

LICENSING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 17 March 2026

Attendance:

Councillors
Laming (Chairperson)

Morris
Brophy
Gordon-Smith
Langford-Smith

Latham
Pett
Wallace
Wise

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Cunningham

Members in attendance who spoke at the meeting

Councillors Becker, Cramoysan and Horrill

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Cunningham 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 29 September 2025 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Patrick Davies, Jerry Adamson and Parish Councillor Antonio De Stefano (Headbourne Worthy Parish Council) spoke during public participation regarding report LR606 and their comments are summarised under the minute below.

Councillors Cramoysan and Horrill also spoke regarding report LR606 as summarised under the minute below.

5. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW (CGR) - STAGE 1 CONSULTATION RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS** (LR606)

The Director (Legal) introduced the report which set out the results of the stage 1 consultation and also detailed the draft recommendations for stage 2 consultation as contained in Appendix A of the report. He emphasised the extensive consultation undertaken with the assistance of external consultants (Public Perspectives) whose report was contained as Appendix C of the report.

Patrick Davies, Jerry Adamson and Parish councillor Antonio De Stefano (Headbourne Worthy Parish Council) spoke during public participation regarding report LR606 and their comments are summarised briefly under the minute below.

Patrick Davies

Patrick Davies spoke in opposition to the proposed Winchester Parish Council, considering the proposals to be unnecessary, time-consuming and expensive. He expressed concern about the timing of the review given the impending transition to a new unitary authority. He also believed there had been a lack of transparency in a process with meetings being held in private. He considered that a new parish council would possess only limited decision-making powers and recommended that the city's historic status be instead preserved through the appointment of charter trustees.

Councillor Antonio De Stefano (HWPC Kings Barton Committee)

Councillor De Stefano requested that a new Kings Barton Parish Council should have a minimum of twelve councillors to manage the council's workload effectively. He requested that the boundary be adjusted to include the park and ride area, in addition to including Wellhouse Mews and extending to the Three Maids Hill roundabout. He asked that stewardship of Barton Meadow should sit with a Kings Barton Parish Council (rather than HWPC) to maintain proper accountability. Finally he requested that the precept should not be determined in isolation and should be through a democratic process.

Jerry Adamson

Jerry Adamson highlighted that the level of support for a new Winchester Parish Council represented only about 1.5% of the registered electorate and suggested that the council's recommendations were based on misinterpreted responses regarding the W4 area. He believed the council

had disregarded opposition from residents and Headbourne Worthy Parish Council regarding the transfer of land west of Courtenay Road to the proposed Winchester Parish Council. Consequently, he argued that a local referendum should be organised to democratically establish whether residents were in favour of the proposals.

The Director (Legal) responded in detail to the comments made by Councillor De Stefano and Mr Adamson. Councillor Becker responded to the points made by Mr Davies.

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

Councillor Cramoysan

Councillor Cramoysan noted that he was a ward councillor for The Worthys ward and the chairperson of Kings Barton Forum. He supported the proposals to establish both a new Winchester Parish Council and a separate Kings Barton Parish Council, noting that a dedicated local tier was essential for representation within a large unitary authority. He also welcomed the inclusion of outlying homes on Andover Road. Additionally, he requested clarification at Stage 2 of the consultation on the boundary preferences for Wellhouse Mews and sought legal assurances regarding the long-term protection of Barton Meadows and walking routes as a vital ecological and recreational asset.

Councillor Horrill

Councillor Horrill agreed that establishing a new Winchester Parish Council would be a positive step toward ensuring all residents across the district were represented in a similar manner. She requested specific clarification regarding the proposed boundaries, particularly seeking to understand whether Harestock would remain within the current Littleton and Harestock Parish Council. Furthermore, she queried the methodology used to determine the proposed number of councillors and asked for further details on how the new body (if agreed) would be administered in comparison to existing parish structures.

The Director (Legal) responded in detail to the comments and questions raised by councillors, including confirming that Harestock would remain within Littleton and Harestock Parish Council and emphasising that there were no proposed changes to existing city council wards. He agreed to consider further the annotation of the map at Appendix D of the report to clarify this point for use during the Stage 2 consultation.

The Director (Legal) and Councillor Becker also responded to questions from committee members including on the process for determining the transfer of assets to a new parish council and the method for calculating the first year's charge and consequent precept. The Director (Legal) also responded to questions regarding the potential name for any new parish council for the Winchester Town area, confirming that the options around Winchester's city status following Local Government Reorganisation were still being explored.

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses received during the Stage 1 public consultation be noted as set out in the report from paragraph 12 and detailed within Appendix C.
2. That the draft recommendations detailed in Appendix A of the report be approved for a further round of public consultation (stage 2) for a period of six weeks, commencing early in the 2026/27 municipal year.
3. That authority be delegated to the Director (Legal), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Healthy Communities, to finalise the stage 2 consultation materials, including indicative precept levels, preparing any statutory notices, and initiating the second stage of public consultation.
4. That it be agreed that provided the further consultation process does not give rise to any issues that would require major changes to the draft recommendations, authority be delegated to the Director (Legal), in consultation with the Chair of this Committee and the Cabinet Member for Healthy Communities, to finalise the recommendations of the review so they can be considered, along with a reorganisation order to implement any changes by full Council.
5. That if any substantive issues arise during the stage 2 consultation process, the recommendations be brought back to this committee to be finalised, at an additional meeting, prior to consideration of final recommendations and a reorganisation order, at a meeting of full Council.
6. That it be noted that whilst a reorganisation order can be made at any time following a review, for administrative and financial purposes, orders should take effect on the 1 April following the date on which the order is made, and electoral arrangements then come into force at the first elections to the parish council following the reorganisation order.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 7.35 pm

Chairperson