

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Amesbury
<b>Date:</b> 2 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chairman), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Ian Blair-Pilling, Stuart Wheeler, Jonathon Seed
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Graham Wright, Kevin Daley, Mike Hewitt, Robert Yuill
<b>Not Present:</b> Fred Westmoreland, John Smale
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer, with support from Cllr Grant, introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>For Divisions presently within or mostly within the Amesbury community area, it was noted that the parishes of Wylve and Steeple Langford had been included within the Nadder Valley Division, predominantly comprised of the former Nadder and East Knoyle Division of South West Wiltshire Area Board. Other parishes previously within Wilton and Lower Wylve Valley were now included within Till Valley. Several parishes currently within the Division of The Collingbournes and Netheravon, presently within the Tidworth community area, were now included in the Avon Valley Division.</p> <p>It was noted that under the present Area Board system only one parish in Wiltshire was divided between Area Boards – Laverstock and Ford, between Southern and Salisbury Area Boards – which had led to a number of community difficulties. It was also confirmed that each Member, and Division, could only be assigned to one Area Board.</p> <p>It was noted that if Council were to seek to avoid splitting any parish between Area Boards, then the Divisions of Laverstock, Old Sarum and Lower Bourne Valley, and Winterslow and Upper Bourne Valley would need to be included within the same Area Board. This was because the first two divisions both included sections of the parish of Laverstock and Ford, and the latter two both included sections of the Parish of Idmiston.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish of Durrington was now divided between the Avon Valley and Durrington Divisions. There was agreement that the both areas looked to and had stronger connections with Amesbury than with the Tidworth area.</li> <li>• There was agreement that the Nadder Valley Division, although including some parishes previously within the Amesbury community area, would not in its current composition be appropriate within the Amesbury area.</li> <li>• It was noted that any community area with fewer than Four Members would require either a wider Board composition (eg South West Wiltshire) or an administrative arrangement (eg Pewsey and Tidworth) to resolve issues around quoracy in the event of absence or conflicts. Members were in agreement it was not necessary or appropriate for there to be an arrangement between Amesbury and Tidworth, the community area for which has only three Members and borders Amesbury.</li> </ul>

