

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Romsey Extra Parish Council	Issue Ref:	SCR 70
LGBCE Implications		Consent	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR For abolition of wards 54.1 Romsey Extra Parish Council 54.19, 54.22 Romsey Extra residents ---- SCR Support Draft Recommendation 54.25-54.26 Romsey Extra residents 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Abolition of parish wards.		
Summary of Issue	Whether Romsey Extra Parish Council should be warded (as per the outcome of the 2017 Electoral Review) or not warded (as it is at present).		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Romsey Extra Parish be not warded. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed change. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Romsey Extra Parish Council – Romsey Extra Parish Council believes that because of the nature of the parish with most of the dwellings located in one quadrant, the residents are best served by the parish not being “warded” for electoral or any other purposes, and the present arrangement should therefore be retained.</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident –Warding may be a good idea where a parish has an even distribution of housing and projected developments. However, in a parish like Romsey Extra, one quarter consists of the Broadlands estate with approximately 100 dwellings, the north-eastern and south-eastern part of the parish have been earmarked for considerable new housing developments, whilst other parts are predominantly rural. Subdividing into wards would create a situation of parish councillors infighting for funding between areas, instead of mutual agreement which currently takes place.</p>		

	<p>Romsey Extra resident – There should be no changes to the current arrangements other than minor boundary changes. As Romsey Extra Parish Council is not [currently] warded, it can and does represent the whole of the parish, both the large rural area of the parish with a small population, and the more urban areas.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support draft recommendation:- Romsey Extra resident – Fully support the decision not to ward Romsey Extra Parish</p> <p>Romsey Extra resident – Agree Romsey should not be divided into wards.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council – Support FCR 70</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>The warding of Romsey Extra parish was implemented due to legislation binding the LGBCE when it carried out the 2017 Electoral Review. The CGR is not bound by the same rules, although it is noted that Consent of the LGBCE would be required to remove the warding arrangements.</p> <p>As the representations received point out, housing development in Romsey Extra is not evenly distributed between these new wards. The parish Council has operated successfully in the past as a single unwarded parish,</p> <p>The Act requires that when deciding whether or not to divide a parish into wards, consideration is given to whether:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number or distribution of local government electors for the parish would make a single election of councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and - It is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented. <p>The Parish Council and the other two representations received clearly favour a single unwarded parish council, and no representations or other evidence have been received to suggest that any area of the parish should be separately represented. Although housing development has occurred in the recent past in certain parts of the parish, it would appear from the representations received from Romsey Extra residents that the single unwarded parish council has continued to represent residents and carry out its functions satisfactorily.</p>
<p>Electoral Arrangement Issues</p>	<p>The parish warding arrangements were put in place as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review. Under its proposals, three new Borough Wards were created covering the Romsey Town</p>

area, as shown on Map FCR70A (Romsey Cupernham, Romsey Tadburn, and Romsey Abbey). This is due to the requirements of the legislation governing LGBCE Electoral Reviews, which require that where a boundary proposed by the LGBCE cuts across an existing parish, the LGBCE must also recommend the warding of that parish on the same line as that proposed boundary. Accordingly, under the 2017 Electoral Review, the LGBCE warded Romsey Town (areas P, Q and R on Map FCR70A, Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn).

The new Borough Wards created under the 2017 Electoral Review also extended outside of Romsey Town, into Romsey Extra Parish. For the same reason, the LGBCE therefore created wards in Romsey Extra Parish, coterminous with the new Borough Ward boundaries. Seven wards were created in Romsey Extra (areas S, T, U, V, W, X and Y, Abbotswood, Broadlands, Crampmoor, Halterworth & Whitenap, Lee, West, and Woodley respectively on Map FCR70A).

Under the Draft Recommendations, Crampmoor Parish Ward (area U) was to move from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield. Under the current proposed Final Recommendations, part of this area (WW on map SCR62B), Crampmoor itself, is to remain within Romsey Extra Parish, with the remainder (areas LL and MM) proposed to be transferred from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield and Braishfield Parish (Issue FCR 62 refers). Under SCR64, areas YY and ZZ on map SCR62B are to be also transferred from Romsey Extra Parish to Ampfield. Finally, Area NN on map SCR62B is to be transferred from Romsey Extra parish to Braishfield parish (although there are no electors in this area) – see Issue SCR 64).

This would leave Romsey Extra Parish having six wards, each with one parish councillor.

The following table set as out the Electorate figures (Jan 2018 and five year projection) for Romsey Extra, as warded in accordance with the 2017 Electoral Review, and a similar set of figures for Romsey Extra without such warding in place (but with part of Crampmoor (U) transferred to Ampfield Parish (area .

