

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

Report of the Democracy and Governance Portfolio Holder

Recommended:

- 1. That the Draft Recommendations for the Romsey Town Community Governance Review, as set out in Annex 2 to the report, be adopted.**
- 2. That the Draft Recommendations as set out in Annex 2 to the report be published for consultation purposes from Friday 8 April to Friday 3 June 2022 inclusive.**
- 3. That the consultation process include sending letters to residential addresses in the part of Romsey Extra Parish outside the existing Romsey Borough Wards.**
- 4. That a further report be made to full Council on 7 September 2022, to include further consultation responses and a set of proposed Final Recommendations.**
- 5. That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive (in consultation with the Democracy and Governance Portfolio Holder) to review the existing polling districts and make such changes as he considers appropriate in the light of the Final Recommendations.**

SUMMARY:

- In 2018, the Council undertook a Borough-wide Community Governance Review, to examine existing parish governance arrangements following a review of Borough Ward boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. Under this Review, Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town remained essentially unchanged.
- In May 2021, Romsey Town Council submitted a formal request to extend the existing boundaries of Romsey Town, so that the new boundary would be coterminous with the existing Borough Ward boundaries.
- Full Council agreed on 1 September 2021 to undertake a Community Governance Review (CGR) of the boundaries of Romsey Town. Terms of reference for the CGR were approved by full Council on 10 November 2021, and a Member Panel appointed to consider the results of a first consultation stage.
- The First Consultation stage of the CGR ran from 12 November 2021 to 28 January 2022, resulting in a total of 14 representations being made. These representations have been considered by the Member Panel, and the proposed Draft Recommendations set out in Annex 2 to the report reflect the views of the Member Panel.

- If Council approves the proposed Draft Recommendations, the next stage in the CGR process is to publish the Draft Recommendations, and invite representations as part of a Second Consultation stage. The responses received will again be considered by the Member Panel and reported to full Council on 7 September 2022, for full Council to approve a set of Final Recommendations and conclude the CGR process.
- Annex 4 to the report sets out the timetable for the various stages which will be undertaken during the Community Governance Review.

1 Introduction and Background

1.1 Members will recall that a Borough-wide Community Governance Review (CGR) was undertaken in 2018, to examine existing parish governance arrangements following a review of Borough Ward boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. Several changes were made, but (apart from some minor boundary changes) Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town remained essentially unchanged.

1.2 Since the 2018 review, Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town Councils have implemented some joint working on matters such as planning, and in May 2021 Romsey Town Council made a formal resolution as follows:-

33. BOUNDARY REVIEW - RESOLUTION NO. 21/54 It was RESOLVED Romsey Town Council will, before December 2021 and with all relevant consultation documentation - that Test Valley Borough Council review the boundary of Romsey Parish, such that it includes all current and planned urban areas identified as Romsey. No possible boundary changes are to be implemented until after appropriate public consultation, although they should be in place for the 2023 council elections.

PROPOSED: Cllr. N. Gwynne SECONDED: Cllr. J. Burnage CARRIED

Discussions with officers subsequently confirmed that the reference in the resolution to “current and planned urban areas identified as Romsey” was indeed seeking to make the area of Romsey Town coterminous with the three Romsey Borough Wards (Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn).

Map 2 (Annex 3) shows the parish boundaries in blue, and the three Romsey Borough Wards edged red. The red edged area would therefore constitute the new extended area of Romsey Town if the proposal were to be accepted and agreed following a CGR process.

1.3 Full Council on 1 September 2021 agreed to undertake a CGR to consider Romsey Town’s request, and appoint a Member Panel to assist in the CGR process. Terms of Reference for the Review were approved by full Council on 10 November 2021.