- Opinion was divided on the most appropriate placement of the Laverstock, Old Sarum and Lower Bourne Valley, and Winterslow and Upper Bourne Valley Divisions.
- If all Three were included within Amesbury this would mean a Nine Member Area Board, with only Three Members in the current Southern Area Board. If all Three were included within the Southern Area Board this would mean a Six Member Amesbury Area Board, taking into account the views above.
- It was noted that the larger geographic area of the incoming Divisions, and the larger number of parishes, were presently within the Amesbury area. However, by population the majority were presently within the Southern area.
- The connections of the area with Amesbury, and lack of connection with Southern, of the upper Bourne Valley area in particular was raised by some Members. It was raised whether the dividing of a parish between Area Boards would be appropriate in this situation. If not appropriate, the level of community connections for either area was debated.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Bradford-on-Avon
<b>Date:</b> 3 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Ian McLennan, Ian Blair-Pilling
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Trevor Carbin, Sarah Gibson, Johnny Kidney
<b>Not Present:</b> Jim Lynch
<b>Officers:</b> Ellen Ghey, Kieran Elliott
<p>Cllr Grant introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>The most significant change had been the inclusion of the parish of Atworth, currently in the Melksham community area, within the Holt Division, and the expansion of the Winsley and Westwood Division to include further parishes to the north currently within the Holt and Staverton Division. There were no significant changes to the Bradford-on-Avon town Divisions.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There was strong feeling that the Area Board should not reduce to only three members.</li><li>• Winsley and Westwood continued to surround and look to Bradford-on-Avon more than any other area.</li><li>• The Holt Division comprised the parishes of Atworth, Holt and Staverton. It was accepted that Staverton had always looked more the Trowbridge than any other area, but that electoral equality had required its inclusion within the Bradford-on-Avon area. Holt looked to Bradford-on-Avon, while Atworth straddled the area between Bradford-on-Avon and Melksham, perhaps looking more to the latter.</li><li>• Atworth comprised approximately one quarter of the incoming Holt Division, and on balance and bearing in mind the need to keep the area at four members, this meant the Division should remain with Bradford-on-Avon.</li><li>• It was discussed whether other areas such as Hilperton, Southwick, or Box might be suitable in an expanded community area with the current Divisions. Subject to any views from those areas, those present did not consider other areas would fit appropriately within the Bradford-on-Avon community area, despite some amount of connection.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Calne
<b>Date:</b> 7 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Ashley O'Neill
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Ian Thorn, Tom Rounds, Alan Hill, Tony Trotman, Christine Crisp
<b>Not Present:</b> NA
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Jane Vaughan, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>No parish or area external to the existing community area had been included. There have been minor tweaks among the town divisions, and significant changes between Calne South and Calne Rural.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The question was raised as to whether Lyneham should be moved from the Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board to the Calne Area Board; members unanimously disagreed.</li><li>• Another question was raised as to whether Kington should be moved from the Chippenham Area Board to the Calne Area Board; again, members unanimously disagreed.</li><li>• It was agreed some areas of Calne Rural closer to Chippenham might look to the town, but the Division as a whole did not and would not appropriately be moved to another area.</li><li>• Bromham was discussed in regard to whether it should move to the Corsham Area Board but members stated that the community would be against the move and unanimously agreed that it should stay within the Devizes Area Board, and that the division also included parts of Devizes Town.</li><li>• Urchfont &amp; Bishops Canning was also discussed in regard to whether it should become part of the Calne Area Board, again, members unanimously agreed that it should not move into their Area Board as there was no synergy between those villages and the rest of the Area Board.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Chippenham
<b>Date:</b> 8 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Peter Hutton, Ross Henning, Howard Greenman, Nick Murray
<b>Not Present:</b> Bill Douglas, Andy Phillips, Melody Thompson
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>There were no changes to the Bybrook and Kington divisions but the part of Chippenham currently in the Corsham Town division is now included in the Chippenham Area Board. Part of Lacock is also proposed to be transferred into the Chippenham Area Board in the Lowden &amp; Rowen division, though it is recommended the area be moved into the town parish through a Community Governance Review. There are also changes to the division names and between town based divisions.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The divisions of By Brook and Kington were discussed, with the questions raised of whether, as two large rural divisions, they would sit more comfortably in more rural area boards. Members agreed that they believed the divisions sit well within their area board and felt that they should remain, but also noted that due to (in particular) By Brook’s size, it could also perhaps fit within the Malmesbury Area Board, as the Division looked to several different areas.</li><li>• Members discussed the “Rural Forum” and its merits but acknowledged that its existence is as a result of the area board’s size and urban centric focus.</li><li>• The division of Calne Rural was questioned as to whether it should remain in Calne Area Board or whether it should be included in the Chippenham Area Board. Members noted that as Chippenham expands as part of its development plan then there are arguments to bring in neighbouring areas, but this raises the concern of when to stop including divisions; when does it become too big.</li><li>• One member suggested changing the name of the area board itself to “Chippenham &amp; Villages/Parishes” to make the board more inclusive and to reflect the twin rural and urban nature.</li><li>• Lacock was also discussed and questioned as to whether it should move from the Corsham Area Board into the Chippenham Area Board, as parts have already been included as a result of the division changes. Members were wary as to whether the parish would want to move fully into the Chippenham Area Board as they commented that it looked to both boards equally. The division it was largely within, Corhsam Without, also included elements of the town of Corsham.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Corsham
<b>Date:</b> 9 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian McLennan, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Ben Anderson, Philip Whalley, Ruth Hopkinson, Brian Mathew
<b>Not Present:</b> N/A
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>The changes to Corsham Area Board were minimal; most notably the proposal that a portion of Lacock had been included within a Chippenham town division, and was proposed to be moved within the town in the community governance review. Bar this, the only differences are amendments to the boundary divisions within the Corsham Area Board and do not impact other Area Boards.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The division of By Brook was discussed with regard to the suggestion of whether, as it is a more rural division, it would fit better moving from the more urban Chippenham Area Board to a more rural Area Board such as Malmesbury or Corsham. Members discussed how due to the size of the division, different parts look toward different areas, with Biddestone having some connections with the Corsham area while others looked more to Chippenham or even Malmesbury.</li><li>• Members agreed that although the south of the By Brook division looks more towards Corsham, the rest of the division does not have a natural affinity with them; more distant areas, and a historical hesitance to do so.</li><li>• One member suggested that if the Parish Councillors and community of By Brook made a suggestion to join the Corsham Area Board then it could work, as they share similar cultures and interests in regard to being part of more rural community areas. Again, members of the Committee and Area Board echoed this and made reference to the “rural forum” mentioned at the Chippenham Area Board meeting. There was some comment that such an arrangement might mean that it allowed rural parishes the opportunity to make their points without feeling marginalized in the face of the more urban centric Area Board, but also perhaps that the rural hinterland was not a great fit for the area. Others raised that they did not feel that Corsham faced the same issues in regard to the perceived rural/urban divide.</li><li>• The same question was then raised regarding Kington and whether that would fit better within the Corsham Area Board. Members discussed how it would not fit into their Area Board due to the lack of natural links and having much closer connections to the town than By Brook, but that it would be best to remain in Chippenham or to move to Calne Area Board.</li><li>• Members discussed the move of the Lacock and new housing development areas into the Chippenham Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that the decisions made sense and one member mentioned the support of the Corsham</li></ul>

Town Council in reference to these proposals, as they are and should be a part of the urban extension of Chippenham's development plan.

