

REPORT TITLE: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - STAGE 1
CONSULTATION RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS

17 MARCH 2026

REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER: Councillor Kathleen Becker, Cabinet Member for
Healthy Communities

Contact Officer: Gareth John, Director (Legal) Tel No: 01962 848135 Email
gjohn@winchester.gov.uk

WARD(S): ALL

PURPOSE

Stage 1 of the Community Governance Review (CGR) for the Winchester Town area has been completed. This report updates the Licensing and Regulation Committee with the results of the stage 1 public consultation and seeks the Committee's agreement to the recommendations set out below including a further stage of consultation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

1. Notes the responses received during the Stage 1 public consultation set out in the report from paragraph 12 and detailed within Appendix C.
2. Approves the draft recommendations detailed in Appendix A for a further round of public consultation (stage 2) for a period of six weeks, commencing early in the 2026/27 municipal year.
3. Agrees 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. Agrees that provided the further consultation process does not give rise to any issues that would require major changes to the draft recommendations, to delegate 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. Agrees that if any substantive issues arise during the stage 2 consultation process, that the recommendations should 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. To note 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.

IMPLICATIONS

1. COUNCIL PLAN OUTCOME

- 1.1. The Council Plan 2025–2030 identifies “Listening and Learning” as a key priority. One of the actions under this priority is to undertake a Community Governance Review (CGR) to ensure a strong network of parish and town councils across the district, capable of operating within any future local government structures. This review directly delivers on that commitment.
- 1.2. The stage 1 consultation has provided residents with the opportunity to make their views known about future governance arrangements for the Winchester Town area, and some neighbouring parish areas.

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1. As noted in reports LR594 and LR603, undertaking a CGR is a resource-intensive process. Costs associated with consultation activities (such as mailings, venue hire for events, and online survey platforms) and ongoing project management will be met from the Council’s transitional reserves.
- 2.2. To ensure the review and its subsequent implementation are adequately resourced, it is prudent to allocate dedicated funding. Accordingly, at its budget-setting meeting in February 2026, the Council approved a budget for the Community Governance Review (CGR), including anticipated implementation costs.
- 2.3. The primary financial drivers for Stage 2 include costs associated with public consultation (printing, advertising, public meetings), specialist legal drafting, and Electoral Services.

3. LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. The legal framework for community governance reviews is set out in Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Council must ensure that community governance reflects the “identities and interests of the community” and is “effective and convenient.” Failure to follow statutory guidance or consult adequately could result in Judicial Review.
- 3.2. Subsequent consultation phases must comply with the principles set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR) to ensure the review is robust and legally compliant. Any legal or specialist advice required, particularly regarding the preservation of Winchester’s city status, will be procured in accordance with the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules.
- 3.3. The Council, as the Principal Authority, retains statutory responsibility for overseeing the CGR and approving its final recommendations. Any subsequent Reorganisation Order, which legally implements the outcome of the CGR, must adhere strictly to the procedures defined within the Act.

4. WORKFORCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. The officer project team is established and has supported the Member Working Group in developing the project to date. Approval to proceed to Stage 2 consultation will require dedicated officer time from Legal, Community Services, Communications, and other services to manage the consultation process, analyse responses, and prepare subsequent reports.

5. PROPERTY AND ASSET IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. A scoping exercise of potentially transferable assets within the areas to be covered by the new proposed parish councils is underway. A final list of assets will be agreed between Winchester City Council, Winchester Town Forum and parish councils affected by proposed changes arising from the CGR and a list of these will be included in the Reorganisation Order to be considered by full council.
- 5.2. As part of the stage 2 consultation, it is anticipated that residents will be asked which services they would like their parish council to be responsible for, which officers will consider, although there would be the opportunity for future transfers to take place subject to agreement between parish councils and WCC or the future Unitary Authority.

6. CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

- 6.1. The consultation strategy, outlined previously within the ToR, is designed to be comprehensive and inclusive, utilising a mix of online and offline methods to reach all segments of the community and key stakeholders within the review area.
- 6.2. In addition to the formal, public committee meetings held, further briefings have been provided for Headbourne Worthy, Littleton & Harestock, Badger Farm, Olivers Battery and Compton & Shawford Parish Councils in June 2025, October 2025 and March 2026.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1. Parish and town councils can play a significant role in promoting local environmental initiatives. The establishment of new parish councils could provide a platform for delivering local environmental priorities and contributing to the Council's "Greener Faster" ambitions.

8. PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 8.1. The consultation processes have been designed to be inclusive and accessible to all members of the community, ensuring compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty. An initial Equality Impact Assessment will be developed alongside the consultation materials to ensure any potential impacts on different groups are considered.

9. DATA PROTECTION IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 9.1. The consultation will involve the collection and processing of personal data from respondents. All data will be handled in accordance with GDPR and the Council's data protection policies. The project team will ensure all necessary measures are in place to protect individual privacy.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk	Mitigation	Opportunities
Financial Exposure.	Financial matters will be reviewed as the review develops to identify and mitigate any potential cost pressures. Risk of residents perceiving the precept as a tax hike.	Clear communication of the "Special Expenses replacement" mechanism
Exposure to challenge. Failure to conduct a legally compliant consultation process could lead to legal challenge.	The process is guided by the approved ToR and a clear timetable. The project team includes legal and democratic services expertise.	A well-managed, transparent, and comprehensive CGR process builds public trust and delivers a robust and defensible outcome.
Reputation. The review could be perceived as a 'done deal', leading to poor engagement or negative feedback.	The ToR and consultation materials are framed around open questions about the future of governance, not a pre-determined outcome. The cross-party Working Group ensures political consensus.	Successfully concluding the CGR will enhance the Council's reputation for listening to and empowering its communities, strengthening local democracy.
Achievement of outcome. The review does not conclude within the anticipated timeline.	The timeline and plan will be subject to constant review.	
Community Support. If the consultation is not sufficiently inclusive, the outcome may not be seen to have the support of the local community.	A multi-channel communication and consultation plan is detailed in the ToR, targeting residents, businesses, and community groups	High levels of engagement will ensure the final recommendations are genuinely reflective of the community's identity and

	through various means to maximise participation.	interests, leading to greater buy-in.
--	--	---------------------------------------

11. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

11.1. Background and Context

- 11.2. This report presents the findings of the Stage 1 public consultation for the Council's Community Governance Review (CGR). The review was initiated in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference (ToR) and is being conducted under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIH Act 2007).
- 11.3. The LGPIH Act 2007 devolves the power to create parish councils to principal authorities. Following the publication of the English Devolution White Paper (December 2024) and the progression of the Hampshire devolution deal, the Council agreed to undertake a CGR. This is set out in detail within report LR603 - Community Governance Review: Winchester Town Area – Draft Terms of Reference (29 September 2025).
- 11.4. The ToR, which was published in November 2025, sets out the scope of this review. The primary objective of the community governance review is to ensure “effective and convenient” local governance that reflects Winchester’s distinct identity as an historic city.

12. Stage 1 Consultation

- 12.1. The stage 1 consultation invited submissions and representations from all stakeholders, including residents, Town and Parish Councils, and other local bodies.
- 12.2. The consultation period spanned seven weeks, commencing on 3 November 2025 and concluding on 22 December 2025, consistent with best practice for CGRs. The council commissioned independent organisation – Public Perspectives to support the consultation process and report the results of the consultation, their full report is attached at Appendix C. The consultation targeted key stakeholders and included engagement with all affected Parish Councils. Broad public engagement was achieved through a dedicated web page, public notices, drop-in events, and widespread distribution of a promotional leaflet.
- 12.3. In total, there were 1,415 responses to the consultation questionnaire. The independent consultants in their report noted that this represented a high number of responses in both absolute terms and relative to other similar consultations, providing confidence in the results.
- 12.4. The key purpose of Stage 1 was to seek views on the principle of parishing the currently unparished area of Winchester Town. In addition, opinions were sought on potential boundary changes. The Council must give regard to the responses when deciding its next steps.

Winchester Town: Creation of a New Parish Council¹

- 12.5. The consultation sought views on the principle of establishing a parish council for the unparished wards of Winchester Town. A total of 1403 responses were received on this topic.
- 12.6. Overall, 65% of respondents agreed with the creation of a new local parish council for the unparished area of Winchester Town, and 23% disagreed. 86% of respondents that live in the unparished area of Winchester Town agreed with the creation of a new local parish council for the unparished area of Winchester Town, with just 11% disagreeing.
- 12.7. Support centred on stronger local representation, with a parish council seen as more accessible, accountable and responsive to local concerns and a way to protect the city's status and mayoralty during potential reorganisation.
- 12.8. Most voluntary and community organisations that responded, including local residents' associations, agreed with the creation of a parish council for Winchester Town.
- 12.9. Respondents who disagreed were mainly concerned about increased costs and council tax, seeing a new parish council as unnecessary and poor value. Many felt it would duplicate existing councils, and offer limited benefits, particularly those living outside the unparished area who questioned its relevance to them.
- 12.10. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 2.1 onwards.

