

## **Community Governance Review 2021 – Romsey Town**

### **First Consultation Responses received**

#### **ID11 – Romsey Town Council**

With reference to our conversation, I confirm Romsey Town Council formally support Community Governance Review. Please find attached supporting documents as follows:-- (supporting documentation at annex at end of this document.

Boundary Motion Paper – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021

RTC Annual Town Council Meeting – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021 – Minute No 33. Resolution No. 21/54

Please let me know should you require further information.

#### **ID 7 – Councillor Mark Cooper**

I was elected to Romsey Town Council and Test Valley Borough Council on 5th June 1986. I have been re-elected to both roles ever since. I served as Romsey Town Mayor in 1991, 2007 and 2012 and TVBC Mayor in 2021 and was Borough Leader 1995-1998. I was elected as Romsey Town's Hampshire County Councillor in 2005 and was last re-elected in 2021. I have lived in the Romsey Extra Parish Council area since 1983 and was elected to said Parish Council in 2019.

I am unreservedly in support of Romsey Town Council's unanimous request for a Community Governance Review and note 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. I further note the Boundary Commission's additional recommendation in 2017 that the Town Council ward boundaries should be coterminous with the Borough Ward Boundaries.

The GCR presents a number of options. My favoured option is 1b, that is, align the Town Wards at Borough and Parish (in accord with the Boundary Commission's recommendation and the request of the Town Council) and pass the rural parts to the surrounding parishes. However, if surrounding parishes are reluctant to take on the rural parts of Romsey Extra Parish Council then option 2 is the rational way forward.

At present the number of REPC electors is 4,959. 4,590 of those, 92.6%, live in the three post-2019 Town Borough wards. 369 electors (or 7.4%) live in the rural parts of Romsey Extra. In my conversations with residents it appears that the vast majority of the 4,490 believe they live in Romsey, not Romsey Extra. In other words change will bring clarity. Many of the 4,490 live in new dwellings on which CIL will have been paid. 1,400 dwellings have been built relatively recently to the north east of the town, all in Romsey Extra. Up to 1,300 additional dwelling are scheduled to be built to the south of the town, again all in the existing Romsey Extra. The parish CIL goes to Romsey Extra, yet the residents use the facilities of the wider town and its centre.

There are few new dwellings in the RTC area so there is little of any CIL funding for the facilities needed by the growing town. The result is that REPC has more than adequate funding whilst RTC with its 15,000 electors is reliant on Council Tax revenue to fund its services. Sharing the CIL across all of the built up area is financially fairer.

Evidence of the synergy between the two Parish councils is the existence of the Joint Planning Committee. The two Councils have delegated all planning matters and comments to the JPC which meets monthly. The system is working exceptionally well. Additionally, RTC, which has a long established Town Mayoralty and Civic life, shares those events with REPC.

On Councillor numbers RTC currently has 15 and REPC, 7 councillors. The new Borough ward of Cupernham has three Borough Councillors, Abbey has two and Tadburn, two. The new Romsey Council could have 17 (Cupernham, 6; Abbey, 5; and Tadburn, 6. (Tadburn's six takes account of future population growth at Whitenap). This equates roughly to one town councillor per 1,000 electors.

#### **ID4**

I support the proposal by Romsey Town Council 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.

#### **ID8 – Councillor Burnage**

I wish to lend my support of Romsey Town Councils request for a Community Governance Review. I know that Romsey Extra Parish Council was also very supportive of Romsey Town Council's suggestion that all the built-up areas of Romsey should be under one parish council.

I understand that it is 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 Town Council ward boundaries should be coterminous with the Borough Ward Boundaries.

From the documentation I have seen I would support option 1b that aligns the wards with the borough ward boundaries. I appreciate that this means the more rural areas of Romsey Extra Parish Council would not be covered by this, but I understand that these could be easily taken over by the surrounding parishes. However if there is opposition to this, then I would have to reluctantly support option 2.

You are no doubt aware that REPC and RTC are already holding joint planning meetings – I am on the planning committee representing REPC. This makes so much more sense as most of the planning matters, particularly for new developments is in Romsey Extra but will have a direct impact on the town of Romsey for numerous reasons. REPC support events in Romsey town and have done for many years as they appreciate that events in the town are attended by residents who live in Romsey Extra but most of them think they live in Romsey, evidence that this review is sorely needed.

