

1	SCHEME 18 COMMENTS PAGE - Halfway Close and Brook (Trowbridge to Hilperton)
2	
3	Community Cohesion is key - if Hilperton is to be considered, as it wishes, as a distinct community from Trowbridge, there needs to be a clear boundary line between the two. The Hilperton Road, A361, is more logical than this highly piecemeal proposal.
4	I attended the so-called public consultation held at County Hall in November 2015, a meeting which as residents affected by Schemes 18 and 22 discovered by accident. The meeting frankly appalled me as a retired civil servant: the residents' concerns were practically shouted down by council officials seemingly giving vent to their own vested interests. There was a very thinly veiled attempt to disguise their interest in making a grab for the precept represented by the properties that would be transferred. I have absolutely no confidence that were the Schemes to be adopted, we would gain nothing from Wiltshire Council. I am therefore totally against the proposals which in my view do not satisfy the first requirement of a CGR, namely to "reflect the identities and interests of the community".
5	
6	
7	
8	This will help deliver more effective and coherent local government reflecting the local geography. In due course the boundary should extend up to the A361, reflecting the contiguity with Trowbridge.
9	
10	The Parish Council supports this scheme and is happy to respond to the comments submitted by Trowbridge Town Council by agreeing to the following 'tidying amendments'. Firstly, the boundary to the green hatched area in the south east of the scheme being moved south east from the stream to follow the fence line of the houses in Moyle Park. REASON - To allow the whole of the open area of grassland to be under the control of the same first tier authority allowing easier maintenance of the whole area when the parish council assumes responsibility for it. Secondly, the boundary to the green hatched area in the north west of the scheme being moved north west from the cycle/footpath to follow the fence line of the housing development. REASON – as above. The parish council can see no improvement to governance by moving any of these houses into Trowbridge and again asks the CGR working group (CGR wg) to assist local democracy by leaving the houses and open spaces in Hilperton parish. It would again remind the CGR wg that this area contains the main shopping area for houses in the parish, the well used Red Admiral public house and the Paxcroft Mead Community Centre (of which the parish council is the custodial trustee and appoints a member to the governing committee of the centre).
11	The parish boundary is clearly defined by a ditch running from the main road across the far end of Halfway Close. Our property is one of a group of four an extension of Halfway Close, within the Parish of Hilperton. We consider ourselves to be Hilperton residents and not Trowbridge. Hilperton is regarded as our social centre for the following reasons: Our friends and family live in Hilperton We attend clubs and societies in Hilperton We support many social activities within Hilperton Our children went to school in Hilperton and christened in the Church Under the Community Governance Review any changes made must improve the communities and local democracy. This would not be the case if the boundary was moved and our property becomes part of Trowbridge.
12	
13	
14	

15	No beneficial outcome from these changes. We have a community that works very well as it is. Why change?
16	
17	
18	
19	I think this proposal keeps Trowbridge Town Council area the right size in terms of households
20	I cannot see and real benefit in making any changes to the parish boundaries however this proposal is the better option if a change must be made
21	
22	Wish to remain as the Hilperton parish
23	
24	Confusing questionnaire. I agree to properties to remain in Hilperton parish. I agree that green hatched areas to become part of Trowbridge parish if absolutely necessary.
25	Hilperton has good community centre and village hall, also good businesses that offer what is needed.
26	Leave as Hilperton
27	By this application it will not have an effect on our secondary school application With this application it will not effect our council rates.
28	
29	The highlighted areas are part of our area of Hilperton. It would be a shame to reduce the size of Hilperton unless there would substantial benefits in facilities. Community cohesion is very important to us and carving up parts of our community goes against this.
30	What the community wants is irrelevant. Wiltshire Council will do as it wishes regardless of what the community feels
31	It seems unfair for these very few houses to be "moved" into Trowbridge if they do not want to be. Other than that the hatched green areas can be put into Trowbridge in my opinion.
32	We have always lived in the parish of Hilperton and see no reason whatsoever to become part of the Trowbridge wide parish. Why change?
33	
34	I have lived at 29 Painters Meadd for 10 years. I moved from Oriel Close in Hilperton with the firm belief that I was remaining in Hilperton. I have worked at the St Michaels pre-school for 9 years and currently walk to, daily, and work at Hilperton primary school. I have worked at the school for 8 years and as such, I feel very much part of Hilperton life and the community. I use St Michael church with school and often engage in the many events at the village hall. I want to remain in the village of Hilperton
35	If it works don't fix it
36	No identified benefits. Does not reflect identities and interest of residents. Proposal should be rejected. Precept charges are less than 5% mentioned as typical in your note. Charges should not be significantly increased and the error of 5% should be amended and notified to all. Recommend reject proposal. I live in Hilperton and wish to stay as we are.
37	
38	Strongly want to remain in Hilperton. We moved to Hilperton to be a part of the Hilperton parish, not Trowbridge.
39	

40	Hilperton I total should remain a village without being controlled by the town council. My other comments can be found on my scheme 22 reply sheet and apply totally.
41	I firmly believe in Hilperton parish council views on this matter are highly relevant including the fact that they are trustees of Paxcroft Mead community centre and most of these residents display a strong inclusive community and voluntary effort
42	
43	
44	
45	This proposal affects less people / households than Scheme 22 and follows roads to give a clear boundary. It also keeps the local school in the Hilperton parish.
46	
47	
48	
49	

1	SCHEME 19 COMMENTS PAGE - Wyke Road (Trowbridge to Hilperton)
2	
3	Community cohesion - most of the road below Canal Road is currently in Trowbridge Parish, and it makes more sense to make that all of the road, not further divide the community.
4	There is no logical basis for this proposal, the road forms a natural boundary and crossing it makes for less cohesive, less effective and less convenient local government.
5	The Parish Council supports this scheme suggested by the CGR working group which would assist the aim of better local governance for the residents by combining them with their near neighbours who are already in Hilperton Parish.
6	

1	SCHEME 20 COMMENTS PAGE - Wyke Road (Hilperton to Trowbridge)
2	
3	See comment for No.19
4	
5	This is a logical proposal, with the boundary stopping at a natural gap between housing of different areas.
6	There is no logical case on the grounds of the statutory tests for excluding this area from Trowbridge parish - hence I support its inclusion.
7	The Parish Council OBJECTS to this scheme as it would not assist the stated aims of the CGR.
8	Moving to Trowbridge parish would cause me a number of significant difficulties as a disabled member of the community - I do not feel that any of the proposed benefits would be true.
9	None
10	
11	

1	SCHEME 21 COMMENTS PAGE - Shore Place (Wingfield to Trowbridge)
2	
3	
4	We have been part of Wingfield parish for more than 20 years and are happy to stay that way. The only difference if we change to Trowbridge is that we will pay more council tax, we won't gain any improvement in our services so I don't believe its in our interest to change.
5	
6	Your proposal will increase my annual "rates". No thank you
7	Have formed relationship with Wingfield parish which I am very happy with.
8	
9	We've always been with Wingfield Parish and they've treated residents fine. We see no reason for any change to the boundaries and wish to remain within Wingfield parish
10	The present arrangement seems to work OK and has done for 30 years, so why change it
11	Shore Place has already been transferred to Trowbridge in 2003, This was overturned in 2007 and returned to Wingfield. We would like it to stay this way. The filed behind is very important and we feel more connected to it (which is part of Wingfield) than we do Trowbridge. Our children go to school in Westwood and we shop in Bradford on Avon. As such, we feel more connected to this area than to Trowbridge
12	1 - I don't think it will have very much affect on very much at all 2 - This assumes I have understood the above very lengthy sentence in non plain English
13	Since moving in to Shore Place we have been out-in-out of Trowbridge and have not noticed any improvement in service whilst being within Trowbridge and I am content with being within the parish of Wingfield, also whilst being within the parliamentary constituency of Bradford on Avon, why change!!
14	

1	SCHEME 22 COMMENTS PAGE Paxcroft Mead, south of Hilperton Drive (Hilperton to Trowbridge)
2	
3	Hilperton wishes to remain a distinct entity, a cohesive community. The existing boundary is anomalous in that regard, and a boundary of the Hilperton Road, A361, marks a clear dividing line for cohesion and effective governance.
4	
5	
6	Since moving into this area in 2000 my family and myself have been involved in the Hilperton community. We feel there is a strong identity with Hilperton as both my children attended the pre-school at the Hilperton village hall and we have attended regular events held in the village over the years.
7	
8	I attended the so-called public consultation held at County Hall in November 2015, a meeting which as residents affected by Schemes 18 and 22 discovered by accident. The meeting frankly appalled me as a retired civil servant: the residents' concerns were practically shouted down by council officials seemingly giving vent to their own vested interests. There was a very thinly veiled attempt to disguise their interest in making a grab for the precept represented by the properties that would be transferred. I have absolutely no confidence that were the Schemes to be adopted, we would gain nothing from Wiltshire Council. I am therefore totally against the proposals which in my view do not satisfy the first requirement of a CGR, namely to "reflect the identities and interests of the community".
9	
10	
11	I feel that there is no real reason behind this proposed change.
12	As Trowbridge expands it can be quite easy to lose the sense of community. Remaining part of Hilperton parish provides the sense of community we look for that an ever growing Trowbridge might not offer. I consider my family to be part of Hilperton and wish to remain as such.
13	I wish my property to stay in the Hilperton Parish. I do not wish to move into Trowbridge Town Council. I feel I am very well represented and served by my local Hilperton councillor and that Hilperton Parish Council support the area I live in very well. Hilperton Parish Council would like my property to remain within the Hilperton Parish and I do also.
14	By proximity, we are closer to Hilperton Village and feel more a part of that. We receive regular updates from our local councillor on local issues in our Hilperton parish and feel informed about what is happening in our area. It is also important to us that we have a say in what happens to/within the Hilperton Parish.
15	
16	This is a coherent and sustainable proposal, establishing the main road as the dividing barrier between the parishes and recognising the existing contiguity with Trowbridge. It will make for more effective and convenient governance of the area.
17	We bought our house in the Hilperton boundary back in 2003, a big part of moving to the area was being part of a village community and not part of Trowbridge town. We have previously lived in Trowbridge and chose not to continue to live there a long time ago due to various factors. We are happy living in the confines of Hilperton village and feel the whole character of the road we live on would change if swallowed up amongst Trowbridge town as this proposal states.

18	The Parish Council objects to this scheme in its entirety as it cannot see how it would achieve the required aims of the CGR. If the CGR working group sees any merit in the scheme, the Parish Council would suggest that the new Leapgate road would form a far more logical eastern boundary to Trowbridge rather than the town council proposal which runs all the way east to Ashton Road.
19	A strong desire to stay within Hilperton because: - There is a strong sense of community i.e. people know each other - Community groups and associations - Regular updates about events - Proud to live in Hilperton - Hackett Place is a distinct part of Paxcroft mead - Local involvement - A proud community - Own services e.g. pub and shop - Away from town centre
20	I have lived in the Hilperton parish for over 16 years and have integrated with the village community. I have a strong sense of place and belonging to Hilperton and am horrified this could potentially be taken away. These houses have always been part of the Hilperton Parish and should remain so as the decision taken by Wiltshire Council for this area to be apart of Hilperton Parish when these houses were built.
21	Have lived as part of the Hilperton Parish for over 16 years and feel a strong sense of community with Hilperton village. The decision made by Wiltshire Council back when the building of the estate started to include this area in the Hilperton Parish should remain.
22	I do not wish to be part of Trowbridge Parish, as they can not provide football pitches for the Children's Town Football Team, nor a decent swimming pool, bowling alley etc. There are also too many undeveloped areas i.e. Bowyers and the old library
23	I do not wish to be part of Trowbridge Parish, as they can not provide football pitches for the Children's Town Football Team, nor a decent swimming pool, bowling alley etc. There are also too many undeveloped areas i.e. Bowyers and the old library
24	The parish boundary is clearly defined by a ditch running from the main road across the far end of Halfway Close. Our property is one of a group of four an extension of Halfway Close, within the Parish of Hilperton. We consider ourselves to be Hilperton residents and not Trowbridge. Hilperton is regarded as our social centre for the following reasons: Our friends and family live in Hilperton We attend clubs and societies in Hilperton We support many social activities within Hilperton Our children went to school in Hilperton and christened in the Church Under the Community Governance Review any changes made must improve the communities and local democracy. This would not be the case if the boundary was moved and our property becomes part of Trowbridge.
25	
26	
27	In Hilperton we have a councillor who tells us of any changes that are happening unlike others who only want your vote and you don't hear from them till the next election
28	
29	My wife and I have lived in our house in Hilperton for 17 years and we are very content with matters the way they are. If we had wanted to be a part of Trowbridge we would have purchased a house there. The seven examples of civic pride on page 6 seem to be a desperate attempt to convince us that it will be in our best interest to be ruled by Trowbridge parish, whereas in effect it is simple way to extract an even higher community charge. Please leave us as we are, we have managed quite well and happy with the way things are.
30	
31	I have lived in Hilperton since 2007 and I am content with the whole way of life and do not see any beneficial changes within this proposal. You say there is no change to postcodes or address details but you do not commit to telling people there will be no additional cost to them. I do not want to see any changes made as I like the way things are, so leave things the way they area!

32	I do not want to move from the Hilperton parish. Ernie Clark is very approachable and has answered some of my questions when I have needed help. Also being part of a village we get regular news letters and it is great to be included in the loop. Village life is totally different to town life. I want the boundary to stay the same. It is working so why change it. Do not be greedy Trowbridge, we are Hilperton.
33	I have lived in Hilperton for nearly five years and enjoy the fact that there is a local community feeling here. I feel if we become Trowbridge we are just a small part of a bigger parish and we will lose our sense of being a local community. I strongly feel that I live in Hilperton and not Trowbridge and that is part of what drew me to the area as I like the fact that there is local distinctiveness. I like that our local councillor lives in the village and engages regularly with the community and feel that would be lost if we were to come under Trowbridge.
34	
35	We feel a part of the Hilperton parish council and enjoy being a part of the community. We feel privileged to be included and kept informed within the local community which we feel is of an adequate size and does not warrant changing
36	Being part of the Hilperton community is part of a sense of belonging. We have a local church, community centre, WI, weekly whist drives and many other activities. All very well supported. Re the final question - how is a parish of the right size defined? Also our local councillor Mr Clark is one of the most enthusiastic supportive and knowledgeable people and has rightly been returned to office for many years
37	We are part of the Hilperton village and should remain in Hilperton parish and should not be transferred to Trowbridge. Our identity and interests are better served by Hilperton parish, not Trowbridge
38	
39	The area is local to residents of Hilperton not Trowbridge with local councillors who represent us in the best interests
40	This will effect our secondary school application in a negative way. This will make our council rates higher when we are in fact closer to Hilperton than Trowbridge
41	We have been part of Hilperton parish council since we moved here in 1998. We have found that they look after our interest very well and we are completely satisfied with their services. Therefore we do not want change.
42	The changes are unnecessary and if changes are made community cohesion will be eroded and many community tensions will mount, along with sectarian divides.
43	We moved to this area to be part of a village community on the outskirts of a town. We therefore don't want to be part of Trowbridge itself. We have a number of neighbours who feel the same way. Smaller communities and a sense of belonging to a community is very important and this proposal goes against this.
44	I live in Hilperton. I bought a house in Hilperton. Moving the boundary line is of no benefit other than to Wiltshire Council who only make changes to suit themselves. As we all know Wiltshire Council is renowned for doing what suits them and taking no notice whatsoever of the residents. The "consultation" of the green wheelie comes to mind.
45	
46	We feel we belong to Hilperton. We rent an allotment and belong to Allotment Association. We use village hall as an extended family and the play area next to it. We visit the village pub regularly. We have had superb service from Ernie Clark and feel as our councillor he helps us feel part of Hilperton. We always refer to ourselves as living in Hilperton and would be most upset to be "moved"
47	I live in Hilperton. I use the village hall / pub / play area. I share an allotment.

48	
49	Why would we wish to change to Trowbridge. We are very happy living in Hilperton
50	
51	I can see no benefit to this proposal but can identify a number of detriments. Council tax will be higher, currently Trowbridge Town council is £126 more than Hilperton with no discernible improvement in services. The strength of the individuals voice will be weaker in Trowbridge with a larger population resulting in a change in local distinctiveness. My view is this is a political land grab by a bigger parish to obtain more tax revenue. There is no benefit to the people affected.
52	Removing the area from Hilperton parish will reduce the parish substantially and make the overheads of running the parish more expensive per person. Also the parish is currently cohesive and well governed.
53	I do not want my boundary to move from Hilperton to Trowbridge as I use facilities in Hilperton and have a strong sense of belonging to Hilperton not Trowbridge. I have added a factor which you have failed to outline (raise in council tax in following year). The above factors are complete jargon and have no relevance in a boundary move. Furthermore in elections I voted for a councillor in Hilperton. I wont be able to do that with this change.
54	
55	
56	Firstly no benefits accrue to residents and this should be the No1 priority. The precept charges are unclear as this is the council tax. We currently pay less than 5% precept mentioned as typical, 1st para, page 2 of Frequently asked questions. Our current precept % should remain unaltered. The proposal is just a cash cow for Trowbridge. There is no enhancement for residents and little to be seen as engagement with the community. We moved to Hilperton by design. The thought of being in Trowbridge was a no-go. No change is recommended to the proposed changes i.e. stick with the status quo. We wish to remain within Hilperton. As pensioners our income is fixed so why push a scheme which has no identified benefits to the residents. We say reject. The proposal does not reflect identities and interests of the community and in no way changes the convenient factor for residents. I fell I live in Hilperton and wish to retain this view.
57	
58	
59	I want to be in Hilperton parish not Trowbridge. That's why we moved here.
60	
61	I have lived on the Hilperton part of the Paxcroft Mead estate for over 15 years and I have always considered my house to be in Hilperton. I have always quoted Hilperton in my address. Although I like Trowbridge I have always considered it to be the nearest large town, rather than the place where I live. I do not wish to be moved in to Trowbridge, or consumed by its expansionist cravings. Please leave my house where it is, in Hilperton.
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	We do not see any benefit in this proposal. It seems to us that this proposal creates change for changes sake and no other reason. It creates unnecessary expense for the residents to advise their contacts of a change of address and moves those residents into a town from a village.

67	I think Paxcroft Mead should stay as one unit of community governance
68	Keep Painters Mead in Hilperton
69	We wish to remain part of a small parish which is one of the reasons we bought the property some 9 years ago. The sense of community is very strong and despite location proximity to the main Hilperton village, we feel very much a part of it. Likewise we do not want to be grouped in with the larger town becoming smaller fish in a large seemingly struggling pond, which will increase our council tax bill with a reduction in services.
70	
71	17 years ago I bought a house in Hilperton and don't see that moving the boundary improves or changes anything for the better.
72	We believe that changing the parish boundaries as outlined will not improve the factors listed under item 6. We identify with Hilperton and its community and leadership and enjoy being part of a smaller parish, our daughter was married in the Hilperton church. Whilst appreciating there may be advantages to the council in creating a wider Trowbridge boundary we believe this will have an adverse effect on our sense of community and distinctiveness. We would therefore urge the Council not to change the boundaries as proposed under Scheme 22.
73	
74	Its going to raise costs for me, so I don't agree with the proposal
75	When we first moved to Paxcroft Mead in 1999 we did so because we wanted to be part of village type community and specifically wanted to live in Hilperton as part of a community of 1100 homes. This has been massively overdeveloped putting a huge strain on the infrastructure.
76	The proposed boundary change merely enlarges the revenue stream for Trowbridge Town Council. As housing exists between Trowbridge and Hilperton the boundary is arbitrary and could be re-drawn along any convenient line, whether topographical or man made. When I bought my house many years ago, I was quite happy to be located within the parish of Hilperton and like all resident bounding Trowbridge have the choice to use services as and where provided.
77	
78	
79	When I bought my house it was because it was in Hilperton which is where I wanted to live. I do not want to have Trowbridge as my place of residence. If I wanted to live in Trowbridge I would have bought a house there. I like being part of a village community and so do my children, we all benefit from being part of the Hilperton community.
80	
81	
82	I do not feel that transferring these properties to Trowbridge Town Council will improve community and local democracy. I believe it will lead to a reversal of these. Residents will also be separated from the Paxcroft Mead community centre which has been instrumental in developing a strong inclusive community and voluntary sector
83	
84	We moved to Hilperton six years ago. We chose this location because we did not want to become attached to Trowbridge. We prefer the rural situation. We do not want to be controlled by a large town council because of the loss of village status. The Town Council should not have a say or have control of our village, which we are very happy with.
85	

86	We live here and find being in Hilperton, its a great community and would prefer it/us to stay as Hilperton
87	I prefer to be part of Hilperton village which has a much better sense of community than Trowbridge. In my opinion Trowbridge has gone down very much in the last 30 years. Its nowhere as good as before.
88	We are too far out of Trowbridge ever to feel part of it. We have been involved in various community events and class ourselves as Hilperton residents. We say we are in Hilperton, we use the local Paxcroft Mead shops- as well do many people in Hilperton village. We use the pubs in Hilperton. We have been involved with Hilperton councillors - I do not feel I live in Trowbridge in any way. I can not see how issues in Trowbridge would relate to us, and therefore think we would become uninvolved.
89	When I moved to Hilperton from North London in 2000 it was beautiful - now it has become the "Building Fields" aka the "Killing Fields" However I still wish my address to remain as Hilperton my now identity.
90	As long term residents of Hilperton parish we enjoy the inclusion we have been afforded by our local councillor, so much that we have felt the need to vote for him in more recent elections. He keeps us well informed on issues which affect us and answers questions put to him promptly. We feel that this proposal will detrimentally affect this parishioner/ councillor relationship. Keep us in Hilperton. Scheme 18 is less disruptive.
91	Came to the meeting on 11th May
92	
93	Came to the meeting on 11 May
94	
95	

1	SCHEME 23 COMMENTS PAGE - Hulbert Close
2	
3	The proposal does not positively impact upon any of the assessment criteria - the entire estate should be in one parish, but this proposal does not meet with the wishes of Hilperton, Trowbridge, or make any sense logically.
4	I walk to work & back on two days per week using the riverside path. There is no community feeling otherwise the area would not be strewn with rubbish and the tress recently planted would not have been vandalised. I would like to know WHY you allowed the developers of this estate to get away with roads which are too narrow and have inadequate parking because they have over-developed the land. People currently park on the pavements and on roundabouts because there is nowhere else to park.
5	I live in Hilperton, it is in my address, we have our own schools, community centre, play groups, nursery shops and businesses. I firmly believe that this should be represented by our parish council and not someone who lives in Trowbridge. People in this area identity themselves as living in Hilperton. I truly hope that the council has the good sense to support this change.
6	
7	Whilst it is appropriate to consider that these areas of the Paxcroft Mead development should not be split by a parish boundary and should therefore fall wholly within either Hilperton Parish or Trowbridge Town it surely cannot be that the Panel themselves have put forward this proposal, the same Panel which has consistently and repeatedly claimed that it is acting neutrally with regard to the proposals made by different parish and town councils to the review process? At its nearest point this area is only 700m from Trowbridge Town Centre, yet is over 1400m from Hilperton village. The government guidance quite clearly says that good natural boundaries should be utilised and that public open space is often the focal point for a community and therefore not a good natural boundary. In this instance the vast majority of the area containing the proposed new boundary is within or on the edge of public open space, to the south, west and north of the proposed new boundary are areas of public open space which act as the focal point for the Paxcroft Mead development and surrounding areas of suburban development. The only good natural boundary within the Paxcroft Mead development which is not within an area of public
8	
9	
10	I live on the Trowbridge edge of the proposed area. The proximity of Trowbridge town makes it easy for me (a non car user) to use the shops; transport links; leisure facilities such as cinema; cafes/restaurants; U3a groups in the town. Although my address is Hilperton, I don't go in that direction and don't consider that I have any association with that area. Therefore I feel that the objectives that you have outlined in this review would not be met by the proposed boundary changes. For me it would not be a positive step.
11	
12	This is a meaningless and nonsensical proposal which would begin the disembodiment of Trowbridge parish as an effective and coherent area.
13	The parish council can see the logic of this proposal which came from the CGR working group (CGR wg). However, it would hope that the CGR wg will not insist that the housing north west of Leapgate all has to be in the same parish. As there are far more houses in this area than in the existing 'Hilperton housing' (see scheme 18) a flawed result to the consultation could be reached if the town council has been lobbying the houses within its boundary as the numbers are heavily skewed in its favour.
14	As always moving boundaries is a political action. It is only in the interests of giving local government reasons to stay employed. What a waste of money, again.

15	
16	
17	
18	
19	I believe that all of Paxcroft Mead should be classed as Hilperton and under Hilperton parish council
20	
21	
22	I do not consider our area to be part of Hilperton, with the exception of having it in my address. I do not engage with Hilperton as a community and all the services I access are within Trowbridge. Geographically I am close to Trowbridge centre than Hilperton. I do not feel extending Hilperton parish council will mean my views are better represented, or the pc will be effective and convenient in meeting my needs.
23	
24	
25	
26	It's just another way to push up council tax bills and receive no benefits in return. There is a massive parking problem in this area and double yellow lines are needed.
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	The community were not happy with the relief road and I certainly cannot see happiness with an extension of the parish. For me personally I wouldn't want to see an increase in council tax
33	
34	
35	I see no reason for the transfer of the notified area to Hilperton parish. All our shops and services are in Trowbridge The notified area does not follow and physical boundaries. How much money has been spent / wasted by Wiltshire Council on this unnecessary review?
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	We feel the proposal would create a parish of the correct size and enable local authorities to deliver a quality and equal service, and deliver a strong sense of place and distinctiveness.

43	
44	
45	
46	I want to keep my doctors at Lovemead Practice. How will the change affect refuse collection / recycling?
47	23 - This is a needless boundary change. There are no elements which would bring true benefits to residents. 23 should not go ahead. No real benefits.
48	Not sure how we ended up in Trowbridge as I believed we was always in Hilperton anyway.
49	We were originally part of the Hilperton parish about 15 years ago. Then the boundary was moved so that we (as an address) were transferred to Trowbridge - which is not correct, fair or right. We are closer in distance to Hilperton and have always listed our address as Hilperton. Due to the original placement of the boundary we in this area are much more aligned with the Hilperton parish in relation to attitudes and aspirations.
50	
51	
52	
53	Maintain a green space between Hilperton and Trowbridge to create a strong sense of and local distinctiveness. Especially around St Michaels church and between the church and Trowbridge Road. (Consider an archaeological review of this area)
54	
55	
56	
57	This addition will increase the size of Hilperton parish which will allow increased representation of local opinions and values in Trowbridge Town Council. A positive move.
58	
59	This makes total sense in making the true urban area of Trowbridge more "on the map".
60	
61	Provide a better quality map as this one was very poor quality and difficult to ascertain the changes.
62	
63	
64	The area in question has a sub focus around the school and "village centre" around Budgens with all roads leading out to the rest of Hilperton. There is a sense of community and this proposal will help to consolidate this.
65	

1	SCHEME 24 COMMENTS PAGE - Lady Down Farm (Holt to Trowbridge)
2	
3	You cannot access the area without passing through Trowbridge parish, so makes sense in terms of cohesion and governance, and the canal forms an effective natural boundary for the local community.
4	It establishes the canal as a natural and sustainable boundary between the parishes and makes for a coherent and contiguous Trowbridge parish.
5	the boundary for Area 2, currently within the parish of Holt, should be put to consultation and that the boundary should be changed so that area 2 forms part of Trowbridge. This area was transferred from the old "Bradford Without" to Holt Parish Council under the Wiltshire County Review Order of 1934. The historical association with Bradford on Avon continues, with Holt Parish forming part of the Bradford Community Area and the Bradford Area Board. The residents of the only 3 properties within area 2 have expressed their wish to remain within the parish of Holt. They feel very much part of the Holt community and use the amenities within the parish on a regular basis. Their sense of belonging to the Holt community is strong and they feel that, due to the size of Trowbridge, the sense of community will be lost if the boundary is changed. The town council's argument that amending the boundary line would improve both community identity and efficient and effective community governance has no foundation. The argument that the properties are separated from Holt by a railway line and canal has little merit. If the change were agreed, then the three properties would equally be separated from Trowbridge by the River Biss and a railway line. We would also point out that parishes defined by field boundaries are the norm and not the exception. The town council also state that
6	See enclosed letter. Holt has better leadership and the only interest you have taken in us is now that you want to move the boundaries.
7	Trowbridge councillors have never shown any interest in us before but with these proposed changes they have been all over us like a rash. Quite happy to remain part of strong community in Holt rather than be part of Trowbridge and then add insult to injury and pay more council tax.
8	I have expressed my views in the enclosed letter.