Land West of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4)

- 12.11. W4 is land west of Courtenay Road and is an area that has been allocated for new homes, but is not yet developed. The land is currently parished within the Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area.
- 12.12. The consultation sought views to the potential change of boundaries to include land west of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4) in a new council for the Winchester Town area. Results from the consultation show the following:
- 30% of all respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 27% disagreed.

¹ The name of the new council is to be determined but for legal reasons it is expected to initially be called Winchester Parish Council until after it is established but would then be able to change its name by member resolution.

- 18% of Kings Barton residents agreed with the proposal whilst 44% disagreed.
 - 42% of the wider Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area ² residents agreed with the proposal whilst 31% disagreed.
 - 52% of residents in the wards of St. Barnabas and St. Bartholomew agreed with the proposal whilst 18% disagreed.
- 12.13. Supporters of including land west of Courtenay Road (W4) in a new Winchester Parish council believed it would create clearer, more logical boundaries and better reflect local life and future development.
- 12.14. Those who disagreed referred to the principle, the costs, practical issues, and disputed the area's connection to Winchester Town area.
- 12.15. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 3.18 onwards.
- 12.16. Officers are of the view that including the land west of Courtenay Road (W4) within the Winchester Town Council area would result in boundaries that are clearer, more logical and more readily understood on the ground, while better reflecting how local communities are expected to function in practice.
- 12.17. The W4 site adjoins the existing built-up area of Winchester and comprises approximately 5.7 hectares. It is contained by strong, boundary features: housing to the east, allotments to the south, and the railway line and the Barton Farm (Kings Barton) development to the west. To the north, a tree belt and the Barton Meadows Nature Reserve provide an additional distinct landscape and ecological edge, reinforcing a clear and durable parish boundary in this location.
- 12.18. Access to the site is taken from Courtenay Road, and the principal road connection aligns with Winchester, supporting the view that the site represents a logical extension of the town in governance terms.
- 12.19. Overall, officers consider that bringing W4 within the Winchester Town Council area would help align administrative boundaries with the day-to-day patterns of movement and connection that residents are likely to experience—thereby supporting governance arrangements that are effective, convenient and responsive as the area comes forward for development. This rationale is consistent with the evidence received through consultation, where respondents in support emphasised that inclusion would create a more coherent boundary aligned with residents' activities and connections.

² Whilst Kings Barton is currently part of the Headbourne Worthy Parish, the figures for Headbourne Worthy exclude Kings Barton respondents.

- 12.20. Officers have carefully considered all the representations that have been made during the consultation. It is considered that the creation of a Winchester Town area parish council³ is a necessary step to address the imbalance in local governance, ensuring residents of Winchester Town benefit from the same level of representation, accessibility, and influence as those in neighbouring parished communities. The proposed council would provide a clearer, more direct voice for local people in decisions affecting their immediate area, enhance accountability, and support decision-making that reflects residents lived experiences.
- 12.21. Furthermore, establishing a parish council would foster a stronger sense of community identity and encourage greater local participation in civic life. It would serve as a focal point for community activities and events, offer improved responsiveness to town-specific concerns, and enable residents to have a greater say over local priorities, including funding and development matters. The council would also play a vital role in safeguarding Winchester's civic identity and ensure clearer communication and coordination with other councils, ultimately strengthening the connection between the community and its local governance.

Number of Councillors

- 12.22. There are no prescriptive rules for the number of councillors; there are however several pieces of long-standing research and guidance regarding parish sizes which officers have considered. In addition current or very recent Community Governance Reviews undertaken elsewhere have been assessed, which are set out below.
- 12.23. Aston Business School in 1992 completed research into the correlation between population and council sizes and found the following patterns - these patterns are believed not to have significantly altered since then:
- Less than 500 electors: 5 to 8 councillors.
 - Between 501 and 2,500 electors: 6 to 12 councillors.
 - Between 2,501 and 10,000 electors: 9 to 16 councillors.
 - Between 10,001 and 20,000 electors: 13 to 27 councillors.
 - Over 20,000 electors: 13 to 31 councillors
- 12.24. In addition the National Association of Local Councils recommends that a parish council should have a minimum of seven councillors and a maximum of 25 for parishes with over 23,000 electors.

³ The name of the new council is to be determined but for legal reasons it is expected to initially be called Winchester Parish Council until after it is established but would then be able to change its name by member resolution.

