

Recommendation 1 - Netherhampton and Salisbury

1.1 - That the area of the Netherhampton East Ward be transferred to the parish of Salisbury City as part of the Salisbury Harnham West Ward.

1.2 - That the Salisbury Harnham West Ward be increased from two city councillors to three.

1.3 - That the total number of councillors for Salisbury City Council be increased from 23 to 24.

1.4 - That the parish of Netherhampton be comprised of five councillors, without wards.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
01-01	Representative	Agree		Netherhampton East Ward is very much part of the Harnham West Ward through development and infrastructure	Number of Parish Councillors required do we really need 4 Councillors to represent Harnham East and West
01-02	Resident	Amendment	Our ward in Netherhampton, but our house is clearly in Lower Bemerton. We have never understood this, as Netherhampton is 2 miles away. To move us to Harnham was [unclear word] as the present situation. As we live in Lower Bemerton, are very involved in village affairs here, and identify this as our [unclear word], this should be our ward.		
01-03	An Interested Party	Agree		Evolving demographics	Change the name of Salisbury Parish to City of New Sarum Parish
01-04	An Interested Party	Agree			

Recommendation 2 - Salisbury

2.1 - To merge the Salisbury City wards of Salisbury Milford and Salisbury St Mark's and Bishopdown into a single ward of three councillors, coterminous with the Salisbury Milford Electoral Division. The city ward would also be called Salisbury Milford.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
02-01	An Interested Party	Agree		Evolving demographics	Change the name of Salisbury Parish to City of New Sarum Parish
02-02	An Interested Party	Agree			

Recommendation 3 - Langley Burrell Without, Lacock and Chippenham

- 3.1 - That the area of the Barrow Farm Ward of Langley Burrell Without be transferred to Chippenham Town Council and merged with the Chippehham Hardenhuish Ward, to continue to contain three town councillors.
- 3.2 - That the area of the Rawlings Farm Ward of Langley Burrell Without be transferred to Chippenham Town Council and merged with the Chippehham Monkton Ward, to continue to contain three town councillors.
- 3.3 - That the area of the Showell Ward of Lacock be transferred to Chippenham Town Council and merged with the Chippehham Lowden and Rowden Ward, to continue to contain three town councillors.
- 3.4 - That Lacock Parish Council be comprised of eleven councillors, without warding arrangements.
- 3.5 - That Langley Burrell Without Parish Council be comprised of five councillors, without warding arrangements.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
03-01	Resident	Disagree		The unanimous rejection of the recommendation by residents of the Showell ward has been ignored. How does this recommendation reflect the 'Community Identity and Interests'	Surely in a democracy the views of the affected residents should not be dismissed out of hand
03-02	Resident	Disagree		Our hamlet is a national heritage site that has always been part of Lacock and actually houses the Saxon fort that protected St Cyriac's church in Saxon times. As part of the Lacock community we are involved in local groups, schools, nurseries etc and the village is the epicentre of our community.	Yes, the fact that our hamlet is a large part of the national heritage and history of Lacock. We have many visitors to our Saxon fort site who take the walk to the connecting Saxon sites in Lacock.
03-03	Resident	Amendment	The draft recommendations document argues that "Whilst the areas in question were largely undeveloped at the present time, significant development was projected and the characteristics of the areas would be urban...". This is not true in the case of Rowden Hamlet (Showell Ward) since the area will remain a Conservation Area and be at the centre of what is to become Rowden Country Park. It would, therefore, make better sense to retain its rural and historic links with Lacock. An exception similar to that planned for Showell Farm/nurseries area should be adopted.	It is stated that the objective of the CGR is to ensure the governance arrangements of town and parish councils continue to reflect the identity and interests of the local communities. Given that every resident who would be affected by the proposed change (recommendation 3.3) has objected to it, both by individual responses and through the petition signed by every resident, the objective has not been fulfilled. Therefore, the recommendation needs to be reconsidered.	No tangible benefits have been identified which might be enjoyed by the residents as a result of implementing this recommendation. In the absence of any tangible benefits to the residents, there remains no justification for the change. Finally, in the current lockdown environment, the residents have not been afforded the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with those driving this change. Without the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the decision makers, it seems the views of the residents affected by the proposal have not been afforded the weighting they deserve. It really feels as if the decision was made before any consultation; as if the consultation process was nothing more than a tick-box exercise. A face-to-face meeting with the residents needs to be arranged urgently so that this can be discussed before it proceeds any further.

03-04	Resident	Disagree		Your CGR objective has not been achieved as you have ignored the interests and identity of all of the local residents of the area affected in the Rowden Manor hamlet.	We live in a rural - not urban - community, surrounded by fields. As part of the Showell Ward we should be treated as Showell Farm and not transferred to the governance of Chippenham Town Council. Your proposal goes against the principles of the Conservation Area. We have a privately-maintained road, a private sewer, no street lighting and sub-standard broadband - no urban benefits - and therefore we want to keep our rural connection and remain under Lacock governance.
04-01	Resident	Disagree		The Hamlet of Rowden we should be considered the same as shower - we are a rural hamlet with strong links & orientation to lacock	to be paired with Chippenham will not meet our rural needs and have more akin with lacock.

Note: Ref 04-01 was submitted against the incorrect recommendation on the online portal, but relates to Recommendation 3.3

Recommendation 4 - Chippenham Without and Kington St Michael

4.1 - That the area including Cedar Lodge, Allington, shown above be transferred from Kington St Michael to Chippenham Without.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
04-01	Resident	Disagree		The Hamlet of Rowden we should be considered the same as shower - we are a rural hamlet with strong links & orientation to Iacock	to be paired with Chippenham will not meet our rural needs and have more akin with Iacock.