Existing Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate
Romsey Extra	Abbotswood	1522	1896
	Broadlands	109	139
	Halterworth & Whitenap	467	1135

		Lee	79	119
		West	202	281
		Woodley	1337	2155
		Crampmoor	184	185
	Romsey Extra	All	3900	5910
	Proposed			
	Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate
	Romsey Extra	Abbotswood	1522	1896
	Romsey Extra	Broadlands	109	139
		Halterworth & Whitenap	467	1135
		Lee	79	119
		West	202	281
	(excluding areas YY and ZZ)	Woodley	1319	2137
	(excluding areas LL and MM)	Crampmoor	128	129
	Total		3826	5836
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Romsey Extra Parish be not warded. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought to the proposed change. 			
Map Reference	<p>SCR 68A/B shows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (coloured green/hatched yellow, lettered P, Q and R) the Romsey Town area and Town Wards; - (coloured green and pink, lettered S, T, U, V, W, X and Y) the six Romsey Extra Town Wards <p>which would subsist if no changes were made to the changes introduced by the 2017 Electoral Review.</p> <p>If the proposed Final Recommendations are accepted, areas U and Y would be reduced in size due to boundary changes (see map SCR62B).</p>			

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	North Baddesley and Valley Park Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 71
LGBCE Implications		Consent	RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 53.1 North Baddesley PC 53.2 Valley Park PC ----- SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Redraw the boundary so Thorn Hill (including Flexford House and nearby houses, and fields to rear) transfer to Valley Park Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the areas of land lettered “DD” on Map FCR 71 be transferred from North Baddesley Parish to Valley Park Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- North Baddesley Parish Council – Stated that they would like to give away Thorn Hill area in its entirety to Valley Park Parish Council.</p> <p>Valley Park Parish Council – Supported the representations put forward by North Baddesley Parish Council.</p>		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	In view of the agreement between the two Parish Councils the Member Group supported redrawing the boundary. This would also give a strengthened community identity to the area.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Valley Park Parish is in Valley Park Borough. North Baddesley Parish (which includes the Thorn Hill area) is in North Baddesley Ward. Both Parishes are in Baddesley County Electoral Division. Ward.		

	Existing																								
	Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate																					
	Valley Park	North	4713	4567																					
		South East	542	502																					
		South West	400	397																					
	Valley Park	All	5655	5467																					
	Proposed																								
	Parish	Parish Ward	Jan 2018 Electorate	2022 Electorate																					
	Valley Park	All	5655	5467																					
<p>Valley Park parish was warded under the 2017 Electoral review, and therefore LGBCE Consent would be required to change these (i.e. by extending Valley Park North Parish Ward to include some or all of Thorn Hill).</p> <p>As the two areas are in different Borough Wards, it would be sensible to recommend that a Related Alteration be made to align the Borough Ward boundary with the revised parish boundary. Only 5 electors are involved. The following table shows the relevant Electoral Variance figures, showing no significant changes:-</p> <p>Borough Wards</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North Baddesley</td> <td>-11.3%</td> <td>-10.2%</td> <td>-2(-5+3)</td> <td>-2(-5+3)</td> <td>-11.3%</td> <td>-10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Valley Park</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td>-5.1%</td> <td>+5</td> <td>+5</td> <td>6.1%</td> <td>-5.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note- the above figures also include changes under SCR76.</p>					Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	North Baddesley	-11.3%	-10.2%	-2(-5+3)	-2(-5+3)	-11.3%	-10.2%	Valley Park	5.9%	-5.1%	+5	+5	6.1%	-5.0%
Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																			
North Baddesley	-11.3%	-10.2%	-2(-5+3)	-2(-5+3)	-11.3%	-10.2%																			
Valley Park	5.9%	-5.1%	+5	+5	6.1%	-5.0%																			
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the areas of land lettered "DD" on Map SCR 71 be transferred from North Baddesley Parish to Valley Park Parish. 2. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary. 																								
Map Reference	SCR 71																								

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Romsey Extra, Michelmersh, Ampfield, Braishfield and Wellow Parishes.	Issue Ref:	SCR 72
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR In favour of transfer:- 55.8 Romsey resident</p> <p>Against transfer:- 49.1 Wellow Parish Council 54.1 Romsey Extra Parish Council ----</p> <p>SCR Support Draft Recommendation:- 51.1(S) Braishfield Parish Council 51.3-51.5 Braishfield residents 52.5 Cllr Martin Hatley 52.6-52.7 Braishfield residents</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	<p>Whether to redraw boundary of Romsey Extra from junction of Ampfield/Braishfield Parish boundary, north to Fairborne Stream, along Fairborne Stream and encircling Timsbury Lake to junction of Jinny Lane/Yokesford Hill, existing boundary to A3057, follow A3057 south to B3084, along Old Salisbury Lane to junction of Danies Road, then south to Shootash crossroads, A27 to Gardeners Lane.</p> <p>[Note – part of this proposal is considered under Issue FCR 55/56. Issue FCR58 also deals with land adjacent to some of the land considered under this Issue 72.]</p>		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue FCR 72.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>In favour of transfer:- Romsey resident – See Summary of Issue above.</p> <p>Against transfer:- Wellow Parish Council – other than one minor boundary change [Issue FCR58], Parish Council is of the view that there is no need to change the parish boundaries. It is not in favour of amending existing boundary to take in any of Romsey Extra</p>		