- 12.25. The following councils are currently or recently undertaking comparable Community Governance Reviews and have proposed or are proposing the following Councillor numbers and ratios.

Council	Electorate	Number of Councillors	Elector to Councillor Ratio
Guildford	52,064	24	2,169
Margate	35,359	19	1,861
Tunbridge Wells	36,846	17	2,167
Epsom	26,489	12	2,207
Ewell	32,934	16	2,058
Average			2,093

- 12.26. Salisbury City Council which was established in 2009 has an estimated electorate of 31,835, with eight, 3 member wards providing 24 councillors in total, which across the city provides a ratio of 1,326 electors per councillor.
- 12.27. Based upon the guidance and available current comparators the following councillor numbers are proposed.

Proposed Parish Ward	Electorate (July 2025)	Number of Councillors	Elector to Councillor Ratio
St Barnabas ⁴	5003	4	1251
St Bartholomew	6421	5	1284
St Luke	3766	3	1255
St Michael	6448	5	1290
St Paul	7012	5	1402
Total	28,650	22	1302

Parish Council Precept

- 12.28. Establishing a parish council comes with financial responsibilities. These are normally funded through a parish precept, which is an additional charge added to residents' Council Tax bills.
- 12.29. For several years, Council Policy has been to charge a special expense to residents of the unparished town area. Special expenses are charges made by the Council to meet the cost of services that benefit only the Winchester Town area. These are services which, in parished parts of the district, would normally be provided by parish councils.

⁴ The Parished St Barnabas ward has a lower Electorate than the City Council St Barnabas Ward as the Parished area of Harestock would not be included within it.

- 12.30. For 2026/27, the total expenditure identified as special expenses for the Winchester Town area is £1,434,779. The Winchester Town Forum considered the draft budget on 22 January 2026 and recommended its approval, including a proposed 5% increase in the Town's special expense charge. This was subsequently agreed by full Council on the 26 February 2026.
- 12.31. Consequently, the Band D Council Tax for Winchester Town special expenses for 2026/27 will rise by 5% (£4.50) to £94.58. The equivalent average Parish Council precept across the district for 2026/27 is £126.51.
- 12.32. The establishment of a new council will require a transition from the current Special Expenses to a separate Parish Precept. The level of the precept is set by the elected parish councillors and reviewed annually. For a newly created parish, the principal council must calculate the first anticipated precept to include it in the Reorganisation Order
- 12.33. The cost depends heavily on the services provided and so it is difficult at this stage to provide a precise figure, however, the Winchester Town Forum budget provides useful data.
- 12.34. The Stage 2 consultation will provide further information in relation to anticipated council tax precept levels. Officers will present respondents with an indicative range for the Band D council tax charge in the first year of the proposed parish council, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement and formal agreement.

Winchester Town Area: Draft Recommendation for Further Consultation

12.35. The Council recommends the following:

- a) **Proposal:** It is proposed to establish a new Parish Council ⁵ to represent the currently unparished wards of Winchester Town. Additionally, the area situated West of Courtenay Road, (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4), to be incorporated within the boundaries of this new parish area.
- b) **Name:** Winchester Parish Council but noting that it is likely to be re styled and known as 'Winchester Town Council' from inception.
- c) **Warding Arrangements:** The existing City Councils Wards will be utilised, ie St Barnabas, St Bartholomew, St Luke, St Michael and St Paul. **Note:** Land West of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4) to be incorporated within the new St Bartholomew Parished Ward (see para 12.11). The Parished area of Harestock (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area A) to be removed from the new St Barnabas Parished Ward. The unparished area of Kings Barton within St Barnabas City Council Ward (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - hatched area) to be removed from the new St Barnabas Parished Ward.
- d) **Number of Councillors:** 22 configured as below:
 - St Barnabas (4)
 - St Bartholomew (5)
 - St Luke (3)
 - St Michael (5)
 - St Paul (5)
- e) **Precept:** That a precept be levied, to replace the current “Special Expense” charge. The level of the precept has not yet been determined but a likely range of precepts to form part of the stage 2 consultation, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement.

⁵ The name of the new council is to be determined but for legal reasons it is expected to initially be called Winchester Parish Council until after it is established but would then be able to change its name by member resolution.