1	SCHEME 25 COMMENTS PAGE - (Hilperton Gap)
2	
3	While the new road may make a natural dividing line, lacking any properties in the area, I cannot see how the proposal meets any other criteria.
4	Hilperton Gap forms an important buffer of undeveloped land between the town of Trowbridge and the village of Hilperton. This land protects Hilperton village from being subsumed into Trowbridge. Therefore it is important that all this land remains part of Hilperton parish so that Trowbridge does not encroach upon it.
5	This is consistent with the recent changes in the area and future proofs the boundary.
6	Inspector made his report) consists of open fields which are not allocated for housing in the 2026 Core Strategy. The parish council would draw the attention of the CGR working group to the comments of the WWDC Local Plan (1st alteration) Inspector when he commented as follows. Please note that, as expected by the Inspector in 2.2.48, there were no substantial earthworks required to construct the Hilperton Relief Road. For your information, the Inspector abolished 'Rural Buffer' areas as his opinion was that they were not needed where settlements had their own development boundaries. 'Trowbridge 2.2.46 The western border of the proposed rural buffer here is drawn tight against the backs of properties mostly in Wyke Road, Victoria Road and Albert Road (to which there is no objection). 2.2.47 This area so contained comprises a series of small fields, separated by hedges, and crossed by a number of public and other footpaths. From my visits to this locality I consider that at present this area appears as a reasonably homogenous tract of open land, although there are subtle differences in landscape character within it. It is partly in agricultural use and partly consists of unused grassland, but there are views of Hilperton and

1	SCHEME 26 COMMENTS PAGE - Old Farm (West Ashton to Trowbridge)
2	
3	The community is entirely separated from the rest of the parish, fully subsumed within Trowbridge and new development to surround it with thousands more properties - so now and in future it fits more properly within Trowbridge
4	This seems to be an attempt to include a rural area within an urban parish. This will undermine any attempt to maintain a green belt around Trowbridge.
5	I object to a rural area being taken over by an urban parish.
6	The area in the map is separate from the rest of West Ashton and clearly has more in common and is closer to Trowbridge. This would make for more effective and convenient local government for existing residents and begins to consider the impact of the urban extension to Trowbridge which clearly needs to be treated as an extension of the town.
7	There will be little (if any) day to day change on local community, sense of pride etc. I understand the need to re-align parish boundaries for those impacted by the parish, but for most little will change. I disagree with this proposal as it will impact on my child's ability to attend West Ashton village school- one reason why I moved here.
8	This is just a way for Trowbridge Council to gain more money from the Council Tax. I do not want to be a part of Trowbridge. The town park is full of drunks urinating in the bushes and all the council spend the money on is County Hall. If asked, I never say I live in Trowbridge but always West Ashton.
9	I purchased my home in the West Ashton parish and I wish to stay in the West Ashton parish.
10	
11	
12	I feel a strong sense of engagement with West Ashton parish and see no benefit to myself in moving to that of Trowbridge. The only reason I can see that this is being proposed is to gain extra money from the area for Trowbridge without any extra supply of services
13	This seems to be a money grabbing exercise by Trowbridge Town council If this goes ahead West Ashton Village parish would lose a lot of income. This could result in the villagers losing a lot of entertainment and identity. We use our village hall for a lot of our social activities. We chose to live in a village, not a town. Keep it as a village.
14	The parish council is working well at present - moving to be included in the Town Council would put added responsibility on the Town Council and I feel this would not be in the overall interest of the West Ashton parish. the sense of "community spirit" would be lost and I feel this is only being suggested as a financial gain to the Trowbridge Town Council. I as a resident bought my property on the understanding that it was in the West Ashton parish and as such enjoy the community spirit. To quote an adage "If it's not broken don't mend it". Leave West Ashton as it is. Another factor is devaluating the property worth
15	This is an act of grubby land grabbing. Why not take in London while you're at it?
16	
17	I would prefer to stay in West Ashton and I see no benefit in moving the boundaries. You are not doing it to benefit residents - only due to the vast building site to propose to cover our lovely greens fields with
18	

1	SCHEME 27 COMMENTS PAGE - West Ashton Employment Land (West Ashton to Trowbridge)
2	
3	Along with 28, the area is to be an urban expansion of the town. In addition to the community looking more to Trowbridge, West Ashton wishes to remain a rural parish - which will not be the case if this land is retained in their parish. Do they want to change their character to that of an urban parish or not?
4	This will include another rural area within an urban parish. This will undermine any attempts at maintaining a green belt around Trowbridge.
5	As a resident in North Bradley parish, I want to keep our rural identity. I do not want to be part of the urban Trowbridge parish. North Bradley needs to remain distinct from Trowbridge. Only by remaining separate can we maintain a green belt between the two parishes.
6	This reflects recent changes and proposals for the area and urban extensions so needs to take place to ensure Trowbridge is a cohesive and coherent town with effective, convenient governance.
7	
8	I was not aware the industrial land was on the east side of the West Ashton Road. How stupid is that, putting it next to a housing development. I thought Persimmons was granted a extension to planning if they got on with it. No sign of any work going on.
9	
10	
11	This seems to be a money grabbing exercise by Trowbridge Town Council. If this goes ahead West Ashton Village Parish will lose a lot of income. This could result in the villagers losing a lot of entertainment and their identity as a village. We use our village hall a lot for our social activities. This would be a great loss to us as a couple. We like living in a village not a town.
12	I wish to stay in the West Ashton parish.
13	
14	Same comment as for 4a (26) - see my response
15	Moving the boundary would not preserve the rural aspect. It will reduce the value of the properties beyond this hatched proposed area and increases the responsibility of Trowbridge Town council which at present has enough commitment with the amount of redevelopment currently ongoing within the boundaries.
16	You have done nothing for your existing community but take!
17	Same comment as 4a (26). See my response
18	

1	SCHEME 28 COMMENTS PAGE - Ashton Park Urban extension (West Ashton to Trowbridge)
2	
3	As with 27, the area is to be an urban expansion, in order to be cohesive it needs to be in Trowbridge.
4	This seems to be an attempt to include a rural area within an urban parish. This will ruin any attempt at maintaining a green belt between the town and the surrounding villages.
5	I object to a rural area being absorbed into an urban parish. The are in question is an important green belt break between Trowbridge and surrounding villages.
6	This is an excellent proposal and needs to take place to secure the future of Trowbridge as a coherent and contiguous area.
7	
8	Again this is just an excuse for Trowbridge Council to make more money. You moved the West Ashton border signs years ago so you have made your mind up. I have no intention of staying here much longer. I'm embarrassed to say I live in Trowbridge
9	
10	
11	This seems to be a money grabbing exercise by Trowbridge Town Council If this goes ahead West Ashton Village Parish will lose a lot of income. This could result in the villagers losing a lot of their entertainment and their identity as a village. We use our village hall a lot for our social activities. This would be a great lose to us as a couple. Keep West Ashton as a village. We like living in a village, not a town.
12	
13	
14	Same comment as 4a (26) - see my response
15	Having attended the public meeting in County Hall on the 11 May 2016, I feel there was not sufficient reasons for the boundaries to be moved and assume this is potentially just a financial gain to the town. West Ashton will lose their community spirit.
16	Why not just sell off the other half of the park you haven't sold already
17	

1	SCHEME 29 COMMENTS PAGE
2	
3	The urban expansion extends to this area, creating a single urban entity stretching up to the west Ashton parish. The inclusion of the business park is irrelevant, but the loss would not negatively impact the community governance of North Bradley, so no objection.
4	We were always promised a green barrier with Trowbridge, not an extension of the Trowbridge development area. North Bradley is a desirable place to live, Trowbridge is rapidly becoming the opposite.
5	The North Bradley parish has its own distinctive identity. To include it within Trowbridge will lose this distinctive feel and put more countryside at risk of urban sprawl.
6	The North Bradley parish has its own distinctive identity. To include it within Trowbridge will lose this distinctive feel and put more countryside at risk of urban sprawl.
7	I object to a rural area being absorbed into an urban parish. This area forms part of the important green break between Trowbridge and the surrounding villages.
8	I would like to know which parish or town council has requested the review and when a review was last carried out. The timing of this review is coincidentally at the same time as development is being proposed in our parish. Being part of the parish of North Bradley is important to us. We are within the catchment area for the local school and would be responsible for paying for repairs to North Bradley church if required - something we took out an indemnity against when we bought the property. Changing the boundaries of Trowbridge to incorporate Drynham Lane would be very detrimental to our community. We are a small lane with no street lights and a rural feel. There is a clear demarcation of fields between us and Trowbridge and a stream that has been the boundary between Trowbridge and North Bradley for centuries. There is no benefit to Trowbridge that I can see.
9	
10	It is clear why Trowbridge would want to annex this area - largely relating to revenue! It can only harm North Bradley to bring Trowbridge's boundary to the edge of North Bradley and Yarnbrook's built areas in this way. To retain the character of North Bradley Parish, it is vitally important to have control of both an area important for employment and open areas characteristic of the parish, with clear separation from Trowbridge. The attempt to take this area from the Parish is seen as a step towards swallowing up North Bradley into Trowbridge, urban interests taking priority through force of numbers. This can only harm all the factors listed in Q.6 above, deliberately damaging the community's belief they can have some say in the governance of the Parish in which they live.
11	The future of the highlighted area is not a rural one. It is closer to Trowbridge than North Bradley village and its inclusion in the town boundaries would recognise this and future growth prospects and place the boundary on a more settled footing. It would also secure North Bradley's focus as a village.
12	This is a cover up so that Trowbridge Council can get planning for houses without going through the parish council. Leave North Bradley alone. My family have lived here for 25 years, happy years. We do not need Trowbridge council.
13	I will email my written response to cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk shortly.
14	I am more than happy with North Bradley Parish Council and the facilities they offer as well as the size of my parish.
15	I've no interest in joining the Parish of Trowbridge. I am happy with the way North Bradley governs me and its close proximity to me.
16	Please see attached letter for my views. (Filed on Consultation folder - J Robinson)

17	See attached letter. Filed on Consultation file - A Robinson
18	See separate sheet - filed on consultation file - T Jones

1	SCHEMES 100 (Merger) 2 Salisbury to Laverstock) AND 3 (Laverstock to Salisbury) COMMENTS PAGE
2	
3	All SCC Council members are elected in fully contested elections. Nearly half of Laverstock and Ford PC are co-opted as insufficient candidates put themselves forward for election.
4	Large parts of Laverstock/Ford are nearer to the Market Place than parts of Bemerton. It is only fair that Laverstock residents should share in the cost of Salisbury services which they use on a daily basis rather than have Bemerton & Friary residents subsidise them. The latter are Wiltshire's most deprived areas!
5	Proposal 100: Geography, daily practice as well as basic fairness are in clear favour of a formal merger. Laverstock residents avail themselves of all Salisbury services due to their proximity. Basic fairness demands that they should not be subsidised by the disadvantaged of say Bemerton & The Friary!
6	Scheme 100 - I'm aware residents do not approve of the proposal in Laverstock, and there is a degree of separation, but looking at the reality of Salisbury, the overall community is characterised by large estates flowing out from the centre, and Laverstock seems to fit that pattern.
7	
8	
9	
10	I'm a resident of Hampton Park and strongly object to Scheme 100 and Scheme 3. It is evidently an attempt to charge residents of Hampton Park a higher precept for nothing in return. I'm perfectly happy with the status quo.
11	
12	Scheme 2 - Bishopdown Farm does not feel to be part of Salisbury City, and has a cohesion, shared character and interests with Laverstock & Ford. Bishopdown Farm as a whole should be in the same parish, and that parish should be Laverstock and Ford. Could I also comment that in my opinion the questionnaire questions in some places lack clarity and are ambiguous e.g. the use of the term 'above', where there are a number of proposals 'above'.
13	Re scheme 100. Laverstock parish council provides value for money. Salisbury City council is extravagant with tax payers money. I do not use facilities in Salisbury. I do not want to be part of Salisbury or anything to do with it. Salisbury is so bad I shop in Southampton. This proposal is purely about expanding Salisbury city council precept base to pay for their extravagant spending on projects I DO NOT USE. I find it unbelievable some Salisbury City councillors think they can just take over a prosperous local community such as Laverstock. It is outrageous.
14	Scheme 2 Given that Laverstock has three senior schools serving the immediate area of Bishopdown and Ford it would seem appropriate that the parish size reflects this ongoing responsibility.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

21	Scheme 3 I believe that the houses to the south of Pearce Way should move to Salisbury but those to the north i.e. Riverdown Park should stay in the Laverstock and Ford Parish. Pearce Way would be a good demarcation line Ve
22	Comment on scheme 100 and 3. Laverstock and Ford Parish Council has been around for more than 100 years and manages its parish in an effective manner using volunteers to run community assets. Through this effective management it has kept the local precept low but delivered very high degrees of service. Salisbury City Parish is an inefficient parish employing a larger number of staff. This leads to a lack of local volunteers and therefore lack of pride. The city parish council seem to only care about the city area and does not provide good services to the outer areas. As a resident of L&FPC living at Hampton Park it will be a disaster for the city parish to take over. Out voice will be lost.
23	Scheme 100 - as it affects my property. Reading through the proposal I see nothing that tells me what there is to be gained. The only thing I can see is that it will give Salisbury Council more access to funds through extra revenue in council tax. Before agreeing to this Salisbury need to sell the idea to the community. The questions asked regarding each scheme are meaningless without more information.
24	
25	Scheme 2 Why have the Bishopdown cottages been left out of the proposal to move properties into Laverstock & Ford PC. This will only isolate these residents. Why is the closing date for return of this questionnaire only 2 days after the consultation in Laverstock giving people very little chance to respond after the consultation meeting.
26	Scheme 2 includes the country park. Whilst this is part of the Hampton Park development, I believe that there would be merit in letting this be part of Salisbury City Council but not the associated houses.
27	
28	
29	Scheme 100: I feel strongly feel that if Laverstock parish was to be absorbed into Salisbury City it would seriously affect the ability of local people, to sit on their Parish Council, and have influence over issues in their area. If they were absorbed it would only be so that an outlying area could financially support the cities bad spending record
30	
31	General comment: Laverstock and Ford Parish council provide an excellent level of communication, they engender a real sense of local community. Therefore, we feel that we should stay as part of Laverstock and Ford PC. Scheme 3: Ultimately a key factor in Schemes 2 and 3 appears to be what the residents of Hampton Park want, but scheme 3 seems designed to reduce the size of Laverstock and Ford Parish, at a time when there is clear pressure to remove Laverstock and Ford parish altogether, it should therefore not come as a surprise if those outside of Hampton Park vote only in agreement with Scheme 2 (or in favour of scheme 100).
32	100, Laverstock & Ford should stay as it is
33	leave whats well alone!
34	Laverstock & Ford are separate communities from Salisbury and should remain so . Costs to the Laverstock and Ford community would increase if merged, you are being deliberately vague on this point, Laverstock and Ford is generally a rural parish , please leave them alone

35	Scheme 100. It is patently obvious from both the map and on the ground that Laverstock is in reality part of 'Salisbury' community. Laverstock can and should remain a separate 'community' or ward within the larger Salisbury City Parish. This will provide the local cohesion while the parish responsibilities can be governed by an effective council with paid officers. The current arrangements are such that L&FPC is unable to provide any of the services we have come to expect. There are no funds for communities outside Laverstock and any requests are met with refusals or pointing at WC. All very inefficient and ineffective. Scheme 2 & 3. L&FPC have been Laverstock centric for many years and ignored the needs of Bishopdown Farm. This has become a political battle with complete disregard of good governance and honesty. We are now being told that everything can be done by volunteers – it is patently obvious that this is pi e in the sky. Bishopdown Farm has no connection with Laverstock – we residents live in Salisbury.
36	
37	Scheme 100. Bigger is not necessarily better when it is a parish council. I consider Salisbury City Council is already too big to properly represent and meet detailed local needs and interests and consider it should be looking at ways to divide itself into smaller parish councils. I chose to live in Laverstock last year because of its distinctive differences from the city, differences which I consider are better reflected in its separate parish council rather than vying for priority with other sub-local needs in a greater Salisbury City Council.
38	
39	scheme 100,2,3.Please leave us alone to develop our rural/semi rural parish, near but not in Salisbury. It has worked successfully for many years so we are happy to remain as we are.
40	Scheme 100 : The merger of the two parishes would be completely detrimental to the residents of Laverstock. The Laverstock Parish Council works tirelessly to improve the local community - as exemplified by the development of the Community Farm.
41	
42	100: Local problems need local solutions. It seems to me that the present parish council do a good job for the parish. 2 & 3: there are already many links between the areas in question and these should be encouraged, respected, and enhanced.
43	Scheme 100. L&F residents have already voted to stay independent of Salisbury why is this now being ignored - the community has stated its wishes. The details of Motion 27 made by 2 Wiltshire councillors who represent Salisbury City St Paul and St Francis Wards do not represent L&F and therefore should not be trying to undo a decision that has already been taken by local people who live in the area. This review is about community and not politics. L&F residents want to remain independent of Salisbury and therefore Motion 27 should be dismissed.
44	
45	
46	
47	Scheme 2 is the only option. Both Laverstock and Ford are villages with historic identities and the residents (including myself) believe that schemes 100 and 3 will wipe out our closely-guarded identity as villages. We are adjacent to Salisbury - not a part of the City - and this is the way it must stay.
48	I want to stay as Laverstock and Ford Parish as they have served our needs really well in the 25 years I've been here. I do not want to be part of a larger more urban community. Leave us as we were with the other houses joining as part of our rural community.
49	

50	Leave us alone! We're fine as we are! We're near Salisbury, not in Salisbury. Salisbury residents are welcome to visit and use our facilities anytime - for free.
51	
52	
53	
54	With respect to Scheme 100, Laverstock and Ford are NOT part of Salisbury! We are a semi-rural village on the edge and do NOT want to be in a city... THIS is our identity! We are a good working community which does not need nor will benefit from any change. With respect to Scheme 2, it simply makes common sense to allow Bishopdown Farm to join Laverstock & Ford as they were originally part of this parish, and looking at the map should naturally be included.
55	Scheme 100: In my opinion Laverstock is a distinctive village outside of Salisbury. It is geographically close, but none of the culture is that of a city. It has a definite village life and a particularly close-knit community, and it should be able to remain a village.
56	Scheme 100 As former Harnham residents who moved to Laverstock 2 years ago my family and we have been staggered by the strong sense of community and feeling of belonging we have now being part of the Laverstock Parish. This community feeling was something that we did not even realise we were missing (and was never realised) during the 17 years we lived in Harnham. Frankly the attempt by the larger and more powerful SCC to consume Laverstock and Ford parish is incredibly upsetting and seems to be placing no value on the local governance within our parish along with the sense of community the parish emboldens. From the farm to the countryside walks and the soon to be Country Park the work done by our Laverstock Parish Council for its residents is astounding. From my family's perspective living in Laverstock scheme 100 seems to have no up side for us at all. Geographically we feel separate from Salisbury and with the Spinny Walk at one end of our road and the Community Farm at the other, Laverstock, with its community spirit and its rural surroundings to us is something special and to be treasured.
57	Scheme 100: Laverstock & Ford remain a semi-rural area and do not naturally fit with the more urban environment of the city. Furthermore, with the emphasis on "localism" in the UK, this realignment represents - in my opinion - a reversal of that trend.
58	Scheme 2 - Over the last few years it appears that Wiltshire and/or Salisbury councils have done little to maintain the good appearance of Salisbury City and environs, whereas Laverstock and Ford Parish Council take great pride in their area. I would like to be part of that !
59	Laverstock has a long history of being run by a successful Parish Council. When we moved to the area three years ago we were swayed by the fact that we would be in a rural Parish not part of a city.
60	
61	
62	Proposal 100 makes little sense and is simply about growth, Salisbury city is the closest destination for the parish in the same way as it is for many other neighbouring parishes. Where do you draw the line. Proposal 2 makes sense as a resident of Bishopdown farm. My local shops, schools, pub, takeaway is all in the parish. Bishopdown Farm should be in the same parish as Hampton park, wherever that is.
63	Proposal 100 makes little sense and is simply about growth, Salisbury city is the closest destination for the parish in the same way as it is for many other neighbouring parishes. Where do you draw the line. Proposal 2 makes sense as a resident of Bishopdown farm. My local shops, schools, pub, takeaway is all in the parish. Bishopdown Farm should be in the same parish as Hampton park, wherever that is.

64	Scheme 100 I live in what was the original settlement of Ford; a semi rural area and have no connection with the huge development across the water meadows. I wish to be administered by a local, non political Parish Council not by a very political urban council based in Salisbury. I am a Governor at OSPS and have seen first hand the many hours that the local council has put in to improve amenities there. Your map does not even show the school and estate and community centre. Local councillors should be just that, answerable to their local community. I am quite sure if Salisbury does swallow us up, then the costs of Mayor making, processing in full fig and insuring chains will rocket. This would not benefit our community. The strapline "where everyone matters" really does apply to us; we do not matter to Salisbury and I do not wish to, I am happy as we are.
65	
66	
67	
68	
69	scheme 100: The service provided by the Parish Council on behalf of the residents is exceptional. Merging with Salisbury would leave the residents seriously and detrimentally unrepresented. Most of the points in the motion to be debated are extremely biased towards Salisbury city and give a good indication of how Laverstock & Ford would be adversely treated in the future should the merger go ahead.
70	
71	Ref scheme 100 - I am extremely content with the current governance of the Hampton Park area within Laverstock and Ford Parish. I am concerned by Salisbury Councils repeated attempts to absorb the parish and believe that this would act to diminish the sense of community in the area. Ref scheme 2 - Given the location of the Bishopdown Farm area I would welcome the idea of the addition of this area to the Laverstock and Ford Parish area. Ref scheme 3 I oppose movement of the Hampton Park properties into the Salisbury Council area as I am happy with the current Laverstock and Ford Parish governance.
72	
73	Proposal 100 does not reflect the wishes of the residents in the Parish of Laverstock and Ford. This survey gives no room for a rejection of all the new proposals - i.e. to leave things as they are! If you MUST do something, then proposal 2 makes the most sense.
74	Scheme 3 I agree with Scheme 3 in that it will form parish areas of manageable size and allow Laverstock & Ford to continue its excellent LOCAL work: They are great communicators; their Newsletter is much appreciated They are small enough to truly represent the community without the burden of career councillors making party political points. True democracy and a rare understanding of the local community. Additionally I do not believe that Salisbury City Council has the infrastructure or strength to absorb anything bigger than this.
75	We just want to say how thoroughly SICK AND TIRED we are at having to express these views three times. PLEASE LISTEN TO US!!
76	
77	Strongly disagree to be merged with Salisbury City Council. Our dedicated PC do a fantastic job and we need to left alone to develop our rural/semi rural parish with councillors have nothing but The Parish at heart, and who's forebearers have served the parish faithfully since 1896.The last thing we want is a council which does not have this Parish at heart but has a different agenda, mainly Salisbury City. We want and need our local democracy which currently works so well and not some inferior watered down version of a council whose only real interest in us is our council tax

78	Scheme 100 - This has NOTHING to do with any positive impact on the population of Laverstock and Ford, it is merely an exercise in leveraging more money out of the residents to fill council coffers, and to attempt to dress it up as anything other than a 'land grab' by the council is disingenuous at best.
79	I have lived here since 2002 and in all that time I have never before seen any motion for us to become part of the now City Council. In fact we have been treated over that period of time, as a parish in the fact that until this past year, our bus service was almost that of a village. Hourly buses used to be the norm, with little or no provision in the evening. Often having that bus cancelled also. Not terribly funny in the winter. I see no move to include Old Sarum into this review. We have previously made our views clear on this proposal. Where is the local democracy that we are supposed to have. Please would someone explain what services we have that Salisbury City provide, that is not already available to other parishes. I am currently a trustee of our community hall and work closely with the parish magazine for the health of our hall. Many of our residents of the estate and parish communicate their use of the hall, which encourages a lasting provision in our community. The schools take pupils from all over the whole district, and were never ever considered City Schools when I attended one of them. If they are city schools, then why do they need such extensive bus provision. It would also seem that the most avid voices to
80	SCHEME 100. Having lived in the Parish of Ford & Laverstock in excess of 23 years, I have always been very impressed by the commitment of our Parish Council. One of its main strengths is the lack of political bias, unlike Salisbury City Council. Our community is always kept informed of current issues by means of an excellent parish magazine and frequent newsletters. I feel our councillors truly represent the views of our community. I have no faith that that would be the case if we were part of Salisbury City Council. Localism has worked well for us in the past, please allow it to continue.
81	SCHEME 100 Having lived in the parish of Ford and Laverstock for in excess of 23 years, I have always been very impressed by the commitment and judgement shown by our parish council. In my opinion, one of its main strengths is its lack of political bias, unlike Salisbury City Council. Our community is kept well-informed of current issues by means of an excellent parish magazine and regular newsletters. I feel our councillors seek the views of the people it serves and truly represents them. I fear this would not be the case if we became part of the much larger parish of Salisbury City Council. I suspect the main reason to include us in their parish is financial. Localism has served us well in the past, please allow it to continue.
82	Laverstock parish should include Ford, Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park to form a semi-rural parish. Bishopdown Park farmland was always part of Laverstock Parish and should come back. Hampton Park (and Riverdown) should remain part of the Laverstock Parish, as it has been for over 20 years. I have no wish for Laverstock, Ford, Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park to merge with Salisbury City Council. This is a comment on Schemes 100, 2 and 3.
83	
84	
85	
86	
87	
88	I strongly believe that governance should be local and that power should be vested in those who can be held accountable at the most local level. I am therefore strongly in favour of schemes 100 and 2 and equally strongly opposed to scheme 3. Laverstock and Ford (and Bishopdown Farm) should have local governance and not be subsumed within the greater Salisbury City Council.
89	The building in the Old Sarum area will increase the size of the Parish without joining Salisbury. We want to retain some autonomy.
90	We want to stay free from Salisbury and independent in scheme 100 along with 2

91	Please leave our parish as it is , this has worked perfectly well in the past!!
92	
93	
94	
95	Schemes 100 and 3 have absolutely no benefit to the local community of Laverstock and Ford Parish. Merging Laverstock and Ford into Salisbury Parish would damage the identity and history of the community which is currently thriving. Scheme 2 would bring homes that should already be within the Laverstock and Ford parish into the close knit community that already exists.
96	I want Laverstock to stay separate from Salisbury because the parish council do a wonderful job and are easily contacted, they know the area and what is best for the area. Our local councillors work hard to keep our parish the best.
97	SCHEME 100 I am in my late eighties and have lived and worked in Ford for many years. During this time the Parish Council has served me well by keeping me informed, via newsletters and visits, and representing my views. I don't think Salisbury City Council will have the same commitment towards the residents of Laverstock and Ford. I am strongly against the proposed take over.
98	Scheme 100 - I have already voted once and feel those views should have been listened to already. I feel a strong sense of belonging to Laverstock, which is a distinct village from Salisbury with a strong parish council, community groups (esp farm), our own shops, pub and social club. Scheme 2 - we already share a parish newsletter with Bishopdown farm and feel that they are part of the community.
99	
100	Leave us alone to develop our rural/semi rural parish, near but not in Salisbury. All Salisbury residents are welcome to visit and enjoy themselves-free! The Parish precept is not part of the Governance criteria. However, as all know, Salisbury continually make it clear that it is all about making us pay for their mismanagement/poor negotiations and delusions of grandeur.
101	
102	Scheme 100 is anti democratic. The vast majority of residents in L&F have said they wish to merger with Salisbury Parish Council. L&F is run well and is not political and run in the best interests of the Parish, in any newly merged Council representation would mean L&F would be a minority number on the Council. Additional funding into the newly merged Council would be disproportionate and would not equate to additional services delivered to L&F. The identity of L&F is rural and very different from the City who have a very different view on how to manage the Parish. No thank you to the merger.
103	Scheme 100: There is a clear community boundary between Salisbury City and Laverstock and Ford Parish Council. The two areas are totally different in nature and require different governance.
104	
105	
106	
107	Sense of community within our area we have excellent doctors surgery, a shop along with a good veterinary practice. Outstanding infants and junior schools. We also have our community centre this is a lot more than other areas of Salisbury. The residents have a sense of community doing regular litter picks to ensure we don't become a litter infested area .