- A suggestion was made as to whether the Area Boards of Corsham and Calne should merge into one large Area Board. Members unanimously disagreed with the suggestion and cited the lack of commonality that the two areas shared and the negative reactions it could provoke from each of the communities.
- The same suggestion was made but instead suggested the merging of the Bradford on Avon and Corsham Area Boards. Again, members unanimously disagreed as they felt they have even less in common with Bradford on Avon. They agreed that the areas shared similar characteristics, but these were mitigated by the sense that Bradford on Avon's connections and links to Corsham were minimal to none.
- Members spoke of the detriment to both boards on either scenario if there was a proposal to create a large Area Board by amalgamating two smaller boards. It was noted that to do so would mean that members would be moved too far away from their current understanding of Area Boards and as such how to manage them.
- As a four person board, the question was asked whether members felt the need to follow the system that three person boards have in regard to substitute arrangements. Members unanimously agreed that it was such a rare occasion that organizing substitute arrangements was not necessary.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Devizes
<b>Date:</b> 10 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Peter Evans, Sue Evans, Richard Gamble, Simon Jacobs, Philip Whitehead, Laura Mayes
<b>Not Present:</b> Anna Cuthbert
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Andrew Jack, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>A new division has been made – Devizes Rural West – which included significant areas currently within both Devizes and Melksham Area Boards. The town divisions have also been amended, including a section of the town being included with the Bromham, Rowde &amp; Roundway division.. All Cannings parish has been moved to the Pewsey Vale West division, and the boundaries of The Lavingtons division has been amended and no longer included Erlestoke.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was asked whether Devizes Rural West fits more comfortably within Devizes or Melksham Area Board. Members agreed that the division’s settlements looked towards potentially different areas with Potterne and Poulshot looking more towards Devizes, but with Bulkington looking towards both equally. One member noted that the Seend Parish Council were instrumental in the naming of the division itself which echoes their affinity to the Devizes Area Board. As such, members agreed that Devizes Rural West should be a part of the area board.</li><li>• Till Valley was raised in reference to whether it should be moved to the Devizes Area Board from the Amesbury Area Board. Members agreed that due to the geographical makeup between Devizes and Tillshead that they naturally leaned towards Amesbury. One member of the Committee noted that Tillshead is very active within the Amesbury Area Board so felt that it makes sense for them to remain a part of that board.</li><li>• Members agreed that although there is a relatively good urban/rural divide in regard to the town of Devizes itself being ringed by a lot of rural hinterland, the villages are closely associated with the town and naturally felt a part of the rural entity of the town.</li><li>• Members agreed that the new proposals and the changes to the divisions made more sense than the current arrangement and felt that they worked better.</li></ul>



## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Malmesbury
<b>Date:</b> 10 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan
<b>Area Board Members:</b> John Thomson, Chuck Berry
<b>Not Present:</b> Toby Sturgis
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>Changes to the Malmesbury Area Board were noted as minimal, with small adjustments made to the Malmesbury and Sherston divisions due to the size of the town.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The question of whether Minety still fits best in Malmesbury Area Board or whether it should move to the Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board was raised. Members unanimously agreed that it should remain a part of Malmesbury.</li><li>• The question of whether Cricklade should be moved to the Malmesbury Area Board was raised. Again, members agreed that it should remain part of the Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board due to its existing connections to Royal Wootton Bassett, and the possibility of complications that would arise if the area board had two main towns.</li><li>• Again, the same suggestion was made but instead in reference to Lyneham and whether this should move to Malmesbury Area Board. Members agreed that as the main travelling routes to Lyneham from Malmesbury took you through either Chippenham or Royal Wootton Bassett; it would make sense for it to remain a part of the Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board.</li><li>• The divisions of By Brook and Kington were brought to focus and the question was asked as to whether these again, would fit more comfortably in the Malmesbury Area Board. Members agreed that although the areas are feeling disconnected from their current Area Board in Chippenham, there are similar issues with Malmesbury due to its distance from the majority of the division's villages. However, it was agreed that as Malmesbury is a more rural centric area board then the two divisions match this culture better, but there were concerns regarding their size and distance to the area board's centre. It was agreed that if either were to be included then By Brook would be the better match over Kington.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Marlborough
<b>Date:</b> 13 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Stuart Wheeler, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Nick Fogg, Jane Davies, James Sheppard, Stewart Dobson
<b>Not Present:</b> N/A
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Andrew Jack, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>Changes to Marlborough Area Board include part of the former West Selkey division now being contained within the Lyneham division. If that Division remained with Royal Wootton Bassett this would mean that the area covered by the Marlborough Area Board includes only three divisions and as such only three area board members, which has governance implications for a quorum in the event of an absence or conflict of interest. Marlborough Town is divided in two, each with a number of rural parishes attached, and Aldbourne &amp; Ramsbury was expanded.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members discussed the move of parts of the former West Selkey division into Lyneham and therefore potentially into the Royal Wootton Bassett Area Board. One member discussed how certain areas of this division, in particular Broad Hinton, looked predominantly towards Marlborough. Others raised that Lyneham, which formed the bulk of the population of the new Division, had far stronger links with Royal Wootton Bassett and should remain together within that area board.</li><li>• The question as to whether Calne Rural should be included within the Marlborough Area Board was raised. Member noted that although there were long past historical links between Calne and Marlborough these were no longer present in the current communities and therefore it would not be appropriate.</li><li>• The same question was raised but in regard to Urchfont &amp; Bishops Cannings. Members unanimously agreed that it should stay a part of the Devizes Area Board.</li><li>• Members noted the movement of the parish of Froxfield into a Pewsey based Division. It was asked whether Marlborough should merge with Pewsey Area Board given both areas had only three members. Members commented on the concern of the Marlborough Town Council relating to this matter and the differences in the communities, with reference to their urban and rural identities.</li><li>• If Marlborough were a three Member area board, substitute arrangements, which would be needed, were discussed. Members discussed the merits of three member area boards, as it was noted that the east of the County now had three, three member area boards. There were a number of options discussed, predominantly: joining with Pewsey and Tidworth in an Eastern Wiltshire Area Committee to make a pool of 9 potential substitutes or twinning with either Pewsey or Tidworth separately.</li></ul>

