

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1
Summary of Option	Agree Romsey Town's request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>11 Romsey Town Council</p> <p>9 Cllr Neil Gwynne</p> <p>4 Romsey Town Individual Resident</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>1 Romsey Extra Individual Resident</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p><u>FOR</u></p> <p>Romsey Town Council's request as set out in this Option was accepted by the Borough Council and led to this Community Governance Review. It submitted copies of the minutes and supporting report outlining the reasons behind the request.</p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 4 - supports the proposal that the boundary be extended to include "all current and planned urban areas identified as Romsey". Given the recent and planned growth of urban Romsey, this is a logical and appropriate change.</p> <p><u>AGAINST</u></p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 4 - resident of Romsey Extra Parish for 25 years, and considers that the Parish Council has served residents well during that time. Sees no need for change to the current arrangements. Councillors are local people who are familiar with, and take an interest in, the parish and its people.</p>	

	<p>Romsey Extra Parish has existed for over 1000 years and should not be swept away. It is the largest parish by area in Test Valley, with fifth largest population, and there is therefore no reason for it not to remain an independent parish.</p> <p>As residents outside the centre of Romsey, does not want to see administration and services further centralised to the town centre. Does not see themselves as living in the town.</p>
<p>Member Panel Observations</p>	<p>This option has the benefit of bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides.</p> <p>However, if Romsey Town Council's proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. The various sub-options (1A, 1B, 1C, 1D and 1E) set out possible ways to deal with this if Romsey Town is not expanded more than as set out in Romsey Town Council's proposal (i.e. the extent of the existing Romsey Borough Wards and no more).</p> <p>Option 2 offers an alternative way, in that the two areas are merged and there is therefore no area left unaddressed. Option 2A (whereby part of Romsey Extra Parish transfers to Awbridge, with the remainder being merged with Romsey Town) is a variation on this solution.</p> <p>Because Option 1 leaves unaddressed the question of what happens to the remainder of Romsey Extra, the Member Panel REJECTED this option 1.</p> <p>However, the Member Panel was supportive of the principal behind Romsey Town's request, and therefore SUPPORTED Option 2/2A, as set out in the other Annexes.</p>

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1A
Summary of Option	Agree Romsey Town's request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u> 9 Cllr Neil Gwynne</p> <p><u>Against</u> 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p>No respondents indicated that this was their preferred option. Cllr Gwynne (whose preferred option was Option 1B) suggested that if Option 1B was not supported, he would recommend a variant of Option 1A (with minor boundary changes such as transferring the area south of the M27 to Nursling & Rownhams Parish). He also recommended that in that case, the remaining parish should not be named Romsey Extra Parish (as the confusion for residents with two parish councils with Romsey in their name would continue), but instead should be named by reference to some geographic feature in the area. He was however concerned that this option would create a parish with fewer than 400 electors.</p> <p>It its representation, Romsey Extra Parish Council was concerned that this option would result in a reduced Romsey Extra Parish Council which would not be coterminous with the Borough Ward boundaries, with less than 400 electors over a large area, meaning that the revised parish would not be viable. Accordingly, Romsey Extra Parish Council considered that this was <u>not</u> a preferred option.</p>	
Member Panel Observations	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>As noted under Option 1, if that proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. This Option 1A is one way of addressing this issue.</p>	

	<p>The Group noted that Romsey Extra Parish Council did not consider this was a preferred option, and that no respondents had suggested this option as a preferred way forward.</p> <p>On current electorate figures, this option would result in a parish of 373 electors. There are 13 separate parish councils in the Borough with less than 373 electors (the smallest being Bullington with 128). The reduced parish would be relatively large compared to the population, and there was no obvious centre or clear community identity across the area.</p> <p>Although the number of electors was over the statutory minimum of 150 electors (below which a CGR cannot create a parish council), the Member Panel considered that this option could not be recommended.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel REJECTED this option.</p>
--	---