I look forward to the results of this review.

### **ID3**

Bringing the closely developed area of land that forms Romsey and its environs into a single Parish / Town Council that includes all of TVBC Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn Wards seems a very logical outcome and should have been adopted at an earlier review.

The change would help deliver a consistent level of representation across the urban area that most would identify as "Romsey" and should reduce some of the duplication of effort by local councillors, indeed most of the current REPC members are also members of RTC.

Residents would be better able to identify local members who represent them  
The rural nature of the remaining REPC area would seem to be best served by being included in adjoining parishes

### **ID9 – Councillor Gwynne – 20.1.22**

I was elected to Romsey Town Council and Test Valley Borough Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019, and I have lived in the Romsey Extra Parish Council area since 2011.

Unsurprisingly (as I proposed the relevant motion at Romsey Town Council) I am unreservedly in support of Romsey Town Council's unanimous request for a Community Governance Review. It is also key that Romsey Extra Parish Council was equally unanimous in supporting Romsey Town Council's suggestion that all the built-up areas of Romsey should be under one common council. And this is absolutely 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 – in such a way that the Town Council ward boundaries are the same as the Borough Ward Boundaries. This would end a great deal of understandable (and anti-democratic) confusion amongst Romsey Town and Romsey Extra residents.

The GCR presents a number of options. **My favoured option is 1b**, that is, align the Town Wards at Borough and Parish (in accord with the Boundary Commission's recommendation and the request of the Town Council) and pass the rural parts to the surrounding parishes .

I am aware that not all of the surrounding parishes are in favour of such an approach, so would personally suggest that if option 1b is seen as unacceptable, then the approach taken is a **variant of option 1a**. Namely that any relatively minor boundary changes that make sense (such as transferring the small area currently within Romsey Extra that is south of the M27 to Nursling & Rownhams parish) are carried out, whilst retaining the bulk of the remaining Romsey Extra area as an independent parish. However, one of the key confusions for residents is the existence of two adjoining parishes – both with Romsey in their name. The remnants of Romsey Extra under option 1a are so far removed from the original 'definition' of what constitutes Romsey Extra that I would suggest the need for a parish name change. The new name to reflect – as the other parishes do – some geographic feature of the area.

At present the number of REPC electors is 4,959. 4,590 of those (92.6%) live in the three post-2019 Town Borough wards. 369 electors (7.4%) live in the rural parts of Romsey Extra – so my only concern about option 1a is that it will create a (renamed, hopefully) parish with fewer than 400 electors.

Evidence of the synergy between the current REPC and RTC is the existence of the Joint Planning Committee. The two Councils have delegated all planning matters and comments to the JPC which meets monthly. The system is working exceptionally well. Additionally, RTC, which has a long established Town Mayoralty and Civic life, shares those events with REPC.

#### **ID14**

I am in favour of this proposal to create one 'town' council, extending the current boundaries to include the recently developed Abbotswood & future development of Whitenap that are not currently within the Romsey Town Council area.

As Romsey has expanded to include Abbotswood, and will expand further with Whitenap, it seems very sensible that the whole town should be represented by one then council.

So much of the work of Romsey Town Council affects everyone within the proposed new boundary that this would be more efficient and I believe that representation more effective. Future strategic planning should also be more sensible.

I am aware that this would leave a rural and relatively low population part of Romsey Extra surrounding Romsey. It seems to me sensible that this is divided between the surrounding Parishes and I hope that they will accept that change.

#### **ID13 – Awbridge Parish Council**

In response to the consultation request.

At a meeting of the Parish Council on January 25th 2022 the following comments were agreed to the consultation request regarding boundary changes to Romsey Town Council.

The Proposed changes to the boundary of Romsey Town Council and the inclusion of areas of Romsey Extra Parish into RTC, would necessitate surrounding parishes encompassing some mostly rural areas of REPC with the resulting increase in maintenance costs to footpaths etc. and any parish assets required (if any) to be transferred across. If changes to Awbridge parish boundaries are to be made, the council feels that it would be of benefit to residents of Awbridge if the areas currently outside the Parish, but considered to be ( by property owners, residents and parishioners ) to be part of Awbridge, could ideally be added into the parish. This area should include properties on Old Salisbury Lane, Stanbridge Lane to the Junction of the A3057, and the area to and along the River Test to the existing surrounding Parish Boundaries. Best described as the area currently receiving the

'Awbridge News' monthly magazine and where residents would describe themselves as residents of the village. We await your proposals in the next round of consultation.  
Grahame Jackson  
Chairman Awbridge Parish Council.