- Members of the Committee expressed positives to the operation of three member boards in Pewsey and Tidworth and the subsequent successful existing substitute arrangements. Area Board members expressed hesitance to the idea of a large 9 person pool, as they felt that Tidworth was too distant. One member discussed how a substitute arrangement with Royal Wootton Bassett could prove better as there was the possibility that the substitute could be closely acquainted with the community that was formerly part of the Marlborough Area Board. However, other members agreed that if they were to have a substitute arrangement then twinning with Pewsey would be the favourable option.
- Concerns were raised regarding the possibility that if there were to be a regular need for a substitution then this would put a burden on the Pewsey Area Board if this was the only substitute arrangement.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Melksham
<b>Date:</b> 13 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Jonathon Seed, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Phil Alford, Nick Holder, Pat Aves
<b>Not Present:</b> Hayley Illman, Jon Hubbard
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Peter Dunford, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>The parish of Atworth was now included in the Holt division. The town divisions had been amended, with one division now part town and part parish, and the existing Summerham &amp; Seend division was splitting between Melksham Without West &amp; Rural division, and Devizes Rural West division.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The parish of Atworth was raised and it was asked whether its inclusion in the Holt division meant it fitted within the Bradford on Avon Area Board, or if the entire Holt division should move into the Melksham Area Board. Although Atworth itself had links to Melksham, considering the totality of the division, and impact upon both area boards, it was generally agreed that it made sense that the entire division should remain a part of the Bradford on Avon Area Board.</li><li>• The question was raised as to whether Hilperton should remain a part of the Trowbridge Area Board or if it would sit more comfortably within the Melksham Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that it should remain a part of the Trowbridge Area Board as there were no meaningful connections stronger than that with Trowbridge.</li><li>• The same question was raised but instead with regard to the Southwick division. Again, members unanimously agreed that it should not be included in the Melksham Area Board despite commonalities in their rural natures.</li><li>• The same question was raised but instead with regard to Devizes Rural West and where it sat more comfortably; Devizes or Melksham Area Board. Members spoke of the confusion this may cause due to the division's title if it were to be included in the Melksham Area Board. The parishes within the division were discussed as to where they naturally look towards, but it was agreed that as the majority of the division has strong Devizes links then it should be included as part of the Devizes Area Board, even though a number did look to Melksham as well.</li><li>• The same question was raised but instead with regard to Bromham, Rowde &amp; Roundway and whether this should be included in the Melksham Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that it should remain a part of the Devizes Area Board, particularly as the division included parts of Devizes town.</li><li>• It was asked whether the division of Ethandune looked toward Melksham at all. One member commented on their much stronger connections to Westbury and it was agreed that it should remain a part of the Westbury Area Board.</li></ul>