Note: This comment is actually in relation to Recommendation 3.3

Recommendation 5 - Manningford and Woodborough

5.1 - That the area shown in the draft recommendation maps be transferred from the parish of Manningford to the parish of Woodborough

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
05-01	Resident	Agree		Better use of shared resources	

Recommendation 6 - Pewsey

6.1 - That the parish of Pewsey be represented by a parish council comprising 21 councillors, without warding arrangements.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
06-01	Resident	Agree		it's logical	

Recommendation 7 - Wilcot and Pewsey

7.1 - That the area shown in the draft recommendations map be transferred from the parish of Pewsey to the parish of Wilcot, Huish and Oare (see Recommendation 8.3).

7.2 - That the Electoral Divisions of Pewsey Vale West and Pewsey be amended to be coterminous with the parish boundaries of Pewsey and Wilcot, Huish and Oare

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
07-01	Resident	Agree		it's logical	
07-02	Resident	Agree			
07-03	Resident	Agree		As per original questionnaire	
07-04	An Interested Party	Agree		As per original questionnaire	
07-05	Resident	Agree		It clarifies the Parish Council boundaries, corrects anomalies in the Parish Boundary, makes the name of the Parish reflect the entire community.	
07-06	Resident	Agree			

Recommendation 8 - Wilcot and Huish

8.1 - That the parishes of Wilcot and Huish be merged into a single parish.

8.2 - For the combined parish to have no warding arrangements, with nine councillors.

8.3 -For the combined parish to be called Wilcot, Huish and Oare.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
08-01	Resident	Agree			
08-02	Resident	Agree		Gives clarification to the area of the Parish Council, makes it simpler for people to vote without having to know which ward they are in.	
08-03	A representative of a parish or town or city council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Agree			
08-04	Resident	Agree			
08-05	Resident	Agree		FURTHER SIMPLIFICATION FOR SMALL VILLAGES	NO
08-06	Resident	Agree		Seems reasonable to merge parishes	
08-07	Resident	Agree		No objection to the recommendation	
08-08	Resident	Agree		As per original questionnaire	
08-09	Resident	Agree		As per original questionnaire	
08-10	Resident	Disagree			
08-11	Resident	Disagree		They are 2 separate parishes with different identities and should be kept that way.	
08-12	Resident	Disagree		I believe that 'Community Identity and Interests' are of importance in preserving the distinct historic and cultural heritage of each of these old villages even if it means sacrificing some administrative efficiencies.	
08-13	Resident	Agree		re 8.3 We agree because that is how we like the situation	

Recommendation 9

9.1 -To NOT recommend creation of a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley during the 2019/20 Community Governance Review.

9.2 -To undertake a further Community Governance Review when practicable, to include Calne Without, Calne Town, and other surrounding parishes, so that all potential options and impacts could be considered.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
09-01	Resident	Agree		Impact on other parish needs to be fully assessed	
09-02	Resident	Agree		Further consideration and investigation of the advantages/disadvantages of the proposal is required	
09-03	Representative	Agree		9.1 the changes to Pewsham and West Wards were thoroughly investigated and discussed by CWPC before submission.	the temporary delay to 9.2 gives CWPC time to discuss how this may impact on the various Wards.
09-04	Resident	Agree		I do not want Calne Without Parish Council to be broken up or disbanded.	I believe that CWPC is stronger and better able to serve the Parishioners in its current form.
09-05	Resident	Agree		We are stronger and can take better decisions as a larger administrative unit	No
09-06	Resident	Agree		I don't believe that those promoting the petition properly explained to the public the 'cons' of creating a new parish. There are I believe more benefits for the parish to remain as is than becoming a smaller entity.	
09-07	Resident	Disagree		The Council has ignored the views of the vast majority of the residents of Derry Hill and Studley, just as Calne Without has been doing for 50 years.	
09-08	Interested Party	Agree			
09-09	Resident	Agree		I wrote in opposition to the original proposal, so am pleased that it is not recommended. I welcome the proposed review of governance of Calne and its surroundings.	The legacy of the 1960s key villages scheme is that some villages have developed to become suburbanised while others have remained rural and static or shrunken in terms of dwellings. The interests of these dissimilar locations need addressing equally.
09-10	Resident	Agree		The changes are not well thought through. The impact of this change on other areas has not been properly assessed or explained.	The impact of this change on other areas outside Derry Hill and Studley have not been properly assessed or explained.
09-11	Resident	Agree		While the proposal to create Derry Hill and Studley as a parish is most definitely supported the impact on existing Calne Without parish is noted. Given the strength of the argument the impact on Calne Without should have been considered at the outset and not now, at the decision stage be subject to review. The risk (and the ask) is that the review is not put off and is in fact considered as the proposal states within the earliest time frames.	