**ID12 – Romsey Extra Parish Council  
INTERIM RESPONSE TO THE ROMSEY COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
2021/2022**

**FUNDAMENTAL POSITION**

At its meeting on 13th January 2022 Romsey Extra Parish Council (REPC) voted unanimously to support the suggestion of Romsey Town Council that all the built-up areas around Romsey should be under one common council. This had been the recommendation of the Boundaries Commission at the last review. 4,590 or 92.6% of Romsey Extra electors live in the three new Borough Wards of Romsey Abbey, Cupernham and Tadburn. Only 369 electors, or 7.4%, live outside those Wards in the rural area of Romsey Extra.

**FURTHER INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION NEEDED**

This is an interim response from REPC pending clarification of four key issues: assets, cash reserves, liabilities and staff. It is proposed that further dialogue will continue with officers on these matters to assist the TVBC Member Panel in its deliberations.

**Assets**

REPC holds certain assets: Woodley Village Hall, Woodley Village Hall open space, a set of allotments, a number of benches and some bus shelters. Woodley Village Hall is currently leased to a community organisation (Woodley Village Hall). Discussion will be required as to how these assets would be divided up under each scenario and confirmed in a Reorganisation Order.

**Cash reserves**

REPC holds a general reserve and some ear-marked reserves. It is assumed that these would be distributed according to the 2008 regulations and confirmed in a Reorganisation Order.

**Liabilities**

REPC has agreed to certain responsibilities such as maintenance of the Woodley Village Hall open space, some highway verges and roundabouts, the closed off section of road across Crampmoor level crossing and a number of bus shelters. It also has a potential liability to the Hampshire Pension Fund should there no longer be an employee of REPC in membership of the fund. It is assumed that these would be distributed according to the 2008 regulations and confirmed in a Reorganisation Order.

**Staff**

REPC currently employs one part-time member of staff as Parish Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer. It is assumed that the future employment of that staff member would be determined by employment law and confirmed in a Reorganisation Order.

## **COMMENTS ON EACH OPTION**

REPC is generally in favour of the suggestion of Romsey Town Council (RTC) that all the built areas around Romsey should be under one common council. However, the detailed response to each option put forward will depend on understanding the implications of each option as described above.

The initial thoughts of REPC are:

Option 1a – Agree Romsey Town’s request and retain Romsey Extra Parish Council to cover the remaining area of Romsey Extra Parish. This would achieve the key objective of bringing all the area that thinks of itself as Romsey under one council and would make the three RTC wards coterminous with the TVBC wards. However, there would still be the problem that the reduced REPC would not be coterminous with TVBC wards. Further the remaining area although large would represent few electors and may not be viable.

**This is not a preferred option.**

Option 1b – Agree Romsey Town’s request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – transfer remaining areas to adjoining parishes.

This would achieve the key objective of bringing all the area that thinks of itself as Romsey under one council and would make the three RTC wards coterminous with the TVBC wards. It would also ensure that the balance of REPC was distributed to adjacent parishes and could, thereby, achieve coterminous TVBC wards around Romsey.

**This is an acceptable option.**

Option 1c - Agree Romsey Town’s request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – establish a parish meeting.

This would achieve the key objective of bringing all the area that thinks of itself as Romsey under one council and would make the three RTC wards coterminous with the TVBC wards. Replacing REPC with a parish meeting will have the same issue as in Option 1a in that the area would not be coterminous with the TVBC wards but would result in a much-reduced administrative overhead.

**This is not a preferred option.**

Option 1d – Agree Romsey Town’s request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – remaining area to be unparished.

This would achieve the key objective of bringing all the area that thinks of itself as Romsey under one council and would make the three RTC wards coterminous with the TVBC wards.

However, leaving the area unparished without even a parish meeting would be unsatisfactory and be contrary to the arrangements across TVBC.

**This is not a preferred option.**

Option 2 - Merge Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish, with a new parish council covering the merged area.