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1B
Summary of Option	Option 1B - Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – transfer remaining areas to adjoining parishes.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>7 Cllr Mark Cooper 8 Cllr Janet Burnage 9 Cllr Neil Gwynne 3 – Individual Resident (Romsey Town) 14 – Individual Resident (Romsey Town) 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>6 Wellow Parish Council 10 Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>13 Awbridge Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p><u>FOR</u></p> <p>Cllr Mark Cooper supports Romsey Town Council's unanimous request for a Community Governance Review and notes that Romsey Extra Parish Council was unanimous in supporting Romsey Town Council's suggestion that all the built-up areas of Romsey should be under one common council. This is also in accord with the Boundary Commission's decision that the three Test Valley Wards should extend their boundaries to include the built-up areas which came into being for the 2019 local elections and that the Boundary Commission's additional recommendation in 2017 that the Town Council ward boundaries should be coterminous with the Borough Ward Boundaries.</p> <p>He favours Option 1B, but if adjoining parishes are reluctant to take on the rural parts of Romsey Extra parish, <u>Option 2</u> is the rational way forward.</p>	

Cllr Cooper points out that 92.6% of electors in Romsey Extra Parish live in the three Romsey Borough wards, and he believes most of these electors consider they live in Romsey, not Romsey Extra. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money has been received by Romsey Extra Parish for large numbers of dwellings recently constructed in the Parish, but the residents of the dwellings use the facilities Romsey centre. Romsey Town has relatively few new dwellings, and therefore has to rely on the precept to fund its services.

Both Councils have worked well together, setting up a joint Planning Committee.

Cllr Janet Burnage supports Romsey Town Council's request for a Community Governance Review and notes Romsey Extra Parish Council's support. She makes reference to the LGBCE's decision to extend the Borough Ward boundaries to include the built-up areas of Romsey in the Romsey Borough Wards.

She favours Option 1B, on the basis that the rural areas could easily be taken over by the adjacent parishes. If there was opposition to this, she would reluctantly support Option 2.

Cllr Burnage refers to the joint planning meetings held by the two councils, which she considers sensible as most developments are in Romsey Extra, but will have a direct impact on Romsey Town.

Finally, she notes the support of Romsey Extra Parish Council for events held in Romsey Town which are attended by Romsey Extra residents, most of whom think they live in Romsey.

Cllr Neil Gwynne (who proposed the motion which led to Romsey Town Council's request for this CGR) notes that Romsey Extra Parish unanimously supported Romsey Town Council's suggestion that the built up areas of Romsey should be under one council, which would be in accordance with the LGBCE's decision on Borough Wards.

Cllr Gwynne is aware that not all the surrounding parishes were in favour of Option 1B, so if option 1B is unacceptable, he would support a variant of Option 1A (see separate annex).

	<p>Cllr Gwynne points to the Joint Planning Committee established between Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, and civic events involving the Town Mayoralty which are shared with Romsey Extra Parish.</p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 3 agrees bringing the closely developed area of land that forms Romsey and its environs into a single Parish / Town Council that include all of TVBC Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn Wards is a logical outcome which should have been adopted earlier. This will help deliver a consistent level of representation across the urban area that most would identify as "Romsey" and reduce some of the duplication of effort by local councillors. Residents would be better able to identify local members who represent them</p> <p>The rural nature of the remaining REPC area would seem to be best served by being included in adjoining parishes.</p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 14 is in favour of this proposal to create one 'town' council, as it is sensible for the whole town (including the recently developed Abbotswood & future development of Whitenap) to be represented by one council.</p> <p>Much of the work of Romsey Town Council affects residents in the proposed extended area, so proposal would be more efficient, lead to more effective representation and more sensible strategic planning. The remaining rural area should be divided between the surrounding parishes.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council confirmed that it unanimously supported Romsey Town Council's proposal for the built-up area around Romsey to be under a single council. It raised various consequential matters such as the treatment of assets, cash reserves, liabilities and staff, and asked for further discussions on each of these matters.</p> <p>The Council went on to comment on each option, and these comments are set out on the relevant Annex.</p> <p>The Council considered that Option 1B was an acceptable option, as it would achieve the key objective of a single council for the whole built-up area of Romsey, and would maintain coterminosity of Borough Wards with the parish boundaries.</p>
--	--