108	There is a sense of civic pride in Ford and Laverstock which I feel would be lost if involved any further with the SDC. The population in the Ford and Laverstock area are generally listened to by local councillors etc., and every effort is made to find a solution. I do not believe that the historical track record do SDC would in any way enhance our way of life.
109	
110	Scheme 2: Laverstock, Ford and Bishopdown Farm are village communities and to incorporate them into Salisbury City would change their nature and sense of identity. They have a lively sense of village community and cohesion as villages outside the City.
111	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council is a large parish and therefore justifies its separate status. It is significantly different to Salisbury in that it is semi rural and makes sense to have its own council which is more focussed on the needs of that community. We would welcome the return of Bishopdown residents as our near neighbours with whom we share many facilities. I would also wish to retain the Laverstock Parish Council as it is cheaper and therefore represents better value for money to its community.
112	L&F PC is a rural parish which share a border with the city. Our residents feel part of our community, not as part of the city. Being part of a non-political parish benefits our residents greatly, as does our parish newsletter and website which are directed to our residents' needs.
113	Concerning Scheme 100 I object because Salisbury City Council is not equipped to manage a rural parish and has demonstrated a complete lack of environmental skill in its management of the city. The community in the local parish is quite different to that of a city. Secondly Ford and Laverstock is not a city parish and would not respond to this approach. 99.3% of residents do not wish this to happen and so the matter should be left alone. We already contribute tax above what should be required to a poorly managed council and yet we have the facilities and countryside (excluding unnecessary development) that Salisbury residents are free to enjoy. Scheme 2 would seem most appropriate to allow Bishopdown Farm back into the local parish, this land was originally part of Laverstock and Ford Parish council
114	
115	Salisbury & Wiltshire Council at being an absolute waste of space for example the millions of pounds wasted on the five rivers leisure centre that looks no different! or homes 4 Wiltshire the biggest waste of tax payers resources possible. Leave our Parish alone as Laverstock with the added 200 homes from BD Farm!. Long live our guider Cllr McLennan. scheme 100 3.
116	100 - Laverstock and Ford is not anti-Salisbury. We welcome people to come and use our open spaces, and are glad to have schools serving Salisbury as well. But we feel our ability to do that as an independent parish is greater than were we absorbed into Salisbury City.
117	Scheme 100 appears to be money grabbing at its worst. It is unnecessary and most of all unwanted by those most affected by it. Elected people must listen to the people, it must not go ahead. Scheme 2, since moving into this area I have been impressed by the sense of community and I fear that would be diminished if the proposal to merge goes ahead. Scheme 3, this area was part of Laverstock and Ford (L&F) in the past, right the wrong and return it to L&F.
118	Laverstock, Ford and Old Sarum have a strong sense of community which has a far more rural feel than Salisbury. Merger with Salisbury would destroy this community feel and merge two very different area types with different needs, this could negatively effect both areas.
119	
120	
121	Laverstock and Ford do great job; we don't want or need to move under the city.

122	Scheme 3: We are happy and feel more part of the Laverstock Community than if we were amalgamated into Salisbury City, therefore don't think it should change. A merger would be too big and you lose a sense of local community.
123	1. Salisbury parish has made it clear that they don't think we are paying our way. We all pay the WC council tax and that is almost every service covered. We pay Salisbury for use of the crem and Guildhall. Their parks and car parks are of no use to us, as they are remote from our parish. They have openly said that it all about having our money to take on street cleaning in Salisbury! That's a bit rich, to say the least! Their parish council is political and divided, with delusions of grandeur. No one in their right mind would want to be part of that governance! 2. Bishopdown Farm uses all the facilities at Hampton Park - shops, drs, dentist, vet, local shop, pavilion, green, school, country park. They receive, by request, the Laverstock & Ford Parish Newsletter, delivered 6 times annually and full of all the local news and clubs + events, for local residents. If anyone has to move, it should be them coming back to the parish where e they were originally. 3. No way should Hampton park move out of L&F. They are over 20 years old as an estate and have always been fully serviced and represented by L&F PC. They have representatives on L&F PC, which is non political and always does its best for our local needs, in all our communities.
124	All proposals. We should keep the identity of the parish. The possible extra cost of being taken over by Salisbury will probably not be reflected in the services provided.
125	
126	Scheme 100 - Laverstock is a well governed parish with a distinctive rural identity but with the benefits of close proximity to Salisbury. This is one of the main reasons we moved to this parish, so we are very much against this aspect, as it could lead to more new house building over green space, etc.
127	The 'area affected' is Salisbury as well as Laverstock.
128	
129	Comments re all schemes - I purchased my home in Laverstock as I did not want to live within the city area. I value the village of Laverstock and do not know anyone in the are who supports you. Laverstock is clearly separate to Salisbury both geographically and communally. There is no sense in joining them together that is to the benefit of Laverstock residents. We support Salisbury, amongst other things, as business customers and car park payers. We do not I believe 'take' from Salisbury. Becoming part of Salisbury will just mean the Salisbury 'takes' from Laverstock without offering any of the support currently given to them by us.
130	Scheme 100: I am totally against this because the phrase " To Merge" would, in reality, be a Takeover. Further, the citizens of Laverstock & Ford voted on this recently - but are now being asked to do so again, because Salisbury City did not like the result of some 98% against the proposal.
131	I have seen NO CREDIBLE EVIDENCE to justify ANY of the proposed boundary changes, so on paper, the proposals appear to be for political gains and financial incentive rather than any kind of community or environmental benefit. I do, however, feel that Scheme 2 to move Bishopdown Farm to Laverstock & Ford provides for the most credible re-alignment of parishes for the following reasons: There are already good relationships between the two communities; My daughter and others regularly use the Pavillion for Guides and other activities; there is more in common between Bishopdown Farm and Laverstock in terms of green space and semi-rural areas than there would be under Scheme 100.
132	
133	
134	

135	Scheme 100 Having been brought up in Salisbury I chose to live in Laverstock as an adult for the rural aspects, village life and sense of community. Making Salisbury council larger does not mean it will be better. Bigger is not always better as is well known. If Salisbury council are unable to arrange adequate funding with Wilts CC to take over the assets which Wilts CC now wish to off load they should not even consider doing so. Scheme 2&3 Laverstock PC has made a good job of running the parish over the years and all the Residents Count so long may they continue.
136	
137	We are commenting on proposals, Scheme 100, 2 & 3. We have a good strong Parish Council in Laverstock & Ford, which we're sure the residents of Hampton Park would be happy to stay with. There's also more chance of the land to the north of Hampton Park (scheme 3) being properly maintained by those living around it than people in Salisbury who'd never use it!
138	Scheme 100 We are a rural parish and have no desire to be part of 'the city' who have for decades proven to be very poor at managing anything. Why do you think you have the right to ruin our way of life because you want it. We don't want it so leave us alone. The very way this has been dealt with tells us what a disaster joining with 'Salisbury' would be.
139	Scheme 100:- Laverstock & Ford Parish is separated from Salisbury Parish on its western side by the A345 and by the course of the River Bourne. The ridge running east from Castle Hill constitutes a natural boundary between the Ford and Old Sarum parts of L & F Parish and Salisbury Parish. There are community Halls in both Old Sarum and Laverstock as well as local schools and shops, which provide focal points and identity for the parish. The parish is therefore separate and distinct from Salisbury and should remain so. General point:- Your accompanying letter does not mention that the working group you set up previously found in favour of keeping L & F Parish independent. You are therefore hiding the fact that you are biased in favour of Salisbury PC and are in collusion with the PC to get the result you want. Is not the real reason behind this second bite of the cherry, that Salisbury wants the extra income from the increased Council Tax which will arise? And of course, if the merger goes ahead it will ensure that the houses at Longhedge will also be taken into Salisbury. I would appreciate a response to this comment but I doubt I will get one.
140	SCHEME 2: Bishopdown Farm was originally part of Laverstock & Ford PC and should be returned having more in common with Hampton Park, Riverdown Park & Ford. Preservation of historic links is very important. SCHEME 100: This is a cynical proposal to remove 'effective and convenient' local government from parishioners in a county 'where everybody matters' according to the slogan. This proposal will sadly only benefit Salisbury City & Wiltshire Council, and is totally unacceptable!
141	Scheme 2: Bishopdown Farm was originally part of Laverstock and Ford PC and should be returned having more in common with Hampton Park, Riverdown Park and Ford than with Salisbury City. Preservation of Historic Links is priceless. Scheme 100: This is a cynical proposal to remove 'effective and convenient' local government from parishioners in a county where supposedly, according to the slogan, 'everybody matters'. Sadly this proposal, if implemented, will only benefit Salisbury City and Wiltshire Council, which is totally unacceptable.

142	<p>Scheme 100: I disagree because people who live in Laverstock CP already have a pride in an inclusive community and voluntary activities which will cannot be improved by merging with the very different area represent the city of Salisbury itself. Under this proposal the existing systems for meeting our local needs will be lost. There will be a serious risk that they will be overlooked by a council whose main responsibility is for the historic and beautiful city of Salisbury. Scheme 2: I believe that this is the best option. It unites the two sections of Hampton Park and ensures that their needs are considered at the same time as the new development at Riverdown Park which will be sharing many services with Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park. This scheme also continues to recognise the very clear difference between the needs of the areas covered by Laverstock CP and those in, or close to, the centre of Salisbury. I am confident that if this option is chosen people living in Laverstock CP will continue to take pride in their local area and activities, while continuing to wholeheartedly support activities in the city centre. It also ensures that we will be represented by local councillors who genuinely and fully understand the</p>
143	
144	<p>Scheme 2 - I feel that the whole of the Bishopdown Farm area should be part of the Laverstock and Ford Parish to help maintain the sense of local identity as this has proved effective in the past.</p>
145	<p>Scheme 100 I totally disagree that Laverstock and Ford should become part of Salisbury, we would loose our rural and semi rural appeal, we already have a very strong inclusive community and an excellent voluntary sector and our local authority deliver excellent services. Should we become part of Salisbury all this would be lost and I believe that Salisbury could not and would not a better job. The parishioners of Laverstock and Ford welcome any visitors from Salisbury or surrounding areas to come and enjoy what we have to offer free of charge, I say this because I feel this is about Salisbury wanting more cash to squander. Scheme 2 & 3 Moving Bishopdown Farm from Salisbury to Laverstock and Ford would strengthen our community further and create a parish that would enable our local authority to deliver enhanced quality services.</p>
146	
147	
148	<p>Scheme 100, 2 and 3 Bishopdown Farm was originally part of Laverstock and Ford Parish and wish very strongly to return. Hampton Park, including Riverdown, have been part of L&V from the outset, 21 years ago. Residents have no wish to move to Salisbury. All the above communities take pride in being part of a semi-rural/ rural setting, free to develop what is in the interest of the people of our parish, rather than have restraints imposed on us by 'outside' forces.</p>
149	<p>Schemes 2 and 3. I wish Laverstock & Ford Parish to remain independent of Salisbury and as such stay as an independent parish in a rural area with a village identity.</p>
150	<p>The parish council is run by local people living in the area with a knowledge of local problems as they arise which could not be matched by Wiltshire council making decisions fro afar.</p>
151	

152	These are comments on all 3 schemes. We have lived in Laverstock for over 20 years having lived in many other parts of UK previously. Throughout these entire 20+ years, our local Parish Council has been highly active and virtually non-political. It has always acted decisively and usually effectively in promoting the interests of local residents and the long term interests of our parish (both great and tiny); always with an outstanding degree of local consultation and financial management. I am quite sure that if merged with the Salisbury Parish Council, our specific local issues would be submerged in the plethora of other important issues generated by the other Salisbury Wards with which the Salisbury Council is necessarily involved. Laverstock & Ford Parish Council has a very distinguished track record, and the inclusion of the recently developed estates at Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park into Laverstock Parish would be both logical and cost-effective.
153	100. As Barrettes and David Wilson Homes insisted we had to be responsible for the roads, drains, communal grass areas and lighting in this development, I am assuming that if are denied our request to stay within the boundary of Laverstock and Ford that the proportion of our Council Tax that goes towards the cost of maintaining our estates will be deducted from our council Tax? Residents in Bishopdown and the other estates in Salisbury have these items taken care of by the Council, we should not have to pay it twice! We do not have the convenience of living on the edge of town and should be treated the same way as Winterbourne and Porton are as a village. We like the community feel of Laverstock and are happy with our own Councillors. We contribute to Salisbury by paying extortionate parking fees even to visit the dentist or go the the bank. We feel the Council is using us as a cash cow and has no consideration for the people involved. We don't see messy verges and expensive parking in Trowbridge like we have in this part of the County, perhaps if you want more money you should look at that first of all?
154	Just leave Laverstock, Ford, Hampton Park and Bishopdown Farm to continue as they are. Salisbury residents are welcome to visit at any time. We do not charge. They can visit the Riverbourne Farm. Their children attend schools. Just leave us alone please to continue as we are and have done for many years.
155	
156	Schemes 1 and 3. These schemes will do nothing to develop localism nor will they effect any increase in a sense of community, in fact they will have the opposite effect. The true motivation behind the proposals is to generate an increase in the income received by Salisbury City. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that any of increased funds will be used to benefit or develop the unique rural facilities within Laverstock and Ford.
157	
158	Scheme 100: Looking at the map there is a clear, logical separation of Laverstock from Salisbury due to the natural boundary of the river and the man made railway line. I really value our distinct rural community identity between the river and the chalk downs and DO NOT WANT to become part of the Salisbury parish.....we are not Salisbury.
159	
160	scheme 100 We enjoy a semi rural environment. Incorporation with Salisbury would mean a loss of local democracy with a very effective parish council working for Laverstock. Green spaces need to be protected.

161	Moving Hampton Park and Laverstock into the city will destroy the strong sense of local community and pride in living within these unique, semi-rural, on the edge of the city, locations. The proposal to move Bishopdown Farm (where I previously lived before moving into a new house at Riverdown Park) into the Laverstock and Ford parish makes complete sense, given the close sense of community identity within the whole Bishopdown Farm/Hampton Park/Riverdown Park area (given things like residents in all areas attending the same school, using the same local shops and facilities, etc.). Frankly, when we lived in Bishopdown Farm it felt like we were far more part of the Laverstock and Ford parish, given things like the provision of a L&F parish newsletter to our home, rather than part of the Salisbury parish. Moreover, in my view, the local parish council have done and (if allowed) will continue to do an excellent job governing and looking out for the people who live within this unique parish.
162	
163	Salisbury City Council's website consultation ONLY allows you to record your support for the proposal. It doesn't tell you how you can record your dissent, or how to respond to the County council's consultation. The assumption is that everyone who replies to the Salisbury City Council supports the City Council's proposal. This process is flawed and will produce a completely distorted result. The views of City residents are unimportant in this matter, as they are not the ones who will lose their parish council. It is the views of the citizens living in the affected parts of Laverstock, Old Sarum, Ford and Hampton Park whose views should count. If they want to be part of the City, then so be it. If not, then the boundary should remain unaltered. Paul Sample
164	Scheme 2.shows an O.S.Boundary line running from west to East which SHOULD continue north of WOODVILL Rd & JEWELL CLOSE to link with the O.S.Boundary line which is following the railway line at the Boundary of St. Thomas`s Farm, thus including Bishopdown Cottages within the cartilage of Laverstock where they belong.
165	
166	Scheme 100. It makes sense economically for Laverstock to merge with Salisbury. The views of the Salisbury residents are just as important as those of the Laverstock residents and (so far) do not appear to have been taken into account (until this survey).
167	Scheme 100 To merge L & F Parish with Salisbury will take away the strongly established sense of community we have in a semi rural parish and we will be 'swallowed up' into part of a much larger City Council area. I can see no expectation of any improvement such a boundary change would bring with regards to leadership, quality of service etc. We would lose our identity for which we would have to pay a substantial increase in Council Tax. Schemes 2 & 3 It makes sense to return Bishopdown Farm to Laverstock & Ford Parish Council and to retain Hampton Park so all areas come under the same Parish as before. Please listen to the wishes of the people involved in this survey and do not discount the previous recommendation.
168	I strongly disagree with Scheme 100,2 and 3. The only reason that Salisbury want to take over Ford and Laverstock Parish Council is that they will receive more money. The Ford and Laverstock Parish Council get things done where as we would end up at the bottom of the pile at Salisbury Council as the area would be far too large for 1 council to work handle all the problems etc.
169	
170	Scheme 100. It is a complete anomaly that Laverstock should be regarded as a separate community. If that is allowed why are not Harnham and Bemerton not regarded as separate communities? One could argue that Ford is such a separate community as it is detached from the rest of Salisbury, but not Laverstock. The only reason that Laverstock residents want to remain a separate parish is that they currently pay a much smaller precept than Salisbury residents whilst enjoying all the benefits of easy access to the City.
171	

172	
173	
174	I live in the Salisbury City Council area. I do not believe that we have heard what the case of the Laverstock and Ford Council is. We have been encouraged to support the merger proposal - and it seems sensible. But if people have opposing views then we do not know what they are. How can anyone make a decision without this information?
175	Schemes 2 & 3 seem to open the likely possibility of developing even more built up area than we have now. There is the strong suspicion that there are therefore ulterior motives. Perhaps more consideration should be given to future developments being built in smaller [village/town] groupings, with fields between, creating a far more pleasant environment for all - and occupying no more land area than large conurbations.
176	Scheme 100, 2, 3 Although not a resident in the parish, I visit frequently. I have attended meetings and listened to the arguments. I have also listened to speeches made by councillors and the public. The local paper, online, is also a source of information about other things such as asset transfer, My observations are as follows: 1. It is very clear that Laverstock & Ford parish has a very strong sense of identity and the people living within it, both identify with it and overtly wish to protect it. My personal thought is that if in 122 years it is still working well - perhaps as good as it has ever been - why destroy something against the will of the local people? 2. The most interesting aspect is that Laverstock & Ford Parish is very large and has four distinct communities. Looking at their website, the parish plan and the parish council minutes, it is very clear that the parish council truly represents the communities and treats them as 'individual' and 'distinct'. Each of the communities is represented on the parish council by choice. No one community is over subscribed to gain power. 3. The parish was mandated to take on and protect green space. From their minutes over a long period, it is very clear that this is exactly what they
177	Scheme 100. I object to paying over £10 per month extra in Council Tax. My husband already pays £186 per month and that is quite sufficient.
178	Scheme 2. We were asked to consider things such as local landmarks as part of our decision making process. With this in mind, I also took into account that we cannot see the Cathedral spire from Hampton Park or Bishopdown Farm, which seems a reasonable enough reason to not feel part of the city.
179	Scheme 2 & 3. We were asked to consider things such as local landmarks as part of our decision making process. With this in mind, I also took into account that we cannot see the Cathedral spire from Hampton Park or Bishopdown Farm, which seems a reasonable enough reason to not feel part of the city.
180	Scheme 100 :- Identity :- I live in Laverstock near Salisbury and have done for 40+ years. When our parish came under the umbrella of the old District Council boundary I did not consider myself a Salisbury resident. My personal social focus has been mainly in Laverstock as has that of my children with Playgroups, Scouts, Guides, Gardening Club etc. We have several other groups based in Laverstock Governance : - Laverstock & Ford Parish Council with 13 councillors and 1 part-time staff working with our community groups is a more financially efficient form of administration than the Salisbury template of 20+ councillors and 50+ staff. Merger would mean 4 Laverstock & Ford representatives in a group of 20+ councillors resulting in disunity at a greater cost. Wiltshire Council became a unitary authority in order to reduce costs and administer the County in a financially sustainable manner. This proposal, re-instating a District Council in all but name would be a backward step.
181	I think merging the parish into the city will take away the rural identity of our community. Laverstock and Ford Parish council are brilliant as it is.
182	
183	With reference to Scheme 100 Laverstock and Ford Parish Council are doing an excellent job by any standard, this is recognised by Salisbury City Council. Our Parish has a unique and totally different identity from the City and we are a forward looking and self sustaining community.

184	I do not want to merge into the city council. I strongly support having Laverstock & Ford as an independent parish and really feel it would be the WRONG thing to do causing many problems for EVERYONE.I must say that it was a silly choice to have brought up this offer, I shouldn't have even had to consider this survey as it is clear what we must do. LEAVE US AS AN INDEPENDENT PARISH! I hope you have considered my opinion to be the right one. Emma
185	Scheme 100 - We moved to Laverstock out of the city intentionally to be part of a village community and enjoy being part of a rural/semi rural parish near but not in Salisbury. When visiting Salisbury, we either walk or pay to park in one of the many (expensive) car parks. We support Salisbury businesses by buying from their shops or frequenting the local bars and restaurants. Laverstock has a strong village identity which we don't want to lose, but visitors from Salisbury are always welcome to enjoy our facilities.
186	It is important that the governance of the parish is controlled from within and not by individuals with no link to the local community.
187	Scheme 100 Laverstock & Ford is not part of the city. To say so is ridiculous. Have you ever tried to walk there from the city centre? There is a real sense of community and a separate identity because of the distance away from the city. We should be proud of our semi-rural parishes and encouraging them to develop themselves. Scheme 2 Bishopdown Farm are already considered as part of the parish, receiving the Parish newsletter and using the Hampton Park facilities. They should officially be part of the parish Scheme 3 Hampton Park is part of our parish and has been for 21 years. Stop trying to divide us and destroy our community values. Shame on you.
188	Scheme 100. Absorption of any element of Laverstock & Ford, Milford Parish - including Bishopdown, Hampton Park and Riverdown - into a greater Salisbury Parish would degrade the present community ethos and civic pride. The present parish (including the foregoing elements) is an efficiently run and cost-effective organisation, whereas the proposed merger would be a classic example of 'bigger is not always better'. English history was successfully built on a cohesive parish system, and we should strive to keep it that way.
189	100. I have no confidence whatsoever that enlarging Salisbury Parish Council's area of responsibility and castrating a viable and efficient Parish Council (representing Ford, Laverstock and its incorporated areas) which has its finger on the pulse of local affairs, is approachable and both pro- and re-active will improve local governance. Salisbury has proved incompetent in running it's own affairs - qv Salisbury Vision, the Market Square, Guildhall refurbishment and Bus station fiascos, the Maltings redevelopment, parking, traffic, support for small businesses (I could go on and on) - so I have absolutely no desire to see them messing up my Parish. Salisbury Council has a grossly inflated view of its importance carrying on with outdated and expensive things like Mayor making which belong to a bygone era whilst failing to move the town into the modern age.
190	The current parish of Laverstock and Ford is a cohesive community that between it has the right services and infrastructure to serve the population. There is a strong sense of community with voluntary groups which meet the community's needs. If this parish were to merge with Salisbury the strong sense of local community will be lost and the good work of individuals and groups will stop.