	<p>parish currently bordering Wellow.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council – Parish Council resolved to keep all its current boundaries in their present form subject to very minor revisions in agreement with neighbouring parishes.</p>
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Braishfield Parish Council – Support the recommendation that no change is made to the boundary at Crook Hill. This is because residents of Crook Hill have a strong sense of belonging to the community of Braishfield.</p> <p>Braishfield resident – Lives on Crook Hill, currently part of Braishfield. Strongly opposed to being made part of Romsey Extra. Very much a part of Braishfield and see no reason for a change.</p> <p>Braishfield resident – Strongly oppose the transfer of the area south of the Dog and Crook pub to Romsey Extra. It is very much part of the village and resident does not wish to be in a different parish to fellow villagers.</p> <p>Braishfield resident – Notes that there are no recommendations but would be totally against the redrawing of the existing boundary line. The village is tight knit and has a strong and well supported PC. The existing boundary makes total sense and should not be tinkered with. As a former parish councillor would be horrified to have home moved outside the Braishfield boundary.</p> <p>Cllr Martin Hatley - Confirms agreement with TVBC and Ampfield and Braishfield Parish Council in that no change should be made with respect to these submissions.</p> <p>Braishfield resident - Upper Crookhill was changed from Romsey Extra to Braishfield when first a resident, seemed to make perfect sense. Residents are to all intents and purposes part of Braishfield and take an active part in Braishfield life, working in the Community shop, serving on the Parish Council or Village Assoc. I myself have both taught at the village school and been a governor there. Would like to express my wish that things stay as they are.</p> <p>Braishfield residents - Residents of Crookhill Farm, Crook Hill, Braishfield strongly object to this change of boundary proposal and feel threatened by the idea.</p>
Members Group Observations	<p>Area A5 was considered under Issue FCR55-56 where it was agreed that this should remain in Awbridge (and other adjoining land should be transferred to Awbridge also).</p>

	<p>The boundary suggested follows natural features, but there is no other clear evidence to support the change. There is a clear sense of community identity with the current boundary and opposition to seeing this changed. Given the lack of evidence to support the change and the comments of Wellow and Romsey Extra Parish Council (which does not wish to see any changes to its existing boundaries), there should be no changes to the boundary (save as covered under other Issues).</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This area is currently within Ampfield and Braishfield, and Blackwater Borough Wards, and areas would be transferred from Ampfield and Braishfield to Romsey Cupernham if the proposal was agreed. The area is within Romsey Extra County Electoral Division, and this would not be affected under the proposal.</p> <p>Land would be transferred from Romsey Extra to Ampfield, Awbridge and Wellow Parishes under the proposed change (shown A1-A7 inclusive on map FCR72).</p> <p>If the proposed change were to be accepted, it would affect parish warding arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore Consent of LGBCE would be required. As the Borough Ward boundaries as proposed would not follow the proposed new boundary, a Related Alteration recommendation would be appropriate to maintain coterminosity if the proposed change were to be agreed.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in respect of Issue SCR 72.
Map Reference	SCR 72 and SCR 72A

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Valley Park Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 73
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR 56.1 Valley Park Parish Council 56.3 Cllr Julia Adey 56.4 Cllr Dianne Moran 56.5-56.9 Valley Park residents ---- SCR Support draft recommendation:- 56.1(S) Valley Park Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary. Abolition/Retention of Parish Council.		
Summary of Issue	Whether any change should be made to existing governance arrangements for Valley Park Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That save for the Draft Recommendation in respect of Issue FCR 71, no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Valley Park Parish Council.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	<p>Against change:- Valley Park Parish Council – Valley Park Parish Council seeks that no changes be made to Valley Park Parish Council. Parish considers it is a competent successful Council and provides excellent value for money to Council Tax payers.</p> <p>Cllr Julia Adey – Valley Park Parish Councillor – Request no change to be made to existing Parish Council. Parish considers it is a competent successful council and provides excellent value for money to Council Tax payers.</p> <p>Cllr Dianne Moran – Valley Park Parish Councillor – comments are that of the rest of the Parish Councillors. Parish Council seeks no changes to existing Parish Council. Parish considers it is a competent successful Council which provides excellent value for money to Council Tax payers, works hard to help environment, keeps area well cared for, and cares for its residents.</p>		

	<p>Valley Park resident – Parish Council appears to work well and efficiently. No clear rationale to change boundaries.</p> <p>Valley Park resident – Understand boundary changes are possible topic for discussion. Very happy with current boundary, strongly request no boundaries and parishes are not changed.</p> <p>Valley Park resident – Surprised to see that under new boundaries, will become part of Chilworth. Have no connection with Chilworth or use of its facilities, unlike Valley Park, whose facilities I do use. If proposed changes come into effect our democratic rights will have been removed, replacing them with right to vote in an area with which we have no connection. Creating more numerically equal numbers disenfranchises many people and undermines value of “local” government.</p> <p>Valley Park resident – Strongly object to any form of breaking up Valley Park Parish Council, which is a competent council offering value for money, is financially prudent and provides wonderful floral displays.</p> <p>In favour of change:- Valley Park resident – Not sure if Parish Council is needed at all. Currently have 8 or 10 Councillors from same political party, with no independent decision-making. Should either have proportional representation for Parish Councils or have non-political Councillors to give unbiased view. Also question budgeting as have little to spend money on (other than their own “expenses”), leading to money being given to charity, which I do not consider is right. Parish Councils should be scrapped.</p> <p>Valley Park resident – Support proposed changes to boundary which appear to reduce the size of the parish and thereby serve to enhance community identity.</p>
<p>Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)</p>	<p>Support Draft Recommendation:- Valley Park Parish Council - Strongly support the draft recommendations and changes being proposed for Valley Park.</p>
<p>Members Group Observations</p>	<p>Support from residents for no change, backed up by Parish Council itself. Some representations may be referring to changes to Borough Ward boundaries, which the CGR has no direct control over, as the Terms of Reference for the CGR made no specific proposals for boundary changes. The CGR cannot change the political make-up or balance of a parish Council, although it could recommend abolition. In this case, however, there is insufficient evidence to support abolition.</p>