09-12	Resident	Agree		The proposed new parish boundaries would create a poorly co-ordinated social framework due to its physical layout and this would not encourage social cohesion.	No
09-13	Resident	Disagree		Any overview of the Calne Without Council will demonstrate the potential inefficiencies and imbalances of a council made up a divergent group of communities spread around a central organisation, Calne, all of which have differing interests and priorities. Whilst this may have had some logic in historical times the pressures of new communities and developments have rendered the current system totally unfit for purpose. Specifically Derry Hill/Studley which now has a population in excess of any of the other parishes within the Calne Without area only has a minority presence on the council. As residents of the Derry Hill/Studley community we are unfairly penalised and have little influence over matters that are a priority in this area but not necessarily elsewhere. This does not reflect good local and representative governance. Now is the time to make sensible change by establishing a new Derry Hill/Studley Council which fulfils the criteria of "Effective and Convenient Local Governance". I accept this will impact on the wider Calne Without Council but suggest that the obvious way ahead is to merge the remaining PC's with their boarding councils with which they have closer relationships anyway.	Calne Without is an outdated inefficient council which fails in all respects to meet the criteria of 'Effective and Convenient Local Governance' An overall review is urgently required to resolve this failure of local government.
09-14	Resident	Agree			

09-15	Resident	Disagree		I disagree with the proposals to not recommend a creation of a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley for the following reasons: The area is expanding with current and new residential development; this will result in an increase in residents and school children. We have a large junior school with a major road (A4) in between, which sees heavy traffic, produces noise, pollution and speeding problems. There is also a concern about safety with crossing the A4. Derry Hill and Studaly are limited in terms of resources i.e. shops and businesses etc. We have also got a major events centre (Bowood) which results in an increase in traffic and visitors to the area. These are all environmental problems, which demand we are better represented in local council and I strongly believe Derry Hill & Studley should constitute a parish and retain its identity.	
09-16	Resident	Agree		I would like this local community to have a say in its own governance	no
09-17	Resident	Disagree		Derry Hill and Studley are of a suitable size to be able to operate its own parish. Decisions are currently made by Councillors who have no connection with Derry Hill and Studley. Calne Without Council is disproportionately representative of areas which have no connectivity with Derry Hill. A new Council for Derry Hill would have Councillors who are local to the communit and therefore more accountable to the electorate. A new Council would ensure a fairer representation for all the electorate rather than the current situation with some Councillors representing a handful of residents!	
09-18	Resident	Disagree		Derry Hill/Studley suitable size to be able to operate its own parish. Decisions are currently made by Councillors who have no connection with Derry Hill and Studley. Calne Without Council is disproportionately representative of areas which have no connectivity to Derry Hill and Studley. A new Council would ensure a fairer representation for electorates rather than the current situation with some Councillors representing a handful of residents.	

09-19	Resident	Disagree		We feel strongly that we are unrepresented in our current area of Derry Hill. Many official publications do not even show the area of Derry Hill on maps of the parish. Our village has many specific issues that would be properly discussed if we had a parish for Derry Hill and Studley. I know there was a very strongly supported local campaign with a very high percentage of signatures on the petition and I feel that this has just been ignored.	Create a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley with meetings held at the Lansdowne Hall.
09-20	Representative	Disagree		I disagree with the recommendation of 9.1 but agree with 9.2 that a further Community Governance Review to take place so that people within the parish of Calne Without buy who do not live in Studley or Derry Hill can have thier points considered. But it should be noted that over 90% of those people living in Studley and Derry Hill who answered the survey, stated that they were in favor of the creation of a new parish covering Studley and Derry Hill.	As a Parish Councillor representing Studley and Derry Hill then I must Support the views of those people living in Studley and Derry Hill.
09-21	Resident	Agree		I disagree with the recommendation of 9.1 but agree with 9.2 that a further Community Governance Review takes place. It is vital that the voice of the 90% of those people who want their own Parish Council be heard. It is a nonsense when Bremhill has its own Parish Council (far less population than Studley and DerryHill).It cannot be local democracy.	It is essential that the unique nature and population of Studley and DerryHill are reflected by the opportunity to have its own democratic voice. People from other villages cannot represent this uniqueness and should not be able to vote. It is frankly undemocratic.
09-22	Resident	Agree		I strongly agree that the case for a new parish is weak and that further consideration must be given to all options and their impact.	Further consideration must be inclusive and take into account the views of all residents in Calne Without: the current case based on the narrow, strongly held opinions of a subset of parish councillors is wholly inappropriate.
09-23	Resident	Agree		The current case does not take into account the views of all residents impacted by the proposals.	Broaden consultation to all impacted residents in order to identify a range of options for impact analysis.
09-24	Resident	Agree		Further work is necessary to capture the views of all residents impacted by the proposal.	Assess the costs, benefits and risks associated with all options.

09-25	Resident	Disagree		West Ward has an electorate of 1008, 628 were canvassed, 601 support the new parish, 27 declined to state their view. Pewsham Ward has an electorate of 211, 169 were canvassed, 162 support the new parish, 7 declined to state their view. Totals: Total electorate = 1219, Canvassed = 797 - 65%, In support = 763 - 62.5%, Decline to say = 34. Survey by loan Rees, 26-11-19. This is an overwhelming support for the creation of a new parish for Derry Hill and Studely which "reflects the identities and interests in this area".	The proposal to create a new parish is that it would better represent the local views of the local people, and is of sufficient size to be very viable - see above. Local areas must be governed by people in that area, not remote neighbours of smaller communities.
09-26	Resident	Disagree		West Ward has an electorate of 1008, 628 were canvassed, 601 support the new parish, 27 declined to state their view. Pewsham Ward has an electorate of 211, 169 were canvassed, 162 support the new parish, 7 declined to state their view. Totals: Total electorate = 1219, Canvassed = 797 - 65%, In support = 763 - 62.5%, Decline to say = 34. Survey by loan Rees, 26-11-19. This is an overwhelming support for the creation of a new parish for Derry Hill and Studely which "reflects the identities and interests in this area".	The proposal to create a new parish is that it would better represent the local views of the local people, and is of sufficient size to be very viable - see above. Local areas must be governed by people in that area, not remote neighbours of smaller communities.
09-27	Resident	Disagree		Derry Hill and Studely villages have grown considerably over the recent years and the governance grouping with much smaller villages is no longer appropriate. There is no reason to defer for a governance review.	
09-28	Resident	Amendment	Recommendation 9.2 should be removed. The proposal for a new Council cannot be approved and it is a waste of time and money to carry out a further review when there is no evidence that the current arrangements do not provide effective and convenient local governance.		
09-29	Resident	Disagree		The area is large enough to have its own governance	
09-30	Resident	Agree		I do not want the parish of Calne Without to be detrimentally affected or weakened by the creation of a new Derry Hill and Studley parish.	