Providing the warding of the new parish was based on the TVBC wards then the town wards could be coterminous with the equivalent TVBC wards. However, the problem would still remain about the residue of REPC, now in the new council, not being coterminous with TVBC wards. If the residue of Romsey Extra represented a fourth ward, then a decision would be needed about the number of councillors representing each ward given the imbalance of number of electors. This option would remove any complications about distribution of assets, cash reserves and liabilities. It is assumed that either all staff roles in both councils would cease, new roles would be defined, and a competitive application process would be initiated, or all staff transfer to the new body.

**This option has potential subject to understanding the implications.**

Option 3 – Group Romsey Town and Romsey Extra Parish under a common parish council.

The implications of this are not understood. It is not clear how this would differ from Option 2 except inasmuch as the two geographic 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.

**It is not possible to assess this option without further discussion.**

Option 4 – No change.

This does not achieve the shared goals of REPC and RTC.

**It is rejected.**

**ROMSEY EXTRA PARISH COUNCIL  
28 January 2022**

## **ID5**

As a resident of Romsey and having grown up, lived and worked in and around the town and villages all my life I would like to express my views regarding this latest boundary review.

Romsey Extra Parish Council (RE) is an historical anomaly that should be absorbed into Romsey Town Council (RTC). Surrounding parishes are not interested as they already view it as one entity.

1. Most residents of both parishes do not realise that there is such a divide.
2. RTC has a Civic function that RE taps into but with no contribution.
3. There is no discernible centre or community to RE and totally relies upon RTC.
4. Vast majority of recent and proposed development is in the RE area. This development greatly affects RTC but it does not benefit.
5. Major facilities such as the Sports Centre, Rapids, Youth in Romsey, Skate Park, Mountbatten School, Woodley Cemetery, Crematorium and the new Ganger Farm Sports and Abbotswood facilities are all in RE.
6. Infrastructure such as the sewerage works are in RE.
7. There were not any shops in RE, until the new Abbotswood development CO-OP.

8. There are four pubs in RE but see themselves reliant upon RTC area trade. Three of them only 100 yards from boundary. The other is currently undergoing major refurbishment and will be dependent upon Romsey.
9. Of the seven RE councillors three live in RTC.
10. Of the fifteen RTC councillors five live in RE and three in parishes adjacent to RE.
11. There are six dual councillors who three live in RTC.
12. This would reduce costs and simplify procedures for all residents.
13. CIL and 106 monies would be able to be spent for the benefit for all the residents of "greater" Romsey.
14. Whitenap development. What can one say.

It would be possible to continue with this list but, I believe this is more than enough to prove the redundancy of REPC and absorption in to Romsey proper.

## **ID 2**

Just seen the information about the boundary changes to the parishes. Fully support the idea to scrap the whole of Romsey town extra and merge with Romsey Town to create a greater Romsey council.

## **ID 1**

We have lived in Romsey Extra parish for over 25 years, and over that time the Parish Council has served and supported us well. Therefore we do not see that there is any need for change to the current arrangements. The councillors take an interest in local organisations and local matters relevant to us. They are all local people who are familiar with the parish, its geography and its people.

Romsey Extra has existed for over a thousand years, since the days of Alfred the Great. This is not to be taken lightly in sweeping away such a historic entity.

Looking at the parish council statistics, Romsey Extra parish is the largest parish by area in Test Valley, with the fifth largest population, only exceeded by Andover, Romsey Town, Valley Park and North Baddesley. There is therefore no reason for it not to remain as an independent parish.

For those of us who live outside the centre of Romsey, we do not want to see administration and services further centralised to the town centre. When visiting the town centre, we talk about 'going into Romsey'; we do not see ourselves as already in the town.

## **ID6 – Wellow Parish Council**

Further to your email date 9<sup>th</sup> August 2021, I can now confirm that at the Full Council Meeting of Wellow Parish Council held on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> September 2021, Councillors unanimously agreed that Wellow Parish Council **DOES NOT** support the proposed boundary changes.

(this was received before the CGR was launched , and therefore not clear how (if at all) the Parish considered the issues – Parish has been invited to respond with reasons (11/1/22)

#### **ID6 - Wellow Parish Council Response 17.1.22**

Thank you for your e-mail dated 11 January 2022 regarding Romsey Town Council's Community Governance Review and its desire to take over parts of Romsey Extra and to pass on other parts to neighbouring Parish Councils.