	Save for the proposed change considered under Issue FCR 71 (Thorn Hill), no change to the existing boundaries or governance arrangements is appropriate.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	If the Parish Council were to be abolished, consideration would have to be given as to whether the area would remain unparished (which is contrary to Government guidance) or transferred to neighbouring parishes.
Proposed Final Recommendation	That save for the Draft Recommendation in respect of Issue SCR 71, no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Valley Park Parish Council.
Map Reference	Not applicable

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Nursling and Rownhams Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 74
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	FCR 57.1 Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council ---- SCR None		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether any change should be made to existing boundaries or governance arrangements for Nursling and Rownhams Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Against change:- Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council have no particular desire to accommodate Lee within its parish boundary but reserve the right to reconsider the position following responses from adjacent parish councils.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	No proposals have been submitted to move Lee from Romsey Extra to Nursling and Rownhams Parish, and there is no evidence to suggest that this should occur.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Lee falls within Romsey Extra Parish, and under the 2017 Electoral Review, it is within one of the Romsey Extra Parish wards (Lee Parish Ward).		
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no change be made to the boundaries, council size, or other parish governance arrangements in respect of Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council.		
Map Reference	SCR 74		

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	North Baddesley and Chilworth Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 76
LGBCE Implications			RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	FCR Officer Proposal ---- SCR None		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to redraw boundary so that Fleming Court, Norton Welch Close, North Baddesley is wholly within North Baddesley Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "FF" on Map SCR 76 be transferred from Chilworth Parish to North Baddesley Parish. 2. That if a reorganisation order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the Borough Ward and County Electoral Division boundaries with the new Parish boundary. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Officer proposal – the boundary between North Baddesley and Chilworth Parish passes through the Fleming Court development. This results in 2 properties being in Chilworth parish, 1 straddling the boundary, and 11 in North Baddesley Parish. It is proposed to realign the boundary so that Fleming Court, Norton Welch Close, North Baddesley is wholly within North Baddesley Parish.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	Fleming Court is at the edge of the North Baddesley settlement and clearly relates more to North Baddesley Parish than Chilworth Parish. Moving the boundary so that all of Fleming Court falls within North Baddesley Parish would reflect this community identity and remove an administrative anomaly.		

Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>The Borough Ward and County Division boundaries are aligned with the current Parish boundary. Most of Fleming Court is in North Baddesley Borough Ward and Baddesley County Electoral Division. The remaining three properties are partly/wholly within Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams Borough Ward and Romsey Extra County Electoral Division.</p> <p>The area is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required. However, as the Borough Ward and County Division boundaries are aligned with the current Parish boundary, a Related Alteration should be applied for if the Parish Boundary is moved, to maintain coterminosity of these boundaries.</p> <p>The change would have no significant effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes, given that only three properties are involved, as shown by the following tables:-</p> <p>Borough Wards</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 853 1423 1223"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North Baddesley</td> <td>-11.3%</td> <td>-10.2%</td> <td>-2(-5+7)</td> <td>-2(-5+7)</td> <td>-11.3%</td> <td>-10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams</td> <td>-11.8%</td> <td>-7.1%</td> <td>-3</td> <td>-3</td> <td>-11.9%</td> <td>-7.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>County Divisions</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 1368 1382 1704"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Variance 2017 (No RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (No RA)</th> <th>Change of electors 2017 with RA</th> <th>Change of electors 2022 with RA</th> <th>Variance 2017 (with RA)</th> <th>Variance 2022 (with RA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baddesley</td> <td>-2.3%</td> <td>-3.1%</td> <td>+81 (+56 +7 +18)</td> <td>+63 (+56 +7 +18)</td> <td>-1.7%</td> <td>-2.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Romsey Rural</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>-63 (-56 -7)</td> <td>-63</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>15.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: These tables also include figures for SCR71 (Borough Wards) and SCR 62-63 &64 (County Divisions)</p>	Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	North Baddesley	-11.3%	-10.2%	-2(-5+7)	-2(-5+7)	-11.3%	-10.2%	Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams	-11.8%	-7.1%	-3	-3	-11.9%	-7.2%	Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)	Baddesley	-2.3%	-3.1%	+81 (+56 +7 +18)	+63 (+56 +7 +18)	-1.7%	-2.6%	Romsey Rural	5.2%	16.3%	-63 (-56 -7)	-63	4.7%	15.9%
Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																																					
North Baddesley	-11.3%	-10.2%	-2(-5+7)	-2(-5+7)	-11.3%	-10.2%																																					
Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams	-11.8%	-7.1%	-3	-3	-11.9%	-7.2%																																					
Ward	Variance 2017 (No RA)	Variance 2022 (No RA)	Change of electors 2017 with RA	Change of electors 2022 with RA	Variance 2017 (with RA)	Variance 2022 (with RA)																																					
Baddesley	-2.3%	-3.1%	+81 (+56 +7 +18)	+63 (+56 +7 +18)	-1.7%	-2.6%																																					
Romsey Rural	5.2%	16.3%	-63 (-56 -7)	-63	4.7%	15.9%																																					
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "FF" on Map FCR 76 be transferred from Chilworth Parish to North Baddesley Parish. 2. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related 																																										