09-31	Resident	Agree		<p>As a resident of the potential new Calne Without parish I want all the possible options fully researched and considered so any possible alliances with neighbouring parishes can be fully investigated.</p>	<p>I am very concerned about Calne Town Council suggesting alterations to the town boundary as is stated occurred during the Consultation. If the Town takes more land along the boundry of the 'new' Calne Without Parish in East Ward it could allow further housing development into existing farmland. This has already happened with developments such as Marden Farm which has had a very detrimental impact on the rural road network. It would also go against the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
09-32	Resident	Disagree		<p>I have been a resident of Derry Hill in Calne Without Parish for over 35 years and a former Calne Without parish councillor. In my view Derry Hill and Studley should be its own parish. The two villages work together and share many local facilities. The main objection in your review seems to be this hiving off of the two villages from the rest of Calne Without PC is that the other parts would no longer share its facilities. This is illogical as many people from Chippenham and Calne use the facilities in Derry Hill and do not belong to Calne Without. People use the facilities that are convenient to them, not where the parish border is. We have little in common with the villagers of Lower Compton, Stockley or any part of the remaining area of Calne Without PC. One could point out that Stockley residents use the school, the pub, village hall and church in Heddington which is only a mile away. They join with Heddington for their Steam Rally, and the Heddington and Stockley firework display. Similarly, residents of Calstone and Lower Compton use the school, pub, village hall and church in Cherhill which is again only a mile or so away. Derry Hill and Studley are over 5 miles away on the other side of Calne. The petition was signed by 767 residents and a majority (70%) of the responses to Wiltshire's own survey, also supported the proposal for a separate parish. That survey</p>	

09-33	Resident	Disagree		<p>I have been a resident of Derry Hill in Calne Without Parish for over 35 years. In my view Derry Hill and Studley should be its own parish. The two villages work together and share many local facilities. The main objection in your review seems to be this hiving off of the two villages from the rest of Calne Without PC is that the other parts would no longer share its facilities. This is illogical as many people from Chippenham and Calne use the facilities in Derry Hill and do not belong to Calne Without. People use the facilities that are convenient to them, not where the parish border is. We have little in common with the villagers of Lower Compton, Stockley or any part of the remaining area of Calne Without PC. One could point out that Stockley residents use the school, the pub, village hall and church in Heddington which is only a mile away. They join with Heddington for their Steam Rally, and the Heddington and Stockley firework display. Similarly, residents of Calstone and Lower Compton use the school, pub, village hall and church in Cherhill which is again only a mile or so away. Derry Hill and Studley are over 5 miles away on the other side of Calne. The petition was signed by 767 residents and a majority (70%) of the responses to Wiltshire's own survey, also supported the proposal for a separate parish. That survey covered all of Calne Without PC. I don't accept</p>	
09-34	Resident	Agree		<p>There would be a lasting affect to those in Calne without that I do not agree with. The proposed movement of parish borders is also not considered and further investigation/review must be sought</p>	
09-35	Resident	Agree		<p>Derry Hill and Studley require their own parish given the size of the combined parish being both geographicallyDistance from other parishes in the current ward and in so far as population is concerned.</p>	
09-36	Resident	Disagree		<p>Derry Hill and Studley needs its own parish council. The rest of Calne Without has nothing to do with our villages and should not have the power to make decisions that completely ignore the wishes of people in Derry Hill and Studley. The rest of Calne Without Is miles away on the other side of Calne has no links with us and could continue as their own parish without any problems</p>	<p>Why has there been no consultation on Calne Town Council's requests for boundary changes? This should have been done first, they are nothing to do with a council for Derry Hill and Studley</p>

09-37	Resident	Disagree		<p>It is very sensible to create a new parish covering Derry Hill and Studley only. The current Calne Without Parish is a non cohesive doughnut that lacks any form of community cohesion. Residents of Derry Hill and Studley have no interest in the affairs of such places as Calstone and Stockley (included in Calne Without). The communities are miles away from us. The councillors from those villages have no interest in Derry Hill and Studley.</p> <p>The Govt. talks enough about community local participation but decisions like this show that such is only lip service.</p> <p>Also the population of Derry Hill and Studley is greater than many parishes so you have no reason not to make this change which is wanted by all residents of D. Hill and Studley.</p> <p>Provide a parish just covering Derry Hill and Studley as all residents apart from a very few want you to do.</p>	<p>To continue to ignore this is to ignore the wishes of local people.</p>
-------	----------	----------	--	---	--

Recommendation 10 - Calne Without

10.1 - To amend the boundary between the West and Pewsham Wards of Calne Without Parish Council as shown in the draft recommendation maps

