Consultation on the Proposal from Winchester CC
Known as '**Option 2'** and it has 5 Unitary Authorities in total:

North: Basingstoke and Deane, Hart, Rushmoor.
Mid: East Hampshire, Test Valley, Winchester.
South East: Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Portsmouth.
South West: Eastleigh, Southampton and New Forest.
Isle of Wight: Isle of Wight to remain unchanged

Questions to be answered for each option.

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 i.e. 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 agree

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?
Neither agree nor 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?
Strongly agree

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?
Somewhat agree

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

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?
Strongly agree

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?
Strongly agree

8. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?
Strongly 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 considers this Option 2 to be the second-best solution for local authorities for the mainland after the Alternative Option of 4 UAs in total put forward by HCC and EHDC. It appears to be a balanced solution, requiring no boundary changes, with the largest UA by area (Mid Hampshire) still being an acceptable size. It allows 3 of the UAs to build on the existing responsibilities for key services such as adult social care, children's services, waste collection and other upper tier services. However, the creation of an additional provider of upper-tier services in the new North Hampshire UA will be extremely expensive and cause major disruption to services that are crucial for the many vulnerable members of our communities.

The option offers the most balanced geographical unitary configuration if 5 UAs are chosen for Hampshire and the IoW, separation of the 2 National Parks into 2 separate UAs and a very reasonable population spread across the mainland UAs, albeit 2 of the 4 have populations of around 400,000 people. It is considered sensible to include the New Forest area with Southampton and Eastleigh because the Waterside parishes look both ways for employment and recreation and the largest settlement in Hampshire is not constrained into the smallest unitary by area. The Mid-Hampshire authority will bring together 3 mixed rural areas with similar challenges, demography, tourism impacts, businesses and towns surrounded by rural parishes. EHDC and the SDNPA already have a joint planning approach that can be joined by Winchester planners and this is important with so much of the SDNP stretching across East Hants and Winchester districts.

For Rowlands Castle Parish, with over 50% of the parish in the SDNP it makes absolute sense to be in a UA incorporating EHDC and also Winchester because we are already engaged with South Downs and East Hants planning authorities. We know them, they know us and this makes for good engagement on planning matters. More widely, many of our residents look north into the rural heartlands of Hampshire for leisure in the countryside and a considerable number travel north for work.

With social care and other services already being provided from Winchester and Petersfield based organisations, Option 2 works for the parish if the HCC/EHDC Alternative Solution is not taken forward as the best solution. Each unitary would be able to deliver a single corporate plan shaped by local priorities and grounded in neighbourhood understanding and knowledge.

In summary, Option 2 is practical to deliver, can focus on the rural economy as well as the urban economy and was well supported by those East Hampshire residents that voted for it as a fallback option should the Alternative Option (3 mainland UAs) put forward by HC & EHDC not be chosen

as the preferred model. Option 2 pretty well sustains local identity (recognising that some western New Forest residents outside the Waterside Parishes may not feel close to Southampton). It is good that all 5 proposed UAs are constructed from existing district, borough and unitary areas without any expensive and inappropriate boundary changes that the residents of the affected parishes do not want and therefore, if it is considered after careful analysis that having 4 mainland UAs is better than having 3, then this solution makes acceptable sense and is likely to work pretty well.

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