191	<p>Scheme 100. The reasons given in support of Motion 27 (Inclusion of Laverstock & Ford Parish into Salisbury Parish) are not borne out by the facts. Laverstock & Ford is a long-standing and financially efficiently-run rural Parish Council dedicated to delivering on the issues important to its residents. Its all-inclusive ethos ensures good communication via its Parish Newsletter and community participation in the running of the Parish through its open meetings which take place in local community facilities. Major services, eg welfare, education, waste disposal, libraries, etc, are provided by Wiltshire Council; Laverstock & Ford residents using services provided by Salisbury Council, eg Crematorium, pay for these at the commercial rate. Laverstock & Ford residents also support retail and commercial enterprises within Salisbury, thus bringing business to the City. Clearly, therefore, Laverstock & Ford residents are not subsidised in any way by Salisbury residents. Laverstock & Ford is a good model of a forward-thinking Parish and is quite rightly proud of its heritage and achievements. IF IT'S NOT BROKE, WHY FIX IT?</p>
192	<p>We are a semi rural parish with a strong sense of identity please allow us to maintain that and not become part of a city. We do not want it. Salisbury's motivation is financial.</p>
193	<p>Schemes 100 and 2 We have lived at Hampton Park for 19+ years and have been very happy with Laverstock & Ford Parish Council. As a new build all those years ago we were immediately welcomed as part of the Parish and they took an interest in the area's needs. Joining Salisbury City Council will not make any additional improvements to our current situation. Costs for us will rise. We feel that this is merely a land grab and a cash making exercise by Salisbury City Council particularly in view of the extra 500 homes in the process of being built adjoining Hampton Park.</p>
194	<p>Laverstock should be allowed to remain as it is outside of the City of Salisbury and a VILLAGE. We are a rural Parish near but not part of the City, with a lively and active population. We welcome hundreds of school children to our village everyday and our Community Farm is accessed by many groups from all over the area including the City. It is not democratic to impose boundary changes on us.</p>
195	<p>I would like our village to remain outside the boundary of Salisbury City. I would wish it to continue as a village and do not agree with the boundary changes.</p>
196	
197	<p>A slightly larger Laverstock parish council will make it more viable. Being swallowed up into a very large Salisbury pc may cause us to loose our influence in local matters.</p>
198	<p>SCHEME 100: Creating a 'super parish' will benefit neither Salisbury nor Laverstock & Ford in the long term, we welcome many Salisbury Residents to our parish to use our leisure and amenities and of course when accessing the 5 schools within our parish and their amenities. However, identity is so important to a community and the very different demands of a city parish and a rural/semi-rural parish can only result in a greater burden on Wiltshire Council in terms of arbitration and financial demand. The short-term gains apparent to Salisbury City Council cannot match the long term benefits of retaining the two distinct parishes who have long, established records of independent local governance. As a family who has migrated from Salisbury City to Laverstock & Ford we cannot see how the concept of a parish merger could bring anything but confusion, much greater expense to residents and councils (even considering potential contract savings) and acrimony. Ill feeling always generates a cost implication, bureaucracy and time wasting. As part of a 'unitary authority' we have suffered a huge reduction in the overall offer and quality of public services, which demonstrates admirably that in the long term bigger is not better.</p>

199	As a young person (aged 24) I tend to neither give much attention to geographical/administrative boundaries or engage with them in a meaningful way. But I have travelled and lived both in the South of England, Middle England and Northern Ireland and have noted that where there are larger administrative centres (such as Birmingham) the local area tends to suffer from a 'mass homogenisation' effect, which involves loss of character and identity. I think this would happen if Salisbury and Laverstock & Ford combined. If Salisbury wants to retain its young people and be a City where they want to stay and work/live then there needs to be strong distinction between a City, its semi-rural suburbs and rural neighbours. Character and distinctiveness also make Salisbury attractive to tourists and visitors. I dont think that a merger would offer any attraction to young people and young families, in particular for whom the amenities of the City have the widest appeal b ut whom in return provide the low income workforce to enable these amenities to function - if Salisbury became bigger and therefore spread its resources thinner, alongside the influx of the maturer outlook of Laverstock & Ford (where I currently live) I'd move.
200	Scheme 100 The expansion of housing in the Ford and Laverstock areas has greatly increased demand on SCC services and influences the quality of life in Salisbury. These areas should be contributing to city services and have a say in the running of the city council.
201	Scheme 100. Laverstock Parish Council do so much for the local area (farm, boardwalk to name but two). I feel we have a real sense of community in our parish and that our parish council are always looking out for our best interests. The council are friendly and approachable (even at weekends) and always willing to listen to local views. In my view all of this would be lost if our parish were merged with Salisbury.
202	
203	Scheme 100 - Laverstock Parish Council look after the local residents interests very well, they are always doing something to improve our parish. The farm is a great success story. There are no advantages that I can see to this proposal other than to increase revenue. It would be real shame if this proposal went through and counter to the general view that government should be local.
204	Scheme 100. I do not wish to be part of a city. The only point to this will be THE CITY increasing their revenue which is not acceptable. There is great pride in our Parish, what right does greedy Politics have to do with this?
205	In every aspect, the identity and cohesion of a rural or semi-rural community (such as Ford & Laverstock enjoy) is at complete odds with the identity of an urban community. Therefore, the governance of such areas by a city council is entirely inappropriate, and will ultimately be detrimental to both communities. If the proposal is based on population and therefore the bigger the unit the more cost effective, then the inclusion of the residents of Bishopdown, whose distance from the city centre means their sense of identity is likely to be more semi-rural than urban, makes total sense.
206	The Parish of Laverstock and Ford would be enhanced by the inclusion of properties in the green hatched areas. We have a thriving community with local doctors, dentist, pharmacy and vets. There are two very good shops and there is a great community spirit. There are sports facilities and clubs too. We have a parish magazine which keeps everyone up to date with what is going on in the community and useful phone numbers and adverts for local tradespeople. There is a nice villagey about the area and it's good to have local parish councillors who are aware of the area and the people.
207	
208	
209	Laverstock and Ford are fine as they stand. Please leave well alone. Any Salisbury resident is very welcome to come over and enjoy what Laverstock has to offer.

210	The following comments apply to the Laverstock parish scheme and its proposed alternatives. My family and I have lived in Laverstock for most of our lives. It's a rural/village community and we're very proud of our parish. We're proud to be close to but not in Salisbury and we would love to welcome back Bishopdown Farm into our parish. We're sick and tired of having to campaign to SAVE our parish from being swallowed up by Salisbury. The vast majority of parish residents do not want to be part of Salisbury, we want to keep our own unique identity. We welcome the residents of Salisbury to our village, to share our facilities such as our wonderful farm, but we do not wish to be taken over by them or to be part of the city. That is why we have chosen to live in the Laverstock parish and not in the city itself. Whats more, I am a proud Conservative and a huge supporter of the party however I am hugely disappointed that the Conservative motion has simply ridden roug hshod over our views once again. It is hugely disappointing and we really feel that we don't have a voice at Wiltshire Council. We simply want to be heard, respected and left alone.
211	
212	Scheme 100 The community at laverstock has been united as a village for many years and able cared for by a non political group of committed local councillors representing all areas of the parish.
213	Scheme 100 will result in a loss of a sense of community and a complete loss of influence concerning local issues. I cannot see any benefit to the residents of Laverstock and Ford as a result of this proposed takeover. Local democracy should stay local and not be subsumed.
214	I believe that Ford and Laverstock parish council represent the parish community very well, I do not believe that Salisbury will recognise and represent our community equally as well, this has been demonstrated a number of times recently especially with planning applications where Salisbury supporting additional over development of our rural area in direct opposition to the Ford and Laverstock view. I also note that Salisbury have been surveying their community with a loaded question set intimating an unfair use of community resource and the precept, this indicates to me that Salisbury cannot be trusted and be unbiased and offer fair representation of our parish. I do not identify myself as a Salisbury resident.
215	Our Parish Council - Laverstock and Ford - represent us very well, and accurately represent our views as local residents. My past experience of Salisbury City Council as that they categorically DO NOT have our interests at heart, and have actually treated our representations as a parish with contempt. I therefore DO NOT want to be represented by them. Furthermore, their recent poll of City residents aimed at inducing a -'yes, lets consume Laverstock and Ford parish into the City' is biased in its questions, and, despite being told by the working party, that the decision will not be based on the precept, they suggest that residents of Ford and Laverstock are freeloading on services funded by city residents. For the record, I would like to state, that I have no interest in Salisbury Christmas lights, the carnival or St George's Day, do not use the parks or playparks nor the allotment, I never have, and never will, enter the Friary Community Centre, nor the Bemerton Heath Health Centre, but probably will be a patron of the crematorium at some time in the future!
216	
217	

218	Further thoughts on the proposed merger of Laverstock and Ford Parish with Salisbury City Council (Scheme 100) The Guidance on Community Governance Reviews (Department for Communities and Local Government 2010) states that 'Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity. Like neighbourhoods, the feeling of local community and the wishes of local inhabitants are the primary considerations.' It seems curious therefore that this proposal has been out forward since in a survey conducted in 2014 99.3% of residents voted to remain within Laverstock and Ford Parish suggesting that there is no local support or demand for the proposed change. Since the proposed 'merger' of Laverstock and Ford Parish with Salisbury City Council has not been sought by Laverstock and Ford Parish Council this move actually seems rather to constitute an abolition of our council and distinctive identity. The guidance states that in cases of the abolition of a council should only occur where there was 'clear and sustained local support for such action'. Even if this is seen as a grouping this 'needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests. It would be inappropriate for it to be
219	I believe that Salisbury should be a united body not small factions such as Ford And Laverstock having separate controlling parish councils. One united council would stop the growth of selfish, self preservation of some aspects of the parish council to cater for the few instead of the majority. Unity would engage the whole community to work as one. Scheme 1 is the only way forward
220	Scheme 100 - Parish/ City Councils have limited power, so the most important thing to me is that Wiltshire Council does a good job and I am represented locally by a Parish Council that is distinct . Option 2 puts Bishopdown Farm in with Laverstock - that feels like a distinct and natural fit. This option should also include Old Sarum in with Laverstock.
221	Scheme 100. The wishes of the residents of Laverstock, Ford, Hampton Park and Old Sarum must be paramount. Everyone that I speak to wants us to remain independent of Salisbury City with their party political Council and massive overheads. Clerks, assistant clerks, assistants to the assistant, press officers etc etc. I can count the folk who think otherwise on one hand, excluding city councillors that is.
222	Laverstock & Ford Parish has a strong sense of community, identity and pride with a very effective and caring Parish Council doing a magnificent job. It has a great history. The loss of Salisbury DC to Unitary Authority was bad please don't make another mistake by killing off Laverstock and Ford PC
223	
224	
225	
226	
227	re. Scheme100. We have lived in Laverstock/Milford for 46 years because we want to live in a village community. We have shops, schools, a church, a pub, sports facilities/social club.Many organisations meet successfully in our own village hall. Now we have our COMMUNITY farm. There are grass areas and a river between us and the city, a boundary for sure! We value our own Parish council, let us remain as we are . Thank you!
228	There is a strong community identity in Laverstock & Ford which, in my opinion, should be preserved. If the village was to become a small part of Salisbury City Council that would be lost. We have an excellent Parish Council which serves our community well and I think this should definitely continue.
229	
230	Laverstock & Ford PC is run for the community and develops good community projects a good sense of community
231	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council are non political nad manage the community developments for the residents of the parish it is not about raising money from additional charges on residents to pay for the maintenance of assets transferred from WCC to SCPC
232	

233	SCHEME 100 -Laverstock and Ford is growing (population will become similar to Malmesbury's) and sustainable. -Parish council is accessible, efficient and effective, and engenders community spirit (eg through parish newsletter). -Parish council offers distinctive, separate voice to Salisbury council, eg on major planning issues. -Merger would amount to reduction in say on very local matters, as they would have to be considered by Salisbury council in the interests of the city overall. -I have clear sense of comfort and security as I cross the city boundary and return home. -I am not dependent on Salisbury for shopping, social and cultural activities - Southampton offers more facilities and places like Andover and Romsey are easily accessible - or even my GP or pharmacy. - Salisbury is already too big to be a parish and effective at grass roots level.
234	In respect of scheme 100: Please note the following points in respect of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy: •The Settlement Strategy, Core Policy 1 within the Core Strategy, defines 4 'tiers' of settlements –' Principal Settlements', 'Market Towns', 'Local Service Centres' and 'Large and Small villages'. •Salisbury is defined as a 'Principal Settlement', and therefore a primary focus for development. [WCS Core Policy 1] •Laverstock and Ford are defined as a 'Small Village' [Core Policy 23]. According to the Core Strategy 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages, to respond to local needs and to contribute to the vitality of rural communities'. [WCS para 4.16]. •It is acknowledged in the Core Strategy in respect of Salisbury that 'the administrative boundaries around the city have led to a large proportion of the development allocations in this Core Strategy being located outside of the boundary of the city. Some are, for example, located on new greenfield sites in the adjoining parishes which are within the Southern Wiltshire and Wilton Community Areas. These allocations are, however, considered to contribute towards the requirement for housing and employment for Salisbury and are included within this
235	
236	
237	
238	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council is ran very well and the size of the Parish currently is good, yet the addition of the houses at Hampton Park (Scheme 2) would be beneficial to Laverstock and Ford, as most facilities that are managed (Greentrees school etc) are already servicing those residents. The main plan of Salisbury City council taking over all of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council will totally ruin the local identity of all within Laverstock and Ford Parish currently. There is simply no need to even consider moving boundaries. There are very limited benefits with any of the schemes.
239	
240	
241	Scheme 100 - I live in a village that looks like a village, feels like a village, acts like a village and IS a village. I am not in a suburb. I have no advantages to being near the city - it costs a lot to go there and park and, frankly, I can get everything I need right here, close to home.
242	Scheme 100 - Laverstock & Ford is a rural parish and we want it to stay that way. Our Councillors live in the area and understand what our community needs. We do not want to join Salisbury CP so please leave us alone to develop our parish ourselves.

243	Re : Laverstock & Ford Parish Council – CGR Proposal 100 Residents of this parish pay the same tariff for WC council taxes as all other county residents, in the same manner. A significant majority of facilities are supported primarily by WC funding rather than SC. If we attend events we pay, the same as any other attendees. People come from miles around to see the Christmas lights, Olympic celebrations and watch the armed forces on Remembrance Day parades – do we all have to live inside the parish to share in laudable, high profile events which bring kudos and visitors to city? These are part of the tourist remit of a city, not a mandate for obligatory subscription. In Laverstock and Ford locality, with its constituent parts, we genuinely wish to remain as a separate, collaborative, politically independent, predominantly rural parish which is adjacent to a fine city with many attributes and heritage of it's own. We have our own heritage here – summarised very helpfully in the Parish Plan. This community view has formed the main strategy of the agenda of the PC for some years now. New residents are pointed to this via the PC website, I saw it before I chose to live here. Within that are a number of strands of work, which have been
244	I spent my working life protecting the R Avon & its tributaries. In 1976 I was relocated to Salisbury and moved to Laverstock because of its rural nature being a long thin ribbon along the east of the R Bourne. It has three natural boundaries, R Bourne, the railway line and the A30. In line with weather forecasts, winter temperatures drop much lower than in Salisbury and the low parish precept helps with the higher heating bills. The average property price is higher than in the City and Wiltshire gets enough money from us through the Council Tax bills particularly when the occupancy is low and mainly of older people. Lay off our Parish Council we love, them they do a great job.
245	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council hve done a brilliant job improving the area in accordance with the wishes of the residents. They should be allowed and encouraged to continue this good work
246	Voted against L&F in SC but not accepted as you want £300K tax and won't stop until you get it. L&F works for the parish, keeps community informed of progress of local issues in a free local magazine. Putting L&F in SC is against our wishes and interests. I already pay full tax as a few feet over the boundary. These forms should have asked do you want to be in or out of SC without 21 boxes to tick. Confusing ordinary and elderly people so they don't vote or don't understand what they have voted for is a shabby way of doing things. It's time you started treating people fairly, using money wisely, ensuring this historic city is cared for instead of driving people away with high rates and high parking charges. Take 'No' for an answer this time, stop wasting money you have got trying to pressurise residents into doing what YOU want.
247	100. The residents of Laverstock & Ford currently enjoy all the facilities provided by SCC but pay nothing towards them. This is unfair, particularly on low income families in Salisbury. Laverstock is closer to Salisbury than large parts of Harnham & Bemerton. It just makes sense.
248	I very much feel that scheme 100 to merge some of Laverstock & Ford parish with Salisbury City Council would have a very damaging effect on the identity of the smaller parish. This would just create a larger city council and lose the character of 'village community life' Salisbury would engulf the essence of the beautiful, characterful, individual community of the parish. The parish has worked well by itself for so long, creating community open spaces for parish residents to use. Which is where children play and dogs are walked, we have no day to day need to use city centre parks or open spaces. Parish newsletter to keep residents upto date and feel involved in the parish. We very much live in the 'countryside' of Salisbury why merge to just create a bigger city? This will lose the attractiveness and character of Salisbury as a whole, as it will become a bland, faceless city. Keep the character of the individual parish. Laverstock and Ford parish Council does an amazing job of building community spirit as the Parish is not too large, I fail to see how Salisbury City Council would achieve the same sense of community spirit and involvement with such a large amount of residents. This is not being carried out for the right reasons, it's not being
249	
250	All proposals but mainly 100 Laverstock and Ford parish Council is the best way to represent the local views. They are very well run and and not influenced by unhelpful political bias or financial inefficiencies in the way a larger Council is.

251	I would like to see the small greenbelt area retained and I think Salisbury council should give the option to say NO on their Salisbury Together, without a NO this should be totally ignored.
252	Schemes 2, and 3. I live at Bishopdown Farm in the in the green hatched area on scheme 2. It seems non sensical to me to split Bishopdown Farm from Hampton Park as we both share the same facilities such as schools, surgery, pharmacy, dentist, veterinary practice and shops. I was also surprised to learn that the area which I understood to be Bishopdown Farm is also split as only the lower end closer to London Road currently appears to be in Salisbury Parish whereas the upper end is not. We receive a regular Parish magazine from Lavestock Parish indicating a whole host of items effecting the Parish (including Bishopdown Farm area) whereas the news from Salisbury Parish is scant. To me, Lavestock has always shown a genuine interest in this area than Salisbury Parish and it seems clear to me that Salisbury Parish is trying to extend its size and population purely for financial reasons. Secondary schools which children are most likely to attend are also based at L avestock so I believe there is a stronger connection with this Parish than Salisbury Parish. I therefore consider that Scheme 2 should be adopted.
253	Having attended the Wiltshire Boundary Review Committee Meeting (Wednesday 18th May) in Laverstock, it was very disappointing that not one of the Councillors who put forward Motion 27 were present at the meeting to state their case. I am aware they attend the meeting in Salisbury the previous Monday which speaks loudly on how much interest SCC really have in the future of L & F Parish and its residents. This leaves an impression rightly or wrongly with Laverstock residents that SCC interests really lie in keeping their urban residents happy and L & F will become insignificant in the wider SCC scheme representing only a very minor proportion of its overall residents and becoming a poor relation to their urban counterparts living in the City. As the majority of SCC Councillors will be from the City our Urban group of councillors will get out voted constantly. Merger with SCC will be a negative step for Laverstock residents that at this time have a well run Parish that meets our local needs and is not political - we want to stay independent.
254	Scheme 100: Laverstock has a strong sense of geographical identity that has not been recognised. It is a separate settlement from Salisbury city it is not a suburb of it. Laverstock is a village separated from the city by the railway line, green land and sits on the east of the River Bourne. It therefore has a separate identity, sense of place and 'as is' the Parish Council serves that community and its interests. The review should also consider the contribution that existing groups make to the Laverstock and Ford community as well as the distinct nature of those groups. It should also take into account how efficiently the parish is managed. Scheme 2: The boundary does not appear to be easily identifiable.
255	With regard to scheme 100, my husband, David Ward and I feel very strongly how important it is for Laverstock to retain our own Parish Council. We are very well represented and our Parish demonstrates a genuine sense of community spirit and cohesion. As has been very evident at both this week and last week's meetings, Laverstock & Ford residents, do not feel confident in the ability of Salisbury City Council to represent our best interests. Their case was not helped by the way in which certain councillors have conducted this review. My only regret is that Andrew Roberts' patronising and inaccurate approach prompted some unfortunate responses from the floor, which are NOT representative of the Laverstock & Ford community. Libby Purves recently made the observation on Midweek that people need to feel they belong. The residents of Laverstock & Ford have made it very clear that we feel we belong in our current Parish. I spoke at last night's meet ing and among other points made the plea for Wiltshire Council to recognise that our response is 'Localism in Action' – PLEASE LISTEN. I will email a copy of the points I made to the Electoral Services Team in case this is helpful for the Working Group in noting my comments. With
256	I can't see any reason to make this change. The local community of Laverstock are well served and the community spirit is good. This change appears to offer noting to the community of Laverstock and appears to only serve to increase the revenue of Salisbury City Council.
257	

258	Leave our rural Parish Council alone!!!! I have no desire to pay for Salisbury Council's over inflated ego.
259	
260	Scheme 100, the total inclusion of L&F parish within Salisbury is wholly inappropriate. Laverstock, Ford and Old Sarum represent significant and growing communities distinct from the City and have to date been effectively managed by L&F PC as is. There has been no strong or rational case presented for this inclusion which would appear only to increase costs to and decrease the representation and influence of the residents of the L&F Parish.
261	Scheme 100 The arguments for merging Laverstock with Salisbury are totally fallacious, unfounded, undemocratic and would destroy a well run parish. Laverstock is mercifully free from party politics and Councillors work together to do their best for everyone in the parish. I value this immensely. No evidence has been produced to substantiate claims that Salisbury residents subsidize Laverstock in any shape or form. In fact the effect of a meger would be that Laverstock residents would fund and underwrite Salisbury. Laverstock's green spaces would be entirely at risk as it would be considered an urban area. Residents have already made their opposition clear and unambiguous and Salisbury City Parish council has no grounds for pressing on with this proposal. It is a naked, unilateral land and cash grab that is undemocratic and will create an historic wrong. Leave us alone. Scheme 2 It makes perfect organisational sense for Bishopdown Farm to be entirely within the Pa rish. It would enhance the community spirit, civic pride and governance and befits a village mentioned in Domesday when New Sarum was but fields. I strongly support and endorse this change. Scheme 3 This merely a variation on the land grab theme and I
262	One parish council bullying another to gain its assets is not democracy. Residents of L&F should decide on their future NOT SCC or Wiltshire Council. It is the Unitary authority process all over again and look where that has got us!
263	With all the new housing in Old Sarum, there needs to be more timely planning of services and facilities in the area. (All proposals - but hopefully 100 can deliver this more effectively)
264	Scheme 3 This area is part of a rural community adjoining a country park. Its' interests have been brilliantly looked after by the current parish council. All decisions have been made for the benefit of the local community. Inclusion of the area into Salisbury City would inevitably result in decisions being made with the interests of the city rather than the local area being made because of the make of the newly formed council.
265	Scheme 100 is entirely the wrong proposal. Salisbury City cannot be considered a "parish" as it is too large to be described as such. Although not part of this proposal, the solution is to allow other areas - eg Harnham and Bemerton - to be parishes in their own right, with the City Centre forming a "central parish". A scheme could then be agreed between all the parishes to create a "federation" covering "Greater Salisbury" to provide agreed key services. Ultimately this could pave the way for a "South Wiltshire Authority" and dissolution of the current Wiltshire Unitary Authority, which is too large and impersonal. Scheme 2 helps residents in Bishopdown Farm to be formally aligned with the local community. The end of my rear garden forms part of the boundary between Salisbury and Laverstock. In the past, I have had to deal with 2 parish councils on certain matters, as neither seemed to know who was responsible for what. Personal experience has shown that we have a greater affinity with Laverstock and Ford Parish. Therefore it make sense for the houses on Bishopdown Farm to be transferred to Laverstock and Ford. We have no link, geographic or otherwise, to Bishopdown Estate, apart from a single footpath.

266	Scheme 100 is entirely the wrong proposal. Salisbury City cannot be considered a "parish" as it is too large to be described as such. Although not part of this proposal, the solution is to allow other areas - eg Harnham and Bemerton - to be parishes in their own right, with the City Centre forming a "central parish". A scheme could then be agreed between all the parishes to create a "federation" covering "Greater Salisbury" to provide agreed key services. Ultimately this could pave the way for a "South Wiltshire Authority" and dissolution of the current Wiltshire Unitary Authority, which is too large and impersonal. Scheme 2 helps residents in Bishopdown Farm to be formally aligned with the local community. The end of my rear garden forms part of the boundary between Salisbury and Laverstock. In the past, I have had to deal with 2 parish councils on certain matters, as neither seemed to know who was responsible for what. Personal experience has shown that we have a greater affinity with Laverstock and Ford Parish. Therefore it make sense for the houses on Bishopdown Farm to be transferred to Laverstock and Ford. We have no link, geographic or otherwise, to Bishopdown Estate, apart from a single footpath.
267	100. I have lived in L&F P/C all my life and have no wish for W/C to join us-no confidence in W/C at all.L&F P/C do an excellent job and I wish them to continue to do so. 2. Hands off Bishopsdown (please note this is the correct spelling) Farm they belong to L&F P/C. Please don't listen to the moaners who complained we don't have a Doctors surgery - we don't need one - good grief they only havw to go less than a couple of miles to Bishopsdown Farm where there is a surgery - those sort of people need to live in Salisbury and leave us to enjoy our lovely parish - we (my husband Alan as well) wish TO REMAIN as we are now - NOT joined with W/C Salisbury. Thank you.
268	100 2 AND 3 I DO NOT AGREE WITH ANY OF THE PROPOSALS PLEASE RETAIN THE STATUS QUO
269	
270	
271	
272	
273	
274	Before commenting on the schemes, I would like to correct a couple of statements made towards the end of the public meeting in Salisbury on 9 May. Firstly, it is not true to say that Laverstock & Ford PC did not support the Hampton Park community from the early days – it did. For example, when the residents no longer wished to run the Community Centre, the Parish Clerk stepped in for a period of time until a new group of residents formed a management organisation. And when this group wound up its activities in 2012 because of insurance issues, a company was formed and a parish Cllr stepped in to become one of the 5 Directors to manage it (and initially carry out the day-to-day running). Also it was incorrect to say that the SCC has not been involved in the redesign of the Hampton Park Country Park. Laverstock & Ford Cllrs, together with a design specialist, spoke with the City Clerk in the early days when an initial drawing of the proposed ru ral redesign was first available. The Clerk was content with what he saw. SCHEME 100 Motion 27 from the Nov 2015 Wiltshire Council meeting called for the Working Group to 'investigate and consult on the merger of Laverstock and Ford Parish into Salisbury City
275	
276	
277	Salisbury Council have proved time and again to serve their own interests and not those of the rural community.
278	I PRESUME THAT IF THE PARISH IS LARGER OUR RATES WILL COME DOWN AS THE LOCAL COUNCIL WILL GET MORE INCOME FROM SO MANY MORE HOUSES. IF NOT THEN I CAN'T SEE THE POINT OF MERGING.
279	100 - I DO NOT WANT A RISE IN COUNCIL TAS. I AM HAPPY TO ACCEPT THAT WE ARE ROUGHING IT!! I LOVE LIVING ON THE LOWER SLOPES OF OLD SARUM AND ARE PROUD TO LIVE IN AN OLD WATER MILL

280	100 - Ford is much better off as it is. It is not, and I believe never has been, part of the city. To agree to scheme 100 would in the end further destroy Wiltshire's rural heritage.
281	100- Why has the question being asked for a second time? staying as it is gives the area greater community identity
282	100 - I want to stay as part of the Laverstock and Ford Parish. They have served us well whereas Salisbury City Council are more concerned with city centre issues and less with rural ones. Leave us alone.
283	100- I began with the perception that Old Sarum was in effect a suburb of Salisbury, but I can honestly say it is more akin to the rural communities where I have spent much time previously. Understanding quite a bit about parish councils, local councillors and local government I don't understand the drive for change, Area boards work well if run well
284	3- on 100 sheet - we prefer to stay as we are to develop our rural/semi rural parish near but not in Salisbury!
285	100 - PROPOSAL 2 AND 3 WE HAVE STRONG IDENTITY AND COHESION IN L&F PARISH. THE COMMUNITY WORKS WELL TOGETHER AND WE ARE FIGHTING HARD TO RETAIN THE GREEN SPACES WITHIN THE PARISH THAT BENEFITS BOTH L&F AND CITY PEOPLE
286	100 - 1. The boundary of Salisbury with Laverstock and Ford was drawn in 1954. Due to the building since then it is completely out of date. 2. The City of Salisbury is a Parish but WCC is prepared to devolve far more powers. This would be far more effective if the City covered the built up area. There is a vital need for joined up thinking and planning - for example, improving the infrastructure between Old Sarum and the City Centre. 3. Laverstock and Ford Parish should have their own elected members on SCC to help shape the common future. 4. For Band D houses the receipt for L&F is £12.50 and for SCC £105. Is it fair on the deprived parishes of Salisbury? 5. There are several existing "village hubs" within Salisbury like Lower Bemerton and Stratford-sub-Castle who enjoy a vibrant local life and don't feel swamped by the City. 6. Laverstock and Ford is not a discreet community. 100s of children from Salisbury attend St. Edwards, Wyvern and St. Josep hs. Laverstock Church is now linked with St. Marks. 7. Old Sarum is a developing separate community thanks to people like the Rev Penny Joyce. The main support comes from St Francis Church in the City.
287	100 - WHY CHANGE A SUCCESSFUL PARISH COUNCIL WHEN THEY LISTEN AND LOOK AFTER THE LOCAL COMMUNITY UNLIKE THE SCC AND WILTSHIRE CC. I THINK THEY SHOULD LEAVE WELL ALONE, WE ARE VERY HAPPY WITHOUT FURTHER INTERFERENCE
288	100
289	100- Laverstock and Ford parish should remain a rural parish. The atmosphere is lovely, you feel like you are in the country. Please leave us to enjoy our rural status
290	
291	100- LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH IS SUFFICIENTLY RUN AND MANAGED AT THE MOMENT, FAR SUPERIOR TO SALISBURY DISTRICT COUNCIL SO THEREFORS WE HAVE NO DESIRE TO JOIN THEM
292	100- Laverstock and ford parish is growing sustainable and has a strong sense of local community. Parish council is accessible, effective and good at keeping in touch via parish magazine. We are not dependant on Salisbury for social, cultural and shopping trips. No guarantee funds from laverstock and ford council tax will be adequately distributed for services required here
293	
294	
295	
296	100 - WE ARE A HAPPY RURAL COMMUNITY,WE ARE NOT BROKEN, PLEASE DON'T 'FIX' US. WE DO NOT WANT CITY STATUS!