Additional Potential Boundary Analysis

Part of Littleton and Harestock Parish (St Barnabas Ward)

- 12.36. Residents were asked to consider the transfer of the southern part of the Littleton and Harestock Parish (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area A) into the proposed Winchester Parish Council area. This proposal generated 1352 responses. The results overall show opposition to this proposal, with 40% of all respondents disagreeing and 84% of respondents that live in Harestock disagreeing, this compares to 28% of all respondents agreeing and 16% of respondents that live in Harestock agreeing.
- 12.37. Respondents who opposed the proposal most often cited their strong attachment to the existing parish, its rural character, and practical ties, preferring to keep established boundaries. They also raised concerns about higher costs and reduced local representation.
- 12.38. Respondents who supported the proposal pointed to strong functional and community links with Winchester, saying the area already operates as part of the town. They felt the change would improve representation, create clearer boundaries—particularly within St Barnabas Ward—and reflect growth by strengthening a future Winchester Parish council.
- 12.39. The Parish Council response indicated support for creating a Winchester Parish council but opposed including Harestock, citing strong survey evidence that residents wished to stay in the current parish. It felt that existing arrangements offer low costs and strong local representation, while joining a larger Winchester Parish could raise costs and weaken the local voice.
- 12.40. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 3.3 onwards.

Littleton and Harestock Parish: Draft Recommendation for Further Consultation:

- 12.41. The Council recommends that no change be made to the boundary between the proposed Winchester Town Council and the existing Littleton and Harestock Parish Council. The southern section of the Littleton and Harestock Parish, located within the St Barnabas City Council Ward, shall be retained within its current parish boundary and would not form part of the Winchester Town Area Parish Council.

Kings Barton and W4 Development Areas

- 12.42. Kings Barton is a major urban expansion creating 2,000 new homes north of the city centre. W4 is an adjacent allocated development site, not yet developed, also referred to as land west of Courtenay Road. The governance of these was subject to a multi-part consultation question to test various options.

12.43. The survey asked for views on governance arrangements for Kings Barton and W4. Respondents considered these options:

- a. Including these areas within a new parish council covering the wider city area.
- b. Creating a separate parish council dedicated to Kings Barton and W4; or retaining these areas within Headbourne Worthy Parish.

12.44. Including These Areas Within a New Parish Council Covering the Wider City Area.

12.45. Respondents were asked to consider including Kings Barton as part of a new Winchester Parish Council. The consultation asked, "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the potential change of boundaries to include the Kings Barton area (Area B) in a new parish council for the Winchester Town area?"

- 32% of all respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 34% disagreed.
- 31% of Kings Barton respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 59% disagreed.
- 48% of the wider Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area⁶ respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 43% disagreed.
- 55% of respondents from St. Barnabas and St. Bartholomew agreed with the proposal whilst 21% disagreed.

12.46. Respondents who supported including Kings Barton as part of a new parish council said it would create logical boundaries that match the area's practical needs. Others viewed it as a proactive step in line with future housing and urban development.

12.47. Respondents who disagreed mostly opposed altering boundaries, mentioning satisfaction with current arrangements and concerns about unnecessary changes or costs. Some feared that changes could weaken local representation in Kings Barton or undermine Headbourne Worthy Parish council.

⁶ Whilst Kings Barton is currently part of the Headbourne Worthy Parish, the figures for Headbourne Worthy exclude Kings Barton respondents.

12.48. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (HWPC) supports a new parish for Winchester Town, but only for areas that were currently unparished and not Kings Barton. HWPC felt that Kings Barton should remain within its present community, either within Headbourne Worthy (with warding and representation) or another chosen parish. The council highlighted concerns over financial safeguards, developer funds, the new town council's capacity to manage development, and risks to local identity. HWPC also questioned its own future viability without Kings Barton. The Kings Barton Residents' Association likewise opposed the inclusion of Kings Barton in a Winchester Town parish, mainly fearing a loss of local control over facilities and spending.

12.49. Creating A Separate Parish Council for Kings Barton and W4

When asked to what extent did respondents agree or disagree that Kings Barton and the Land West of Courtenay Road should form their own Parish Council rather than joining a council for the Town area or remaining as part of the Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area;

- 28% of all respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 33% disagreed.
- 57% of Kings Barton respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 36% disagreed.
- 47% of the wider Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area⁷ respondents agreed with the proposal whilst 36% disagreed.

12.50. Supporters of a separate parish council for Kings Barton and land west of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4) mentioned the areas distinct community identity, modern development, and lack of alignment with Winchester or Headbourne Worthy, suggesting dedicated representation would better meet local needs.