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
10-01	Interested Party	Agree		Seems sensible to simplify the boundaries	
10-02	Resident	Agree		It removes an anomaly	
10-03	Representative	Agree		this deals with some anomalies where houses are placed in Wards that do not identify with the community	no
10-04	Interested Party	Agree		It makes logical sense.	None.
10-05	Interested Party	Agree		makes sense for those living there to be part of the west ward	
10-06	Resident	Agree		new development is just outside existing boundary hence boundary should be moved to accommodate	no
10-07	Resident	Agree		I agree with the proposal because amending the existing boundary would make it easier for both residents and the Calne Without Parish Council to better identify the delineation between wards and thus reduce administration workload.	
10-08	Resident	Amendment	I support the change in boundary - this should have been done years ago, why did the Parish Council take so long to propose it. My suggestion is that the number of councillors for each ward should also be revised to give more councillors to Derry Hill and Studley to take account of the new housing development and the transfer of all the houses into the ward through the boundary changes from this recommendation and others.	Derry Hill and Studley has half the population but not half the councillors. Needs to be more equitable representation	What has happened to Calne's request for boundary changes? There had been no consultation on this ! When house development in Calne spills over the boundary those houses should be part of the town
10-09	Resident	Agree		All properties in a village should be in the same ward. Residents affected were incensed not to be able to vote in an election in their own village in 2017. This is a shameful example of a parish council that was aware of an electoral anomaly for many years and did nothing to correct it until forced to by residents	Presumably the number of councillors for each ward in the parish will be reviewed and adjusted to take account of the latest figures on voters following the various boundary changes and housing growth.

Recommendation 11 - North Bradley

11.1 - That the area of the White Horse ward of North Bradley Parish Council be transferred to Trowbridge Town Council as part of the Trowbridge Drynham ward, coterminous with the Unitary Division of the same name, and to be represented by three town councillors.

11.2 -That the area of the Park ward of North Bradley Parish Council be transferred to Trowbridge Town Council as part of the Trowbridge Park ward, coterminous with the Unitary Division of the same name, and to be represented by three town councillors.

11.3 -That North Bradley Parish Council be comprised of eleven parish councillors, without warding arrangements.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Reasoning	Additional Comments
11-01	Resident	Disagree	Sheer greed on Trowbridge councils part. Taking this away from North Bradley leaves the Parish with much reduced funds to do its job.	
11-02	Resident	Disagree	This area belongs in North Bradley Parish and should be kept under the Parish council. Trowbridge Council only want it so they can past building plan on these sites. I want North Bradley to remain as a village.	
11-03	Representative	Disagree	The field between Woodmarsh and White Horse Business Park, is historically linked to North Bradley, as Woodmarsh Farm. Regardless of potential new developments, this should remain as North Bradley. Additionally we were offered a plot by the developers for part of the land to be allocated as a new North Bradley Graveyard. residents who wish to be buried in the Parish, would now be buried in Trowbridge.	If the Field off Woodmarsh had to go to Trowbridge, could the field be split into two lengthways, and we get half each. This still allows the landscape gap.

11-04	Resident	Disagree	<p>It is clear the boundary move is motivated by a previous proposal to build on the Greenbelt land separating North Bradley from the White House trading estate. There have been significant objections to these proposals as North Bradley will be sucked up into the urban sprawl of the ever expanding town of Trowbridge. This is particularly frustrating as there are a number of significant derelict sites within Trowbridge which offer great potential for development for housing (particularly the 10+ acre site adjacent to the railway station) which has been left rotting for many years now. There are also greenfield sites available for development on the West Ashton road which have been brought up by Persimmons which also sit idle having not yet been built on which will have absolute no effect on the identity of any village in the area or its boundaries.</p>	<p>The North Bradley proposal is motivated by money and greed. That of the current land owner and the builders. Its Green-belt land supporting lots of important wildlife, flora and fauna. It provides a natural barrier between North Bradley and Trowbridge maintaining the identity and integrity of the village. There are some inconsiderate uses of "a large marker pen" when drawing up the proposed boundary as 16 & 18 Woodmarsh fall outside of the village boundary but are directly connected to it in both physical (houses accessed off of Woodmarsh Road) and historical terms. This is true of a number of other properties in village and once again demonstrates a strategy to set the</p>
11-05	Resident	Disagree	<p>I have lived in the surrounding areas of trowbridge for 30+ years and it's just expanding and expanding but Trowbridge itself need to look at its brownfield sites first before trying to expand and take away the identities of villages that is what makes Wiltshire what it is.</p>	<p>This will close the virtual gap between North Bradley and Trowbridge therefore taking away the identities of the town and village.</p>

11-06	Resident	Disagree	<p>Wiltshire council is moving whole areas of North Bradley to Trowbridge, including houses off little common lane and the corresponding fields which have always been in the parish of North Bradley. Also these fields have acted as a buffer of urban spread. The houses in little common lane will only be accessed via North Bradley and including the farm are in a rural setting. If you are going to let Trowbridge take such a large part of North Bradley for the spread of Trowbridge where will it stop, can we assume in 5 years time Trowbridge will claim land up and beyond Axe and clever lane and why stop there surely the village of North Bradley might as well be taken over as well</p>	<p>What was the point of the parish council spending thousands of pounds on a parish plan, as to allow reasonable building if the allotted land is removed from the parish and placed in Trowbrige. Due to the present circumstances the plan has not been voted on. Who is to say once the plan is passed that a developer can come along and say the parish council plan is irrelevant as any building land is not in the parish. Perhaps Wiltshire council and TTrowbridge council would like to compensate the residents of North Bradley parish for the wasted money.</p>
11-07	Resident	Disagree	<p>The land is North Bradley land and we have a parish council where we can have a least a day in what is happening there, if Trowbridge town council get hold of it there is then nothing to stop them taking the rest of our rural village and turning us in to Trowbridge housing estate.</p>	<p>North Bradley parish have spent a lot of money on the parish plan which will be irrelevant as it's been written up to protect those fields.</p>
11-08	Resident	Disagree	<p>The number of residents moving from North Bradley to Trowbridge would be very small so not worthwhile. those residents will face increased council tax for no benefit. Its clear that this is a land grap to provide potential new housing. See Q48 g</p>	<p>The Parish Council has already put to a referendum a plan for this area. This was suspended due to the corona lockdown (although my vote already in the post. There should be no more actions taken until that process complete. This proposal should be withdrawn with immediate effecte)</p>