	<p><u>AGAINST</u></p> <p>Wellow Parish Council unanimously voted against taking over parts of Romsey Extra Parish that were not wanted by Romsey Town, on the basis that the areas which Wellow might be asked to take over would have no benefit to the Council or Wellow residents. Most of the land would be fields with little precept gain, but would result in the Parish Council incurring more expenditure. It was opposed to Romsey Town “cherry-picking” areas with mass housing development that would bring financial benefits to the Town Council whilst trying to offload unprofitable areas of Romsey Extra Parish to adjoining parishes.</p> <p>Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council oppose this option, for a number of reasons. Polling District UJ2 is divided by the River Test which is a natural barrier across that area. The larger area to the west of the River Test has no community link to Nursling and Rownhams, and includes Ridge, but this is 7-8 miles travel distance to the Parish.</p> <p>Ridge sees itself as a distinct and separate community from Nursling and Rownhams, and if Romsey Extra Parish is abolished, it is more logical to include Ridge in Romsey, which (at 1-2 miles distance) is better placed to serve residents of this area.</p> <p><u>COMMENT</u></p> <p>13 Awbridge Parish Council noted that this option would result in increases in maintenance costs for parishes, and the need for assets to be transferred across. It suggested that part of Romsey Extra Parish could be ideally added to Awbridge, and this is considered under Option 1E (see separate annex).</p>
<p>Member Panel Observations</p>	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>As noted under Option 1, if that proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. This Option 1B is one way of addressing this issue.</p>

ANNEX 1(1B)

	<p>Under this option, three adjacent parish councils would have parts of Romsey Extra Parish transferred to them. Although Awbridge Parish Council indicated that it would accept part of Romsey Extra Parish (the area immediately adjacent to the village, including Stanbridge Earls, see Option 1E), it did not want any other parts. The other two parishes (Wellow and Nursling & Rownhams) were both clearly opposed to taking any of Romsey Extra Parish.</p> <p>The Panel accepted that other than the area adjacent to Awbridge, this option would provide little benefit and impose additional financial burdens on the adjacent parishes. It also accepted the points made by Nursling & Rownhams concerning the lack of connection with that parish.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel <u>REJECTED</u> this option 1B.</p>
--	---

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1C
Summary of Option	Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – Establish Parish Meeting.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p>No respondents indicated that this was their preferred option.</p> <p>In its representation, Romsey Extra Parish Council noted that this option would achieve the key objective of a single council for the whole built-up area of Romsey, and would maintain coterminosity of Borough Wards with the parish boundaries.</p> <p>This option would result in a reduced administrative area which would not be coterminous with the Borough Ward boundaries. If the Parish Council was abolished and a Parish Meeting was established for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish, there would be a much reduced administrative overhead.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council concluded that this was not a preferred option.</p>	
Member Panel Observations	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>As noted under Option 1, if that proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. This Option 1C is one way of addressing this issue.</p>	

	<p>The Group noted that Romsey Extra Parish Council did not consider this was a preferred option, and that no respondents had suggested this option as a preferred way forward.</p> <p>On current electorate figures, this option would result in a parish of 373 electors. There are 13 separate parish councils in the Borough with less than 373 electors (the smallest being Bullington with 128). The reduced parish would be relatively large compared to the population, and there was no obvious centre or clear community identity across the area.</p> <p>The number of electors for the reduced parish was below the statutory limits (1000 electors) where a parish council is not required. There are Parish Meeting arrangements for 5 parishes in Test Valley:-</p> <p>Ashley (53), Bossington (44), Faccombe (75), Leckford (109), Little Somborne (67).</p> <p>The Panel noted that the existing Parish Meeting parishes were small and/or centred around a landowning estate, which was not the case here. The Panel also noted that the area was larger than any of the existing parishes operating through a parish meeting system, and that it had previously always had a formal parish council administering it.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel REJECTED this option.</p>
--	---