12.51. Those against preferred inclusion in a larger Winchester Town or Headbourne Worthy parish, referencing stronger functional links and governance coherence. They expressed concerns about the viability, cost, effectiveness, and potential fragmentation of a standalone parish, believing there is not enough justification at this stage.

12.52. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (HWPC) believed Kings Barton and land west of Courtenay Road should remain part of HWPC for continued viability reasons, and referred to nearby developments that may require future boundary changes.

⁷ Whilst Kings Barton is currently part of the Headbourne Worthy Parish, the figures for Headbourne Worthy exclude Kings Barton respondents.

- 12.53. The Kings Barton Residents' Association stated a preference of forming a separate parish council for Kings Barton, with boundaries to include all residents, so local issues are handled by those living in the development.

The unparished area of Kings Barton.

- 12.54. The hatched area shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D covers 60 households currently located in the unparished St. Barnabas Ward of Winchester Town. These households are also within the Kings Barton development area, which itself is within Headbourne Worthy Parish Council area. As this review directly affects these 60 households, extra effort was made to ensure they were aware of and encouraged to participate in the consultation process.
- 12.55. By reviewing postcodes, it was identified that 17 responses were received from residents in this area. Regarding the proposal to join a Winchester Town Parish Council, 53% of these respondents were opposed, while 30% were in favour. When asked about the possibility of becoming part of a Kings Barton Parish Council, 65% supported the idea, whereas 30% were against it.
- 12.56. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (HWPC) also expressed the view that the unparished section of Kings Barton should be incorporated into the same parish as the rest of Kings Barton, this view was shared by the Kings Barton Residents' Association.
- 12.57. Officers have carefully considered all the representations that have been made during the consultation and are recommending establishing a new Parish Council to represent the current Kings Barton development area (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area B) and to include the unparished area of Kings Barton currently within St Barnabas Ward (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - hatched area).
- 12.58. A new parish council is considered appropriate for this growing part of the district because a distinct and increasingly self-contained community is forming, shaped by recent development and a shared local identity. Kings Barton is a major urban expansion, and it is considered that the scale and pace of change in the area supports the case for community governance arrangements that reflect this emerging identity.
- 12.59. Residents have described this area as having limited commonality with the long established nearby villages, which sit on the opposite side of the railway line and reflect different settlement histories and community patterns. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council serves an established community that forms part of the wider cluster of "Worthy" villages, with a character and community identity that differs from a modern, planned neighbourhood such as Kings Barton.

- 12.60. The railway line, Well House Lane and Andover Road provide clear boundaries that separate this community from neighbouring areas. These strong physical features create a logical parish boundary and were noted by many residents who felt Kings Barton does not naturally align with either the existing Winchester or Kings Worthy communities.
- 12.61. Kings Barton is also expected to function increasingly as a relatively self-contained settlement, with on-site facilities intended to serve day to day community needs as delivery is completed. This strengthens the rationale for governance arrangements that reflect the area's emerging identity and ensure local decision making remains focused on the requirements of a developing community, rather than being shaped primarily by the priorities of long established settlements with different needs.
- 12.62. It is therefore considered that a dedicated parish council would provide the area with its own local voice, more focused representation, and stronger accountability for issues specific to Kings Barton as the development matures. At the same time, officers acknowledge the significant work that Headbourne Worthy Parish Council has undertaken in engaging with the developer and supporting the development as it has progressed.
- 12.63. The Stage 2 consultation will provide further information in relation to anticipated council tax precept levels. Officers will present respondents with an indicative range for the Band D council tax charge in the first year of the proposed parish council, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement and formal agreement. The council tax precept for Headbourne Worthy Parish Council for a Band D equivalent for 2026/27 is £115.14

Kings Barton Area: Draft Recommendation for Further Consultation:

- a) **Proposal:** It is proposed to establish a new Parish Council to represent the current Kings Barton development area (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area B). Additionally, the unparished area of Kings Barton currently within St Barnabas Ward (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - hatched area) to be incorporated within the boundaries of this new parish.
- b) **Name:** Kings Barton Parish Council.
- c) **Warding Arrangements:** Not warded.
- d) **Number of Councillors:** 11
- e) **Precept:** The level of the precept has not yet been determined but a likely range of precepts to form part of the stage 2 consultation, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement.