	<p>Alteration to align the Borough Ward with the new Parish boundary.</p> <p>3. That if a Reorganisation Order is made to implement the proposed changes, a recommendation be made to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to align the County Division with the new Parish boundary.</p>
Map Reference	SCR 76

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Michelmersh Parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 77
LGBCE Implications			RA
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR Officer proposal ---</p> <p>SCR None</p>		
Nature of Issue	Related Alteration to reflect existing Parish boundary.		
Summary of Issue	Whether to seek a Related Alteration to align the County Electoral Division Boundary at Bunny Lane, Timsbury, to the boundary between Michelmersh and Braishfield Parishes.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That a Related Alteration recommendation be made to the LGBCE to transfer the area of land lettered “GG” on Map FCR 77 from Baddesley County Division to Test Valley Central County Division.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Officer proposal – the County Electoral Division boundary passes through the Gas Distribution Station in Bunny lane, Timsbury. This follows a previous Borough Ward boundary which has been altered as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	<p>Although there are no electors affected, it is in the interests of effective and convenient local government that the County Division and Parish boundaries be aligned.</p> <p>An application to the LGBCE for a Related Alteration to this effect should therefore be made.</p>		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	This anomaly does not affect any Borough Wards (as reorganised under the 2017 Electoral Review). Given the nature of the site, there are no electors affected by the		

	<p>proposal.</p> <p>The area in question is wholly within Michelmersh Parish, and is currently within Baddesley County Electoral Division. The majority of the Gas Distribution Centre is within Test Valley Central County Electoral Division.</p> <p>The area is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required.</p> <p>A Related Alteration should be applied for to secure coterminosity of the Parish and County Division boundaries.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That a Related Alteration recommendation be made to the LGBCE to transfer the area of land lettered "GG" on Map SCR 77 from Baddesley County Division to Test Valley Central County Division.
Map Reference	SCR 77

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	No specified parish	Issue Ref:	SCR 78
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	FCR 59.1 Lockerley resident ---- SCR None		
Nature of Issue	No change.		
Summary of Issue	Whether any change should be made to existing boundaries or governance arrangements for unspecified parishes.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That no specific recommendation be made in response to this Issue.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Against change:- Lockerley resident – Concerned about any reduction in number of parishes and wards, as this will lead to a reduction in local representation as ratio of Councillors to parishioners will increase. Parish Councils cost a negligible amount of money so Government should be seeking to maintain or even increase number of Parish Councils.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	Agree with representation. Government guidance advises against reducing number of Parish Councils. CGR does not make any proposals to reduce number of Parish Councils.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	Not applicable.		
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no specific recommendation be made in response to this Issue.		
Map Reference	Not applicable		

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 79
LGBCE Implications		Consent	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR Officer proposal ----</p> <p>SCR Support draft recommendation:- 54.1(S) Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to redraw boundary so that Feltham Close Romsey is wholly within Romsey Extra Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered “HH” on Map FCR 79 be transferred from Romsey Town to Romsey Extra Parish. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought for the proposed change. 		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Officer proposal – the boundary between Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parishes passes through the Feltham Close development. This results in 2 properties in Feltham Close being in Romsey Town, 1 straddling the boundary, and the remaining 37 properties all being within Romsey Extra Parish. It is proposed that the boundary be realigned to provide for all Feltham Close properties to be within Romsey Extra Parish.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	Romsey Extra Parish Council – Regarding FCR 79, support the draft recommendation.		
Members Group Observations	The County Electoral Division boundary (shown in red on Map SCR79) has been drawn so as to include all of Feltham Close in Romsey Rural County Division. A logical boundary between Romsey Town and Romsey Extra in this area would be to follow this Electoral Division boundary, thus removing the anomaly that currently exists, whereby most of the		

	development is in Romsey Extra Parish, but with three properties are wholly or partly in Romsey Town. This would restore community identity of Feltham Close being wholly within Romsey Extra Parish. Coterminosity would be in the interest of retaining community identity as well as convenient governance of the area.
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>All of Feltham Close is within Romsey Cupernham Borough Ward. Due to the alignment of the County Electoral Division boundary, it is also wholly within Romsey Rural Electoral Division.</p> <p>Moving the parish boundary so as to align with the County Electoral Division boundary would therefore not require a Related Alteration. However, as Romsey Town/Romsey Extra was warded under the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, the Consent of the LGBCE will be required.</p> <p>The change would have no significant effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes, given that only three properties are involved.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the area of land lettered "HH" on Map SCR 79 be transferred from Romsey Town to Romsey Extra Parish. 2. That LGBCE Consent be sought for the proposed change.
Map Reference	SCR 79