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1D
Summary of Option	Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – remaining area to be unparished.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p>No respondents indicated that this was their preferred option.</p> <p>In its representation, Romsey Extra Parish Council noted that this option would achieve the key objective of a single council for the whole built-up area of Romsey, and would maintain coterminosity of Borough Wards with the parish boundaries.</p> <p>However, leaving the area unparished without even a parish meeting [which would not be required if parish status was revoked] would be unsatisfactory and contrary to the arrangements across the Borough.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council concluded that this was not a preferred option.</p>	
Member Panel Observations	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>As noted under Option 1, if that proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. This Option 1D is one way of addressing this issue.</p> <p>The Group noted that Romsey Extra Parish Council did not consider this was a preferred option, and that no respondents had suggested this option as a preferred way forward.</p>	

ANNEX 1(1D)

	<p>The Member Panel noted that Government Guidance is firmly against abolishing existing parishes with no community governance arrangements in place. If exceptionally abolition is to be considered, the Guidance states that local opinion (including parish councillors and local electors) should be sought , and that there be clear and sustained local support for such action.</p> <p>Given this guidance, the lack of any support for abolition, and the fact that every other part of the Borough is parishes, the Panel concluded that abolition was not appropriate.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel REJECTED this option.</p>
--	--

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey Town - Draft Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	1E
Summary of Option	<p>Agree Romsey Town’s request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish ((excluding the part adjacent to Awbridge Parish [north of the Old Salisbury Road] as shown coloured blue on Map 4.</p>	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u> 13 Awbridge Parish Council</p> <p>(Note As this was a new option proposed by Awbridge Parish Council, the respondents below have not commented on this option, but did comment on Option 1A (where Romsey Extra Parish is retained). The comments below therefore relate to Option 1A, for reference).</p> <p>9 Cllr Neil Gwynne</p> <p><u>Against</u> 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p>Awbridge Parish Council supported Option 1B but only in respect of the inclusion within Awbridge of that part of Romsey Extra Parish considered by Awbridge residents to be part of Awbridge (including properties in old Salisbury Lane, Stanbridge Lane to the junction of the A3057, and the area to and along the River Test to the existing parish boundaries (see Map 4). For the purposes of the CGR, this has been designated Option 1E.</p> <p>Other than Awbridge Parish Council, no respondents indicated that this was their preferred option. Cllr Gwynne (whose preferred option was Option 1B) suggested that if Option 1B was not supported, he would recommend a variant of Option 1A (with minor boundary changes such as transferring the area south of the M27 to Nursling & Rownhams Parish). [Awbridge’s proposal could equally fall into Cllr Gwynne’s reference to “minor boundary changes”]. He also recommended that in that case, the remaining parish should not be named Romsey Extra Parish (as the confusion for residents with two parish councils with Romsey in their name would continue), but instead should be named by reference to some geographic feature in the area. He was however concerned that this option would</p>	