Badger Farm Parish Council Area

- 12.64. Residents were asked to consider the transfer of Badger Farm Parish Area into the proposed Winchester Parish Council area. This proposal generated 1335 responses. The results overall show opposition to this proposal, with 41% of all respondents disagreeing and 73% of respondents that live in Badger Farm disagreeing, this compares to 28% of all respondents agreeing and 22% of respondents that live in Badger Farm agreeing to the proposal.
- 12.65. Respondents who opposed including Badger Farm in a new parish council, stated a preference for its current governance, concerns over increased costs and reduced local representation, and the belief that Badger Farm is distinct from Winchester Town in daily life and identity.
- 12.66. Respondents supporting Badger Farm's inclusion in a new Winchester Parish council cited strong links to the city and improved access to services, jobs, and facilities. Many felt the change would ensure better representation, establish logical boundaries, and enhance the parish council's effectiveness amid urban growth.
- 12.67. The Parish Council responded and requested to stay independent and were opposed to merging with Winchester's unparished areas, feeling no advantages and concerns over less local representation and possible extra costs.
- 12.68. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 3.33.

Badger Farm Parish Council Area: Draft Recommendation:

- 12.69. It is recommended that no change be made to the boundary between the proposed Winchester Parish Council and the existing Badger Farm Parish Council meaning Badger Farm Parish, shall be retained within its current parish boundary.

Bushfield Site (W5)

- 12.70. Residents were asked to consider the transfer of the Bushfield Site into the proposed Winchester Parish Council area. This proposal generated 1338 responses.
- 12.71. The results overall show opposition to this proposal, with 36% of all respondents disagreeing, 57% of respondents that live in neighbouring Badger Farm disagreeing and 71% of respondents from the Compton & Shawford Parish area disagreeing. This compares to 29% of all respondents agreeing, 23% of respondents that live in neighbouring Badger Farm

agreeing and 24% of respondents from the Compton & Shawford Parish area agreeing with the proposal.

- 12.72. Respondents who opposed including Bushfield in a new parish council, expressed concerns about losing community identity, historic parish ties, and effective local representation if the Bushfield site were included in Winchester Town. Financial worries such as loss of future income and increased burden on residents were noted, as well as potential for inappropriate development and reduced planning control. Many opposed boundary changes without a clear reason, especially given uncertainty over Bushfield's future use.
- 12.73. Respondents supporting Bushfield's inclusion in a new Winchester Parish council felt that it had closer ties to Winchester than nearby parishes, it sits on the urban edge, and its inclusion would clarify boundaries. Some also felt that oversight by a town-focused council could improve planning, development, and infrastructure for both Winchester and adjacent areas.
- 12.74. The Parish Council responded and opposed removing Bushfield Camp from the parish, stating risks to community identity and local representation. The council felt that losing the site would harm future viability, limit service delivery, and reduce funds for infrastructure.
- 12.75. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 3.40.

Bushfield Site: Draft Recommendation

- 12.76. The Council recommends that the Bushfield Camp site (W5) shall be excluded from the proposed Winchester Parish Council boundary and remain within the Compton and Shawford Parish Council area.

Oliver's Battery Parish Council Area

- 12.77. Residents were asked to consider the transfer of the Oliver's Battery Parish Council area into the proposed Winchester Parish Council area. This proposal generated 1382 responses.
- 12.78. The results overall show opposition to this proposal, with 52% of all respondents disagreeing, and 93% of respondents that live in Oliver's Battery disagreeing. This compares to 23% of all respondents agreeing, and 5% of respondents from the Oliver's Battery Parish area agreeing with the proposal.
- 12.79. Respondents who opposed including Oliver's Battery in a new parish council, referred to its unique identity and satisfaction with current arrangements. Others viewed boundary changes as unnecessary or disruptive, and some worried about potential increases in council tax, reduced value for money, and diminished local representation.

- 12.80. Respondents supporting Oliver's Battery 's inclusion in a new Winchester Parish council felt that the area operates as part of the city, sharing facilities and services. They also saw inclusion as offering better representation and more logical boundaries consistent with the town. Some believed it would help form a more effective and comprehensive parish council to address urban issues and future growth.
- 12.81. The Parish Council responded and opposed being included in a new Winchester Parish council due to concerns over redirected development funds and reduced local influence on planning decisions.
- 12.82. Full details regarding this part of the consultation are set out in Appendix C, Paragraph 3.47.

Draft Recommendation: Oliver's Battery Parish Council Area

- 12.83. The Council recommends that the Oliver's Battery Parish Council area remains unchanged as a separate civil parish and is not incorporated into the proposed Winchester Parish Council.