11-09	Resident	Disagree	This is simply a land grab by Trowbridge, and will significantly reduce the size of the village of North Bradley.	North Bradley has almost finalised its Neighbourhood Plan, and these proposals go completely against the plan
11-10	Resident	Disagree	If the council wish to build more houses why cant the do it in Trowbridge. Why do they have to take a large part of our village and make it part of Trowbridge. It is not necessary and just another means of increasing the council rates that we pay.	
11-11	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley is a rural parish with a long history of independence from Trowbridge. In the 18th century Drynham Common ran along the boundary with Trowbridge and has formed a buffer between the two communities ever since. We have lived in North Bradley for 40 years and identify with the parish rather than Trowbridge. We strongly object to our part of the parish being absorbed into Trowbridge.	
11-12	Resident	Disagree	This measure would effectively make North Bradley part of Trowbridge and take away from us the "green area" between us and Trowbridge, taking out of our hands any new housing, for the first time since 1894.	
11-13	Resident	Disagree	risk of losing integrity of the village. Reduce local parish influence. Money will go to Trowbridge council.	Trowbridge Town council and wiltshire council land grab.
11-14	Resident	Disagree	This is the first step of an attempt to remove the village status of North Bradley. I object wholeheartedly to this proposal as I did not move here to be a part of Trowbridge.	There is already heavy congestion during the normal rush hour periods and little thought appears to have been given as to the impact extra vehicles will have on the local environment.
11-15	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley is an historical parish and autonomous village which is likely to lose it's unique identity and become amalgamated into Trowbridge. This is nothing more than an attempt to grab land to raise revenue through unnecessary housing development which contravened the North Bradley Local Development Plan	Please refer to the recently formulated North Bradley Local Development Plan which has overwhelming support from local inhabitants

11-16	Resident	Disagree	I do not want to see the village of north Bradley eroded and merge into Trowbridge. The village has it's own unique character and I do not see why a transfer to Trowbridge would be of benefit to the residents.	
11-17	Resident	Disagree	Having recently moved into the village, wanting a community feel and that being important for our young family I feel that increasing the size of Trowbridge and the decrease to North Bradley would significantly impact on the feel and community within the village.	
11-18	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley is a village and should remain so - with the green fields separating us from Trowbridge the school is over subscribed - the roads are already heavy with lorries etc .	
11-19	Resident	Disagree	we want to remain a village not a offshoot from Trowbridge .no logic or benefit in this proposal to our village, short and long term	this was resolved only recently what compelling reasons are for this review/none!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
11-20	Resident	Disagree	We disagree with the proposal, because North Bradley will not be a village anymore, places need identity, Trowbridge is an embarrassment	The extra housing that will be built will clog up the existing roads, as we all know , houses get built first then roads. There is so much land that is just left empty that once had buildings on. All you want to do is just keep shuffling the areas of living.
11-21	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley's current parish boundary sets the village at the centre helping to achieve it's rural identity. Removing the 'White Horse' and 'Park' areas of the parish would in my opinion be detrimental to the community and nature of the parish. The proposed new boundary is much too close to the dwellings along Woodmarsh and would open the floodgates for development on both areas in question. We haven't yet had the chance to vote on the Neighbourhood Plan, surely this should take first, then this consultation?	The vote on the Neighbourhood plan should take place before this boundary issue is decided. This was due to take place on 19 March and was cancelled due to lockdown. It is a priority that this be rearranged.
11-22	Resident	Disagree	There is no valid reason for the action this is just a land grab to increase revenue to Trowbridge council I feel	no valid fair reason for this change has been made
11-23	Resident	Disagree	We will lose the integrity of the village that has been in place since 1894.	Likely increase in crime. Less green space. Loss of community spirit

11-24	Resident	Disagree	<p>I am particularly concerned about the 'White Horse Ward' area This area of land to be transferred is important because not only does it contain a significant housing allocation but it also includes land critical to achieving the objective, stated in Wiltshire Core Strategy, of maintaining the current separation of North Bradley from Trowbridge. Wiltshire Core Strategy 5.150 it is recognised that the villages surrounding Trowbridge, particularly Hilperton, Southwick North Bradley and West Ashton, have separate and distinct identities as villages. Open countryside should be maintained to protect the character and identity of these villages as separate communities. The local communities may wish to consider this matter in more detail in any future community-led neighbourhood planning. Currently the settlements are separated not only by open land but also the strong physical boundary markers of the A363 and Drynham Lane. The proposed changes would breach these barriers and effectively make North Bradley and Trowbridge contiguous in respect of built up areas. Consequently, It seems to me that extending the boundary of Trowbridge into North Bradley would clearly undermine the separation objective because once the change takes place the existing open, separating, land would no longer be part of North Bradley village, but part of the built up urban</p>	
11-25	Resident	Disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposal to reduce the area of the North Bradley parish which has been as it is for over 125 years. At present there is a green belt division between Trowbridge and North Bradley and the proposals would effectively change this, ultimately leading to North Bradley becoming part of Trowbridge. I have lived in North Bradley for 37 years and enjoy the village life and do not wish to see the parish council area reduced in any way.</p>	
11-26	Resident	Disagree	<p>North Bradley is small enough and close enough to Trowbridge as it is, giving a large chunk of it to Trowbridge Council would lose the village vision and only increase the view that North Bradley is not a village in its own right.</p>	<p>There are plenty of open areas/pieces of land left in trowbridge that can be used for new projects and new housing etc, there is no need to be taking it from a little village.</p>