	<p>create a parish with 373 electors [removing the part sought by Awbridge might reduce that by a further 109 compared to current figures, plus any occupants of new units at Stanbridge Earls occupied before May 2023].</p> <p>It its representation, Romsey Extra Parish Council was concerned that this option would result in a reduced Romsey Extra Parish Council which would not be coterminous with the Borough Ward boundaries, with less than 400 electors over a large area, meaning that the revised parish would not be viable. Accordingly, Romsey Extra Parish Council considered that this was <u>not</u> a preferred option. [Given this response, it is assumed Romsey Extra would consider this option is not a preferred option either.]</p>
<p>Member Panel Observations</p>	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>As noted under Option 1, if that proposal is agreed, a decision on the governance arrangements for the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish is required. This Option 1E is one way of addressing this issue.</p> <p>The Group noted that Romsey Extra Parish Council did not consider that option 1A was a preferred option, and that it was likely that they would not favour this option for the same reasons.</p> <p>However, this option would meet Awbridge Parish Council's suggestion to bring into Awbridge a part of Romsey Extra Parish that Awbridge residents consider part of Awbridge (including the area around Stanbridge Earls).</p> <p>On current electorate figures, this option would result in a parish of approximately 264 electors (109 less than Option 1A). There are 13 separate parish councils in the Borough with less than 373 electors (the smallest being Bullington with 128). The reduced parish would be relatively large compared to the population, and there was no obvious centre or clear community identity across the area.</p> <p>Although the number of electors was over the statutory minimum of 150 electors (below which a CGR cannot create a parish council), the Member Panel considered that this option could not be recommended.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel REJECTED this option 1E.</p>

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	2
Summary of Option	Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, with a new parish council covering the merged area.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>8 Cllr Janet Burnage 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council 5 Individual Romsey Town resident 2 Individual (address not known)</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>None</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p>Cllr Janet Burnage's preferred option was Option 1B, but if there was opposition to this she would reluctantly support this Option 2.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council noted that this option would have the benefit of coterminosity (for the built-up area) if the wards of the new parish were coterminous with the equivalent Borough wards. However, the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish would not be coterminous [as it would remain split between Blackwater and Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams Borough Wards].</p> <p>This option would also remove the complications [with Options 1A and 1B) concerning distribution of assets, cash reserves, liability and staff.</p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 5 considers Romsey Extra Parish to be an historic anomaly which should be absorbed into Romsey Town. Most residents of both communities do not realise there is a divide between the two parishes, and there is no centre, community or shop to Romsey Extra Parish, which therefore looks to Romsey Town. The vast majority of recent/planned development is in Romsey Extra, which greatly affects Romsey Town but does not benefit the Town.</p>	

	<p>Majority sports, leisure and education facilities and infrastructure are situated in Romsey Extra. Four pubs in Romsey Extra rely on trade from Romsey Town, and three are within 100 yards of Romsey Town. Many Romsey Extra parish councillors live in Romsey Town, and six represent both councils.</p> <p>Pursuing this option would allow Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 monies to be spent for the benefit of the residents of “greater” Romsey.</p> <p>Individual 5 fully supports the idea to scrap the whole of Romsey Extra and merge with Romsey Town to create a greater Romsey Parish Council.</p>
<p>Member Panel Observations</p>	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p> <p>However, it also deals with the objections raised by Wellow and Nursling & Rownhams Parish Councils (who did not wish to take on any parts of Romsey Extra Parish) which would have arisen under Option 1B).</p> <p>It would be possible to incorporate Awbridge’s suggestion to take on part (the area around Stanbridge Earls) of Romsey Extra Parish into this option, whereby that part would be transferred to Awbridge and the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish merged with Romsey Town. This is considered under Option 2A (see separate Annex).</p> <p>The Member Panel noted that under this Option, the built-up areas would be coterminous with the Romsey Borough Wards, but the area comprising the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish would be split between two Borough Wards (Blackwater and Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams). However, the Panel considered that the benefits of this option would avoid the issues with retaining a separate parish council for this remaining area (Option 1A). In addition, it would avoid any issues with Romsey Extra Parish’s existing assets/cash reserves/liabilities, as these would all transfer to the new merged council.</p> <p>Further decisions would be required on a number of issues, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The name of the new merged area; • The name and style (parish/town) of the new council;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The warding of the new Council - it is suggested that a new fourth ward should be formed, comprising the remaining part of Romsey Extra Parish, with the other three wards being coterminous with the existing Romsey Borough Ward boundaries;• The numbers of councillors in each ward. <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel <u>APPROVED</u> this option 2 [although it preferred option 2A].</p>
--	--

Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	2A
Summary of Option	Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish (excluding the part adjacent to Awbridge Parish [north of the Old Salisbury Road] as shown coloured blue on Map 4), with a new parish council covering the merged area.	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>13 Awbridge Parish Council</p> <p>NB – this was an additional option proposed by Awbridge Parish Council, but it is assumed that the respondents below (who supported Option 2) would also support this option.</p> <p>8 Cllr Janet Burnage 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council 5 Individual Romsey Town resident 2 Individual (address not known)</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>None</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p><u>FOR</u></p> <p>Awbridge Parish Council supported Option 1B but only in respect of the inclusion within Awbridge of that part of Romsey Extra Parish considered by Awbridge residents to be part of Awbridge (including properties in old Salisbury Lane, Stanbridge Lane to the junction of the A3057, and the area to and along the River test to the existing parish boundaries (see Map 4).</p> <p>Cllr Janet Burnage's preferred option was Option 1B, but if there was opposition to this she would reluctantly support Option 2. [As this Option is a minor variation to Option 2, it is assumed that she would also support this option.]</p>	

	<p>Romsey Extra Parish Council noted that Option 2 would have the benefit of coterminosity (for the built-up area) if the wards of the new parish were coterminous with the equivalent Borough wards. However, the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish would not be coterminous [as it would remain split between Blackwater and Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams Borough Wards].</p> <p>Unlike Option 2, this option would re-introduce issues concerning distribution of assets, cash reserves, liability and staff [but as it is only a small part, this may not be significant, and it is assumed that Romsey Extra Parish Council would therefore support this option also.]</p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 5 considers Romsey Extra Parish to be an historic anomaly which should be absorbed into Romsey Town. Most residents of both communities do not realise there is a divide between the two parishes, and there is no centre, community or shop to Romsey Extra Parish, which therefore looks to Romsey Town. The vast majority of recent/planned development is in Romsey Extra, which greatly affects Romsey Town but does not benefit the Town.</p> <p>Majority sports, leisure and education facilities and infrastructure are situated in Romsey Extra. Four pubs in Romsey Extra rely on trade from Romsey Town, and three are within 100 yards of Romsey Town. Many Romsey Extra parish councillors live in Romsey Town, and six represent both councils.</p> <p>Pursuing this option would allow Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 monies to be spent for the benefit of the residents of “greater” Romsey.</p> <p>Individual 5 fully supports the idea to scrap the whole of Romsey Extra and merge with Romsey Town to create a greater Romsey Parish Council.</p> <p>[The above individuals supported merging the whole of both parishes, so may not support this option, although it does largely conform with their views.]</p>
<p>Member Panel Observations</p>	<p>This option has the benefits which the proposal made by Romsey Town (i.e. bringing the built-up area of Romsey under a single council) provides (as set out under Option 1, see separate Annex).</p>

	<p>However, it also deals with the objections raised by Wellow and Nursling & Rownhams Parish Councils (who did not wish to take on any parts of Romsey Extra Parish) which would have arisen under Option 1B).</p> <p>It also meets Awbridge Parish Council's suggestion to bring into Awbridge a part of Romsey Extra Parish that Awbridge residents consider part of Awbridge (including the area around Stanbridge Earls).</p> <p>The Member Panel noted that under this Option, the built-up areas would be coterminous with the Romsey Borough Wards, but the area comprising the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish would be split between two Borough Wards (Blackwater and Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams). However, the Panel considered that the benefits of this option would avoid the issues with retaining a separate parish council for this remaining area (Option 1A).</p> <p>Although this option would In addition, it would avoid any issues with Romsey Extra Parish's existing assets/cash reserves/liabilities, as these would all transfer to the new merged council.</p> <p>Further decisions would be required on a number of issues, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distribution of Assets, cash reserves, liability and staff between the new merged council and Awbridge Parish Council;• The name of the new merged area;• The name and style (parish/town) of the new council;• The warding of the new Council - it is suggested that a new fourth ward should be formed, comprising the remaining part of Romsey Extra Parish, with the other three wards being coterminous with the existing Romsey Borough Ward boundaries;• The numbers of councillors in each ward. <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel <u>APPROVED</u> this option 2A as their preferred option.</p>
--	---