297		
298		100
299		100
300		
301	100 - Laverstock Parish has a distinct character separated from Salisbury City both socially and geographically from the City. To argue that the parish uses the facilities and amenities of the City which only applies to Laverstock is false. If this were true it would apply equally to all surrounding parishes and villages within a 10 mile radius. This attempted absorption is merely an afterthought to increase financial income for the City Council which, in the past, has not been noted for its planning or management skills.	
302		100
303	100- I am very proud to have lived her 36 years. Laverstock & Ford parish council formed in 1894 is non political and runs very very efficiently by them for the benefit of its residents. their Number One priority. I believe the city council would benefit to a greater extent by gaining laverstock and ford parish council than they would in transferring to Salisbury City council. Larger councils do not always work more efficiently as evidenced by Wiltshire Council	
304	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL WORKS VERY WELL AS IT IS, THE PROPOSED CHANGE WOULD HAVE A NEGATIVE AFFECT ON THIS	
305		100
306	100-there is no merit in the proposed scheme. The laverstock and ford parish council are far better placed to look in the interest of local residents than would be the case if we were simply within a ward or the enlarged Salisbury TC	
307	100 - EACH COMMUNITY HAS AN IDENTITY OF THEIR OWN AND CHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED UNDER THE HEADING OF A TOWN. WHAT IS ALRIGHT FOR A TOWN IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR THE LAVERSTOCK COMMUNITY OR FOR BISHOPDOWN FARM AND HAMPTON PARK COMMUNITIES - BEING BASICALLY RURAL	
308	3 - I THINK LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL IS AS LARGE AS IT SHOULD BE SO TO MOVE HAMPTON PARK IS THE CORRECT ONE FOR SALISBURY PARISH COUNCIL. THIS IS ONLY ABOUT MONEY FOR SALISBURY PARISH COUNCIL, WHAT ABOUT ALL THE OTHER VILLAGES AROUND SALISBURY THAT USE ALL THAT SALISBUTY OFFERS, MOST ARE PAID FOR ON A VISIT.	
309	I don't think it is necessary to merge laverstock and ford parish into Salisbury city. IO think it is very important to retain a village identy of ford and feel would be ruined if incorporated into Salsibry. The Roman road makes a natural boundary and the differences between the new build and ford is immense. The new build is high density and far more urban than Ford. I think it makes more sense to merger Hampton park to Salisbury City council. The development belongs to an urban setting and not a village	
310		100
311		
312	100- these rural and semi rural communities are not part of the city and therefore should not be treated a such. Leave the villages and communities outside of the city alone, they are fine as they are!	
313		
314		
315		

316	100- I live in Laverstock near Salisbury not in Salisbury. Laverstock has always been a village and has been run by a very good council	
317		
318		100
319	100- I value the fact that our parish council makes decisions for the benefit of the people of the parish. Party politics doesn't enter into it. SCC by contrast is dominated by party politics which in my view have no place at parish council level. Would someone from SCC please tell me which services they provide that I do not pay for, I cannot think of any. the people of Salisbury are very welcome to visit our community farm, and walk on the laverstock down and admire the beautiful views. In due course they will no doubt enjoy visiting the country park. We certainly wont be complaining that they don't pay to visit our Parish and its amenities	
320		
321		100
322		100
323		
324		
325		
326	100 WE HAVE A STRONG COMMUNITY IN THE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH AND FEEL THAT BISHOPDOWN FORM WILL BENEFIT FROM MOVING BACK TO OUR PARISH AS THEY ALREADY RECEIVE OUR PARISH NEWSLETTER AND USE THE HAMPTON PARK FACILITIES. PLEASE LEAVE US ALONE TO DEVELOP OUR RURAL/SEMI RURAL PARISH NEAR BUT NOT IN SALISBURY. WE DO NOT WANT TO PAY FOR SALISBURY MISMANGEMENT/POOR NEGOTIATIONS. I LOVE THE CITY OF SALISBURY BUT DONT WANT TO HAVE OUR COMMUNITY SWALLOWED UP JUST BECAUSE THE COUNCIL HAVE PROBLEMS MANAGING THIER INCOME. WHAT'S IN IT FOR US TO JOIN SALISBURY? WILL SALISBURY RESIDENTS PAY LESS COUNCIL TAX?	
327		
328	100 - THE SURVEY DOES NOT GIVE ANY DETAILS OF COSTS OR SAVINGS TO THE PEOPLE INVOLVED. THIS MAKES ME QUESTION THE VALUE OF THE SURVEY	
329		
330		100
331	100 - laverstock, ford, old sarum, bishopdown farm are not part of the city. It is a different more rural area and has different focus. It should not be merged as we are so different. At old sarum we are 2 miles away from a shop how can we be within the city?	
332	100 - IN MY OPINION THE ONLY REASON SALISBURY WANTS TO TAKE OVER LAVERSTOCK IS FINANCIAL GAIN. SALISBURY PROVIDES NO ESSENTIAL SERVICE TO LAVERSTOCK SO A MERGE WOULD MEAN THAT AS A BAND D COUNCIL TAX PAYER I WOULD GIVE SALISBURY COUNCIL ABOUT £93 PER YEAR FOR NOTHING. SCHEMES 2 AND 3 - SALISBURY COUNCIL SHOULD TRY DECISIONS MADE BY THE RESIDENTS OF THOSE AREAS. I CAME TO LIVE IN LAVERSTOCK IN 1937 AND HAVE SEEN WITH DISMAY HOW DECISIONS MADE BY OUTSIDE COUNCILS HAVE HAD ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE VILLAGE. THIS MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN AGAIN.	
333		100
334	100 - LEAVE AS IS PLEASE TO DEVELOP OUR AREAS	
335		100

336	
337	2 - Please leave us alone so that we can develop our rural/semi rural parish but not in Salisbury.
338	
339	
340	ALL - I THINK THAT WE ALL LIVE IN 'SALISBURY' THAT IS HOW MOST PEOPLE EXPLAIN WHERE THEY ARE FROM. I KNOW LAVERSTOCK AND FORD ARE KEEN TO BE INDEPENDENT BUT I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY, FOR A SENSE OF UNITY AND EASE OF RUNNING IT SEEMS SENSIBLE TO ALL BE PART OF SALISBURY. M THIS VOTE IS LIKELY TO HAVE COST A LOT ALREADY, THIS MONEY COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN BETTER SPENT ELSEWHERE?
341	100 - Have been resident in Laverstock since 1968 - it is a lively strong community and recognising modern developments and ideas has been progressive in all fields of administration. Strongly in favour of this support and vision.
342	100
343	100 Successive councils of Salisbury have failed in their position as caretakers of the city. THEY HAVE FAILED MISERABLY. Salisbury IS CALLED A MEDIEVAL CATHEDRAL CITY, APART FROM SOME OBVIOUS BUILDINGS, NOTHING ELSE IS ADVERTISED, THERE SEEMS TO BE NO OFFICIAL TOURIST GUIDE. What was the shopping centre of a medieval city is now a ghastly site. It is no wonder that any of the parishes involved in the usurping operation wish to be involved.
344	100 - LAVERSTOCK IS A VILLAGE IN ITS OWN RIGHT AND THERE IS A STRONG COMMUNITY FEELING AMONGST ITS RESIDENTS
345	
346	
347	
348	100 - ALLOW BETTER FUNDING FOR PROJECTS AND EDUCATION
349	100 - I LOVE LIVING ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF SALISBURY BUT I MOVED TO LAVERSTOCK IN 1999 BECAUSE OF ITS SPECIAL SEMI-RURAL CHARACTER AND ITS DISTINCT COMMUNITY FEEL - AND I WISH THAT TO BE PRESERVED. I'M ALSO AN ACTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OF THE MILFORD PRESERVATION GROUP
350	
351	100
352	
353	100
354	100 LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAVE A NATURAL SEPARATION FROM SALISBURY CITY BOUNDARY AND THIS SHOULD BE KEPT. THE PARISH HAS ALWAYS HAD ITS OWN IDENTITY AND IS FINANCIALLY MAINTAINED IN AN EXCELLENT WAY AND THIS SHOULD NOT CHANGE TO HELP FINANCE THE LOSS MAKING SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL
355	100 - just leave things alone, it is fine as it is and all the time and money spent on unnecessary changes is annoying. I was born in Laverstock and it was always separate from Salisbury. I can see no advantages in changing the boundaries. THings need changing in Salisbury not Laverstock.
356	
357	100

358	100 WE CAME TO LIVE IN A VILLAGE NOT A CITY. OUR PARISH COMMUNITIES ARE ALL LOOKED AFTER BY LAVERSTOCK AND FORD AND THAT IS WHAT WE WANT. GO AWAY SALISBURY!	
359	100-WE WOULD NOT GAIN AS A COMMUNITY ANY EXTRA BENEFITS THAN WE DO NOW ONLY TO PAY A HIGHER COUNCIL TAX. 3- BISHOPDOWN HAS ALWAYS BEEN APRT OF SALISBURY THEREFORE HAMPTON PARK WHICH IS IN BISHOPDOWN SHOULD BE UNDER SALISBURY COUNCIL	
360		
361		100
362	100 - IF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD BECOME PART OF SALISBURY, AN IMPORTANT LOCAL BULWARK AGAINST UNREASONABLE DEVELOPMENT, WHETHER COMMERCIAL OR IMPOSED, WILL BE LOST. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD BECOME JUTS A PART OF A LARGER ENTITY WITH NO DISTINCTIVE VOICE. WHILST IT IS CERTAINLY TRUE THAT RESIDENTS USE SALISBURY SERVICES, THE HIGH NUMBER OF VISITORS TO THE AREA WHO ALSO MAKE USE OF THE SERVICES, YET PROVIDE VITAL INFLOWS OF CAPITAL SEEM NOT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. AN ARGUMENT FOR INTEGRATING THE PARISHES IT IS, IN MY VIEW, A RED HERRING.	
363	100 - WITH A SMALLER PARISH THE VOICE OF RESIDENTS ARE TAKEN ON BOARD VERY QUICKLY THIS WILL NOT HAPPEN IN A BIGGER PARISH	
364		100
365		
366	100 - I MAY LIVE IN LAVERSTOCK BUT I HAVE ALWAYS FELT THAT I LIVE IN SALISBURY. I WORK IN SALISBURY AND FEEL THAT PEOPLE IN LAVERSTOCK UJSE SALISBURY FACILITIES, BUSES, SHOPS ETC AND ATEND MANY FREE EVENTS RUN BY SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL EG CHRITSMAS LIGHTS SWITCH ON, ST GOERGES DAY, BUT DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE COSTS OF THESE EVENTS. I WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO BECOME PART OF SALISBURY.	
367	100 - Scheme 2 seems geographically the most sensible in terms of ironing out the peculiarity of Hampton Parks division. I can see no conceivable advantage to residents of laverstock and ford to scheme 100 and significant financial disadvantages. If Salisbury is reluctant to allow laverstock and ford to become a larger parish, scheme 3 would be a reasonable compromise.	
368		
369	100 - THE PARISH COUNCIL ARE DOING A BRILLIANT JOB HERE IN LAVERSTOCK, A COMMUNITY I HAVE BEEN VERY HAPPY TO LIVE IN FOR THE PAST 28 YEARS. TO ENLARGE OUR COMMUNITY BY JOINING US WITH SALISBURY OUR IDENTITY WOULD BE GREATLY DIMINISHED. I AM THEREFORE FOR SCHEMES 2 AND 3	
370		
371	2-LAVERSTOCK IS A VILLAGE WITH A STRONG COMMUNITY FEELING - WE WISH TO KEEP IT THIS WAY AND WOULD STRONGLY RESIST ANY MOVE TO BECOME PART OF SDC	
372		
373		100
374		100
375		100
376	ALL 3 SCHEMES - IT AIN'T BROKE DON'T FIX IT. THE REASON THE COUNCIL WANTS TO BRING LAVERSTOCK AND FORD IN SCC IS TO WE WILL PAY MORE COUNCIL TAX FOR NO BETTER SERVICES	

377	2 on 100 sheet - although not elected the parish council is very effective and fully representative of all parts of the parish, working to bring cohesion to all parts whilst each still keeping their individuality which I feel will be lost if it becomes part of the city which will result in fewer people representing it.	
378		100
379	100 - laverstock has its own historic identity - keep it	
380	100 - DUE TO THE INCREASING LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH VIA OLD SARUM AND LONGHEDGE VILLAGE BUILDING THAT IS TAKING PLACE, I'M SURE COMMUNITY PRIDE, LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS, QUALITY SERVICES WILL CREATE THE RIGHT SIZE PARISH WITH POSITIVE AND GOOD LOCAL LEADERSHIP. NO NEED TO INCREASE FURTHER	
381		
382		
383	2 Scheme 2 Right or wrong we fell more part of the Laverstock village than of the City community. Being on the outermost reaches of NE Salisbury we have had a good engagement and leadership from this parish council	
384	100 - would leave Laverstock and Ford parish members with the costs of living in the City but with few of the benefits particularly for the elderly. 100 and 2 - Laverstock and Ford parish, though a somewhat strange shape, has the amenities, local leadership and strong sense of community.	
385		2
386		
387		2
388		
389		
390		
391		
392	100 - No more housing please - particularly on the airfield!	
393		
394		
395		
396		
397	2 Scheme 100 we have lived in Laverstock for 53 years. During this time the village has changed considerably due to the building of many new properties. To support these communities the village provides a good balance of amenities, ie an excellent shop, pub, church sports and social club. In addition we have a village hall that hosts many clubs and activities. All these are run by people who care about Laverstock as a village. One of our most prized thing is the Community Farm which is a great success, being used by both villagers and beyond. We have an excellent newsletter which keeps every householder informed of local matters. All these are run by volunteers. Our local councillors work hard for the village life that we have here. We want to keep it this way - Laverstock village - separated from the City of Salisbury by green fields and the river.	
398		2
399		2
400		2

401	2 Scheme 2. Community identity. Effective governance. L&F parish have taken the trouble to include us in their events, newsletter and sense of community. We feel strongly attached to L&F parish, not to Salisbury City Council. The L&F parish council is aware of the views of local people and effectively represents us. The City Council is less aware of our more rural, close-knit type of community. Geographically we are close to the city but no road links join the housing areas directly, we are completely separate so this makes perfect sense	
402		2
403		
404	100- regarding scheme 100, my husband and I are very happy for Laverstock to continue to be a parish. It works very well and we do not want to be taken over by Salisbury	
405	100- we feel it is important to keep our own individual identity as Laverstock village and Ford. Keeping a control over our parish affairs in a manageable size area and within our local community	
406	100- waste of time and money, do the right thing and give up	
407	100 - I have lived in Laverstock for 40 years. We have always been well looked after by our parish council. They are caring and omitted people who have the interests of their people the village at heart and give no allegiance to political parties. I firmly believe that governance at local levels should not be swayed or aligned to any political parties	
408	100- the parish should be left to develop by itself without the interference of Salisbury. We pride our open spaces and wish to keep them for the sake of dwindling wild life. 2 the land was originally part of Laverstock and Ford 3 this area has been part of the parish for 21 years, I see no valid reason to change this to - only financial gain	
409		
410		100
411		100
412	100- I always thought Salisbury had a sense of history. This review would indicate this is not the case	
413	100 - I BELIEVE THIS ACTION WOULD BE BASED ON GREED. LAVERSTOCK ETC IS WELL REPRESENTED BY AN ADEQUATE COMMITTEE WHO HAVE THE AREA'S VITAL INTERESTS AT HEART.	
414	100- DEMOCRACY WORKS BEST IN THE SMALLEST PRACTICABLE UNITS. SINCE THE STATUS QUO WORKS WELL, THERE IS NO ADVANTAGE TO BE GAINED	
415		100
416		100
417		100
418		100
419	100 - having moved into the parish in May 2015 we are aghast at the possibility that the views of parishioners might be so blatantly disregarded. If we thought that becoming part of Salisbury City Council MIGHT HAVE BEEN A POSSIBILITY IT WOULD HAVE HAD A MAJOR BEARING ON WHETHER WE WOULD HAVE MADE OUR DECISION TO MOVE INTO THE PARISH. KNOWING WHAT WE KNOW NOW, REGARDING SALISBURY COUNCILLORS' BLATANT DISREGARD FOR PARISHIONER VIEWS WE WOULD NOT HAVE MOVED, OUR FEELINGS ARE THAT STRONG.	
420		100

421		
422		100
423	100 - These area should retain their own separate identify and not be swallowed up by the City Council!	
424		100
425	100 - SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL DO NOT REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF THE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD RESIDENTS AS CLEARLY SEEN BY THIER APPROVAL OF THE OLD SARUM AIRFIELD DEVELOPMENT WHICH HAD SO MANY OBJECTIONS. THEY CLEARLY SEE OUR AREA AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO SOLVE THIER HOUSING PROBLEMS AND CASH IN ON DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS	
426	100- I have lived in laverstock for nearly 51 years and have watched the parish grow into what it is today, and still managed to keep a sense of a rural community which is so important. The is has been achieved by the excellent work of our parish council. To be swallowed up by Salisbury city council whose management skills leave a lot to be desired,, if a ring road through the centre of the town and I still remember the road to nowhere and if the dreafult state of the streets and pavements is anything to go by, it is obvious the only reason they wont laverstock is for the extra revenue they would receive to plug the hole in their deficit budget	
427	100 - I LIVE IN LAVERSTOCK NOT SALISBURY. I HAVE NO OPINION ON SCHEME 2 OR 3 AND I'M HAPPY WITH EITHER IF IT KEEPS LAVERSTOCK INDEPENDENT	
428	100 - 1. Please leave us alone. There is a saying, if a system works, don't mend it. We in Laverstock have a perfectly good system so it doesn't need to be changed nor does it need any interference. 2. My council tax is at present £186 per month. For that I receive my dustbin emptied fortnightly (cost £4 per month, the same as the green rubbish collection). A bus pass say £10 per month and a bit of street lighting say £2 per month. Given by me £186 per month, Given by council £16 per month. Discrepancy £170 per month. If this was anybody else but the council you would be having a police investigation for fraud. 3. Following the comments in 2 I do NOT wish to pay more in council tax. You are receving sufficient already.	
429	100 - WHEN ASKED WHERE I LIVE I ALWAYS ANSWER FORD, NOT SALISBURY. HAVING LISTENED TO THE DEBATE ON THE WEBCAST, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE ARGUMENT FOR MERGING IS SIMPLY BASED ON EXPANDING THE TAX BASE NOT EFFECTIVENESS AND CONVENIENCE	
430		
431	100 - CANNOT SEE ANY BENEFIT WITH WHAT IS ALREADY IN EXISTENCE	
432		100
433		2
434		
435	I was born and have lived in Laverstock and would hate it if we were swallowed up by Salisbury . We don't need to grow anymore. We need to keep our independence as a rural parish that is the reason we live here. Leave us as we are.	
436	100 - GOVERNANCE SHOULD TAKE PLACE AT THE MOST LOCAL LEVEL TO ACHIEVE OPTIMUM ACCOUNTABILITY	
437		
438	100 PLEASE HAVE FORD AND LAVERSTOCK AS A PARISH. THERE IS NO NEED TO MERGE. PROPERTIES IN BISHOPDOWN WOULD BE WELCOME IN OUR PARISH. WE HAVE A UNIQUE IDENTITIY AND SENCE OF COMMUNITY, WE ARE NOT SALISBURY. WE ARE FORD AND LAVERSTOCK!	
439	100- we have a great community in Laverstock and there is no need to develop our rural parish that is near but not in Salisbury. we do not want to merge with Salisbury	

440	100 - Having lived in the parish of Laverstock and Ford since 1973 and serving for a time as a parish councillor, I share the view of many of our residents and neighbour that we wish to remain as a parish with clear geographical frontiers, river and railway. We do not participate of use Salisbury facilities and wish to remain as a Parish.	
441		100
442	2 I do not feel the City Council has a close enough understanding or interest in the local community's requirements and needs. It is too large and priorities lie elsewhere. Local governance and oversight will be more effective and efficient and serve the needs of the community better	
443	just leave all boundaries as they are, why waste money reorganising boundaries. When the monies could be spent on more important issues or services	
444	100- leave as currently is as it works well and has done for 21 years	
445	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAS ITS OWN UNIQUE IDENTITY THAT SHOULD NOT BE CHANGES FOR MERGER WITH ANYONE ELSE. 2 - BISHOPDOWN FARM RESIDENTS USE HAMPTON PARK FACILITIES AND WOULD BE WELCOMED INTO THE FORD AND LAVERSTOCK PARISH 3 - HAMPTON PARK HAS ALWAYS BEEN PART OF FORD AND LAVERSTOCK, IT SHOULD NOT BECOME PART OF SALISBURY	
446		
447	100 - 1. We moved to Laverstock from Salisbury 34 years ago because we wanted to live in a village with a strong sense of community. This did not exist in Salisbury and still does not. 2. Laverstock is treated as a village in respect of its poor bus service and I'm sure this would not improve if Salisbury and Laverstock merged. 3. We deserve to pay a lower rate of parish council tax as we have to put up with all the disruption and inconvenience caused by the schools traffic. 4. We can't see any advantage for us in merging with Salisbury, only disadvantages.	
448	100 - We live in Ford which is a rural/semi rural parish near Salisbury. We do not want to be part of Salisbury so wish to remain as we are.	
449	100 - THE AREAS INVOLVED IN SCHEME 100 IS AS IF GERMANY TOOK OVER CHECHSLOVAKIA IN A LAND GRAB FOR 'LEBENSRAUM'	
450	100 - THIS WHOLE PROPSAL HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH ANYTHING OTHER THAN FINANCIAL BENEFITS IN FAVOUR OF SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL SHAME ON THEM!	
451	100 - AS A RESIDENT IN LAVERSTOCK FOR THE PAST 48 YEARS WE HAVE BEEN WELL SERVED BY THE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL AND WISH FOR THIS TO CONTINUE	
452	100 - Our views are shown by the boxes we have marked. Leave us alone so we are able to continue to be the very contented parishioners that we are.	
453		
454		100
455	100 - IF we are merged with Salisbury City Council the number of parish councillors representing our area will fall to 4 out of a total of 27 with the merged parish. As currently constituted in 1894, the parish is run very efficiently employing only one part time clerk and is a non political. I t is rune solely for the benefit of the residents. We would lose all these benefits if wc merged with Salisbury cc, and we would pay extra council tax for less representation. it is an undemocratic proposal	
456		100
457		

458	100 - IF THE MERGER WITH SALISBURY COUNCIL GOES THROUGH I WOULD EXPECT TO SEE MUCH IMPROVED SERVICES IN OLD SARUM. WE ARE THE POOR RELATIVE AT THE MOMENT	
459		
460	100 - I like smaller communities so you know people and feel part of the community.	
461	100 - do not merge us with Salisbury. We want to stay small and manageable with a true local voice. the current size promote true localism our councillors listen to their local residents and are passionate about issues we all understand they are no party political career politicians with loud voices	
462	100 - Leave us alone!	
463		
464	100 - I WANT YOU TO LEAVE PARISH OF LAVERSTOCK TO RUN OUR OWN AFFAIRS AND INCLUDE BISHOPDOWN FARM WITH LAVERSTOCK PARISH. I HAVE A STROGN DIS-TRUST TO SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL IN FINANCIAL DECISIONS THEY MAKE. I DO NOT WANT LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH TO BE ANY PART OF SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL	
465		100
466	100 - There can be little to commend a council that lacks decisiveness and foresight, the case with Salisbury District, now City. The proposal promises further financial and political muddle. There is a general absence of corporate identity awash in new developments and traffic congestion. From a lovely city, Salisbury is fast degenerating into a dump.	
467	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD ARE VILLAGES, DO NOT FEEL THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO MERGE THIS AREA WITH THE CITY. MERGING WILL MEAN WE WILL LOSE THE COMMUNITY IDENTITY AND COHESION. WE WILL HAVE TO PAY MORE COUNCIL TAX, THE SIZE AND POPULATION OF THE PARISH WILL CHANGE SO FOR THOSE OF US LIVING HER WE WILL NO LONGER BE IN A VILLAGE AND WILL LOSE THE BENEFITS WE HAVE BY CHOOSING TO LIVE IN THIS AREA. SALISBURY AND SURROUNDING AREA ARE LOST ALREADY BEING PART OF WILTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	
468	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAVE THROUGHOUT HISTORY BEEN SEPARATE INCLUDING THE OLD WILTON AND RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL DAYS. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD ARE VILLAGE COMMUNITIES. LAVERSTOCK BEFORE THE CITY OF NEW SARUM. LAVERSTOCK AREA USED TO REACH TO STRATFORD SUB CASTLE. WE MIGHT THEREFORE PROPOSE THAT LAVERSTOCK MIGHT TAKE OVER SALISBURY SINCE WE RUN OUR AFFAIRS MORE EFFICIENTLY AND ARE NOT SEEKING TO SWELL OUR INCOME BY A TAKE OVER BID.	
469		100
470		100
471		100