When this Governance Review was first requested, Wellow Councillors unanimously voted against the idea of taking on the parts of Romsey Extra that Romsey Town Council do not wish to take on and have not changed their stance.

Councillors have looked at the areas that Wellow Parish Council could possibly be asked to take over and can see no benefit whatsoever to either the residents of Wellow or to this Council.

The vast majority of land that Wellow Parish would most likely inherit is extremely rural, consists mostly of fields with very little residential development which, in turn, would bring in minimum Precept gain to the Parish and would incur more expenditure than income overall.

There is nothing contained in this area that would be of benefit to Wellow Parish as a whole and no financial gain that would make it attractive for Wellow Parish Council to inherit.

Wellow Parish Council has no problem with Romsey Town Council absorbing Romsey Extra Parish as a whole but it is totally against the proposed 'cherry picking' that would have huge financial benefits to them through recent mass housing development, whilst trying to offload any parts of the Parish that are unprofitable onto adjoining Parish Councils and Parishes.

In conclusion, Wellow Parish Council is firmly against taking on any of Romsey Extra Parish and would expect, at the very least, to be offered the opportunity to decline any further increase to our Parish boundaries via a Community Governance Review instigated by Romsey Town Council.

#### **ID 10 - Roy Hamilton Parish Clerk for Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council**

I would like to thank you on behalf of the Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council for being given the opportunity to respond to this Review.

The option that directly impacts on Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council is shown below and are response is limited to that option.

Option 1B - Agree Romsey Town's request and abolish Romsey Extra Parish Council – transfer remaining areas to adjoining parishes.

The Parish Council are opposed to this option. The reasons are listed below:

1. The area UJ2 indicated as being transferred to Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council is divided by the River Test. The River Test provides a natural barrier to travel, social activities and communication between the current area covered by the Parish Council and the greater part of area UJ2, to the West of the River Test.
2. The greater part of the area UJ2 falls to the West of the River Test and includes the community of Ridge. The actual travelling distance from the Parish to the community of Ridge is some 7 to 8 miles. In order to travel between Ridge or any area West of the River Test and our Parish a considerable road journey would be required. This journey either has to be taken through Romsey Town or past the proposed boundary with Wellow Parish.
3. The community to the West of the River Test do not have a social or community link to Nursling and Rownhams.
4. We believe that the community in Ridge would see themselves as distinct and separate from the Nursling and Rownhams community. The much more logical fit being the community of Romsey, if Romsey Extra were to be abolished.
5. The town of Romsey is 1 to 2 miles from Ridge and would be much better placed to serve the residents in that community and all residents on the West side of the River Test.

I would like to make it clear that the Parish Council were unanimous in their opposition to this proposal.

Once again thank you for the opportunity to participate in this review and we look forward to be advised of the recommendations in due course.

**Romsey Town Council**

Town Hall  
1, Market Place  
Romsey  
SO51 8YZ

**ANNUAL MEETING**

Minutes of the Meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2021 the Court Room, Town Hall, Romsey

**In the Chair: Councillor J. Burnage**

**Attendance:**

P Councillor J. Burnage	A Councillor N. Gwynne
P Councillor J. Cairney	A Councillor S. Lamb
P Councillor M. Cooper	P Councillor J. Parker
P Councillor J. Critchley	P Councillor J. Ray
P Councillor I. Culley	P Councillor M. Southey
A Councillor N. Daas	P Councillor C. Wise
P Councillor K. Dunleavey	P Councillor S. Wilkinson
	A. Cllr. D. Baverstock

**Clerk:** Mrs. Judith Giles  
Members of the public 1

**17. The Council Meeting was adjourned until Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021 in the Council Chamber of the Town Hall at 7.30p.m.**

**PROPOSED by Cllr. J. Burnage**  
**SECONDED by Cllr. J. Parker**  
**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Romsey Town Council**

Town Hall  
1, Market Place  
Romsey  
SO51 8YZ

**ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING**

Minutes of the Adjourned Meeting held on 25th May 2021 in the Court Room, Town Hall, Romsey

**In the Chair: Councillor K. Dunleavey**

**Attendance:**

P Councillor J. Burnage	P Councillor N. Gwynne
P Councillor J. Cairney	P Councillor S. Lamb
P Councillor M. Cooper	P Councillor J. Parker
P Councillor J. Critchley	P Councillor J. Ray
P Councillor I. Culley	- Councillor M. Southey
A Councillor N. Daas	P Councillor C. Wise
P Councillor K. Dunleavey	P Councillor S. Wilkinson
	P Cllr. D. Baverstock

**33. BOUNDARY REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Cllr. N. Gwynne **PROPOSES** and Cllr. J. Burnage **SECONDS** 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.