- The relationship between the Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council was discussed and it was asked whether the whole area board sits well together or if it should be split on an urban and rural basis. Members agreed that despite issues within the Melksham Town Council, the two areas work well together and are one cohesive unit that includes an equal number of rural to urban divisions, and as such should remain as one.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Pewsey
<b>Date:</b> 14 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian McLennan, Ian Blair-Pilling, Jonathon Seed, Stuart Wheeler, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Jerry Kunkler, Paul Oatway, Stuart Wheeler
<b>Not Present:</b> N/A
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Richard Rogers, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>Changes to the Pewsey Area Board were noted as minimal, with a small number of rural parishes included within the Pewsey community-based divisions in order to ensure they have sufficient electorates.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Urchfont &amp; Bishops Cannings was raised and it was questioned whether it should move from the Devizes Area Board into the Pewsey Area Board, as it is at the end of the Pewsey Vale. Members agreed that the decision to move All Cannings into the Pewsey Area Board through inclusion into Pewsey Vale West was logical, but there was no argument to include Urchfont and Bishops Cannings, especially with the latter having strong links to Devizes.</li><li>• As Marlborough Area Board is likely to become a three person area board alongside the Pewsey and Tidworth Area Boards, the question was raised as to whether the Pewsey and Marlborough Area Boards should merge. Members of the area agreed that while the current substitute arrangement between themselves and Tidworth worked well, they did not feel a merger of the two area boards would be appropriate due to the rurality of their board compared to Marlborough and the subsequent geographical size.</li><li>• The same question was raised but as to whether the Pewsey and Tidworth Area Boards should merge. Again, members unanimously agreed that they should not merge due to the urban and rural differences between the two and the military focus of Tidworth which Pewsey does not share.</li><li>• The new division of Avon Valley was discussed and it was asked whether this, as it includes Durrington, should be moved into the Pewsey Area Board. Members agreed that the majority of the division's natural links were towards Amesbury and should therefore remain a part of the Amesbury Area Board.</li><li>• Again, the existing substitute arrangements with Tidworth were discussed and it was asked whether it would be appropriate to include Marlborough within this arrangement to make a nine person pool of substitutes across the three Area Boards. Members acknowledged that this group of people already work in tandem together as part of the Eastern Area Planning Committee and agreed that this larger arrangement could feasibly work, particularly as the need for substitutes in the past has been minimal.</li><li>• It was then questioned as to whether, if the nine person pool were not to come to fruition, Marlborough and Pewsey Area Boards and then Tidworth and Amesbury</li></ul>

Area Boards should continue this shared substitute arrangement but in those separate pairs. Members commented on the commonalities the two pairs shared and acknowledged that this could again, feasibly work. One member however stated that although that option could work, they preferred the idea of the nine person pool as it could provide valuable and more diverse insights.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade
<b>Date:</b> 6 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chairman), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Ian McLennan, Ian Blair-Pilling, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Allison Bucknell, Chris Hurst, Mary Champion
<b>Not Present:</b> Bob Jones MBE, Mollie Groom, Jacqui Lay
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Jane Vaughan, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>Changes to the divisions were noted as minor; specific mentions were made towards the Lyneham division now containing the parishes of Winterbourne Bassett and Broad Hinton, which are a joint Parish Council, and were previously a part of the West Selkey division of the Marlborough Area Board.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Lyneham division was discussed in reference to whether it should remain a part of the RWB Area Board. One member stated that it should remain due to the majority of residents travelling to Wootton Bassett for their main services.</li><li>• Members then discussed any potential changes to the other boundaries if it is agreed that Lyneham should stay. Members noted the “tensions” that surrounded Cricklade and Wootton Bassett in regard to two market towns within one community area and the subsequent stretched resources as there isn’t a main hub as such. However, it was decided that again, Cricklade should remain.</li><li>• The main issue noted was the parishes that are moving into the RWB Area Board from Marlborough may be hesitant and adverse towards the change.</li><li>• Councillor Mary Champion joined once the session has concluded, but she discussed the matters and meeting with the Vice-Chair and agreed with the above conclusions.</li></ul>



## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Salisbury
<b>Date:</b> 6 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chairman), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Atiqul Hoque, John Walsh, Brian Dalton
<b>Not Present:</b> Mary Douglas, Derek Brown OBE, Sven Hocking, Ricky Rogers
<b>Officers:</b> Ellen Ghey, Kieran Elliott, Marc Read
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>The revised divisions now do not include any part of Laverstock and Ford parish within a Salisbury City based division. However, they do include a section of the Netherhampton parish in the new Salisbury Harnham West division, which has been recommended by the Electoral Review Committee to be transferred to the city and has been supported by both parishes. The remainder of the Netherhampton parish is in the Wilton division which is presently part of the South West Wilts Area Board.</p> <p>As Laverstock and Ford parish is now divided between the Laverstock and Old Sarum and Lower Bourne Valley division, both divisions would need to be included together to avoid splitting a parish between area boards. However, Idmiston parish is also divided between the Old Sarum and Lower Bourne Valley division, and the Winterslow and Upper Bourne Valley divisions, so would also need to be included together if a split were to be avoided.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members discussed the possibility of the Laverstock Division joining the Salisbury Area Board. The history of the parish (also included in Old Sarum Division) with community governance reviews was noted, with some members strongly feeling that the area would most appropriately belong with the city area, although the community feeling in that area, which had been against the parish being included with the city, was also noted.</li><li>• The merits of splitting Laverstock and Ford parish were discussed, however if splitting the parishes were to be best avoided then the three parishes of Laverstock, Old Sarum &amp; Lower Bourne Valley, and Winterslow &amp; Upper Bourne Valley would need to be moved together. It was not felt the Bourne Valley parishes part of the latter two divisions had as close a connection as Laverstock division.</li><li>• Reference was made to difficulties in the past arising from splitting of Laverstock and Ford parish.</li><li>• The question was raised in regard to Wilton and bringing it into Salisbury Area Board. Again, members discussed its merit but concluded it was not appropriate to move the area into the Salisbury Area Board</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Southern
<b>Date:</b> 13 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chairman), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Ian Blair-Pilling, Graham Wright, Ian McLennan
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Richard Britton, Ian McLennan, Richard Clewer
<b>Not Present:</b> Leo Randall, Christopher Devine
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Karen Linaker, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>Against the wishes of Wiltshire Council the LGBCE had included Winterslow with parishes of the upper Bourne Valley. This had also resulted in the parish of Idmiston being split between two divisions, the other being combined with the Old Sarum area of Laverstock and Ford and Winterbourne.</p> <p>It was noted that under the present Area Board system only one parish in Wiltshire was divided between Area Boards – Laverstock and Ford, between Southern and Salisbury Area Boards – which had led to a number of community difficulties. It was also confirmed that each Member, and Division, could only be assigned to one Area Board.</p> <p>It was noted that if Council were to seek to avoid splitting any parish between Area Boards, then the Divisions of Laverstock, Old Sarum and Lower Bourne Valley, and Winterslow and Upper Bourne Valley would need to be included within the same Area Board. This was because the first two divisions both included sections of the parish of Laverstock and Ford, and the latter two both included sections of the Parish of Idmiston.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was discussed whether it would be appropriate for any divisions currently within the SWW Wiltshire area to be included along with current Southern divisions, such as Wilton or Fovant and Chalke Valley. Those present considered that Wilton had closer links with Salisbury than Southern, and under the incoming divisions there were not strong links for the larger part of Downton and Ebble Valley with Fovant, particularly given closeness to the New Forest.</li><li>• It was stated that some Salisbury members had felt that the Laverstock Division (as opposed to Laverstock and Ford parish) did not fit comfortably with the other Southern divisions and would be more appropriately included within Salisbury Area Board. The local member was strongly opposed to such a move, noting issues of history, community and identity, and that to do so would split the parish between Boards.</li><li>• There was some discussion of the principle of three member Area boards, and whether the more rural divisions south east of the city could work in such an arrangement. Aside from the general principle of such boards, it was discussed whether it would be appropriate in this area, or would artificially divide the area.</li><li>• The three divisions containing parts of parishes were discussed, and whether a split of parishes between area boards should be avoided, in which case all three</li></ul>

divisions should be included in the same board, or whether in the circumstances it would be acceptable to split parishes between area boards.

- It was stated some members of Amesbury had argued particularly in relation to the Winterslow and Upper Bourne Valley Division should be included in that area board. It was noted that across the three divisions the majority of the population was contained in divisions presently in the southern area, though significant numbers and many parishes within them were not. The largest settlement of the division was Winterslow. It was agreed the connections between the two areas of the Upper Bourne Valley were not extensive, and that whatever board the division was placed in it was likely some would be unhappy.
- If all three divisions were included in the southern area this would mean a six member area board. If all were included within Amesbury then this would mean a nine member area board.
- It was noted that parishes would be contacted for their views in a public consultation.