472	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH IS NOT PART OF SALISBURY CITY. IF I WANTED TO LIVE IN THE CITY OF SALISBURY I WOULD MOVE THERE. I PREFER TO LIVE IN A MORE RURAL ENVIRONMENT WHICH HAS ITS OWN DISTINCTIVE COMMUNITY AND AMENITIES E.G. A VILLAGE FEEL, VILLAGE SHOP, SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, VILLAGE SCHOOL (PRIMARY) AS WELL AS THE SUPERB COMMUNITY FARM PLUS THE PUB. I LOVE BEING NEAR SALISBURY AND ABLE TO ENJOY THE BENEFITS OF LIVING SO CLOSE TO A CITY BUT I WANT TO LIVE IN A RURAL/SEMI RURAL ENVIRONMENT I.E. LAVERSTOCK VILLAGE. I THINK THAT IF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH IS ABSORBED INTO SALISBURY WE WOULD LOSE OUR DISTINCTIVE COMMUNITY IDENTITY AND LAVERSTOCK AND FORD WOULD JUST BE SUBSUMED BY THE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS IN SALISBURY CITY. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAVE A VERY ACTIVE AND VOCAL PARISH COUNCIL WHICH HAVE ALWAYS BEEN EXCELLENT ADVOCATES FOR THE RESIDENTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAS A STRONG COMMUNITY FEEL WITH SEVERAL EVENTS BEING ORGANISED THROUGHOUT THE YEAR E.G. PRIMARY SCHOOL FETE, THE VILLAGE FUN DAY, THE COMMUNITY FARM DAY, PEOPLE LIVING IN LAVERSTOCK HAVE A STRONG SENSE OF IDENTITY AS LAVERSTOCK VILLAGERS. IT HAS ITS OWN DISTINCTIVE IDENTITY WHICH WOULD BE LOST IF IT WAS CONSUMED BY SALISBURY CITY
473	100 - ANY MERGER WOULD REDUCE THE DEMOCRATIC REPRESENTATION. CURRENTLY 123 COUNCILLORS UNDER MERGER - ONLY 4
474	ALL SCHEMES - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAS ALWAYS MAINTAINED ITS OWN SEMI RURAL PARISH SERVICE ITS LOCAL RESIDENTS WELL, SO LEAVE US ALONE TO CONTINUE WITH THIS. THE ARGUMENT THAT WE USE THE CITY'S FACILITIES FREE DOESN'T HOLD UP AS ALL VISITORS FROM ACROSS BRITAIN AND ABROAD USE THEM FREE. WE ALL PAY WILTSHIRE COUNCIL RATES AND IF PARKING IN SALISBURY, PAY THE HIGHEST PARKING CHARGE IN WILTSHIRE!
475	100 - BY ALLOWING LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL TO BECOME MERGED WITHIN THE CITY BOUNDARY WILL ONLY DIMINISH THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY. ANOTHER CONCERN IS THAT INCOME AND RESOURCES CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO LAVERSTOCK AND FORD WILL ONLY BECOME SECONDARY TO THE NEEDS OF SALISBURY. I FEAR THAT OUR TAXES WILL BE RAISED TO PAY FOR THE WEIRDNESS OF RUNNING SALISBURY COUNCIL IF IT WERE TO BECOME LARGER AND LAVERSTOCK AND FORD WOULD NOT NECESSARILY SEE ANY OF THOSE BENEFITS. HAVING OUR OWN LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES WHO TRULY UNDERSTAND AND WORKS FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY IS A MUST.
476	100 - THIS IS ALL ABOUT MONEY NOT PEOPLE'S WISHES
477	100 - I WANT LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH TO REMAIN AS IT IS AND NOT BECOME PART OF SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL. WE HAVE LIVED IN LAVERSTOCK FOR NEARLY 41 YEARS AND LOVE IT AS IT IS. WE WANT IT TO RETAIN ITS IDENTITY AND INDEPENDENCE AND TO CONTINUE TO FOSTER ITS COMMUNITY SPIRIT BY WORKING TOGETHER AND GETTING THINGS DONE WITHOUT EXCESSIVE INTERFERENCE FROM OUTSIDE BUREAUCRACY AND RED TAPE. WE ARE PROUD OF OUR PARISH AND ALL IT STANDS FOR
478	100 - WE HAVE PRIDE IN SALISBURY BUT WE ARE VERY PROUD THAT WE ARE A VILLAGE THAT HAS MANAGED ITSELF SUCCESSFULLY FOR HUNDREDS OF YEARS. WE ALL FEEL RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR VILLAGE WE TAKE GREAT PRIDE IN OUR VILLAGE. WE WISH YOU WOULD LEAVE US ALONE AND TRY AND SORT OUT THE MESS THAT YOU ALL HAVE CREATED IN SALISBURY. YOU REALLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THE PEOPLE OF SALISBURY WANT. YOU JUST SEEM TO BE MORE CONCERNED OF YOUR OWN IMPORTANCE
479	2 100 I believe that Laverstock and Ford have an independent way about them away from Salisbury District, and should remain so. 3 I think that the new houses should be included into Salisbury District Council as they are more [akin?] with the City than they are Laverstock and Ford
480	

481	2 Scheme 100 - no reasoned justification has been made to warrant merging the two. What's the purpose? Both councils work perfectly well as they area. Pointless bureaucracy to merge when there is no compelling case. The questions are curious - they are hadly a reliable barometer to test this key issue why there should be a merger / boundary changes	
482	100 - I DO NOT WISH TO BE PART OF SALISBURY CITY IF I DID I WOULD MOVE INTO THE CITY. I WISH TO REMAIN IN THE PARISH OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD NOT GOBBLED UP AND BE JUST ANOTHER NUMBER SO SALISBURY CAN GRAB MORE MONEY FOR THIER OWN COFFERS. I HAVE GREAT PRIDE IN OUR PARISH ADN WISH TO BE LEFT ALONE	
483	2 Salisbury is a relatively small city; it doesn't make much sense to me to have one area (ie Laverstock) separate when all the other areas are together.	
484		100
485	2 All aspects of Laverstock and Ford Parish council are open, caring and capable and most of all know their area and its people. 2 A loer council tax would enable me to spend and support venues in Salisbury	
486		100
487		
488	Having only been in this area for 4 months I cannot be sure about the impact of any of the three proposals. However, I don normally prefer to keep communities small and local as this is more likely to provide the needs of the residents and to listen to their views and concerns. Incidentally why change the boundaries at all?	
489		100
490		
491		
492		
493		
494	100 - I SEE NO VALUE IN EXISTING RESIDENTS OF THE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH BEING MERGED WITHSALISBURY CITY UNDER SCHEME 100. THIS OPTION WOULD DETRACT FROM THE CURRENT FOCUS ON PARISH ISSUES WHICH SERVES THE AREA SO WELL. WE WOULD BE 'LOST' WITHIN THE SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL. SCHEME 2 - WOULD BE A POSITIVE MOVE, CREATING A MORE COMPLETE PARISH FOR BOTH EXISTING MEMBERS OF THE PARISH AND THOSE BROUGHT INTO IT VIA THIS PROPOSAL SCHEME 3 - APPEARS TO JUST DETRACT FROM THE EXISTING PARISH COMMUNITY AND WOULD ADD LITTLE VALUE TO THOSE RESIDENTS TRANSFERRED TO SALISBURY CITY.	
495		100
496	100 and 2 I personally have been a happy resident of laverstock for 59 years Currently our forward lookand and efficient laverstock & ford parish is managed by a good, keen and sincere cross section of non political volunteers who care, as I do, for our rural also semi rural parish. It must remain as it is near, but not in Salisbury city. Salisbury with it congestion and high pollution, dense traffic and high charges for most facilities as soon as the boundary is crossed - not for me. Laverstock and ford parish is free, welcoming and friendly and with its fresh air local well used facilities, long may it remain that way.	
497	100 WE ARE A VILLAGE COMMUNITY AND HAVE NO WISH WHATSOEVER TO JOIN SALISBURY CITY	
498		
499		100

500		
501		
502		
503	100 - I am very concerned about a possible increase in council taxes and therefore cannot agree to this	
504	100 - I HAVE NOT COMPLETES SECTIONS7,8,9 AND 10 BECAUSE I DONT HAVE A VIEW ON THE BOUNDARY CHANGES AFFECTING HAMPTON PARK AND BISHOPDOWN FARM. HOWEVER I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL MERGING WITH SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL	
505	100 - please leave our community alone to develop our rural/semi rural parish near but not in Salisbury. Salisbury residents do visit laverstock and enjoy themselves free. Thee parish precept is not part of the governance criteria	
506		
507		
508	100 - I WOULD LIKE TO REMAIN PART OF LAVERSTOCKL AND FORD AS THE PRESENT COUNCILLOR HAVE WORKED LONG AND HARD TO MAKE THE PARISH AS GOOD AS IT IS SO SCHEME 2 HAS MY UNANIMOUS VOTE	
509		100
510	SCHEME 2 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAVE AN EXCELLENT PARISH COUNCIL WITH STRONG LOCAL INVOLVEMENT I RUN A MEMORY SUPPORT GROUP FOR PEOPLE WITH DEMENTIA IN THE VILLAGE FUNDED BY WILTSHIRE COUNCIL AND THE LOCAL PARISH COUNCILLORS ARE SUPPORTIVE. IT IS IMPORTANT TO RETAIN A 'VILLAGE ATMOSPHERE' IN ORDER TO SUPPORT VULNERABLE RESIDENTS	
511	100 - LAVERSTOCK PARISH HS A VERY STRONG SENSE OF COMMUNITY AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE VOLUNTARY INPUT INTO RIVERBROUNE COMMUNITY FARM. WHY IS THERE NO MENTION IN THIS DOCUMENT OF THE PREVIOUS WC WORKING PARTY RECOMMENDAION TO RETAIN LAVERSTOCK'S SEPARATE STATUS? WHY IS THE COUNCIL IGNORING THIS?	
512		100
513		100
514	100 - AS A RESIDENT OF 66 YEARS I PREFER TO KEEP LAVERSTOCK AND FORD AS A SMALLER PARISH AND NOT BE PART OF SALISBURY DISTRICT COUNCIL	
515	100 - FORD HAS ALWAYS BEEN A RURAL AREA CLOSE TO BUT NOT PART OF SALISBURY. WE WELCOME THE RURAL FEEL AND DO NOT WANT FURTHER URBANISATION OF OUR PARISH. WE ENJOY NIGHT SKIES WITHOUT THE INTRUSION OF STREET LIGHTING. WE ENJOY UNMADE NATURAL PATHS - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS. WE DO NOT WANT TO BE PART OF SALISBURY CITY, WE WANT TO REMAIN SEPARATE, A RURALL HAMLET AND PART OF THE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH.	
516	100 - LAVERSTOCK IS A SEPARATE ENTITY WITH ITS OWN STRONG SENSE OF COMMUNITY, ITS OWN FACILITIES I.E. CHURCH, VILLAGE HALL, PUB AND ITS PARISH COUNCIL. ITS OTHER COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES ARE VIBRANT AND WELL SUPPORTED I.E. EVERGREEN CUBS, SCOUTS ETC, WI. IT HAS ITS OWN PARISH MAGAZINE. NOT LEAST ITS COMMUNITY FARM IS A FLOURISHING VENTURE. IT ALSO HAS ITS OWN SHOP AND TWO TAKEAWAYS.	
517	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD IS VERY EFFICIENTLY RUN AND IN NO WAY WILL AMALGAMATION BE BENEFICIAL TO LAVERSTOCK RESIDENTS	
518		100
519		100

520	100 LAVERSTOCK AND FORD HAS FUNCTIONED VERY WELL UP UNTIL NOW. GOOD SENSE OF COMMUNITY, REGULAR LOCALLY ORIENTATED NEWSLETTER ALL GIVE A WELCOMING ENVIRONMENT. BOOSTS QUALITY OF LIFE ESPECIALLY FOR THE OLDER GENERATIONS WHO FEEL A BIT ISOLATED IF THEY CAN'T GET OUT MUCH. PEOPLE WHO FEEL PART OF A COMMUNITY LIKE LAVERSTOCK AND FORD MAY BE LESS OF A BURDEN ON THE CARIGN SERVICES IF THEY FEEL BETTER IN THEMSELVES - LESS PRONE TO DEPRESSION AND ANXIETY SO MORE HEALTHY OVERALL. SMALLER COMMUNITY UNITS ARE BETTER THAN HUGE CONGLOMERATES.	
521	100 - THE SERVICES IN THE CITY AREAS ARE GETTING VERY POOR. THE SELLING THE SERVICES TO BELFORD BEATY WAS A DISGRACE AND LOOKS LIKE SOME PERSONS MUST HAVE HADA VERY NICE BACK HANDER. I CANNOT TRUST THE PERSENT LEADER SO PLEASE LEAVE THE BOUNDARIES AS THEY STAND	
522		100
523		100
524		100
525	SCHEME 100 IS LOGICAL. WE SAY THAT WE LIVE IN SALISBURY IF ANYONE ASKS, IT REMOVES A SET OF BUREAUCRACY. 2 SMALL COUNCIL WILL BECOME 1. THE MAP FOR SCHEME 100 CLEARLY SHOWS THAT INSTEAD OF 2 ODD SHAPE JIGSAW PIECES WE CAN HAVE A ROUGH CIRCLE AROUND THE URBAN AREA OF SALISBURY WITH NO ARBITRARY BOUNDARIES	
526		100
527		100
528		100
529		100
530		100
531		100
532		100
533	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD IS A SEMI RURAL PARISH WITH DISTINCTIVE AMENITIES - WHOLLY INAPPROPRIATE TO MERGE WITH CITY. MERGER WOULD LEAD TO A LOSS OF COMMUNITY INFLUENCE OVER ISSUES SUCH AS AIRFIELD DEVELOPMENT FOR THOSE MOST AFFECTED. LAVERSTOCK ANF FORD RESIDENTS PAY FOR SERVICES AND PARKING IN CITY JUST LIKE VISITORS FROM FURTHER AFIELD. CITY RESIDENTS BENEFIT FROM AMENITIES SUCH AS THE COMMUNITY FARM FOR FREE. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL HAS PROVED ITS ABILITY TO EFFICIENTLY RUN A VIABLE PARISH. ISSUES SUCH AS VERY SLOW INTERNET CONNECTION WOULD BE EVEN LISEE LIKELY TO BE ADDRESSED WHEN ITS A SMALLER MINORITY AFFECTED	
534		100
535		100
536	100 - COSTS TO THE RESIDENCE	
537	100-Parish Councils should not be elected on party lines. I cannot see how this will benefit residents of Laverstock and Ford. Parish Councillors should not get expenses. The area of Laverstock and Ford is large enough for a Parish council to manage, any larger and I feel Old Sarum will not get a look in when decisions are made. It will not be long before Lavistock and Ford has a large population than Salisbury	
538		100

539		100
540	100 - WE ARE AT A LOSS AS TO WHAT BENEFITS THE RESIDENTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH WOULD GAIN BY BECOMEING PART OF SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL!	
541	100 - WE HAVE ALREADY VOTED TO STAY AS A PARISH. THE VOTE WAS 90% PLUS NOT TO JOIN SALISBURY	
542	100- Leave us alone	
543		100
544	100-I purchased a home in a village called Laverstock. I do not want to become part of a parish being gradually eroded by Salisbury city council	
545	100-Council has just gone up when inflation is going down??! If we join Salisbury council it will go up again! JOKE!!	
546	I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON SCHEME 100. LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL ARE ALL FOR THE COMMUNITY AND HAVE A BRILLIANT TRACK RECORD OF LOOKING AFTER THIER PARISHONERS. SALISBURY COUNCIL HAVE NO INTEREST OUTSIDE THE CITY CENTRE ADN ARE ONLY INTERESTED IN THE MONEY TO SPEND IN THE CITY. I RARELY GO INTO THE CITY, IT COSTS FAR TOO MUCH AND IF I MUST, I PAY THE SAME AS ANY VISITOR. I LIVE AT OLD SARUM, A VERY RURAL COMMUNITY WITH FIELDS SURROUNDING ME. OUT HISTORY PREDATES SALISBURY BY MANY THOUSANDS OF YEARS. THE CITY COUNCIL VOTED TO BUILD ON THE LOCAL AIRFIELD, THEY DIDN'T ASK THE LOCAL COMMUNITY WHAT THEY THOUGHT, SO MUCH FOR THEM CARING ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS OUTSIDE THE CITY. WE HAVE A EXCELLENT PARISH COUNCIL WHO ARE ALL FOR THE COMMUNITY AND A BADLY RUN CITY COUNCIL WHO ONLY CARE ABOUT USING US TO RAISE MONEY FOR THE CITY CENTRE. OVER 99% OF US THAT VOTED AGAINST A MERGER. I THOUGHT WE LIVED IN A DEMOCRACY OR DID MY DAD FIGHT FOR NOTHING	
547		
548		
549	100 - AS A PARISH WE HAVE A STRONG SENSE OF LOCAL COMMUNITY WHICH MAKES LAVERSTOCK FEEL A VERY SMALL AND FRIENDLY PLACE TO LIVE. THIS IS WHY I DISAGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL TO MERGE LAVERSTOCK AND SALISBURY AS IN SCHEME 100	
550	100-Whatever is decided it makes sense to unite the 2 parts of Bishopdown instead of splitting them between two different parishes	
551	LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PC REPRESENTS THE LOCAL COMMUNITY. IT SHOULD REMAIN AS IT IS AND NOT BE SWALLOWED UP BY SALISBURY	
552	PLEASE LEAVE ALONE TO DEVELOP OUR RURAL/SEMI RURAL PARISH, NEAR BUT NOT IN SALISBURY. THANK YOU	
553		100
554	100 - MOVEMENTS OF PROPERTIES AT HAMPTON PARK OR LAVERSTOCK AND FORD TO MERGE WITH SALISBURY Ciry WOULD NOT IMPROVE THE PRESENT SERVICES CURRENTLY PROVIDED TO THE EXISTING PARISHES. MOST SERVICES ARE PROVIDED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL FROM WHICH THE CURRENT COUNCIL TAX IS EXTRACTED. MEDICAL, POLICE, FIRE AND REFUSE SERVICES IS ALREADY AREA BASED AND NOT THE SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITY OF SALISBURY CITY. I NOTE SALISBURY CITY RECENTLY SUPPORTED THE OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION TO BUILD HOUSING ON OLD SARUM AIRFIELD WHICH IS OUTSIDE THIER REMIT. I ALSO NOTE HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE IS A COUNTY RESPONSIBILITY AND IS NOT A SALISBURY CITY ONE. MOVEMENT TO SALISBURY CITY WOULD NOT PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL BENEFITS TO LAVERSTOCK AND OLD FORD PARISH	
555	100- I love things as they are.	

556	100-Old Sarum is developing a strong sense of identity and community which is essential in view of forthcoming developments in the area. A sense of distinctiveness and appreciation of the needs of a community would not be well served by integrating with the city - to make Laverstock and Old Sarum essentially suburbs of Salisbury would harm the development of strong village like communities in these areas of new development which is important to the maintenance and rural character	
557		100
558		100
559	100-	
560	100 - LAVERSTOCK SHOULD BE LEFT AS A VILLAGE AS IT HAS BEEN FOR MANY YEARS!	
561		100
562	100-	
563	100-Laverstock and Ford are villages. We do not want subsumed into Salisbury City	
564	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD IS A PARISH COUNCIL AND SO SHOULD REMAIN A PARISH COUNCIL AND ALL THE RESIDENTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD ARE PROUD TO LIVE HERE. SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL HAS BEEN TOLD BY THE RESIDENTS ALREADY AND ALSO BY THE WC WORKING GROUP TO LEAVE US ALONE. THIS IS ALL A WASTE OF TAX PAYERS MONEY 'OUR MONEY' SO LEAVE US ALONE!	
565	100-	
566		100
567		
568	100-	
569		
570		100
571	100-A city that has no central police station, no support for the local football club. We in the South of the county have no say what is happening in the rest of the county.	
572		100
573	100- I was born and brought up in Salisbury and although lived elsewhere in various places spent majority of my life here. I have lived in various parts of city. I moved to Laverstock 18 months ago. There is nothing to stop Salisbury residents from elsewhere enjoying e.g. walks in this parish, children attend schools here etc. As a Laverstock resident I still contribute to Salisbury e.g. by working 2 days a week in city centre charity shop, supporting Salisbury businesses of the market etc.	
574		
575	100 - LAVERSTOCK AND FORD IS A THRIVING COMMUNITY WHERE I HAVE LIVED FOR THE PAST 38 YEARS. IT DOES NOT DESERVE TO BE SWALLOWED UO BY SALISBURYS LARGE UNITARY COUNCIL	
576	100-	
577		100
578		

579	100 - THE MAP DOES NOT SHOW THE NEW OLD SARUM ESTATE. WHY NOT!! IS IT WE DO NOT MATTER? HOW CAN WE EVEN CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL WHEN WE ARE NOT EVEN ON THE MAP!! GET IT WRIGHT	
580		
581	100 - THERE IS A CLEAR DISTINCTION FOR PEOPLE, SOME CHOOSE TO LIVE IN URBAN AREAS AND OTHERS SMALLER COMMUNITIES. SMALLER COMMUNITIES OR VILLAGES DEVELOP THEIR OWN CHARACTER AND INFRASTRUCTURE THAT MAKE THEM UNIQUE AND DESIRABLE. WE ALL PAY OUR COMMUNITY CHARGE WHETHER WE LIVE IN TOWNS OR VILLAGES SO QUALITY OF SERVICES SHOULD BE THE RIGHT OF EVERYONE	
582	100 - the parish of laverstock as it exists at present and has existed for many years works extremely well and has a distinct personality. It is different from Salisbury City but complements it. Laverstock has a good sense of local community with many families having lived there for their whole lives. If they move they stay in Laverstock. If it aint broke don't fix it!	
583		100
584		
585	100-Return Laverstock to original boundaries	
586	SCHEME 100 - LAVERSTOCK AND SURROUNDING AREAS SHOULD BE KEPT SEPARATE FROM THE CITY OF SALISBURY TO PRESERVE THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE AREA. SCHEME 2 - BISHOPDOWN FARM SHOULD BE MOVED TO PRESERVE THE COHESIVE NATURE OF THE AREA SCHEME 3 - IT WOULD BE A RETROGRADE STEP TO SEVER THE STRONG LINKS OF THE AREA BUILT UP OVER DECADES	
587	I elected to live in a semi rural parish and not in the city environment so hands off Salisbury city council. The laverstock and ford parish council support very strongly the interests of the Parish, being very motivated and pro-active with all aspects of the parish. Also they are very efficient and effective representing value for money. Both bishopdown farm and Hampton park are naturally part of the laverstock parish so they belong by right to the parish. The above comments are for all 3 proposals.	
588		100
589		
590	100-Salisbury council do not do anything here, apart from emptying the rubbish bins fortnightly. We have been Laverstock and Ford forever and there is no need for it to be changed. If it is not broke don't fix it	
591		
592		
593		
594	100- We bought our house in Ford in 1990 to live in the country and be governed by the local parish. we strongly resent being moved from Parish to City.	
595	100-	
596	100-	
597		
598		100
599	100-	
600	100-	

601	100 - WITH THE ALLEGED INDIFFERENT LEADERSHIP FROM COUNTY HALL IN TROWBRIDGE, I UNDERSTAND THAT AN ENLARGED SALISBURY CITY PARISH WOULD REFLECT MORE THE WISHES OF RESIDENTS. THIS SHOULD BE A MARKED IMPROVEMENT AS MY LIFE REVOLVES AROUND WORK AND PLAY IN THE CITY. WHAT IS THERE IN LAVERSTOCK? HOW ABOUT A BETTER BUS SERVICE FOR A START! THANK YOU	
602	100 - I am very concerned that local democracy will suffer should Salisbury take over Laverstock. Laverstock PC is an example of efficient friendly and cost effective local government. It appears to me that the same cannot be said for Salisbury town council	
603		100
604		
605		100
606		100
607	The Salisbury Council fail totally to protect local interests on planning for housing and particularly on roads. I have no confidence in what they do for FORD	
608	100- Leave well alone - why upset residents just for the sake of it. In my experience any changes made i.e Petersfinger Road have had a detrimental effect	
609		100
610		100
611		
612		100
613		
614	Keep the identity of Laverstock & Ford. Been a resident of Laverstock for 30 years - enjoyed many aspects the village has to offer ie local schools, church and village hall where many clubs provide services etc to the community for all ages. The Bourne Community Farm is growing stronger each year providing many educational and social events for local residents and visitors from a wide area. people have strived long and hard to keep rural life alive, please respect the wishes of this local community	
615	100 - Leave our village alone	
616	100-I've lived here 47 years for me Laverstock is Laverstock and Bishopdown is Bishopdown separated by the railway line. If it wasn't for the schools it would be a truly sleepy village. Whilst we have to move forward in life I believe Laverstock and Ford should be left as it is and perhaps a third parish created. With all the new houses planned over time. So maybe it should be Laverstock, Bishoptown and Ford as a new parish.	
617	100- I strongly believe that Laverstock and Ford should continue to develop outside of the City of Salisbury. I believe that If the village is subsumed into the city it will loose its unique identity and character.	
618		
619		100
620		
621	100-We have been here before and made it perfectly clear that we wish to be left alone by Salisbury. Whilst we love th city we also love having our own parish and independence. Near but not in salisbury	

622	Scheme 2. Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park will lose their identity if swallowed up by Salisbury City Council. The council does not have best interests of residents at heart but only wish to increase council tax.
623	100- Laverstock Resident have a strong sense of belonging to the village of Laverstock and sense of community. This would be lost and not felt if Laverstock was merged with Salisbury
624	100-
625	100- Laverstock & Ford has a very strong local community and deserves to remain as is.
626	100
627	Scheme 100 - The proposal is solely based on financial gain for Salisbury. Who in Laverstock and Ford is in favour? No one! Our parish council is effective and efficient - just look at the mess SCC has made of Salisbury City centre to see the difference. L&F wish to retain its identity & community & govern itself. Scheme 2 & £ - it makes sense for all Hampton Park to be moved to SCC - the current split reduces the cohesion of the local community & services.
628	100-There are geographical and historical reasons for keeping the separation of Laverstock and Ford from Salisbury city. The river Bourne, meadows and railway embankment provide a clear demarcation for the current boundaries, as far as the major part of L&F are concerned. Laverstock has a strong and effective social community spirit and governance within a semi rural setting, which has led us to a deliberate choice to reside outside the city boundaries.
629	For all three proposals. We do not want to be part of Salisbury Parish. We are Laverstock & Ford. We do not want to subsidise Salisbury through taxes ect. We do not want their ridiculous parking schemes. We want to keep our identity as it is.
630	SCHEME 100 - THE RESIDENTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH DO NOT CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE PART OF SALISBURY. THYE HAVE A DISTINCTIVE AND DIFFERENT COMMUNITY AND ARE EFFECTIVELY REPRESENTED AND SERVED BY AN EXCELLENT PARISH COUNCIL. WE HAVE OUR OWN AMENITIES, ATTRACTIONS AND INTERESTS AND WISH TO REMAIN CLOSE BUT SEPARATE FROM TEH CITY OF SALISBURY. WE MAY CHOOSE TO VISIT SALISBURY FOR SHOPPING OR ENTERTAINMENT, BUT WE COULD EQUALLY VISIT AMESBURY OR ANDOVER AND THER IS NO QUESTION OF BEING PART OF THIER LOCAL COUNCILS!
631	Laverstock (including Milford) and Ford are villages. We no longer have a post office or a doctors surgery or a police station. There are no police officers assigned to us. The people who live in this parish choose to do so because of the quiet countryside environment. So far we have managed without complaint and without the so called "amenities" of Salisbury city. We only as to be left to live our lives in peace.
632	
633	The proposal to amalgamate Laverstock with Salisbury is purely for financial gain only. In fact I think its a cheek to even think we would be better off. Your council is too often found to be sitting on their hands and dither too much about important decisions. Our parish is doing very nicely thank you and long may it continue. Laverstock is a lovely village quite capable of looking after itself
634	100- We are happy with our present council. Bringing Salisbury into this would mean new councillors whom we have no knowledge of and do not know our present council is doing a good job and helping to improve facilities. If we became part of Salisbury all this would disappear and any improvement would never happen.
635	100-Please leave us alone to continue to develop our semi-rural parish which is a contented, successful community
636	