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Over Wallop and Nether Wallop Parish Councils	Issue Ref:	SCR 80
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	FCR Officer proposal ----- SCR None		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to redraw boundary so that The Furrows and Harvest Way, Middle Wallop are wholly within Over Wallop Parish.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	That the area of land lettered “II” on Map FCR 80 be transferred from Nether Wallop Parish to Over Wallop Parish.		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	Officer proposal – all of the residential development at the Army Aviation Centre at Middle Wallop is within Over Wallop Parish, save for 4 properties in The Furrows and Harvest Way that are wholly within Nether Wallop Parish, and a further 9 properties in these two roads that straddle the boundary between Over Wallop and Nether Wallop Parishes. It is proposed to realign the boundary so that these properties are wholly within Over Wallop Parish.		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	No representations were made.		
Members Group Observations	It is clear that these properties relate to the airfield and the other residential development associated with it. As this is within Over Wallop, it would be logical to realign the boundary so that all the residential development at Middle Wallop is within Over Wallop Parish. This change would reflect the community identity and remove an administrative anomaly, making governance more effective.		
Electoral Arrangement Issues	All the residential development in The Furrows and Harvest Way is within Mid test Borough Ward and Test Valley Central		

	<p>County Electoral Division. Changing the parish boundary will not therefore affect these other boundaries, and so a Related Alteration will not be required.</p> <p>The area is not affected by the Electoral Arrangements put in place by the 2017 Electoral Review, and therefore the Consent of the LGBCE will not be required.</p> <p>The change would have no significant effect on the distribution of electors between the two parishes, given that only thirteen properties are involved.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That the area of land lettered "II" on Map SCR 80 be transferred from Nether Wallop Parish to Over Wallop Parish.
Map Reference	SCR 80

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Final Recommendations

Parish (s)	Lockerley, Sherfield English and Awbridge Parishes	Issue Ref:	SCR 82
LGBCE Implications		None	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p>FCR None -----</p> <p>SCR For Transfer 48.2 Lockerley resident</p>		
Nature of Issue	Alteration of Parish Boundary		
Summary of Issue	Whether to transfer property in Newtown Road Lockerley to Awbridge.		
Agreed Draft Recommendation	Not applicable		
Summary of Representations (First Consultation Stage)	None		
Summary of Representations (Second Consultation Stage)	<p>In Favour of Transfer</p> <p>Resident and his wife wish to apply to move home from parish of Lockerley to the parish of Awbridge. Pay Council tax precept to Sherfield English but have no connection and consider it strange to be referred to as members of the Lockerley parish, vote in public elections at the Lockerley Village hall, which at 2.1 miles away, is a lot further from residents' house than the Awbridge Village hall which is within walking distance. Other houses on the same road, Newtown Road, are seen as being part of the Awbridge parish. Socialise within the Awbridge parish boundaries which are within walking distance of home. Both residents are associate members of ADVA and distribute copies of the monthly ADVA - Awbridge News magazine to homes in the eastern end of Newtown Road, therefore feel a much greater affinity with Awbridge than either Lockerley or Sheffield English. Residents are concerned that they cannot officially partake in important local decisions such as the provision of input to, and the</p>		

	approval of the NDP because not seen as eligible voters within Awbridge parish.
Members Group Observations	<p>Members noted that in this case (unlike others in the Review) the property in question was not adjacent to the parish to which the resident wished to be linked. Although the residents making the representation may feel more of a connection to Awbridge than Lockerley, transferring this property to Awbridge Parish could therefore only be achieved by either creating a “corridor” along the boundary between Lockerley and Sheffield English Parishes so as to create a geographical connection with Awbridge Parish, or by transferring a far greater area of land (e.g. properties in Newtown Road or the Golf Course) to create such a connection. It would be incongruous to create a corridor connection, and transferring a greater area would lead to land being transferred without the owners and occupiers having had an opportunity to comment on the proposal.</p> <p>Accordingly, this proposal was not accepted by the Members Group.</p>
Electoral Arrangement Issues	<p>This property is within Lockerley Parish. If the proposal were to be accepted, the property would remain in Mid Test Ward unless a Related Alteration application were to be submitted.</p> <p>The issue raised by the resident concerning payment of Council Tax precept [i.e. the parish precept] to Sheffield English will be addressed by the Local Taxation Team so that when bills are issued in March 2019, the occupiers of the property are charged the correct precept according to the parish within which the property is situated.</p>
Proposed Final Recommendation	That no recommendation be made in regard of Issue SCR 82.
Map Reference	SCR 82

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Timetable

This Annex sets out the timetable for the CGR

Ref	Action	Planned Date
1	Test Valley Borough Councillors briefing session	Monday 16 th October 2017, 5:30pm.
2	Council to consider Terms of Reference / start of review	Wednesday 8 th November 2017
3	Publish Terms of Reference (if agreed)	Thursday 9 th November 2017
4	1 st consultation period (11 weeks)	13 th November 2017 – 29 th January 2018
5	Special Council meeting to consider initial draft recommendations	26 th April 2018
6	Publish initial recommendations report	4 th May 2018
7	2 nd consultation period (8 weeks)	4 th May 2018 – 6 th July 2018
8	Council meeting to consider final recommendations report	5 th September 2018
9	Publication of final recommendations	September 2018
10	LGBCE consent for parish warding arrangements and related alterations	September 2018
11	Make reorganisation Order	September 2018
12	Related Alterations Order application/decision	October 2018
13	Publish electoral register	3 rd December 2018
14	Reorganisation Order in force	1 st April 2019
15	Borough and parish elections	May 2019

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations

Glossary of Terms Used

This Annex sets out terms which are used throughout the Report.