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> South West Wiltshire
<b>Date:</b> 8 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Pauline Church, Jose Green, Bridget Wayman
<b>Not Present:</b> Tony Deane, George Jeans
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Karen Linaker, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>There are some adjustments to the Nadder Valley, Fovant &amp; Chalke Valley and Wilton divisions. The Nadder Valley division now includes the parishes of Wylve and Steeple Langford which were previously a part of the Amesbury Area Board.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questions were asked as to whether Mere and Nadder Valley should remain in South West Wilts Area Board or whether it should move out, and whether Wylve Valley should move from Warminster and join with South West Wilts Area Board. Members unanimously disagreed with both points; they agreed that they were happy to continue with the status quo and raised concerns of the Area Board becoming too big and thus unmanageable if they took on Wylve Valley.</li><li>• The same question was asked as to Till Valley and if it should move to South West Wilts Area Board; members unanimously agreed that it should not as the majority of the division looks more to Amesbury and thus should remain a part of the Amesbury Area Board.</li><li>• Members discussed whether Wilton, which was now more compact and urban, would be appropriate within Salisbury Area Board. Members noted the independence of the community and distinction from the city, as well as historical concerns over local boundaries.</li><li>• A point was made as to the possibility of the Southern Area Board having only a three person board, and if this were to happen whether it would make sense to have a substitution arrangement with the SWW area. Members noted the very large areas covered by both Boards and did not consider substitution arrangements as appropriate.</li><li>• It was also discussed whether, in the event of Southern being reduced to three members, Wilton would suitably be included within it to ensure it had four members. It was stated there was some connection, being a parish on the edge of Salisbury, though it would also be somewhat separate from the other divisions by transport links and create a half-doughnut shaped area board; something that they were looking to avoid and undo across the County.</li><li>• However, as noted above the preference of all area members present was to retain the existing five member structure.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Tidworth
<b>Date:</b> 8 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian McClennan, Stuart Wheeler, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Christopher Williams, Mark Connolly, Ian Blair-Pilling
<b>Not Present:</b> N/A
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Richard Rogers, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>There are several notable changes to the Tidworth Area Board. Firstly, several parishes within the former Collingbournes and Netheravon division are now included in the Avon Valley Division, which members considered looked more to Amesbury. Secondly, as a result of development growth in other areas and army rebasing; the three divisions around Tidworth cover a smaller geographical area.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As Tidworth has an existing substitute arrangement with Pewsey, then the question was raised as to whether these two area boards should merge. Members unanimously agreed that they should not merge due to the urban and rural differences between the two and the military focus of Tidworth which Pewsey does not share. However, members commented on how well the substitute arrangement works.</li><li>• The military focus was explored by members and the concept of a more “military focused” area board was discussed. It was questioned whether Amesbury and Tidworth should merge into a larger area board. Members agreed that if this happened, as Amesbury is naturally bigger than Tidworth, then they would be the dominant area which could lead to tensions in both the community and area board.</li><li>• Again, the existing substitute arrangements with Pewsey were discussed and it was asked that if Marlborough were to become a three person area board, would it be appropriate to include them as part of the arrangement, and as such become a nine person pool of substitutes across the three Area Boards. Members acknowledged that this group of people already work in tandem together as part of the Eastern Area Planning Committee and agreed that this larger arrangement could feasibly work.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Trowbridge
<b>Date:</b> 13 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Jonathon Seed, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Ernie Clark, Horace Prickett, Andrew Bryant, Peter Fuller, Steve Oldrieve, Stewart Palmen, Jo Trigg
<b>Not Present:</b> David Halik, Edward Kirk
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Liam Cripps, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>The incoming Trowbridge Park and Trowbridge Drynham Divisions each contain a part of the town and part of North Bradley Parish, with the remainder in the Southwick division, and the other town divisions have been amended slightly.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The division of Winsley &amp; Westwood was brought into question with regard to its expansion and if it should be included within the Trowbridge Area Board instead of the Bradford on Avon Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that due to the layout of the division in relation to Bradford on Avon and its strong links to the town, it should remain a part of Bradford on Avon Area Board.</li><li>• The same question was raised in regard to the division of Holt and if it should be included in the Trowbridge Area Board. Members discussed the idea but agreed that although Staverton naturally looked towards Trowbridge, bringing in the entire division did not make sense and should therefore remain a part of the Bradford on Avon Area Board.</li><li>• The division of Hilperton was discussed as to whether it should remain a part of Trowbridge or if it would sit more comfortably in the Bradford on Avon Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that Hilperton should remain a part of Trowbridge Area Board.</li><li>• Members discussed the Southwick division's parishes in regard to their desire to retain their rural identities despite expansion of the town. It was then asked whether the Southwick division would sit more comfortably within a more rural area board such as Westbury or Bradford on Avon. Members agreed that despite these concerns and the impact of new development plans on the area, the parishes within the division has such strong ties to Trowbridge then to move it would be inappropriate and could hinder any future relationships.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Warminster
<b>Date:</b> 14 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan, Jonathon Seed, Graham Wright
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Pip Ridout, Tony Jackson, Fleur De Rhe-Phillipe
<b>Not Present:</b> Andrew Davis
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Graeme Morrison, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>There have been substantial amendments of the town divisions and the divisions which are part town, part parish. The former Copheap &amp; Wylve division no longer contains any part of the town and extends through the Deverills. The former Warminster Without division includes the northern part of the town and rural parishes to the west and south.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The question was raised as to whether the area boards of Westbury and Warminster should be merged into one. Members unanimously agreed that they should not merge due to historical differences and large geographical spread.</li><li>• The divisions of Devizes Rural West and The Lavingtons were discussed and it was asked whether these should move from the Devizes Area Board into the Warminster Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that due to the large patch of rural hinterland separating the two areas, it would be inappropriate for them to be included in the Warminster Area Board.</li><li>• The Till Valley division was also discussed and questioned as to whether this should move from the Amesbury Area Board into the Warminster Area Board. Again, members unanimously agreed that Till Valley was too far away and had minimal to no natural links to Warminster and should therefore stay within the Amesbury Area Board.</li><li>• As part of Wylve Valley sits within Nadder Valley Division, it was questioned as to whether both the divisions of Mere and Nadder Valley should be moved into the Warminster Area Board from the South West Wilts Area Board. Members commented on the distance between the two divisions and Warminster but acknowledged that some Mere residents have connections with the town. It was agreed that if one of the two were to be moved, then Mere would be the more suitable option, but were happy to continue with the status quo.</li></ul>