11-27	Resident	Disagree	I am particularly against your proposal at 11.1 as you seem to be undertaking a land grab without strong reasons. In particular the natural boundary in relation to North Bradley and Trowbridge would be the main White Horse Business Park link road. Just because you have plans to build on even more rural land you seem to imply this gives you a reason to take land away from the village community/rural land and life. Your proposal seems to continue to seek to integrate the rural village of North Bradley into the continued urban expansion of Trowbridge whereby rural life and local village community and supporting governance arrangements are diminished/devalued and disrespected. The idea that big brother ie. Trowbridge Town Council knows best should gain and North Bradley as a parish can be reduced/diminished is poor and disrespectful to existing local residents and particularly those who currently live in the rural village and with no choice then live within an urban community.	Seek greater collaboration between the parish council and town council in working together in the future - many people prefer to live in a rural village community and not an urban community - seek to acknowledge and respect local residents views and preferences
11-28	Resident	Disagree	A land grab by Trowbridge Town Council to aid their dire financial position is hardly democratic .	The first hundred houses to be built is such a poor proposal that North Bradley Parish Council are best to deal with it .
11-29	Resident	Disagree	I am very, very happy with being part of a village community under North Bradley Parish Council and vehemently oppose becoming part of Trowbridge	Exactly what would North Bradley, and Woodmarsh in particular, gain from such a transfer. NOTHING! There is absolutely nothing we would gain so leave us alone!
11-30	Resident	Disagree	It will cause a loss of the integrity of the village. The loss of approx. 25% of the parish, which has been in it's present shape since 1894, will yet again be responsible for eroding the very core of the existence of village life and what it stands for. I can see no benefits to the residents of the village or the surrounding areas if this proposal was to go through..	

11-31	Resident	Disagree	it is not a requirement that unitary Electoral Divisions align to a parish boundary. The area had been reviewed in 2015/16 and another review was not warranted. The belief that significant development was still anticipated across the area of the ward by 2021 is highly unlikely in my opinion.	
11-32	Resident	Disagree	Support North Bradley Parish Council in its objections as given in para 69 of the Community Governance Review 2019/20 Draft Recommendations.	
11-33	Resident	Disagree	The extension of the Trowbridge Town Council boundary will detrimentally the very effective and good local governance of the area by the North Bradley Parish Council. These changes will also damage the identity and community feel within the village.	
11-34	Resident	Disagree	These areas have been part of NB parish for over 100 years, this is just land gran from the town council due to financial considerations.	The fact that the NB Chapel will remain within NB boundary but the burial ground will be in Trowbridge is a complete nonsense and does not make sense. Several old Rural houses are also being taken - I assume to enable access to any future housing proposals.e
11-35	Representative	Disagree	It would mean North Bradley Baptist Church would be under North Bradley but our graveyard would be under Trowbridge council.	
11-36	Resident	Amendment	n considering a parish boundary review the criterion is "To consider whether to do so would reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area, and is effective and convenient for local governance." Consider the "reflect the identities of the Community in that area". Does the proposal reflect the identities of the North Bradley village? I submit that it does not for the reasons given in response to Q46	The way this document is presented with these single line windows seems to try to restrict the response. I do not believe that you will get a fair response through this method. The Neighbourhood Plan will have to go through a Public Referendum. I believe that the Governance reviews should be subject to the same process.

11-37	Business	Disagree	I believe that the Parish, which has existed for we over 100 years best represents the local community.	The proposed area is where there is proposed new development on green fields. This appears to be a way to circumvent the local community's opinions.
11-38	Resident	Disagree	The Parish Council best represents the local community.	The proposed area is where there is proposed new development on green fields. This appears to be a way to circumvent the local community's opinions.
11-39	Resident	Disagree	The proposal infers that the North Parish council is unable to effectively manage community identity and interest because of the proposed new development on the site which is to be transferred to Trowbridge. North Bradley manages particularly well with its semi rural status and could easily manage the ward as it is now and participate in the proposed changes which will hugely impact the status of the village. There is no valid reason for change.	In these times of huge difficulties for council finances, it is highly irresponsible for the Councils to be indulging in this unnecessary waste of scarce resources, you have stated that work for 3 addition town councillors will be needed and no doubt clerical support and addition expense to expedite the change.. I understand from the press that Wiltshire is facing a deficit of £51m, and is in danger of effectively going bankrupt without central government help. In the current economic climate, these proposals are akin to re-arranging the deck chairs on the titanic. Please exercise some common sense and use our council taxes effectively, especially now.

