Consultation on the Proposal from Basingstoke & Deane BC, New Forest DC & Test Valley BC
Known as '**Option 1**' and it has 5 Unitary Authorities in total:
North: Basingstoke and Deane, Hart, Rushmoor.
Mid: East Hampshire, New Forest, Test Valley, Winchester.
South East: Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Portsmouth.
South West: Eastleigh, Southampton.
Isle of Wight: Isle of Wight to remain unchanged

Firstly, every respondent has to tell the Government about themselves:
1. What is your name?
2. Are you responding as an individual or providing an official response on behalf of an organisation?
Individual or Official response on behalf of an organisation
3. Have you been invited to respond as a named consultee?
Yes or No
4. In which council area is your address? (if you are responding as an individual this is your home address. If you are responding as an organisation this is your organisation address)
Hampshire County Council
5. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know the organisation's name:
6. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know your position within the organisation e.g. Chairman:
7. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the type of organisation from the options below:
Business / Education / Health
Local government - parish/town council or other
Other public sector - National body / Police and Fire / Voluntary sector
Other
8. What is your email address?

Secondly, read statement on no personal data and tick the box before proceeding with the consultation
The sections for each proposal in this consultation include free text boxes where you can explain your answers.
Then comes the questions about each of the 4 proposals on which the Government is seeking views. There are dropdown answers for each question

Rowlands Castle Parish Council responses:
1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?
Somewhat disagree

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?
Somewhat disagree

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?
Neither agree nor disagree

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that this proposal will put local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing, particularly given that some councils in the area are in in receipt of Exceptional Financial Support?
Don't know

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Neither agree nor disagree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?
Neither agree nor disagree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?
Somewhat agree

8. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?
Somewhat agree

9. If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-8 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

Text box comments as follows:
Rowlands Castle Parish Council has a key concern with Option 1 in that the Mid Hampshire UA stretches all the way from the Dorset border up to Surrey and cover a vast geographical area. This means that wherever the main authority is based it will be a long way from the UA extremities. This one UA also includes both National Parks with all the issues that arise from that such as limited housing land. While the South-East Hampshire and North Hampshire UAs are fine as they are it would be better to link the New Forest with Southampton and Eastleigh as the Waterside Parishes look both ways, into Southampton and into the very adjacent New Forest. That is why Option 2 with New Forest joining Southampton is the 2nd best option after the Alternative Option of only 3 mainland UAs and this Option 1 lies third best in our view. It does keep all existing boundaries into the transition so that the extra costs and bureaucracy involved in boundary changes are avoided and the Southern Parishes stay with East Hampshire as it moves into either the proposed Mid Hampshire UA or the Mid-North UA from the Alternative Option.

We consider that, to achieve an effective and easily delivered changeover to the new Unitary Authorities (UAs), it will be by far the best thing to maintain the proven upper-tier services currently delivered by HCC and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils through the transition period, thus having 3 mainland UAs is the best solution. The creation of an additional provider of upper-tier services in a new UA will be extremely expensive and cause immense disruption to services that are crucial for the many vulnerable members of our communities.

Apart from the issue of the geographic size of the Mid Hampshire UA, the fact that it contains both National Parks is a matter of serious concern. If there are to be 4 mainland UAs we would much prefer the option of joining Southampton and Eastleigh with the New Forest to make a better UA in the South West as given in Option 2. This would then ensure that the National Parks are split between 2 UAs. We have no other points of major concern.

10. I confirm that I have not included any information that identifies an individual in the free text box.
Yes