**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**

**Motion at May 25<sup>th</sup> RTC Meeting – proposed by Cllr Neil Gwynne, seconded by Cllr Janet Burnage****The Motion:**

**“This council will request – 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”.**

**The Background:**

The boundaries of what is now Romsey Parish and Romsey Extra Parish were originally drawn up in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In common with many towns at the time, the aim was:

- . an inner urban parish, containing all of the relevant urbanized areas
- . an outer rural parish, whose residents all looked to the inner parish as their sole urban focus

Ever since the creation of these ‘ring doughnut’ arrangements, two things have happened:

- . the invention of the car and the arrival of railways have both diluted the extent to which residents of any such outer rural parish look to an inner parish as their sole urban focus
- . urban sprawl has led to the boundaries of inner parishes extending outwards, thereby reducing the size of the outer parishes (Romsey Parish boundaries have twice been extended outwards in this way, since its original formation)

The Boundary Commission recommends boundary changes – at all levels of government – every year. They aim to remove such ‘ring doughnut’ arrangements on the basis of the changing circumstances described above. They recommended changed Romsey boundaries as follows:

- . Romsey Cupernham, Romsey Tadburn and Romsey Abbey wards would (between them) cover all of the current – and planned – urbanized areas that constitute Romsey
- . remaining (rural) parts of Romsey Extra Parish would be absorbed into the surrounding rural parishes
- . the boundaries of the area that Romsey Town Council are responsible for would match that of the Romsey wards (collectively) at Borough level

Whilst these changes went ahead at Borough level, they did not at parish level - because of objections described in Cons & Pros below. This has created a number of confusing anomalies, e.g. which area being a Romsey Cupernham Ward councillor covers.

**RTC Subsequent Actions if Motion Carried:**

The individual RTC actions listed below need to be completed in readiness for submitting a request to TVBC. They assume that up to four options will be considered by TVBC:

*Option 1* – leaving matters as they are.

*Option 2* – implementing the recommendation of the Boundary Commission, i.e. Romsey Parish to mirror Romsey Borough wards, with Romsey Extra Parish being absorbed into the surrounding rural parishes.

**Motion at May 25<sup>th</sup> RTC Meeting – proposed by Cllr Neil Gwynne, seconded by Cllr Janet Burnage**

*Option 3* – as per Option 2., but instead of the remaining parts of Romsey Extra Parish being absorbed into the surrounding rural parishes, it is retained as a separate parish – albeit smaller than it was.

*Option 4* – as per Option 3., but instead of Romsey Extra remaining as a separate parish, it becomes a fourth ward of Romsey Parish and therefore the responsibility of Romsey Town Council.

**NOTE A** Any implications re staffing of officer support are a consideration for the parish where that officer works, and TVBC, only.

Individual RTC actions:

- a. Agree which of the Options RTC support, and why.
- b. Approach the Parish Councils of the following parishes, in order to record their views:
  - a. Romsey Extra
  - b. Ampfield \*  
(RTC may wish to challenge this boundary change under Options 2-4, as it moved Crampmoor outside of Romsey parishes. As long as the boundary is consistent at Town and Borough level, RTC could make a request to include Crampmoor within Romsey Tadburn or Romsey Cupernham wards)
  - c. Braishfield
  - d. North Baddesley
  - e. Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams \*
  - f. Michelmersh & Timsbury
- c. If RTC support Options 2 or 4 then – as this would mean Romsey Extra Parish Council does not exist going forwards - also approach potentially impacted Parish Councils whose parishes border Romsey Extra, in order to document their views as well:
  - a. Wellow \*
  - b. Sherfield English
  - c. Awbridge \*

**NOTE B** Those parishes that were identified in the Boundary Commission recommendations as expanding to take in parts of Romsey Extra under Option 2, are marked with a \*.