13 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 13.1 To not approve the draft recommendations for further consultation. This would halt the CGR process, contradicting the Committee's resolution of 16 June 2025, the formal request from the Winchester Town Forum, and the commitment made in the Council Plan. This option is not recommended.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: -

Previous Committee Reports: -

1. LR603 - Community Governance Review: Winchester Town Area – Draft Terms of Reference (29 September 2025)
2. LR594 - Community Governance Review: Winchester Town Area (16 June 2025)
3. WTF339 - Response to the request of Winchester Town Forum for CGR (12 June 2025)
4. WTF337 - Request for Governance Review (23 January 2025)

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Draft recommendations for stage 2 consultation

Appendix B – Project Timeline.

Appendix C – Public Perspectives Report including Consultation Questionnaire

Appendix D – Maps

- Stage 1 Options Map
- Stage 2 Proposed boundaries for Winchester Parish Council
- Stage 2 Proposed boundaries for Kings Barton Parish Council
- Stage 2 Proposed boundaries for Headbourne Worthy Parish Council

Appendix A - Draft Recommendations for Stage 2 consultation

1. Winchester Town Area: Draft Recommendation for Further Consultation

The Council recommends the following:

- a) **Proposal:** It is proposed to establish a new Parish Council ⁸ to represent the currently unparished wards of Winchester Town. Additionally, the area situated West of Courtenay Road, (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4), to be incorporated within the boundaries of this new parish area.
- b) **Name:** Winchester Parish Council but noting that it is likely to be re styled and known as 'Winchester Town Council' from inception.
- c) **Warding Arrangements:** The existing City Councils Wards will be utilised, ie St Barnabas, St Bartholomew, St Luke, St Michael and St Paul. **Note:** Land West of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4) to be incorporated within the new St Bartholomew Parished Ward (see para 12.10). The Parished area of Harestock (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area A) to be removed from the new St Barnabas Parished Ward. The unparished area of Kings Barton within St Barnabas City Council Ward (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - hatched area) to be removed from the new St Barnabas Parished Ward.
- d) **Number of Councillors:** 22 configured as below:
 - St Barnabas (4)
 - St Bartholomew (5)
 - St Luke (3)
 - St Michael (5)
 - St Paul (5)
- f) **Precept:** That a precept be levied, to replace the current “Special Expense” charge. The level of the precept has not yet been determined but a likely range of precepts to form part of the stage 2 consultation, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement.

⁸ The name of the new council is to be determined but for legal reasons it is expected to initially be called Winchester Parish Council until after it is established but would then be able to change its name by member resolution.

2. Kings Barton Area: Draft Recommendation for Further Consultation:

- a) **Proposal:** It is proposed to establish a new Parish Council to represent the current Kings Barton development area (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area B). Additionally, the unparished area of Kings Barton currently within St Barnabas Ward (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - hatched area) to be incorporated within the boundaries of this new parish.
- b) **Name:** Kings Barton Parish Council.
- c) **Warding Arrangements:** Not warded.
- d) **Number of Councillors:** 11
- e) **Precept:** The level of the precept has not yet been determined but a likely range of precepts to form part of the stage 2 consultation, noting that this estimate is subject to refinement.

3. Headbourne Worthy Parish Council

It is proposed that Headbourne Worthy Parish Council's current area be reduced in size by removing the proposed parished area of Kings Barton (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - Area B) and the land West of Courtenay Road (shown on the Stage 1 Options Map, Appendix D - W4) but all existing arrangement to remain as they are.

4. Littleton and Harestock Parish

The Council recommends that the Littleton and Harestock Parish Council area remains unchanged as a separate civil parish and is not incorporated into the proposed Winchester Parish Council.

5. Badger Farm Parish Council Area

The Council recommends that the Badger Farm Parish Council area remains unchanged as a separate civil parish and is not incorporated into the proposed Winchester Parish Council.

6. Oliver's Battery Parish Council Area

The Council recommends that the Oliver's Battery Parish Council area remains unchanged as a separate civil parish and is not incorporated into the proposed Winchester Parish Council.

7. Bushfield Site (W5)

The Council recommends that the Bushfield Camp site (W5) shall be excluded from the proposed Winchester Parish Council boundary and remain within the Compton and Shawford Parish Council area.

8. Other Recommendations

“Overcombe” – St Cross Road.

It is proposed that the boundary of Compton and Shawford Parish Council area be adjusted so that the property known as Overcombe, St Cross Road be included within the St Michaels Ward of the proposed Winchester Parish Council.

Appendix B - Overall Timeline

Community Governance Review

Roadmap

Key phases & milestones 2025- 2027