Term	Definition
2017 Review	The 2017 Electoral Review carried out by the LGBCE which reorganised wards within Test Valley Borough, to come into force at the 2019 Borough Elections.
The Act	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007
Community Governance Review (CGR)	A review of governance arrangements at Parish level, across the whole (or a specified part of) the Borough. The Review can make recommendations on a number of issues including creating, merging or abolishing parishes, boundary alterations between parishes, grouping parishes, changes to parish council arrangements (including size, warding, name, retention/abolition).
Consent	Where a CGR recommends changes to Electoral Arrangements which have been specified by the LGBCE in an Electoral Review (i.e. the 2017 Review of Test Valley Borough, or the 2016 Review of Hampshire County) within the preceding five years, a Reorganisation Order to implement those changes can only be made with the Consent of the LGBCE.
Coterminosity	Boundaries that follow the same line are said to be “coterminous”, e.g. where the Borough Ward boundary follows the same line as a Parish Council boundary. Coterminosity aids electoral administration, and means that residents in one electoral area will be represented by the same Parish, Borough and County Councillors as their neighbours.
Division	The electoral area of a County Council. Hampshire County Council’s area is divided into a number of Divisions, and each Division is represented by one or more County Councillors. The boundaries of these Divisions were last set following the 2016 Electoral Review of the County Council by the LGBCE.

Term	Definition
Draft Recommendations	Recommendations for governance arrangements at parish level made by the Borough Council following an initial consultation exercise. Draft Recommendations will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 26 April, and these will then be published for consultation purposes (leading to adoption of Final Recommendations).
Electoral Arrangements	The following matters in relation to a Parish Council:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the total number of councillors to be elected to a council; • the number and boundaries of wards or divisions; • the number of councillors to be elected for each ward or division; and • the name of any ward or division.
Electoral Review	A review of Electoral Arrangements for a Borough or Country area, carried out by the LGBCE. The LGBCE carried out a review of Test Valley Borough in 2017, and the changes arising from this will be implemented at the May 2019 elections. It also carried out a review of Hampshire County in 2016, which was implemented at the May 2017 County Elections.
Electoral Variance	The difference (expressed as a percentage) between the number of electors for a Borough Ward or County Division, and the average number of electors per Ward/Division across the whole council.
First Consultation Period	The first consultation carried out as part of the CGR (which ran from 13 November 2017 to 29 January 2018. During this period, representations were invited to inform the preparation of Draft Recommendations.
Final Recommendations	Following consideration of the responses received after publication of the Draft Recommendations, the Council will then consider Final Recommendations for the governance arrangements at parish level at its meeting on 5 September 2018 (prior to making the Reorganisation Order).
Grouping	Grouping occurs where two or more parishes are grouped under a Common Parish Council. Each parish remains a separate entity, although they are all governed by a single Parish Council. Grouping is an alternative to abolishing parishes and making a single (larger) parish under a new Parish Council.
Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE)	The body charged with dealing with governance arrangements of a Borough or District council (size of council, and the number/size/boundary of wards/divisions within that council, and the number of Councillors within each ward/division).

Term	Definition
Polling District	The Borough is divided into polling districts, which are then used to administer electoral registration and elections. Each parish must be in a separate polling district, unless special circumstances apply (e.g. if a parish only has a small number of electors and it would not be practicable for the parish to have its own polling district. Proper division into polling districts is required to ensure that electors are able to vote in the correct parish/ward/division at elections.
Protected Electoral Arrangements	Electoral Arrangements (which include the parish council size, the name, number and boundaries of wards, and the number of councillors for each ward) which were put in place following an Electoral Review carried out by the LGBCE and implemented by an Order made within the five years before the start of a CGR:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the total number of councillors to be elected to a council; • the number and boundaries of wards or divisions; • the number of councillors to be elected for each ward or division; and • the name of any ward or division
Related Alterations and Related Alterations Order	A CGR may make recommendations to the LGBCE for changes to Borough Ward or County Division boundaries, usually to make these boundaries coterminous with parish boundaries that are altered under the Final Recommendations. The LGBCE will consider such recommendations, and if it agrees, it will make an order (Related Alterations Order) to give effect to those recommendations.
Reorganisation Order	An order made by the Council, giving effect to those Final Recommendations which it decides to bring into force. The Order will take effect on 1 April 2019, and will implement any changes to parish governance arrangements which are agreed by the Council.
Second Consultation Period	A period from 4 May to 6 July 2018, seeking comments on the Draft Recommendations.
Style	Parishes are normally designated as e.g. “Westacre Parish”, and the name of the Parish Council follows this style. Alternative styles are available, including “Town”, “Village”, “Community” and “Neighbourhood”. A CGR leading to the creation of a new parish can include recommendations as to the style to be adopted, but cannot change the style of an existing parish/town.
Terms of Reference	A document issued by the Council at the start of the Review setting out what the Review will cover, timetable, etc.

