

LICENSING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

Monday, 29 September 2025

Attendance:

Councillors
Laming (Chairperson)

Brophy
Cunningham
Gordon-Smith
Latham

Morris
Pett
Wallace

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Langford-Smith

Deputy Members:

Councillor Godfrey

Members in attendance who spoke at the meeting

Councillors Horrill, Becker and Porter

Other members in attendance:

Councillor Batho

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Langford-Smith for whom Councillor Godfrey deputised, as noted above.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Wallace declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of various items on the agenda due to his role as a Hampshire County Councillor. Councillor Pett also declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of various items on the agenda due to his role on the South Downs National Park Authority. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Audit and Governance Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council and South Downs National Park involvement.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 16 June 2025 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Parish councillors Liz Winn (Chair of Littleton & Harestock Parish Council), and Julian Hamblin (Chair of Headbourne Worthy Parish Council) together with Brendan Gibbs (Clerk to Olivers Battery parish council) all spoke during public participation regarding report LR603 and their comments are summarised under the minute below.

Councillors Horrill and Porter also spoke regarding report LR603 as summarised under the minute below.

5. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - WINCHESTER TOWN AREA - DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE**
(LR603)

The Director (Legal) introduced the report, advising that a cross-party Member Working Group had met twice to consider the scope and content of the terms of reference (ToR). The Working Group had endorsed the draft ToR for consideration by this committee.

Three representatives of parish councils spoke during public participation as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Liz Winn (Chair of Littleton & Harestock Parish Council)

Councillor Winn confirmed the parish council's support for the proposals to parish the unparished Winchester town area but not to extend the review to include Littleton & Harestock Parish Council (LHPC).

She questioned the rationale for splitting the parish, raised concerns about the viability of the remaining parish area, asked to be consulted on the consultation questions and requested assurances that all residents within the LHPC area would be consulted. She also believed there could be a potential lack of independent scrutiny in a review both being conducted and decided by the City Council.

Councillor Julian Hamblin (Chair of Headbourne Worthy Parish Council)

Councillor Hamblin echoed the concerns expressed above regarding the lack of consultation to date and also the support for parishing the Winchester Town area only. However, he queried the appropriateness of incorporating the new Kings Barton development, arguing it was already forming its own distinct identity and its governance could be compromised within a larger city council. He also raised concerns about the future viability of Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (HWPC) if Kings Barton were to be separated from it and stressed the need to consult all residents of the HWPC parish. He highlighted that if, alternatively, Kings Barton

was to be included within an expanded HWPC then the numbers of parish councillors would need to be increased.

Brendan Gibbs (Clerk to Olivers Battery Parish Council)

Brendan Gibbs expressed disappointment that the parish council had not been made aware of the proposals at an earlier stage. He questioned the rationale for expanding the review to include neighbouring parishes and voiced concern that a new town council might take a more benign view on a controversial local planning issue. He requested that neighbouring parishes be consulted more widely and receive regular updates on the process. However, he queried why it was considered necessary to consult all parish councils within the district on the proposals.

At the invitation of the chairperson, Councillors Horrill and Porter addressed the committee as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Horrill

Councillor Horrill supported the proposal to undertake a CGR for the unparished areas of Winchester to help protect the city's historic status. However she shared concerns expressed above about including some already parished areas at the edge of the town, raising the potential impact on community cohesion in places like Littleton and Harestock. She requested that the ToR be amended to explicitly include consulting residents in all parts of affected parishes, such as Littleton village, and recommended that information on the potential precept and services of a new town council be included in the consultation materials to help inform residents' choices.

Councillor Porter

Councillor Porter, who had participated in the working group as a deputy for Councillor Cramoysan, provided assurance that the process had been well-considered and highlighted the general agreement on creating a new council for the five unparished Winchester wards. She explained the review provided an opportunity for residents in areas like Kings Barton to decide on their local identity and to consider whether they felt more aligned with the city or their existing parish. She highlighted the proposed multi-stage consultation process, which would use fair and unbiased questions.

As chair of the working group, Councillor Becker responded to the comments made above including emphasising that the committee was just being asked to agree the terms of reference at this stage. No decision had been made regarding the future governance of the Winchester town area or any of the adjoining parish areas it was proposed to include in the consultation. The working group had included councillors who represented the parish areas who had addressed the committee. She mentioned that briefings on the impact of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) had taken place with all of the district's parish councils and parish councils would continue to be updated.

The Director (Legal) confirmed that it was a legal requirement of the CGR process to consult all residents of affected parishes and this was outlined in

paragraph 7 of the ToR. He also confirmed that the consultation would not be biased in favour of any proposal and would be undertaken by independent consultants.

Councillor Becker, the Director (Legal) and the Communications Manager also responded to questions from committee members including on the extent and format of the consultation, the estimated costs of the CGR process and the rationale for widening the possible options to include parished areas adjoining the town area.

Following questions and debate by the committee, it was agreed that the Director (Legal) have regard to the following points:

- a) Amending the ToR to be explicit about which parish council area residents would be consulted.
- b) Whether the consultation could be worded to emphasise that none of the possible options would be cost-neutral.
- c) The results of the consultation should be reported to a future meeting of the committee.
- d) Further consideration as to how the CGR would be funded, in particular whether an element be funded from the Winchester Town Account.

RESOLVED:

1. That the draft Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review of the Winchester Town Area be approved, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.
2. That the indicative timetable for the review be approved, as outlined within the Terms of Reference.
3. That authority be delegated to the Director (Legal) to make any minor amendments to the Terms of Reference prior to publication having regard to the points raised above, to determine the specific date of its publication and to initiate the first stage of public consultation.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 8.15 pm

Chairperson