**NOTE C** I have excluded from this list three parishes that border Romsey Extra, but which are not part of Test Valley Borough – namely Totton & Ealing, Netley Marsh and Copythorne.

- d. Write to Test Valley Borough Council formally requesting the boundary review, copying in all of the views from the parishes noted above.

**NOTE D** I have not included public consultation at this stage. TVBC will conduct their own public consultation – as they did before – and whilst we can do that ourselves, that would just be duplication of what TVBC will be doing subsequently.

**TVBC Responsibilities:**

These are to:

**Motion at May 25<sup>th</sup> RTC Meeting – proposed by Cllr Neil Gwynne, seconded by Cllr Janet Burnage**

- a) arrange a public consultation
- b) decide – via vote of full TVBC council – which Option is to be implemented
- c) define what that means re finances/resources for any changed parishes (the experience of running joint RTC/REPC planning meetings will help inform this process)
- d) define what that means for RTC governance, as well as governance of any other impacted parishes

**NOTE E** I am yet to confirm whether it is RTC who decide how many councilors should be in RTC if the parish expands in size. But at present all of RTC and all of REPC added together are governed by 16 individuals. So I personally would not see a strong case for increasing the current number of RTC councilors.

**Cons and Pros (of change)**

- a. CON – I am putting the Cons first, as these were the two objections that featured commonly on the last occasion such boundary changes were proposed. This first CON is that Romsey Extra Parish residents – and organisations based there, e.g. Mountbatten School – benefit from the fact that Romsey Extra Parish is where most CIL funds are generated. Consequently REPC residents, organisations & projects are more likely to get substantive parish grants and funding than are RTC residents, organisations & projects.
- b. CON – The second main objection last time was loss of Romsey Extra as an historic term. This does not bear close examination. Firstly because the historic term is Romsey Extra (not Romsey Extra Parish Council). And secondly because there is no evidence that losing it from a parish council name will make it more likely to disappear as a historic term. On the contrary, Romsey Infra and Rum's Eg are both well known – and historic – terms relating to Romsey, and neither has ever been used in the name of a parish council.
- c. PRO – Many voters are confused by the current parish boundaries/names, i.e. Romsey Extra vs Romsey Parish vs Romsey Town. Many voters are also confused re the same ward names meaning different things (depending on whether you mean Town ward or Borough ward). If voters are not sure what they are voting for, that diminishes democracy.
- d. PRO – Another lessening of democracy potentially arises when parish councilors in adjoining parishes – particularly when those parishes interact – are the same people. Current RTC and REPC membership could hardly make the point more clearly!
- e. PRO – This is the other side of the coin to point a. Currently the approx. 15,000 RTC residents pay a higher parish levy and yet have virtually no access to CIL funds. Whereas the approx. 5,000 REPC residents have access to virtually all CIL funds generated by Romsey's new developments AND access to the town centre assets that RTC are responsible for promoting and (in some cases) maintaining. These arrangements do indeed benefit 5,000 REPC residents – but effectively at the expense of 15,000 RTC residents. Putting all urban areas under RTC – as was intended when it was set up – is far fairer, financially.
- f. PRO – We would be reverting to the principle used in first setting out the boundary of RTC i.e. RTC looks after all urban areas; which is also the principle used for each of the two subsequent expansions of RTC. In other words, this change is really about putting things back to where they were always intended to be.

**Motion at May 25<sup>th</sup> RTC Meeting – proposed by Cllr Neil Gwynne, seconded by Cllr Janet Burnage****5. Map**

The map shows at its centre Romsey Parish (which RTC governs) and the three Borough wards of Romsey Cupernham (red), Romsey Tadburn (orange) and Romsey Abbey (blue). The motion concerns Romsey Parish expanding to cover all three of these areas, which RTC would then retain responsibility for.

The size and position of these wards reflects the fact that Romsey has expanded (and is expanding) North and East. This means the area that would remain of Romsey Extra Parish would no longer surround Romsey Parish. It would instead be the vaguely 'C' shape to the left of Romsey Abbey and Romsey Cupernham wards. (With Crampmoor becoming part of one of the parishes that it is adjacent to it).