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	3
Summary of Option	Group Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish under a common parish council	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p><u>For</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Against</u></p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council stated that the implications of this option were not understood. It was not clear how this would differ from Option 2 except inasmuch as the two geographical areas would remain but under one council. It is not clear if the Council would run separate budgets and levy separate precepts for the two areas.</p> <p>It concluded that it was not possible to assess this option without further discussion.</p>	
Member Panel Observations	<p>The Member Panel noted that although this option would bring both areas under a single council, the existing Romsey Town/Romsey Extra Parish areas would still exist. Each area would need to be allocated a number of councillors on the common parish council, and decisions on how each area should be warded (if at all) would be needed.</p> <p>Each area would still need to hold an annual Parish Meeting, emphasising the continued separate identity of the two areas.</p> <p>Against this, there would be a single council setting a single precept and having one set of accounts. The assets, cash reserves and liabilities would vest in the new common parish council.</p>	

	<p>The Panel also noted a NALC example in Dorset where a common parish council created in 1954 was abolished and the two parished areas merged, in recognition of the fact that the division maintained by this arrangement was unnecessary and unhelpful.</p> <p>https://www.nalc.gov.uk/library/our-work/create-a-council-resources/1353-affpuddle-turnerspuddle-parish-council-dorset-case-study/file</p> <p>Moreover, because the grouped council covered two parishes, seven of the nine Councillors had to be elected by Affpuddle and the other two had to be elected by Turnerspuddle. This made little sense to local people and it felt like an unnecessary division within the council. How far did Councillors in one parish feel able to speak out about issues arising in the other? It just seemed logical to get rid of this anomaly. We have always considered this community to be Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle. – Parish Council Chairman</p> <p>The Member Panel concluded that although this might be a further step from the current joint working arrangements, a full merger (Option 2/2A) was better than this option, which would maintain the existing division in the built-up area which is not reflected on the ground.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Member Panel <u>REJECTED</u> this option 3.</p>
--	--

**Test Valley Borough Council Community Governance Review – Romsey
Town - Draft Recommendations**

Summary of Responses and Draft Recommendations

	Option Reference	4
Summary of Option	No change	
Respondent Ref(s) and Details	<p><u>For</u> 1 Individual Romsey Extra resident</p> <p><u>Against</u> 12 Romsey Extra Parish Council</p>	
Summary of Representations	<p><u>FOR</u></p> <p>Individual Romsey Resident 1 - resident of Romsey Extra Parish for 25 years, and considers that the Parish Council has served residents well during that time. Sees no need for change to the current arrangements. Councillors are local people who are familiar with, and take an interest in, the parish and its people.</p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish has existed for over 1000 years and should not be swept away. It is the largest parish by area in Test Valley, with fifth largest population, and there is therefore no reason for it not to remain an independent parish.</p> <p>As residents outside the centre of Romsey, does not want to see administration and services further centralised to the town centre. Does not see themselves as living in the town.</p> <p><u>AGAINST</u></p> <p>Romsey Extra Parish Council rejects this option, as it does not achieve the shared goals of Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town Councils.</p>	
Member Panel Observations	The Member Panel noted that only one representation supported this option of no change to the current arrangements.	

	<p>The fact that an area has existed for a long historical period does not, in the Panel's view, mean that the statutory considerations (identities and interests of the community, and effective and convenient governance) are automatically met. Moreover, the changes that have taken place in Romsey Extra (particularly in terms of development around Romsey) constitute good reason for change to the existing governance.</p> <p>Both Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town Councils clearly wish to secure change, at least to have the built-up area to be under one single council.</p> <p>Taking the above into account, the Member Panel <u>REJECTED</u> this option 4.</p>
--	--