Parish	Style	Number of councillors	Parish wards (no. of councillors)	2017 electors (as of 31/10/17 register)	2022 electors	Change		2017 councillor: elector ratio
						Increase/decrease	% change	
Abbotts Ann	Parish council	7		1917	1904	-13	-0.7%	1:274
Ampfield	Parish council	11		1347	1382	35	2.6%	1:122
Amport	Parish council	10		1013	1031	18	1.8%	1:101
Andover	Town council	19	Alamein (3) Harroway (4) Millway (4) St Marys (4) Winton (4)	30677	33739	3062	10.0%	1:1615
Appleshaw	Parish council	8		471	458	-13	-2.8%	1:59
Ashley	Parish meeting	N/A		46	53	7	15.2%	N/A
Awbridge	Parish council	7		595	575	-20	-3.4%	1:85
Barton Stacey	Parish council	9		748	793	45	6.0%	1:83
Bossington	Parish meeting	N/A		35	44	9	25.7%	N/A
Braishfield	Parish council	7		578	565	-13	-2.2%	1:83
Broughton	Parish council	10		859	892	33	3.8%	1:86
Buckholt	Parish meeting	N/A		12	11	-1	-8.3%	N/A
Bullington	Parish council	5		105	89	-16	-15.2%	1:21
Charlton	Parish council	9		1593	1652	59	3.7%	1:177
Chilbolton	Parish council	8		829	809	-20	-2.4%	1:104
Chilworth	Parish council	9		990	1094	104	10.5%	1:110
East Dean	Parish council	5		179	191	12	6.7%	1:36
East Tytherley	Parish council	5		152	149	-3	-2.0%	1:30
Enham Alamein	Parish council	7		963	1429	466	48.4%	1:138
Facombe	Parish meeting	N/A		72	75	3	4.2%	N/A
Frenchmoor	Common parish council (with West Tytherley)	1		29	33	4	13.8%	1:29
Fyfield	Parish council	5		280	277	-3	-1.1%	1:56
Goodworth Clatford	Parish council	10		619	594	-25	-4.0%	1:62
Grateley	Parish council	6		472	509	37	7.8%	1:79
Houghton	Parish council	7		313	364	51	16.3%	1:45
Hurstbourne Tarrant	Parish council	6		664	643	-21	-3.2%	1:111
Kimpton	Parish council	6		288	290	2	0.7%	1:48
King's Somborne	Parish council	10		1289	1293	4	0.3%	1:129
Leckford	Parish meeting	N/A		91	109	18	19.8%	N/A
Linkenholt	Parish meeting	N/A		35	37	2	5.7%	N/A
Little Somborne	Parish meeting	N/A		60	67	7	11.7%	N/A
Lockerley	Parish council	7		627	652	25	4.0%	1:90
Longparish	Parish council	10		558	506	-52	-9.3%	1:56

Parish	Style	Number of councillors	Parish wards (no. of councillors)	2017 electors (as of 31/10/17 register)	2022 electors	Change		2017 councillor: elector ratio
						Increase/decrease	% change	
Longstock	Parish council	7		381	389	8	2.1%	1:54
Melchet Park & Plaitford	Parish council	7		247	277	30	12.1%	1:35
Michelmersh & Timsbury	Parish council	7		748	737	-11	-1.5%	1:107
Monxton	Parish council	5		240	216	-24	-10.0%	1:48
Mottisfont	Parish council	6		261	324	63	24.1%	1:44
Nether Wallop	Parish council	7		650	774	124	19.1%	1:93
North Baddesley	Parish council	9	Mountbatten (5) Fleming (4)	5518	6105	587	10.6%	1:613
Nursling & Rownhams	Parish council	11		4230	5004	774	18.3%	1:385
Over Wallop	Parish council	8	Over Wallop (7) Palestine (1)	1366	1728	362	26.5%	1:171
Penton Grafton	Parish council	6		619	662	43	6.9%	1:103
Penton Mewsey	Parish council	6		292	330	38	13.0%	1:49
Quarley	Parish council	5		135	126	-9	-6.7%	1:27
Romsey	Town council	15	Abbey (5) Cupernham (5) Tadburn (5)	11850	12210	360	3.0%	1:790
Romsey Extra	Parish council	7		3872	5725	1853	47.9%	1:553
Sherfield English	Parish council	7		554	591	37	6.7%	1:79
Shipton Bellinger	Parish council	10		1000	1123	123	12.3%	1:100
Smannell	Parish council	7		2301	3465	1164	50.6%	1:329
Stockbridge	Parish council	10		493	467	-26	-5.3%	1:49
Tangley	Parish council	7		458	434	-24	-5.2%	1:65
Thruxton	Parish council	7		518	518	0	0.0%	1:74
Upper Clatford	Parish council	10		1233	1223	-10	-0.8%	1:123
Valley Park	Parish council	9		5639	5467	-172	-3.1%	1:627
Vernham Dean	Parish council	8		474	404	-70	-14.8%	1:59
Wellow	Parish council	11		2689	2735	46	1.7%	1:244
West Tytherley	Common parish council (with Frenchmoor)	7		457	431	-26	-5.7%	1:65
Wherwell	Parish council	7		374	358	-16	-4.3%	1:53
59 parishes								
48 parish councils								
1 common parish council								
7 parish meetings								
2 town councils								