- 1.4 The approved Terms of Reference for the CGR provide for a two-stage consultation process. The outcome of the First Consultation Stage (which is the subject of this report) is a set of Draft Recommendations which detail the proposed changes (if any) to governance arrangements for Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, taking into account the representations received under the First Consultation stage.
- 1.5 The First Consultation stage ran from 12 November 2021 to 28 January 2022. Comprehensive information was posted on the Council's website, and all parish councils, together with Borough and County Councillors in the area, were notified. In addition, emails were sent to various community groups and press releases issued, as well as social media used to publicise the Review.
- 1.6 14 representations were received under the First Consultation Stage. These representations have been considered by the Member Panel and taken into account when preparing the proposed Draft Recommendations set out in Annex 2.
- 1.7 If full Council agrees the proposed Draft Recommendations, these will be published and a Second Consultation stage commenced, which will invite representations in response to these Draft Recommendations. Again, any responses received will be assessed and considered by the Member Panel, and a report back to full Council on 7 September 2022 will propose Final Recommendations for governance changes in Romsey Town/Romsey Extra Parish.
- 1.8 As noted above, after any necessary Consents have been obtained, a further decision will be required as to the extent to which the final recommendations are given effect. This is done by the making of a formal Reorganisation Order. In compliance with the guidance on implementation of Reorganisation Orders, it is intended that any Reorganisation Order implementing the CGR will take effect from 1 April 2023. However, this would not affect the status of existing parish councillors (even where parishes are altered), who will continue in office until the May 2023 Election (when they would retire and could seek re-election).
- 1.9 To allow time for any changes to be reflected in the Electoral Register (due for publication on 1 December 2022) it will be suggested that delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Democracy and Governance Portfolio Holder, to determine what changes are to be included in the Reorganisation Order. This authority will be covered in the report to full Council on 7 September 2022.
- 1.10 The last part of the process will be to make a decision as to the extent to which the Final Recommendations are given effect. That decision is then implemented by the Council making a formal Reorganisation Order, setting out the changes to be made 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.

- 1.11 Subject to obtaining any necessary consents from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, a Reorganisation Order will then be made, which will implement any approved changes in time for the May 2023 elections.

2 Corporate Objectives and Priorities

- 2.1 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.

3 Consultations/Communications

- 3.1 As noted above, the first period of consultation ran for 11 weeks from 12 November 2021 to 28 January 2022. In order to assist participation in the consultation, an options document was prepared and published on the website, which set out some potential outcomes to the CGR. It was however made clear that this document was not intended to be an exhaustive list of potential outcomes, and by issuing the document the Council was not precluding other outcomes which respondents might suggest.
- 3.2 The consultation invited respondents to participate in the consultation process. The Terms of Reference made it clear that the area of the CGR was limited to Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, although the CGR would consider the impact on adjacent parishes. However, given that this was a Community Governance Review, all parish councils in the Borough were sent details of the Review and invited to participate.
- 3.3 Borough and County Councillors, community and residents' associations, and associations representing businesses and parish councils in the review area 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.
- 3.4 14 responses were received during the consultation period. In addition, 1 response was received after the consultation period had ended (Ampfield Parish Council, which formally made no comment on the proposals). Once the Draft Recommendations have been published, officers will be writing to the respondents, inviting them to review the Draft Recommendations and make any further representations they wish in the light of these.
- 3.5 Of the 14 representations received, 5 were from parish councils (Romsey Town, Romsey Extra Parish, Awbridge, Wellow and Nursling & Rownhams). 3 were from Borough/Town/Parish Councillors (Cllrs Burnage, Cooper and Gwynne) and 6 from individuals. The representations received within the consultation period have been analysed and assessed by officers, and have also been considered by the Community Governance Review Member Panel. The views of the Member Panel are reflected in the proposed Draft Recommendations in Annex 2.

3.6 In order to consider the representations, they have been referenced to the option (or options) that they supported. The representations are summarised in Annex 1 against the options to which they refer.

4 Options

4.1 The options document issued as part of the CGR process identified a number of possible outcomes for the CGR process. Some representations supported Romsey Town's proposal but did not express any views on what should be done with the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish, and "Option1" is used to identify these representations.

4.2 In addition, Awbridge Parish Council put forward an additional proposal, which suggested that if Awbridge's parish boundaries were to be changed, that part of Romsey Extra Parish which is considered by residents to be part of Awbridge village should be transferred to Awbridge Parish (see Map 4 in Annex 3). This suggestion creates two further permutations of the original options, carving out part of Romsey Extra and transferring it to Awbridge. This could be applied against option 1A (reducing the residual area of Romsey Extra further) or option 2 (reducing the extent of Romsey Extra parish to be merged with Romsey Town). These are referred to as options 1E and 2A respectively in the report.

4.3 This report therefore assesses the following options:-

- Option 1A - Agree Romsey Town's request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish.
- Option 1B - Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – transfer remaining areas to adjoining parishes.
- Option 1C - Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – Establish Parish Meeting.
- Option 1D - Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – remaining area to be unparished.
- Option 1E - Agree Romsey Town's request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish but transfer part of Romsey Extra to Awbridge (see Map 4 in Annex 3).
- Option 1 - Agree Romsey Town's request (but no preference on options for remainder of Romsey Extra Parish left over).
- Option 2 – Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, with a new parish council covering the merged area.
- Option 2A – Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish (excluding part to be transferred to Awbridge - see Map 4 in Annex 3), with a new parish council covering the merged area.