637	All Three proposals- We have a strong civic community governed by a thoughtful communicative Parish council. We do not feel part of Salisbury and would much prefer the current set up continued. The alternatives are designed to resolve the city's mismanaged Financials situation and would have a devastating impact on our well managed community lifestyle.
638	
639	
640	100 - Laverstock parish should be independent of Salisbury 2 & 3- I strongly feel that the properties at Bishopdown Farm be moved back with LFPC and Hampton Park be moved to stay as the land was LFPC in the first place. Our local councillors are in tune with the parish and the identity should be left alone.
641	
642	I AM COMMENTING ON ALL THE PROPOSALS AS A VERY STRONGLY HELD OPINION AND POSITION. I REJECT PROPOSALS 100 AND 3 ON THE BASIS OF HAMPTON PARK REMAINING PART OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH. HOWEVER WITHIN THIS BOUNDARY CHANGES A FURTHER CHANGES SHOUDL HAPPEN - OLD SARUM AND LONGHEDGE SHOULD BECOME PART OF SALISBURY OR ANOTHER PARIOSH OF FORM ITS OWN. THIS WOULD MAINTAIN AND PROMOTE THE KEY ASPECTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH BEING A RURAL PARISH WITH THE SIZE THAT REFLECTS THIS AND GEOGRAPHY. NEW PARISH WOULD BE CALLED LAVERSTOCK, FORD AND HAMPTON PARK PARISH
643	we are a flourishing parish with a keen sense of community. This semi rural parish has the key services of shops doctor, vet, pub, sports club, an active busy village hall, a well run community farm and a very good parish news letter. We have a good community sprit and a keen sense of identity which would disappear if we were swallowed up by the big city next door. Salisbury citizens benefit from the use of our more rural ways and spaces, our downs and parks, our farm and our wish is to keep our identity
644	Laverstock & Ford Parish Council has, and still continues, to operate very effectively and efficiently over a number of years and therefore has a proven history. Merger with Salisbury City Council would serve no practical purpose for L&F residents. In fact unifying areas into larger units makes services more remote & using the unified Wiltshire County Council more inefficient and less effective
645	100-Laverstock and Ford has a distinct community feel and the feeling of the village that borders Salisbury rather than being part of it. It has been managed as a parish well in my opinion up to this point and I see no clear reason why is should be consumed into Salisbury - It appears to be a financial proposal with no benefits for the residents having been put forward.
646	All schemes - The Parish of Laverstock, Ford , Hampton Park, Riverdown Park and Old Sarum have in place a very effective and efficient parish council. as set up under the local government act in 1894 with Voluntary parish councillors from all working on a Non Political basis and is solely run by local people for the benefit of local people. Should the parish be absorbed into Salisbury City we would lose the local identity and just become a 'lost' part of the city with no local identity. I object VERY strongly TO THE ABSORTION INTO SALISBURY CITY. BUT STRONGLY SUPPORT THE RETURN OF BISHOPDOWN FARM BACK TO THE PARISH
647	100- I feel that the present system works well so why change. This survey and any subsequent changes must be costing finance that the council (WC) can ill afford. Lets just leave things alone. As the Americans say 'If it ain't broke, don't fix it'.
648	100-
649	100- Laverstock and Ford needs to be independent and not part of Salisbury. Strong local community and better developed by ourselves.
650	100-

651	please leave Laverstock as it is. We have a wonderful sense of community. We do not want any intruders from other councils.
652	100- 12 years ago I moved here from a small village because Laverstock was a village on the outskirts of the city not part of the city and really would not like to be part of the city.
653	100- point 7 - not affected by this proposal.
654	100-
655	100-
656	100-
657	100-We chose to live in Laverstock because it is a vibrant village. It is well run by a dependant council composed of dedicated volunteers who all live in the parish and have the interest and wellbeing of the community at their heart. A fine news letter is delivered to each home every 2 months giving news of the councils business and all the many activities that happen in the village. The village hall was recently opened and the Old Sarum community centre are all well used by clubs and youth organisations e.g. Woman's institute, gardening club, scouts, playgroup. The community forum is a valuable asset to the village. It holds regular events such as open days, cream teas, barn dances and concerts. It has opened many walks and nature trails in the parish. Many of the residents are Friend of the Farm to financially support their activities whilst others do voluntary work. Laverstock sporta and social club is a thriving club running sports teams for all a ges and organising charity events. We strongly urge you to reject the Salisbury city council proposal to take over the Laverstock and Ford Parish. Remember 99.3% of Laverstock residents expressed the desire to stay separate from salisbury
658	100- Laverstock and Ford need to try and keep their own identity. It already feels we are merging into a suburb of Salisbury City and we were originally villages. The relentless addition of school huge buildings has changed enough already.
659	100-I wish to remain in the Laverstock parish as it seems to have worked very well up until now and can see benefits no benefits in becoming part of Salisbury
660	
661	100- Please leave Laverstock parish to govern itself and maintain semi rural feel.
662	
663	
664	100-
665	100-
666	100-
667	100- Do not confuse Laverstock with Harnham, Bemerton and Bishopdown. Laverstock is a separate and distinct stand alone village not part of Salisbury - if you really want to "make a difference" lower Salisbury parking charges.
668	100-
669	100-We enjoy Laverstock as an integrated and friendly community with good links with Salisbury but links does not equate absorbtion. There is no need here for a change o governance or alteration to our local services, especially any changes to our council tax 2 & 3. Can't speak here for people who live in Ford, Bishoptown and Hampton parish but we do seem to share a number of community facilities already - why change
670	

671	100-We really do not want our parish to inherit anything from SDC. The appalling state of Salisbury assets are not something SDC should be proud of - Taking on more responsibility will merely increase the burdon of responsibility which they are not good at
672	100- We have a good Parish council who care about our villages and works hard to provide a clean and pleasant environment. Ours is an ancient rural parish with a strong community spirit and should remain so. WE DO NOT WISH TO BECOME PART OF SALISBURY.
673	
674	100- The seven factors listed in parts 6,8 & 10 already exist, thankfully, in Laverstock and Ford parish. The unprincipled are in earnest pursuit of funds and the end justifies the means - £300,000!
675	
676	
677	100- Laverstock has a strong and effective parish council acting on behalf of the residents without political influence. The population has repeatedly expressed its wish to remain as a separate parish. Examples of effective governance are the community farm, the parish newsletter, accommodating the schools, Laverstock football club and with a strong social influence.
678	
679	100-
680	100-I wish us to be left alone to develop our rural parish
681	100-
682	
683	100-With so many possible developments taking place on this side of the city Laverstock and Ford residents need strong effective local governance which represents their views
684	100- Note - not nearly having information on the actions of the parish council it is difficult to make meaningful decisions regarding whether the status quo should be changed. Any decision is a guess. Maybe joining up the proposed areas would make sense from the geography of the areas concerned more a part of Laverstock and Ford than Salisbury.
685	100-In terms of scheme 100 my very strong preference is to leave things as they are and allow Laverstock and Ford to develop our own parish close to but not in Salisbury. In the (hopefully unlikely) event that this does not happen I would be stongly in favour of Bishoptown farm coming closer to Lavistock and Ford (scheme 2) as there are obviously advantages to both doing this. I am completely against the scheme 3 proposal
686	100- We want Laverstock and Ford parish to stay as it is. We see no benefit to us in merging with Salisbury. The only gain would be for Salisbury residents having extra revenue to do as they please in their area, not ours.
687	100-
688	100 - FORD WILL LOSE ITS IDENTITY AND SIMPLY BECOME A SUBURB OF SALISBURY AND ALL THE COSTS INVOLVED
689	

100

690	100-I am strongly opposed to the proposed merger of Lavistock and Ford Parish council with Salisbury city council. The proposal and its timing is clearly a cynical move by Salisbury city council to increase its annual income so that it can take over the assets that Wiltshire council want to hand back to it. The reasons they have given in support of the merger don't stand up to scrutiny. In my opinion there are parallels here with what happened when we lost Salisbury District council to Wiltshire council. Supposedly "good" reasons were put forward as to the advantages of scrapping Salisbury district council but what was the outcome? Our councillors might have influence on Wiltshire council but they can be easilt out voted on local issues Laverstock and Ford are separate from Salisbury and deserve to have their own parish council which understands and can respond to local needs. If this merger goes ahead we will lose a very good parish council and it will be yet another blow to local democracy Scheme 2 - I am in favour of scheme 2 as the land was originally part of Laverstock and Ford Scheme 3 - I disagree with scheme 3 as Hampton park, including riverdown, has been part of Laverstock and Ford parish since the outset
691	100- We chose to live in a village - yes a village very close to a town, but nevertheless, a village with a distinct personality and the advantages and disadvantages of life in a community separate from the city. if 99.3% of us want to remain a separate parish, surely our wish should have some weight and we should make the decision.
692	100- 1) Laverstock has a strong sense of being a distinct community. 2) we are kept well-informed about local issues by our parish council. Our council seems to be effective and well led. 3) Salisbury's whole approach seems uninvited and high-handed.
693	100
694	100- This scheme is put forward solely to provide additional tax payers/income to Salisbury. It offers absolutely no benefits to the residents of Laverstock and Ford. Laverstock and Ford is not a part of the City and it is well served by its parish councillors as a rural parish. no attempt has been made by Salisbury City Council to consider the impact of this scheme on the residents of Laverstock and Ford. the only factor mentioned is to gain additional income to be paid by the residents of Laverstock and Ford parish council. 9, together with the overwhelming majority of residents in Laverstock and Ford (from my conversations) are strongly opposed to this scheme.
695	100- I live in the country not the city, a move into the city would mean no effective way of making life better for my parish as we would be out voted at every move. The council did away with S.D.C. and you would be recreating the old S.D.C. with its mismanagement, overspending etc. the need for more money for the city is what the city want.
696	
697	100 THE INCLUSION OF THE MORE 'RURAL' L;AVERSTOCK AND FORD pc INTO THE MORE URBANISED SALISBURY CC IS MERELY A DEVICE TO PROVIDE SALISBURY CC WITH EXTRA INCOME. THE ABSORBTION WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE MORE RURAL CHARACTER OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PC. I AM SURE THAT THE ENLARGED SCC WOULD NOT LOOK FAVOURABLE INTO PROVIDING MORE AMENITIES/IMPROVED INFRASTRUCTURE TO THE MORE RURAL LAVERSTOCK ANF FORD PC AREA. ANY INCOME FROM THE CURRENT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS AT OLD SARUM, LONG HEDGE AND HAMPTON PARK ETC WOULD BE BETTER USED BY THE EXISTING LAVERSTOCK ANF FORD PC. SCHEME 2 - THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE SCHEME PUT FORWARD IS SCHEME 2 AND I'M NOT TOO SURE ABOUT THAT
698	
699	
700	
701	100- I believe that we are well served at the moment with Laverstock and Ford having their own identities. We are separated from Salisbury by a hill and have a passionate and effective councillor to represent us.

702	100- I feel that by combining our area with the city area our needs will be collectively lost as the needs of the city would be seen as more important. Living in Old Sarum and living in the city are very different experiences and the parishes should be separated or kept separate to reflect this.	
703	100- The proposals put forward is partly for Salisbury City parish council to make money to pay off their debts it has nothing to do with the welfare of the residents of Laverstock and Ford parish council.	
704	100- As a resident of Laverstock I feel I do not have the right to agree or disagree with proposals affecting Bishopdown Farm or Hampton Park residents.	
705		2
706		2
707		2
708		2
709		2
710		2
711		2
712		2
713		100
714		100
715	100- 1. Cities are constantly swallowing up parish to their own ends meet. 2. I've lived here 20 years + and now Salisbury cc want to embrace/gobble up Laverstock and Ford parish within their boundaries. Time will bring in Old Sarum and Long Hedge as well - it's a no brainer to the SCC penny pinchers CC with no better facilities they are constantly reducing year on year. Time to leave I suspect.	
716	2 As a resident of 20 years I have felt more a member of Laverstock and Ford than Salisbury City. I can rarely recall the information sent by Salisbury City whereas I receive regular quarterly information form Laverstock and Ford. As a Laverstock and Ford resident I feel I would have a committed backing to local issues and an identity which I don't feel I have with Salisbury City	
717		2
718	100- Laverstock and Ford should stay their own parish. SCC only want to change to make more money. Most of us do not use the facilities in Salisbury so why should we be joined together. Leave things alone.	
719	100 WE NEED TO BE LEFT ALONE TO DEVELOP SEMI RURAL PARISH AND NOT BE A PART OF SALISBURY CITY. I PURCHASED MY HOME IN 1987 BECAUSE OF ITS AREA AND BEST PEACEFUL ATMOSPHERE. IF I WISHED I COULD HAVE MOVED TO THE CITY WITH ITS EXTRA COMMUNITIES BUT I CHOSE LAVERSTOCK BECAUSE OF WHAT IT IS AND HAS BEEN UNDER LAVERSTOCK AND FORD COUNCIL	
720	100- Leave well alone. Except have scheme 2 as part of Laverstock.	
721		100
722	2 I find very effective parish concerns about the area it controls. The community puills together over various issues and resolves its own problems without other factors intervening. We do not want people outside of the parishes telling us how to manage our problems as we can do it more effectively ourselves. It feels that Salisbury is like Big Brother wants everything it can get. No thanks.	

723	100- 3. If SCC get this proposal passed you gain as it seems like common sense to me, they have all the new builds at Hampton Park, with tax added income they obviously need. 2. Laverstock will be better off with the new builds at Old Sarum and Long Hedge which gives them added income. Everyone gains something? 100. "Always a village".	
724	100- Just leave the communities of Laverstock and Ford as they are.	
725	100- LAVERSTOCK ADN FORD INCLUDING OLD SARUM IS A LARGE PARISH IN ITS OWN RIGHT, EFFICIENTLY RUN BY A DEDICATED TEAM OF PARISH COUNCILLORS LOOKING AFTER LOCAL ISSUES. WILLING TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETINGS ON LOCAL ISSUES I.E. INCREASED AND SPEEDING TRAFFIC ON THE ROMAN ROAD THROUGH FORD.ALL THIS GOOD WORK WOULD BE 'WATERED DOWN' IF JOINED WITH THE LARGE SALISBURY PARISH COUNCIL. LOOK HOW SALISBURY HAS SUFFERED BEING A SMALL PART OF A LARG UNITARY AUTHORITY. DO NOT L&F SUFFER THE SAME FATE.	
726		100
727		100
728	100 - WE HAVE AN ANCIENT PARISH WITH OUR OWN HISTORY. WE HAVE RAILWAY AND RIVER BOUNDARIES WITH SALISBURY. WE HAVE A VILLAGE SCHOOL, SHOP, HALL AND PARISH CHURCH. ALSO A SPORTS AND SOCIAL. WE VALUE OUR PARISH COUNCIL. THE SCHEME TO JOIN SALISBURY WOULD TAKE ALL THIS AWAY. I SINCERELY TRUST THAT THIS WILL NOT HAPPEN. WE VOTED OVER 99% TO STAY INDEPENDENT, PLEASE LET IT BE THAT WAY	
729	SCHEME 2 ALLOWS THE AREAS LARGELY BEYOND THE RAILWAY LINE TO CONTINUE TO BE AB AREA SOMEWHAT SEPARATE FROM SALISBURY CITY AND TO RETAIN ITS ATMOSPHERE OF A SMALL VILLAGE. I CAN SEE NO ADVANTAGE TO THE CURRENT RESIDENTS OF LAVERSTOCK AND FORD TO BE JOINED WITH SALISBURY CITY	
730		100
731	100 - WE ARE HAPPY WITH OUR SEMI RURAL PARISH. THERE WOULD BE NO ADVANTAGES TO MERGING WITH SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL	
732		100
733	100 - WE WILL END UP PAYING MORE COUNCIL TAXI IF WE MERGE WITH NOTHING TO GAIN. WE DON'T HAVE A POLICE REPRESENTATIVE HERE OR EVEN A POST OFFICE OR PHARMACY. LOCAL COMMUNITIES ARE FINE AS THEY ARE, ITS JUST A CHEAP SKATE WAY OF INCREASING REVENUE FOR THE ONE COUNCIL'S COFFERS. THINGS THAT GET BIG DON'T IMPROVE!! THERE ARE NO ADVANTAGES TO LOCALS WHATSOEVER	
734	100 - I HAVE LIVED WITH MY FAMILY IN LAVERSTOCK FOR 24 YEARS AND I FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT OUR VILLAGE SHOULD BE LEFT ALONE AND ALLOWED TO CONTINUE TO DEVELOP AS A RURAL/SEMI RURAL PARISH NEAR BUT DEFINITELY NOT IN SALISBURY	
735	These moves are unnecessary, they will raise our Council Tax charges.	
736		
737	2 As one of the first residents to live in Bishopdown Farm (1993) I have experience of Laverstock parish council. The councillors on the parish council have provided exemplary service and advice in all matters. I now live in mt third property in the area (the second was in Hampton Park)and strongly desire to be remaining with the Laverstock parish council. This is a rural and semi rural area and provides much needed opportunities for the young and not so young to enjoy a countrydie experience and better quality of life. I hope that it will be allowed to continue	
738		2
739	2 Doing nothing is a legitimate option	
740		2

741		2
742		2
743		2
744		2
745		2
746		2
747		2
748	100- Laverstock and Ford have previously made it very clear that they wish to retain the present structure. The Laverstock/Ford Parish Council is effective in community governance and identity because it collects and responds to local opinion in a way the S. District Council does not. Scheme 2 develops this to build the local community.	
749	100- I consider that the existing Laverstock and Ford Parish is run in a very efficient manner keeping over heads as low as possible. The ancient villages of Ford and Laverstock now have their own strong community facilities and there is a great sense of local pride. The nature/character of these villages should be preserved as separate from the city of Salisbury. The rural aspects of Laverstock and Ford make it not appropriate for inclusion within the city.	
750	100- It is the complete opposite of "localism" i.e. residents choosing what is best for their locality to transfer Laverstock and Ford into Salisbury. Laverstock and Ford is a very well managed Parish Council and scheme 2 Bishopdown Farm is best served to join Laverstock and Ford Parish Council. Scheme 3 Hampton Park fits geographically into Laverstock and Ford. This together would make Laverstock and Ford Parish Council a very active and efficient PC.	
751	2 Bishopdown Farm, Hampton and Riverdown Parks are essentially one estate. Laverstock and Ford seem to have the interests of local people at heart - including a commitment to deliver facilities which developers were told locally must be included in their plans. Houses were sold(sometimes at a premium in certain parts of the estate) largely because those facilities were promised. Diverting money to other projects is something we have come to expect of Salisbury District Council and should they continue to receive income from the Bishopdown Farm properties this could happen leaving Riverdown Park residents in particular without promised facilities	
752		2
753	2 Having lived in Bishopdown Farm for 19 years we feel our community identity is, as part of the parish of Laverstock and Ford and not Salisbury. There is a distinct boundary between "Old Bishopdown" and the new areas of Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park as there is no link road joining them, only one small footpath. We therefore feel geographically closer to Laverstock and Ford and would welcome and support the move as proposed in scheme 2	
754		2
755	2 I think local identity is important and decision making and civic pride and values are more meaningful and valid done locally by people who live in Laverstock and Ford. The larger organisations become, the more small things that matter become lost and subsumed. Small is beautiful and I would like to properly be part of an independent Laverstock and Ford parish council. Thank you.	

756	2 Very impressed with the clever and appropriate scheme 2 which would formally acknowledge our local situation and Laverstocks strong local leadership. Whilst the amenities of Salisbury are valued its community governance cannot match Bishopdown Farm's more rural natural blending with Laverstock Parish Council.
757	2-on 100 form At least weith this schme we keep our village identity in laverstock. I moved to the village as I wanted to be part of a community. Our local council know sour needs and managed us well Salisbury city council is a large community - the council is too busy as it is to cater for our village needs
758	I will make them at the open meeting
759	100 - Laverstock and ford parish council have served us tirelessly and well over the years and I don not believe that Salisbury would do such a good job. All they want, no disrespect to the them - is our money. We are a rural community bounded by farmland - we are not a suburb of Salisbury. We have a unique character which would be eroded by joining salisbury
760	
761	
762	
763	
764	
765	
766	100 - the residents of Laverstock choose to live here because it is a village and not part of the city. The same applies to ford. There may not be as many facilities available to these villages but the residents have made that choice and I believe that by merging with Salisbury will not provide any benefit and will instead land us all with a heft increase in council tax. We are semi rural let us stay that way!
767	
768	2 I consider myself and family as belonging to the parish of Laverstock. St Andrews church Laverstock is my community place of worship and where all my family worship. I have lived in the Laverstock area all my life and have a strong sense of community / place with it.
769	100 - a sense of local place is ever more important in this homogenised world. I consider myself a resident of laverstock, not Salisbury. Any dealing with my parish council of laverstock and ford have confirmed in my mind the importance of localism, the nearer the better. The feeling of an inclusive very local community is of great value
770	
771	
772	2 I don't live in Hampton Park so don't feel I should comment for the people living there.
773	2 The main proposal to merge Salisbury with Laverstock and Ford is the one I agree with most.
774	I have lived in the parish of laverstock for some time now. We have a wonderful village live and I wouldn't want to loose this to some organisation so far aware at Trowbridge where Salisbury doesn't matter never mind a small place live laverstock so hands off leave us alone to get on with village life as we know and want to continue

775	100- 1. If Salisbury city/parish council had reacted against unitary council for Wiltshire and become a borough, it would have made sense. 2. We wish to remain rural and not become an urban community. 3. We have improved our areas of this parish consistently and have accepted responsibility for numerous land gains (\$106). 4. We have helped WCC meet this areas new homes target. Has Salisbury council? No. Leave us alone.
776	100- I wish you would stop trying to change our parishes when they have worked perfectly well up to now. I have lived in postcode SP4 6DE for 35 years and we don't want to change and get larger and join Salisbury.
777	100- Laverstock and Ford have councillors who are residents themselves and arguably, the best run parish in the area and should be applauded for that. They are aware of the needs of the parish and residents as a whole and can and do act accordingly, unlike any distant representatives could at Salisbury or Trowbridge. we have a community spirit that will be lost if merged with Salisbury and consequently lose so many of its councillors - also, as residents, we would lose all influence on matters concerning the parish and lose our sense of identity and belonging.
778	100- Scheme 2 +3 Properties at Hampton Park and Bishopdown Farm need to be part of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council so that a sense of community cohesion can be built without being 'swallowed' up into Salisbury City council.
779	100- This would be to the advantage of Salisbury city council only. It would be most detrimental to Laverstock and Ford, Milford, Old Sarum, Hampton Park and Riverdown. Leave us alone. We are happy with the way things are with Laverstock and Ford PC which is historical. I do not feel at all part of Salisbury.
780	100-
781	100-
782	100-
783	100-
784	100-
785	100-
786	100-
787	100-
788	100-
789	100-
790	100-
791	100-
792	100-
793	100-
794	100-
795	100-
796	100-
797	100-
798	

799	2 - The area to the West of Wolverton Drive RTC is already part of Laverstock and Ford Parish and has worked well with the Parish Council in the part over the extra housing to the north. It would make sense for the rest of the estate to be taken in and the countryside gap between it and Salisbury presents a natural border. I do not like the way Salisbury Council has conducted itself over this issue trying to use it to bribe Wiltshire Council over assets. The should be treated separately shame on them. It's about a money grab on the precept.	
800	100 - Lammenting on all three proposals. We are a local, separate village community and want to stay that way. I believe its just the extra money you're after. If that is the case I'll gladly pay extra to be left alone. We are very happy as we are. LEAVE US ALONE.	
801		
802		3
803		3
804	3 My preference is to be part of Salisbury City Council area	
805		3
806		3
807	3 I strongly disagree with scheme 3, the proposal to move properties at Hampton Park back to Salisbury PC. We have no luck with the City and are well served by a local and locally focused parish council ie Laverstock and Ford. Leave our parish alone.	
808		3
809		3
810	3 I am already in Laverstock and Ford CP and would strongly prefer to be in Salisbury Proposal scheme 100 - I note that other villages already in Salisbury still have distinctive characters. I want to be part of Salisbury. I already regard myself more as a Salisbury citizen than aLaverstck and Ford one	
811		3
812	3 Scheme 2 - it seems ridiculous that the two areas of Hampton Park and Bishopdown Farm are separate - residing in Hampton Park we enjoy the community of Laverstock and Ford and feel Bishopdown Farm residents should too. We like being part of Ford / Laverstock - had we wanted to live in a city we would have moved into the city itself. L/Ford are very community minded and it suits us perfectly. So why change. No doubt for economic gain - NO!	
813	3 Scheme 2 I thinkthat I have more of a say in what happens locally staying with Laverstock and Ford. I am kept up to date with newsletters and wouldn't like to be part of Salisbury parish.	
814		3
815	3 We are new to Wiltshire having moved in January. We cannot see any logic in our new development of 500 houses being in L+F parish. It is clearly part of Salisbury. Similarly we are bemused by the idea of L+F regarding themselves as lying outside Salisbury	
816	3 Scheme 2 we value our semi rural lifestyle and are happy that our current councillors represent our community with our best interests at heart. They maintain the heritage of our area whilst considering modern life. By moving the proposed areas to Salisbury CP we feel the area will be too large to deliver services effectively. We would be happy to pay a little more towards the annual parish tax to enable us to stay within Laverstock and Ford CP. Please leave us as we are - we are happy!	
817		3

818	3 L+F parish council do an outstanding job and would continue to do it. I have no faith in Salisbury City Council and its leaders	
819	3 Who wants the change? SDC I think it will cost me more on my council tax, what advantages will I get? How will the change improve communities and local democracy in the parish. You have not explained this. Why fix it if it's not broke?	
820	3 Scheme 100 - anybody from my locality who does not recognise the validity of merging all into one is being disappointingly parochial in their perspective and - to be short - is free riding. All the enormous benefits of proximity to Salisbury City centre which is the clear centre of gravity for all of our lives {... can't read the next phrase ...] I am more than content to pay increased charges to ensure parity of contribution and benefit. Thank you for the opportunity to comment	
821		3
822	3 Scheme 2 - Hampton Park should remain in the Laverstock and Ford parish	
823		3
824		3
825		3
826	3 On the surface it would appear that decisions are being influenced by the potential to increase revenue from taxation to "gain back" Salisbury assets that were taken away when the unitary authority was formed. We have seen the effect Wiltshire County Council have had on the city and surrounding areas of Salisbury and would not want to be part of a smaller occurrence of a smaller scale but just as bad. I want to remain with Laverstock and Ford parish	
827		3
828	3 The formation of the Wiltshire Unitary authority has been a disaster for Salisbury. The general appearance of the city and the roads are a disgrace. The scheme 100 is purely a ruse by which Salisbury City Council will gain more income to no benefit on the part of those potentially affected. Scheme 2 would improve the management of the area. Scheme 3 is unacceptable	
829	3 As a recent member of the community having moved from Kent, I feel Bishopdown area is quite distinct from Salisbury city. Whilst it makes no sense for Hampton Park to be split between parishes, I feel they are both suited to the Laverstock CP and therefore support scheme 2.	
830		3
831	3 The building of new houses over the last 25 years has meant that areas such as Bishopdown and Hampton Park are contiguous with Salisbury. Local residents of Hampton Park utilise many of the services provided by Salisbury City Council and should expect to contribute to the costs of these facilities.	
832		3
833	3 Really angry that you have not included monetary impact figures (council tax) for those affected by proposal. Also disgraceful to be canvassing for views during food festival from people who don't even live on Bishopdown Farm	
834		3
835		3
836	3 These decisions should be left to those elected officials who have all the relevant information not left to the public to make their decisions for them	
837		3

