

Starkie, Emily

From: Charles Louisson [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 December 2017 11:54
To: reviews
Subject: East Hampshire Local Government Boundary Review - response to Draft proposals - Cllr C Louisson (Ropley & Tisted ward councillor)

I would like to submit the following comments on the draft proposals for East Hampshire District Council, published on 3rd October 2017. These are my personal comments and do not necessarily reflect the views of any parish within the current Ropley & Tisted ward nor any parish proposed to be incorporated into a new ward including Ropley & Tisted, nor do they necessarily reflect the views of East Hampshire District Council.

Content of Draft proposals:

I wish to correct for the record that the comments attributed to Ropley Parish Council in the draft proposals were submitted by myself, as shown in the list of representations, and represented my personal views which are not necessarily those of Ropley Parish Council.

Comment on draft proposals:

As a rural ward councillor I am pleased to see that the commission have assembled predominantly rural wards to exploit the synergy between those communities rather than using the smaller rural parishes to balance the numbers in urban dominated wards, which would have been an easy solution given the mainly numeric approach taken to this review. This approach allows the elected councillor the focus clearly on the rural issues without distraction by more urban issues.

At a local level the commission have understood the synergy between East Tisted and Colemore & Priors Dean suggested in my previous representation and included that in the proposal for the Ropley and Tisted ward. The addition of Hawkley, while creating a significantly larger ward, matches the rural nature of the other parishes in the proposed ward.

The Commission has included, possibly without realising it, many of the local requests expressed in the 2000 review for these parishes.

During the 2000 review the Hawkley PC stated "... that it was "disappointed" that the parish had not been included in a ward with the parishes of East Tisted, Colemore & Priors Dean, Newton Valence and Selborne but accepted the Commission's draft proposal ...". In the current review most of those previous wishes have now been granted.

In the same review, Colemore & Priors Dean Parish Meeting expressed the view that "... it had no "particular objections" to the proposal to include Priors Dean & Colemore Parish in Froxfield & Steep ward, but stated that it was "very far from convinced that this represents any advantages from the proposal which we put forward to the District Council", which was to remain aligned with Hawkley.

Adding Hawkley and Colemore & Priors Dean to Ropley and Tisted creates a ward that has significant synergy and similar challenges – they are all rural, agricultural parishes with an aging population, almost non-existent public transport, a mix of large houses and smaller dwellings, with a need for more housing that people can afford but not necessarily

“affordable”, and a desperate need for faster broadband. I believe that the commission have come up with a good proposal for this part of the district.

Clearly a new name needs to be selected for the ward. One that includes all six parish names is obviously impractical, and I propose “Ropley, Hawkley & Hangers” as the name for the new ward. This recognises the two larger parishes within the proposed new ward as well as highlighting one of the most significant geographic features of the other constituent parishes, while remaining a manageable expression.

I am less enthusiastic about the significant increase in the number of multi-councillor wards included in the draft proposals. Although these are mostly in the towns of the district, they will increase the distances involved in servicing the wards, reduce the sense of locality and community cohesion and most importantly blur the direct elector to councillor relationship impacting on accountability.

Kind regards,

Charles Louisson,
Ward Councillor for Ropley & Tisted, East Hampshire District Council.

Information in this message is confidential and may be privileged. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete the message from your system immediately.