- Option 3 – Group Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish under a common parish council.
- Option 4 – No Change.

4.4 Annex 1 sets out each option, summarise the detailed comments received, and set out the Member Panel observations.

4.5 The following table summarises the favoured option(s) expressed by those responding to the First Consultation Stage:-

Option Ref	Individuals	Parishes	Total
1A – Agree RTC request, retain REPC for remainder of REP	0	0	0
1B – Agree RTC request, abolish REPC and transfer to adjacent parishes	3	1	3
1C – Agree RTC request, abolish REPC and establish parish meeting	0	0	0
1D – Agree RTC request, abolish REPC and leave remaining area unparished	0	0	0
1E – Agree RTC request, retain REPC for remainder of REP (excluding part to Awbridge)	-	1	1
1 - Agree RTC request, no preference for remainder of REP	3	1	4
2 – Merge RT and REP under one parish council	2	2	4
2A – Merge RT and REP under one parish council (but transfer part to Awbridge)	-	1	1
3 - Group Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish under a common parish council	0	0	0
4 – No change	1	1	2

4.6 The vast majority of respondents supported (or were content with) Romsey Town’s proposal for Romsey Town’s boundaries to be extended to become coterminous with the Borough Wards. Only two respondents (one individual, and Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council) preferred no change to the current governance arrangements and boundaries.

- 4.7 Many of those favouring Romsey Town's proposal did not express any views on what should happen to the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish. There was clear opposition from two adjacent parish councils (Wellow and Nursling & Rownhams) to any parts of Romsey Extra Parish being transferred to them, and Awbridge was only interested in taking on a small part of Romsey Extra (the part which it and local residents consider to be part of Awbridge village). In addition, Romsey Extra Parish considered that Option 1A (retention of a reduced Romsey Extra Parish as a standalone parish council) was not (in its view) a preferred option.

5 Member Panel Deliberations

- 5.1 Two meetings of the Member Panel took place after the close of the First Consultation period. The Member Panel carefully assessed the representations which had been received, and the implications of the various options for future governance arrangements.
- 5.2 It accepted that the suggestion from Awbridge Parish Council (for the part of Romsey Extra Parish adjacent to Awbridge Parish, which was considered part of the village (see Map 2 in Annex 3) appeared to be a sensible proposal, regardless of what arrangements were adopted for Romsey Town and the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish. This is reflected in options 1E and 2A.
- 5.3 It accepted that Romsey Town's proposal (that Romsey Town's boundaries be extended to become coterminous with the Romsey Borough Wards) should be supported, as it would reflect the extended built-up area of Romsey and would remove the anomaly whereby part of this area is in Romsey Town with the remainder being in Romsey Extra Parish. Such an outcome would meet the statutory tests of a CGR. The Member Panel therefore rejected option 4 (no change). However, it was then necessary to consider what should happen to the remainder of Romsey Extra Parish (the area to the west and south-west of Romsey).
- 5.4 The Member Panel shared the concerns expressed by respondents, including Romsey Extra Parish Council, that the remaining area would be a relatively large area with a relatively small population, and was unlikely to be viable as a continuing (albeit reduced) Romsey Extra Parish Council. It accordingly rejected option 1A.
- 5.5 The Member Panel noted the opposition of the other two adjacent parish councils to Option 1B (whereby the remaining part would be transferred to the adjacent parishes), and agreed that there would be additional demands on those parishes without a significant corresponding increase in resources, as well as a lack of community and physical connections between the remaining part and those parishes. Accordingly, the Member Panel rejected option 1B.
- 5.6 The Member Panel considered that retaining the reduced area as a Parish, but without a parish council, was not appropriate for an area of this nature, size and population. It considered abolition of parish status for the area would be a retrograde step. Accordingly, options 1C and 1D were also rejected.

- 5.7 Option 2 (merging the two parishes under one parish council) and option 3 (grouping the two parishes under a common parish council) would both result in a single parish council for both areas, but the Member Panel felt that a common parish council would retain what is now an artificial and historic division between Romsey Extra Parish and Romsey Town. It therefore concluded that option 3 should be rejected.
- 5.8 The Member Panel therefore concluded that in the light of its acceptance of Awbridge's proposal, option 2A (merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish (excluding the part adjacent to Awbridge Parish) with a new parish council covering the merged area, should be supported. This conclusion is reflected in the proposed Draft Recommendations in Annex 2, although the Draft Recommendations provide for Romsey Town Council to be retained as the parish council for the new merged area, rather than creating a new town/parish council. Romsey Town Council is already established with staff, financial systems, etc. Abolishing both Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish Councils, and creating a new town/parish council for the merged area, would require the setting up of new employment contracts, financial arrangements, accounts, etc., which it is considered would create unnecessary administrative burdens.
- 5.9 The Member Panel also proposed that as part of the Second Consultation Process, letters should be sent to the residential addresses where electors are registered in the part of Romsey Extra parish outside the Romsey Borough Wards, advising those electors of the CGR process and the adopted Draft Recommendations and inviting them to participate in the Second Consultation.