838	3 All three schemes. Salisbury City Council have virtually admitted in the local press that they only want the residents money in the form of tax. As far as I can see that is all they want. Laverstock and ford is a welcoming, local and vibrant community. The idea that it might be swallowed up into a giant faceless council is awful. Please leave Laverstock and Ford parish council to get on with what they do best - serve the residnets.	
839		3
840	3 This is deliberately obscure. I want to remain as a part of Laverstock and Ford because it works. The present situation where I am part of Laverstock and Ford works. I feel part of a caring local community. I do not want to be part of a faceless amorphous mass. I want to be part of Laverstock and Ford parish.	
841		3
842	3 Scheme 100 - There is absolutely no need to further centralise government and treat the public in Ford Laverstock Bishopdown as part of Salisbury. They are quite content to remain a part of the semi-rural parish and enjoy it. We should not have to pay increased taxes to cover Salisbury City's financial mismanagement. Scheme 2 - It makes sense to transfer Bishopdown Farm into Laverstock and Ford so that it can use the Hampton Park facilities and enjoy lower taxes.	
843		3
844		3
845	3 In the map, the area in my opinion is Laverstock and Fords area, it isn't but should be. 2 Yes this part of Bishopdown Far should be in Laverstock and Ford parish not Salisbury City Council	
846	3 House building design should not be generic, force developers to create multiple designs for each development zone No development on flood plains More schools, surgeries, cricket pitches, exercise areas Housing development should also have good lighting and security systems	
847		3
848		3
849		3
850		3
851	3 I fell that Hampton Park should remain as part of Laverstock and Ford parish council. The parish council have looked after the residents of Hampton Park through all the new development. We are part of the parish as we receive the magazine that keeps us informed of events. I look to Ford, not Salisbury for my sense of community. The Farm is an integral part of this. I do not feel part of Salisbury.	
852		3
853	3 Scheme 2 is the ideal solution in terms of forming a cohesive community and giving BishopdownFarm an undivided situation. Laverstock and Ford currently manage the parish admirably and should be allowed to continue. I consider this whole review a shameful wste of money and resources and the misquoted councillors should be heavily censored (sic!) for not accepting the previous outcome.	
854		3
855	3 Not for Salisbury - too big. For L&F perfect	
856	3 I feel that Salisbury City Council are simply attempting to do a council tax land grab on the communities in Laverstock and Ford. The refusal of them to accept the CCTV scheme from Wiltshire County Council is clearly an attempt at blackmail.	
857	3 As said in earlier questions I echo the local community and effective engagement as well as strong local leadership	

858		3
859		3
860		3
861		3
862	3 Scheme 2 - I am proud to be part of the Laverstock and Ford parish. It is well run and efficient. Everything a parish should be. I feel remote from Salisbury City and far more part of the L and F community There is resentment, that will be ongoing, that Salisbury City see us as a "cash cow". There is no evidence to suggest governance will be more effective or convenient if we are part of the city.	
863		3
864	100 - OLD SARUM IS WELL SERVED BY LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL, THEY KEEP US INFORMED OF DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PARISH AND I FEEL INCLUDED IN THE PARISH ENVIRONMENT. I SPECIFICALLY MOVED TO OLD SARUM IN 2014 TO BE 'OUTSIDE' A TOWN OR CITY JURISDICTION SO THAT WE COULD ENJOY A RURAL LIFE. SALISBURY CITY COUNCIL DOES NOT HAVE A GOOD TRACK RECORD IN MANAGING ITS RESPONSIBILITIES WHEREAS LAVERSTOCK AND FORD PARISH COUNCIL HAS AMPLY DEMONSTRATED THAT IT DOES AND BY ITS ACTIVITIES HAS CLEARLY SHOWN THAT IT DOES.	
865	3 Communities work well as they are now. If the merger goes ahead Bishopdown/Hampton Park will lose its identity. The size and population will be too big, Laverstock / Ford work well as it is, especially for the elderly. To merge with Salisbury could be a disaster in the future. We will become lost. If possibly council tax goes up I will not be able to afford to live where I am, as will be too expensive. I work with vulnerable adults. If you don't look after me who will be left to look after the vulnerable. I work a 60 hour week as it is.	
866		3
867	3 The work undertaken by Laverstock and Ford Parish Council has been outstanding over the last ten years Scheme 2 will provide a more unified approach particularly with regards to the County Park and the residents of Bishopdown with Hampton Park.	
868	3 100- A merger of the 2 councils: will undermine the strong L&F community; is not a merger of equals so needs of L&F would no longer be represented; can not be taken for financial reasons as it is simply not right. 2 - to move Bishopdown Farm into L&F; makes a lot of sense as residents of BF have same identity as Hampton Park (geographically and ideologically); would create a good size L&F parish; would allow L&F to retain its rural outlook Overall - Laverstock and Ford is a thriving local community and I wish it to remain so. L&P residents contribute hugely to Salisbury financially) parking, spend in Salisbury businesses etc) but I would like the parish to remain independent.	
869	3 Bishopdown Farm / Hampton Park have a very rural feel about them. They are a very strong community within themselves I consider myself to be part of the community here, not really part of the city centre. I don't follow the argument about the city residents subsidising [??] from Laverstock/Ford/ Hampton Park - surely the same would apply to any villages outside Salisbury who visit the city?	
870		3
871	3 Where will Riverbourne Park be placed?	
872		3

873	2 Scheme 2. Having lived on Bishopdown Farm for over 10 years I and my family have always felt part of the Laverstock and Ford community. We have used many of the local facilities. My children went to the Laverstock toddler group, are members of the Laverstock scout pack. We use the Hampton Park and Laverstock footpath trails. We visit the Laverstock Community Farm. Bishopdown Farm / Hampton Park feels like a village with our own green and local facilities. It has never felt like part of the city of Salisbury. Laverstock and Ford do not feel like they are part of the city. Please do not make them be. Please let us keep our own village identity	
874	100 - sort out the road infrastructure, the portway is becoming a nightmare!	
875	3 All schemes are unacceptable. The existing community identity is perfectly satisfactory. There is no need for change.	
876	3 Scheme 100- This proposal is not about the factors listed. It is about money. Having looked at the responsibilities of SCC, most (Allotments, Bemerton Heath Centre, camping and caravanning, their two car parks, trees, benches, football pitches, cricket pitches, toilets - I use M&S and Debenhams - the Guildhall and twinning) do not apply. I only occasionally go to the markets or the parks and they are used much by tourists. Scheme 2 - the housing area in Bishopdown Farm is clearly closely linked to my area and it should be part of one community.	
877		3
878		3
879		3
880	3 Scheme 100 - we do not have the same convenience as the Friary or the same quality location and do not see why we should pay the same council tax. Riverdown Park residents pay for their own street lighting and maintenance of roads and verges via a private contractor. Why should we pay the same as Salisbury residents. We use the facilities of Salisbury but so do Winterbourn and all the other villages. We like being part of Laverstock and Ford parish.	
881		3
882		3
883		3
884	3 Do not change things that work well just for financial gain to SCC	
885		3
886	3 I know that the Salisbury Council tax is higher - we will end up paying more - for what? Are there going to be improvements on the estate - upkeep of the parks / improvements, upkeep of the country park? We have a strong community ethic at the moment and that will be lost	
887		3
888		3
889		3
890		3
891		
892		3
893		3
894		3

895	3 Scheme 100 - Full inclusion is necessary. If all the population in all areas is using all facilities then it is right that they should all pay the correct rates. Schemes 2 and 3 - These schemes are nonsensical. Splitting an estate, Bishopdown Farm, is madness.	
896		3
897	3 The maps provided do not show the Riverdown Park estate and therefore do not illustrate the full gain / loss of householders under every option. It also very clearly ignores the impact of any change in council tax to the household under each proposal as past charges have not been publicised. As part of the literature was sent to households. A local vote has already been taken. Why are the views of 1003 residents who voted against the L&FPC merger to SCC being ignored? You don't simply remove [?] an election because you don't like the result.	
898		3
899		3
900	3 100 - Laverstock and Ford parish are an interface between city and rural areas. Residents and local parish councils have greater knowledge insight and interest in such needs than dwellers of a medieval city. The area boasts infrastructure, quality facilities, schools and manages semi-rural affairs very well. The inclusion of the country park into the parish is just a continuation of the local management carried out by engaged parishioners and organisations to enhance this outer city area. Scheme 2 will heighten community cohesion and will form a natural boundary between city and rural surrounds Geographically no roads interlink with Bishopdown Farm / Hampton Park than from the London Road, so natural access boundaries already exist	
901	3 Scheme 2 - The representatives of Laverstock and Ford Parish have put forward perfectly sound reasonable and correct reasons for Hampton Park to remain within the parish. They have my full support. Scheme 3 - I strongly disagree with the proposal to move this green hatched area to Salisbury City Council	
902		3
903		100
904		100
905	100 I have lived in the parish of Laverstock for half a century since coming here in my early twenties. I have always found it to be a pleasant place to live. I do not see any need for change in the future and hope that no changes are made to the parish during the rest of my lifetime. I think any changes resulting in the raising of Council Tax are totally unwarranted.	
906		100
907	100 The Laverstock parish has a number of activities run by its residents who welcome other communities to participate in. We feel the proposed changes by SDC would have adverse impact on the parish residents. The parish has been well run by its councillors, with good information passed on to its residents on affairs that impact on the parish. Bishopdown Farm and Ford residents do attend many of Laverstock parish functions. It would make sense to include these areas with Laverstock	
908		100

909	100 All proposals - removal of properties into another group = rates increase for those moved. Laverstock and Ford = removal of properties to Salisbury would mean the rates from Laverstock and Ford going to Salisbury. I have no confidence that money will be sent on Ford, We have little lighting, no pavements, no bus service (except school bus), no shops. I am happy to accept this in exchange for the countryside, not more housing. The funds for Laverstock and Ford should be spent on this area. We need a car to get to town / park and ride / shops / doctors / dentists / libraries - even road edges poor here. We do not belong to the city - we belong to the countryside ie accepting no facilities in return for lower rates. Despite being slowly forced to accept hundreds of extra properties at close proximity no plans have been made for walking access to Hamptons country park - no footpaths made and one access public right of way simply cut off by the builders.
910	100 Stop interfering. Leave us alone. We are happy as we are.
911	100
912	100
913	100 With regard to the schemes. I would not like to lose the sense of a village community which Laverstock and Ford still maintains. This would be damaged by increasing its size by a merger with Salisbury or another substantial area.
914	100 Does it matter - Scott does what she wants!!! WCC are bulldozing again. Fix the roads and improve education (sic) and gain some respect and dignity for yourselves You are here to serve us. Broadband is crap
915	100 Laverstock is such a lovely place. Its built its own character and community. The hours that were given to start the community farm. The river and meadow walks we now have. It shares. It comes together and goes ahead as a very loving community. Scheme 100
916	100
917	100 1 - Salisbury City Council only has the powers of a parish 2 - None of the Salisbury City councillors are good enough to be on the Wiltshire Council cabinet 3 - None of the Salisbury City council people have the integrity to fight this appalling decision 4 - The largest town (or city) play no part in the decisions 5 - They simply rubber stamp the cabinet decisions 6 - The Green Belt is being eroded 7- The derelict properties in Salisbury lie empty 8 - Empty properties are left untouched 9 - The Green Belt is not protected

1	SCHEME 102 COMMENTS PAGE - Box and Corsham (Box to Corsham)
2	
3	Box Parish Council objects to this proposal. It does not consider the present boundary to be either outdated or anomalous. The resolution made under Scheme 41 to transfer part of Rudloe to Box united the housing under one parish i.e. Box. Planning permission has been granted for new housing on the B3109 (Hannick Homes) and there is an application pending for housing at the top of Westwells Road (Rudloe No 2 site). There is currently housing on The Links at the Junction of the B3109 and Westwells Road. If this proposal were to be granted it would mean an even BIGGER split of the housing population at Rudloe with one side of the road in Box and the other in Corsham. As Box Parish is within the green belt these two proposed development areas are the ONLY way in which new housing could be built within Box. As proved by the granting of scheme 41, Box Parish Council is able to provide effective governance.
4	The current boundary is anomalous, running through the middle of development, so a more natural boundary such as the suggestion would improve all the appropriate criteria.
5	I disagree with Corsham encroaching on Box parish land. I think they should concentrate on looking after what they have already. The town centre is almost derelict with few shops or restaurants and to take more on when what they have is so poorly managed. Box parish has a much greater sense of community and take great pride in the historic parish of Box. Corsham is only interested in this land for the financial benefit especially when the new 100 houses are built. This is not an acceptable justification for this change. In the consultation I sent a written letter of disapproval and my opinion has not changed since in spite of further debates.
6	
7	ALONG WITH THE PARISH COUNCIL I STRONGLY OPPOSE ANY TRANSFER OF LAND AND HOUSES TO THE CORSHAM TOWN COUNCIL AREA IT IS NOT IN KEEPING WITH COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE OR COMMUNITY COHESION.
8	This proposal does not enhance community cohesion and does not comply with community governance.
9	
10	We, as Box Parish residents, owners of property in Box Parish, and as citizens of Box Parish find this approach to be totally unacceptable. We have participated in Box Parish meetings on this issue of excising Rudloe from Box Parish to Corsham Parish and note that Box Parish participants overwhelmingly disapprove of this. We do not understand the rationale for changing Box Parish boundaries, but, we do understand that we have not been consulted in ANY manor, whether by post, by phone, by email or other means by Wiltshire Council on this matter. We know that should this proposal be pushed through that it will raise our council taxes and represent an undemocratic approach to local government governance. As residents, property owners, and as council tax payers we object in the strongest manner to the approach taken by Corsham Council, both at the onset of this proposal, and in the last-minute submission of a revised proposal. However, we can understand that Corsham Council wants to expand to gain more property tax from development, but, what we cannot understand is how and why Wiltshire Council could allow this to happen. Representative democracy starts at the local parish level in this country. Consultation should be robust and all-inclusive. This proposal is neither democratic, nor is it inclusive or representative of an inclusive approach. We strongly

11	This is a rural area. Box was praised at the previous review and for sticking to the rules of the review and its justification for staying as is. The legality of this proposal was questioned at the Full Council Meeting and I fully support Box Parish Council and the large group of parishioners that attended the first review meeting with their wish to keep the boundary as it was. The proposal appears to be nothing more than to ensure that any future development land is part of Corsham! This is not one of the guidance considerations listed above! Apart from the financial aspect which we all know is also not for discussion any decision MUST be on the above points!
12	This is obviously an avaricious power play by Corsham Council to seize a large extra area containing a mixture of housing and industrial units, with an option of more development land, in order to increase the income of Corsham Council, (and perhaps pay for their new Campus?). This proposal has nothing to do with the welfare and care of the affected parishioners, and ceases to provide the required breathing space between parishes. An observation by a Planning Officer recently that this area has been over developed has fallen on deaf ears, & why no public meeting on this subject? Perhaps the justification required would stick in the throat! I would submit that a better route for the boundary would be south from the Rudloe Estate/B3190 on Skynet Drive to Park Lane, east on Park Lane To Hudswell Lane, down Hudswell Lane to Puckets Way, then south following the MOD boundary to Spring Lane. Then south on Spring Lane to Westwells Road, south down Green n Hill to Moor Green, east along Moor Green to Church Rise, south down Church Rise to Wadswick Lane, and then west on Wadswick Lane to meet up with the B3109 at Chapel Plaister. This route meets the requirements of permanent markers, supplies a clear area for most of the way between parishes, is fairly close to the present route so is easy to understand the reasoning, and is easy to follow on the map. It does
13	In recent dealings with both parish councils it is only Box Parish Council that have stood up for and seriously listened to the views and wishes of local residents. I do not want a very viable and effective Parish Council (Box) to be undermined in its financing by the larger neighbour. No arguments of any note from Corsham PC have been offered to counter this.
14	This proposal is about future financial potential of the proposed transfer area; it has absolutely nothing to do with any of the headings above. It is detrimental to the Box/Rudloe parish in that the potential development areas, and the amenities such as the Westwells Post office, are proposed to be arbitrarily transferred to Corsham; this is merely a 'land grab' for future financial benefit of Corsham, and therefore to the detriment of Box. The proposal should be firmly rejected.
15	This Land 'grab' by Corsham includes a small housing estate and industrial estate (the Links), and our local Post Office and shop then the rest is derelict land now up for housing development and a proposed new housing estate. Corsham has remained totally disinterested in this land up until now. They can only be interested the potential financial gain of additional housing and therefore Council Tax revenue. As moving Parish boundaries purely for financial gain is against you own criteria this submission must be rejected. As a move to Corsham will mean an increase in Council Tax it is not in the interest of the existing population or the potential one. Leave things as they are. Such a move is totally against the wishes of the people in Box and to their detriment and is therefore undemocratic. Leave Box alone.
16	As a resident of Box Parish and I strongly want this area to remain in the parish of Box. We are concerned that the people of Box and the people living in the affected area want to stay in Box. Box parish need this area of the community for it's rates and we are happy with our own decision making (in the future) as to the development within. It is our firm view that Corsham residents are not interested and Box residents are. This was illustrated by the non-existent Corsham representation, held in Corsham, recently.

17	The proposal includes the whole of the Wadswick Green community existing and planned in a single local authority, Corsham, where most of it is already. It ensures all the planned new communities to be linked to those which already exist and with whom they will have most common interest. The new communities will have no historic affiliation with Box which is a small, largely rural authority. The Corsham Framework Study shows the need to have clear definable boundaries so that West Corsham has a sense of identity and is part of the wider Corsham community.
18	This review needs to come out strongly in support of this measure because it reflects the basic purpose of creating coherent communities and clear boundaries (following a road rather than a field boundary). It makes no sense to divide the Wadswick Green retirement village between two councils, and it complements the move to keep Rudloe as a whole for planning purposes.
19	I strongly oppose this land grab by Corsham Town Council. This land belongs to Box Parish Council and it is essential that it remains so. I have lived in Ashley, Box for nearly twenty years and feel strongly that Box Parish must remain untouched. Box has a very strong sense of community cohesion and is a thriving and successful village. Box Parish serves the community extremely well. Nothing should be done to damage this community through reducing its size, population or boundaries. I feel that the views of the residents of Box should be paramount in deciding this issue.
20	Corsham are being greedy and selfish. They do nothing for the Rudloe people but they still want the council tax money. This is all about building yet more houses so they can get even more money. Corsham has already got its quota of houses, why do they need even more. Why don't they give the Corsham people a supermarket, doctors, schools, etc.
21	Is it just a coincidence, that CPC is proposing to take over land, that may have housing built on it in the not-too-distant future and that the said housing will generate further tax revenue from the community charge applied to each house? Otherwise, I cannot see any real reason for CPC wishing to take over the area proposed. Also, I do not think that the questions asked at Q6 above have any real relevance?
22	The area concerned is part of historic Box, mentioned in the 1626 map of Box and Haselbury (not Corsham) and it was the location of homeless Hungarian Refugees which Box was proud to take into its community in 1956. I have heard no rationale for the proposed change, which I assume is for the financial or development support of Corsham. Why should Corsham's short-term financial and development issues be allowed at the expense of the destruction of Box's community cohesion, which has taken generations of people and hundreds of years to establish?
23	There is no rationale or justification for such a radical proposal by Corsham Town Council other than, as mentioned by the Corsham Town Council Chairman at the Wiltshire Council meeting on 24th November three "anomalies" viz part of the MoD Car Park; part of Wadswick Green and the Data Storage Centre at Spring Park being in Box - which could easily be corrected by minor adjustments. This extreme proposal to take a huge swathe of Box Parish would create even greater anomalies by splitting the future population at Rudloe and Westwells in half and even cutting one farmer's land in two. It would appear that the overwhelming objections of the parishioners of Box Parish do not appear to have been taken into account. Where is the support for any of Corsham Town Council's proposals from its parishioners?
24	
25	This is just about more houses and more council tax for Corsham. They don't look after their existing Rudloe residents who I visit during the normal course of my work so why do they want to build even more houses for people they will ignore!
26	
27	I strongly disagree as this will make Box Parish smaller which will increase the precept, hence penalizing the poor. All these proposals are costing us money in what I believe is solely a political move.

28	The removal of the Links would adversely reduce the Box Parish income, A more natural boundary would be to the south of Park Lane. Currently our sense of community is reflected in Box not Corsham
29	I feel part of the Box Parish and community. Corsham's population has grown considerably since I have lived here and this is made us even more on the edge of the Corsham community. The facilities I use on a daily basis are within the Box Parish and will continue to be so with the revised proposal and my income should not be taken away from the Box Parish.
30	
31	
32	As residents of Ashley and the wider area of Box and Rudloe and its hamlets we object most strongly to this counter proposal in the continuing saga of the Box/Corsham Boundary Change review. There appears to be no rationale why this area should be transferred to the parish of Corsham and in our view there is no logical basis for this proposed course of action other than a blatant land grab by Corsham to the detriment of Box. The B3109 is not a suitable boundary between the two parishes and in effect would split us in two and we strongly oppose any transfer of land and houses in the area suggested to Corsham Town Council. Box and Rudloe have an independence and identity of their own even though we are a large and scattered parish. We do not wish to be an extension to Corsham or to have part of our parish swallowed up by Corsham which is becoming more urban as Box is rural but nevertheless well able to care and pay for a well kept cemetery, an incredibly well used Rec reation Ground with numerous sports facilities and our now renowned Box Rock Circus and also the 11 acres of Box Hill Common which is managed by the Parish Council for the recreational use of all from inside and out of our Parish and the area is
33	As the first review was against the proposal of Corsham expansion are we to assume that you will continue to put out surveys until you get the answer you require. The cost for the parishioners in Box would fall on the poor with an increase in council tax that we can not afford. This review is motivated on a political basis and is not in the interest of the community.
34	SCHEME 102 PROPOSAL IS NOTHING SHORT OF A LAND GRAB BY CORSHAM COUNCIL TO AUGMENT IT'S INCOME/REVENUE/JURISDICTION IN ANTICIPATION OF FUTURE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS BETWEEN BRADFORD ROAD & RUDLOE. IT IS ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY AND PURELY SERVES THE EXPANSION PURPOSES OF CORSHAM COUNCIL ONLY. FURTHERMORE IT IS IN CONFLICT WITH HUNDREDS OF OBJECTORS AS DEMONSTRATED BY THE TURNOUT AT CONSULTATION MEETING IN SPRINGFIELD CAMPUS ON 14-OCT-2016. THE COUNTER PROPOSAL BY BOX PARISH COUNCIL TO INCLUDE ALL OF RUDLOE IN THE BOX PARISH IS BY CONTRAST MOST CONSTRUCTIVE AND WILL BEST SERVE RUDLOE, STRENGTHENING THE VERY LONG-STANDING BOX PARISH COMMUNITY AND COHESION.
35	
36	
37	
38	This is nothing more than a land grab by Corsham CP for no other reason than financial gain with absolutely no benefit to the affected residents
39	I strongly object to the transfer of ANY of the Box parish into Corsham. I do not see any justification for this at all and it would be the grave detriment of Box parish.
40	The reduction in size of Box Parish will adversely affect the performance of the Parish Council. It will lose all the income from this area. Box Parish has a strong sense of community because it is a village. Corsham is a town and does not have the same sense of community because of its size. My husband and I fully support Box Parish Council in its objection to this boundary change.

41	As a resident in the Parish of Box for the last 39 years, I find the proposal (Scheme 102) not at all good for the area. Leave Box Parish as it is. The latest proposal looks as though it is designed to make our parish poorer in the long run.
----	---

1	SCHEME 103 COMMENTS PAGE - Victoria Road area (Trowbridge to Hilperton)
2	
3	The proposal meets no criteria, follows no natural boundary and affords no advantage to anyone. I object.
4	We, in Wyke Road, are directly affected by decisions relating to Hilperton Parish and the Hilperton Marsh/Gap which is part of Hilperton Parish. Since we are directly impacted we should have the opportunity to be involved in the decisions relating to this area therefore being integrated into the Hilperton Parish would allow our direct involvement and mean that we continue to be apprised of any development issues/proposals
5	
6	Why would part of Victoria road want to be in Hilperton ? Equally as in scheme 25 would the residents of this area have a sense of civic pride and civic values, being mainly wildlife. It would appear to me that there is more to this than is being published.
7	Like many of Hilperton PC's proposals this seems almost entirely nonsensical - it would not further effective governance, undermines contiguity and community cohesion and splits houses on one side of the road from another.
8	The Parish Council proposed this scheme as it would use a natural feature (the existing roads) and thus tie-in with the town council idea of using roads in various schemes which the town council has suggested. The Parish Council is aware that many residents whose houses back onto the Hilperton Gap use it as an ad hoc recreation space and also worship at the local Hilperton Church and avail themselves of the facilities at Hilperton Village Hall and the adjacent playing field.
9	
10	It is OK as it is so why change
11	
12	This proposal aligns well with our experience of living in the area. We have been part of the civil and ecclesiastical parish of Hilperton whilst technically in Trowbridge. As we identify more with the parish this will enable us to feel closer to civic life.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	More affinity with Hilperton, as border Hilperton Gap Always "Hilperton" side of town, makes sense to move
18	I disagree. We have lived here since 1968. We are happy to remain Trowbridge after all if we became Hilperton there would be Hilperon Gap any more. I think there should be a gap for recreation and not housing.
19	1 The proposed area is already in the parochial parish boundary of Hilperton's St Michael and All Saints church 2Accept that the council tax might rise as the precept for the Hilperton parish council is an "extra"
20	
21	
22	
23	As part of Wyke Road is already included it will make the rest of us feel more of a community
24	On my deeds when the house was built my address was Hilperton Marsh

25	
26	
27	
28	
29	The lane and land at the back of our house belongs to Hilperton and the flooding of this land is a big issue for us but we belong to Hilperton. Having the road at the back and front of our house and the fields would be beneficial.
30	
31	Very happy to become part of Hilperton Parish. This is a rural area and we hope the parish boundary review takes into account the desire of local residents not to have further development in their area, and to retain the village feel of the community and surrounding area.
32	We already use the church, and often go to local events in the village. We also have many friends who live in Hilperton.
33	The lack of jobs for the number of people that will be in the new parish. I assume it will be social housing in the main which will not help the image of Trowbridge in any positive sense.