## Electoral Review Committee – Area Board Boundary Review – Member Session Notes

<b>Area Board:</b> Westbury
<b>Date:</b> 7 July 2020
<b>Committee Members:</b> Richard Clewer (Chair), Gavin Grant (Vice-Chair), Ian Blair-Pilling, Ian McLennan
<b>Area Board Members:</b> Gordon King, Carole King, Russell Hawker, Suzanne Wickham
<b>Not Present:</b> N/A
<b>Officers:</b> Kieran Elliott, Angela Gale, Ellen Ghey
<p>Cllr Clewer introduced and chaired the session, providing details of differences between the existing Electoral Divisions, and the Electoral Divisions incoming for the elections in May 2021.</p> <p>There were minimal changes to the existing area board arrangements, the only significant change is that the Coulston Parish has been moved from the Ethandune division and is now included in the Devizes Rural West division.</p> <p>Those Area Board Members present discussed the incoming Divisions and potential implications for establishment of a community area. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questions were raised concerning the move of Coulston to Devizes Rural West. Members spoke about the serious links it has to Westbury but also of its links to Erlestoke and how its new Division fit better in Devizes Area Board.</li><li>• There was also mention by one member of the consequences of the expansion of the Ethandune division to include all of Heywood parish, including the area around The Ham.</li><li>• A point was made regarding Southwick and whether it should be included in the Westbury Area Board. Members unanimously agreed that it should not be included due to its strong links to Trowbridge and its lack of connections to Westbury.</li><li>• The same point was made in regard to North Bradley and West Ashton parishes and the same answer was given in that members unanimously agreed that it looked more towards Trowbridge and not Westbury.</li><li>• Again, questions were asked whether Warminster North &amp; Rural should move to Westbury Area Board, but again members unanimously agreed that it should not and should remain in the Warminster Area Board due to geography and its inclusion of part of the town of Warminster.</li><li>• As a four person board, the question was asked whether members felt the need to follow the system that three person boards have in regard to substitute arrangements. Members unanimously agreed that it was such a rare occasion that organizing substitute arrangements were not necessary and, in the event, that an urgent decision had to be made without the full set of members present then they would call another meeting.</li></ul>



## Councillor Comments on ERC Area Board Meetings

### Salisbury:

#### **Councillor Sven Hocking**

Thank you for your notes, my observations are as follows:-

- 1) Having been caught up in the Governance Review in 2016 around the proposal to bring Laverstock and Ford Parish Council (LFPC) under the umbrella of Salisbury City Council (SCC) and the resulting very inflammatory and bitter dispute that followed it was quite clear that Laverstock and Ford residents were vehemently against joining with Salisbury in any way shape or form. I believe that LFPC residents may feel that this is the start of another attempt by Salisbury to move them into the City's scope of influence and may ultimately reopen a very divisive debate which nobody wants to go through again.
- 2) The Division boundaries within the Salisbury Area Board and the Salisbury City Council Parish boundaries are also co-terminus which allow for very close joint working and funding on any number of Council, Community and residential related issues, so, grant awards, community support projects, environmental planning and events, highways and streetscene improvements, CATG initiatives and so forth. To bring Laverstock and Ford into the Salisbury AB without doing the same with the Parish boundaries (see point 1 above for why I would support this) would change the dynamics of a collaboration which works well now and both Salisbury Area Board and City Council are continuing to build on.
- 3) Most of the projects the Salisbury Area Board fund, and those with joint funding from the City Council, are City-centric thus the majority of the funding stays inside the current boundaries whereas in the Southern Area Board and LFPC the issues are far more rural and therefore generally different. The pressure to keep any funding within the City would remain, even more so now with the level of community support that will be required in some of the more disadvantaged part of the City post the effects of COVID-19 and the nett result could well mean LF losing out in bids for funding and therefore be worse off than at present.

I feel it would be far better to keep the status quo and that L & F PC remain within the Southern Area Board and that the Salisbury Area Board boundaries remain aligned with that of the Salisbury City Council.