6 Council Size/Electoral Arrangements/LGBCE Consent

- 6.1 If the proposed Option 2A is taken forward, the Draft Recommendations will also need to deal with consequential electoral arrangements, including the date of elections, how the enlarged Romsey Town is to be warded, and the number of councillors for each ward.
- 6.2 The next elections are due in May 2023, and the CGR has been timetabled to fit that date, so no change to the usual election date/frequency is proposed.
- 6.3 At present, Romsey Town is warded along the same lines as the Borough Wards (so that Abbey Town Ward is wholly within Romsey Abbey Borough Ward, etc.). As the request from Romsey Town Council seeks coterminosity of the Town's boundaries with the existing Borough Wards, it is logical to follow the same principle, so that the extended Romsey Town is warded, with divisions between Town Council wards being the same as the existing Borough Ward lines. This would therefore result in three enlarged Town Wards, covering the same area as the three Borough Wards.

- 6.4 This would deal with that part of the existing Romsey Extra Parish which is within those three Romsey Borough Wards. If option 2A is pursued, the remaining part of Romsey Extra (other than the part proposed to be transferred to Awbridge) would still be transferred to Romsey Town, and would therefore need to be included in the warding for Romsey Town. Although this area is in two Borough Wards (Blackwater and Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams), and Government guidance recommends that in this situation the parish warding should reflect the Borough warding, the number of electors (estimated at 264 under option 2A) is considered too low to justify making this area into two separate wards. The proposed Draft Recommendations therefore designate this area as a single ward, and the name “Romsey Extra” is suggested as a possible name for this ward.
- 6.5 In terms of council size (number of councillors), details of current and proposed electors per councillors are given in the table below. Romsey Town Council currently has 15 councillors, an average of 779 electors per councillor. Romsey Extra Parish Council currently has 7 councillors, with an average of 664 per councillor.
- 6.6 Other than a minimum size of 5 councillors, legislation does not prescribe any maximum number of councillors, or require that the number of councillors is proportional to the electorate size. The table below shows the current size of each town/parish ward, and a possible distribution of seats for a Town Council of the same size (15 councillors) as at present.

Current/Proposed Council Size

	Current			Proposed		
Town/Parish Ward/Council	Electors	No. of councillors	Ratio	Electors	No. of councillors	Ratio
Abbey	4664	6	777	4778	4	1195
Cupernham	2957	4	739	6524	6	1087
Tadburn	4063	5	813	4654	4	1164
Romsey Extra				264	1	264
	11684	15	779	16220	15	1081
Romsey Extra	4645	7	664			
Awbridge	621	7	89	730	7	104
	16950			16950		

- 6.7 The Draft Recommendations in Annex 2 therefore include a proposed Town Council size of 15 councillors, with warding to reflect the above table. As part of the Second Consultation process, the views of residents and the councils involved can be sought, and adjustments made at the Final Recommendations stage if that is considered appropriate.

- 6.8 Where Final Recommendations involve changes to “protected electoral arrangements”, the consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is required before they can be implemented. “Protected electoral arrangements” means arrangements which have been determined by the LGBCE within the preceding five years in respect of the year of election of councillors, number of councillors, division (or not) into wards, and the number, boundaries, name and number of councillors to be elected to such wards. In Test Valley’s case, both Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish Councils were warded by the LGBCE as a result of the 2017 Electoral Review, and the LGBCE also set the number of councillors for each ward.
- 6.9 Under the 2018 Review, the Borough Council decided to de-ward Romsey Extra Parish Council. As this constituted a protected electoral arrangement, the LGBCE’s consent was required. The consent was sought and obtained, and the Reorganisation Order therefore provided that Romsey Extra Parish should be a single unwarded parish council, comprised of 7 parish councillors.
- 6.10 No changes were made to the warding arrangements put in place by the LGBCE for Romsey Town, which therefore remained warded in three wards. The LGBCE also set the number of parish councillors for each ward, and again no change was made to these. If the boundaries of Romsey Town are extended (as is proposed in the Draft Recommendations), this would alter the warding arrangements set by the LGBCE in the 2018 Review, and therefore consent would be required from the LGBCE for the changes in warding arrangements and the number of parish councillors for each ward.

7 Resource Implications

- 7.1 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.

8 Polling Districts and other Electoral Registration Issues

- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 A review of polling districts is required every five years. The last full review of polling districts was carried out in 2019, and reflected the changes made by the 2018 Community Governance Review. Accordingly, the next review will be due in 2024.

- 8.3 Changes to polling districts will be required if the outcome of the CGR includes boundary changes (e.g. the transfer of part of Romsey Extra Parish to Awbridge Parish). New polling districts would be required, and they would also be renamed to relate to the parish/town area that they would be transferred to. The recommendations of this report therefore include delegated authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Democracy and Governance, to undertake an interim review of polling districts, in order to reflect any changes which arise out of the CGR.

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 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>

- 9.2 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.

- 9.3 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.

- 9.4 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 9.3 above).

- 9.5 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.
- 9.6 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. As noted above, fourteen representations were received within the specified first consultation period, and these have been taken into account by the Member Panel and are summarised in Annex 1 to the report. The only representation received after the deadline had no comments to make.

10 Next Steps

- 10.1 Having started the CGR, the Council must now complete it within one year. Completion of the CGR takes place when final recommendations are published.
- 10.2 The Council must therefore work towards determining Final Recommendations. The Terms of Reference for the CGR have set out the process which the Council will undertake to reach that stage, namely a First Consultation stage (completed), the preparation and publication of Draft Recommendations (the subject of this report), a Second Consultation stage (consulting on those Draft Recommendations), and the preparation and publication of Final Recommendations (taking into account the results of the Second Consultation process).
- 10.3 Subject to having regard to the statutory tests set out in paragraph 9.3 above, the Act allows wide scope in what is proposed as recommendations. For example, recommendations can propose retention of an existing parish unaltered, the alteration of the parish, or the abolition of the parish.
- 10.4 Draft recommendations are set out in Annex 2, and these reflect the deliberations of the CGR Member Panel, which took into account the representations that were received in the First Consultation period. It is considered that these are appropriate proposals to deal with the issues which are raised.

11 Equality Issues

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

12 Other Issues

- 12.1 Community Safety – None.
- 12.2 Environmental Health Issues – None.

- 12.3 Sustainability and Addressing a Changing Climate – None.
- 12.4 Property Issues – this report will not affect any TVBC property. Assets belonging to parish councils may be affected by the CGR, and there are provisions in legislation to deal with assets where parishes are abolished, or parts transferred. If the proposed Draft Recommendations are accepted, assets held by Romsey Extra Parish (e.g. Woodley Village Hall, cash reserves, etc.) would be transferred to Romsey Town Council.
- 12.5 Wards/Communities Affected – the CGR will not affect boundaries of Borough Wards, as these are set by the LGBCE. This CGR review area is within Romsey Abbey, Romsey Cupernham, Romsey Tadburn, Blackwater, and Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams Borough Wards. A central test for the CGR is community identity and interest.

13 Conclusion

- 13.1 This report considers the request made by Romsey Town Council to extend its boundaries, to coincide with the Romsey Borough Ward boundaries. It sets out possible options to deal with this request, and other consequential matters.
- 13.2 Annex 1 sets out these options, summarises the representations received, and sets out the Member Panel observations on each option. The Draft Recommendations set out in Annex 2 are appropriate responses to these representations, which have regard to the statutory matters, and will allow the CGR to proceed to the next stage in the process, namely the Second Consultation period on these Draft Recommendations.

14 List of Annexes

- Annex 1 - Options and Member Panel Observations
- Annex 2 - Proposed Draft Recommendations
- Annex 3 - Maps
- Map 1 – Parishes in Romsey Area
- Map 2 – Romsey Extra Parish/Romsey Town and Borough Wards
- Map 3 – Romsey Showing Parishes and Borough Wards
- Map 4 – Awbridge – Options 1E/2A
- Annex 4 - Timetable
- Annex 5 - Electoral Data

Background Papers (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

Representations from respondents to First Consultation period (names of individuals to be redacted).

Confidentiality

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:	5	File Ref:	N/A
----------------	---	-----------	-----

(Portfolio: Democracy and Governance) Councillor I Jeffrey

Author:	Howard Bone	Ext:	8467
---------	-------------	------	------

Report to:	Council	Date:	6 April 2022
------------	---------	-------	--------------