11-40	Resident	Disagree	<p>We disagree with the Recommendation 11 for the following reasons: 1. North Bradley Neighbourhood Development Plan (NBNP), which has been developed carefully by our Parish Council, with strong representation from residents and elements of the village including several public consultation meetings, has now passed Regulation 16 confirmed by the Minister. Although the final referendum has been postponed due to COVID-19, the NBNP still carries weight and must be considered as operational for matters such as this CGR. 2. The land at Woodmarsh and Elm Grove Farm (H2.1 and H2.2) are already within the NBNP and therefore also in the WHSAP. North Bradley Parish Council is discussing planning for both sites with developers. Therefore the proposed boundary changes transferring White Horse and Park Wards would not help to increase the Trowbridge Town Council supply of housing. 3. Wiltshire Council has stated that because of the existing NBNP any boundary changes resulting from this CGR will NOT be automatic, especially where North Bradley has a plan for sustainable development, which it does. 4. There are no approved plans to build on land in the White Horse or Park Wards areas: this is currently rural land with very little population, and it will be some time before housing could be established there. So there is no justification whatsoever to take</p>	
11-41	Representative	Disagree		
11-42	Resident	Disagree	<p>This parish has existed in its present shape since 1894. Historic villages are important parts of the rural historical and cultural heritage. In a time of increased urbanisation it is important to preserve North Bradleys cultural heritage. The area of land is to be used for and by the community. The boundaries also play an important ecological function in maintaining green areas. Transferring this area signals a desire to develop green areas whilst ignoring the half empty town centre. There are many brown field sites in the town centre near to public transport link and other facilities that are sorely in need of redevelopment and could easily be used for housing, flats, etc. rather than exacerbating the problem with future green field development.</p>	<p>The governance of towns and villages are different entities and transferring this land is not to the benefit of the village residents of North Bradley who chose to live in a village environment rather than a town</p>

11-43	Representative	Agree	As the majority of the area will, following proposed development form an extension to the town of Trowbridge it will result in a greater level of community identity and interest and more effective and convenient local governance.	Once the development has been completed on the allocated sites then a further review should take place to ensure that all parts of the town are included in the town boundary including the remainder of Ashton Park and the Hilperton Gap. Also that those areas close to North Bradley village which have not been developed are returned to North Bradley.
11-44	Resident	Disagree	I strongly disagree with this proposal. Trowbridge made a similar attempt in 2016 which was rejected and nothing has changed. We are five cottages in Drynham Lane one of which is a Grade 2 listed farmhouse. We identify with the parish of North Bradley and have attended Parish Council Meetings, are on first names terms with the councillors there - we would certainly not get this level of support or even interest from Trowbridge Town Council. North Bradley Parish have been looking after the interests of the residents of Drynham Lane since 1894. We have very little to do with Trowbridge - my gym is where I work in Frome, we shop in Westbury or Warminster. Being part of Trowbridge has no benefit for us as residents and I can only consider it as part of another 'land grabbing' attempt by Trowbridge which would completely change the character of the Lane and, indeed, of the village as a whole. If the councilors allow this to happen North Bradley will soon just be assimilated into a large characterless County Town of Wiltshire. Shame on this attempt of Empire Building. Let the character of the Parish of North Bradley remain as a pleasant oasis of calm and tranquility.	This was proposed four years ago and nothing has changed. Drynham Lane is a much loved facility used by dog walkers, cyclists, families, joggers etc. If this space was changed to Trowbridge they would just over develop and completely destroy the charm and character of this little oasis that in fact has become even more popular and treasured during the Covid19 crisis - please leave us this little corner.

11-45	Resident	Disagree	I disagree with the recommendation which appears to consider effective and convenient local governance over community identity and interests without any indication as to how a change to the current parish governance to a central authority requires a suppression of any democratic principles in favour of administrative convenience.	
11-46	Resident	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal as someone who has lived in this village for 20 years and will be directly affected by such changes. We need to protect community identities and these villages have always been part of the local landscape. This is seriously threatened by any absorption into the town. Our boundaries and limited green spaces that separate us from the town must be protected from development to safeguard the community and its identity	Pressure on the local facilities, school and our roads which are already subject to speeding drivers using it as a short cut
11-47	Resident	Disagree	It is taking away from the village ,increasing traffic and will allow further applications for unsuitable housing	Traffic and loss of village
11-48	Resident	Disagree	To keep the village a village	
11-49	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley has had a parish council since 1300. The village has a history and that should remain. The residents of North Bradley do not want to be part of Trowbridge. We chose to live in a village, we love our community and we don't want it destroyed by the town council. People in this parish work hard to keep the villagers happy and protected.	There is a green belt land as a buffer between North Bradley and Trowbridge, this land is the home to animals and wildlife that cannot simply be destroyed. Bats and birds are protected in this country, and removing their homes is a disgusting offence.
11-50	Interested Party	Disagree	There should be a clear division between Trowbridge Town Council and North Bradley Parish council. Allowing this would muddy the waters	It's a blatant misuse of power by Trowbridge Town Council
11-51	Resident	Disagree	I support North Bradley Parish Council's objection as outlined in paragraph 69 of the Community Governance Review 2019/2020 Draft Recommendations	

11-52	Resident	Disagree	North Bradley boundaries should be respected and maintained. There is no benefit to the village of this proposal, or to the residents affected by it. There is a wonderful rural identity as soon as you walk down Drynham Lane which has been so valuable during lockdown. This should be preserved by keeping the current boundary and rural buffer zone.	The green space available for residents in the area is under threat. Eroding village boundaries will see space that residents desperately need for health and exercise swallowed up. There is no benefit to local people of this change. Does any resident want this? Poor decisions cannot be undone in the future so should be avoided now.
11-53	Resident	Disagree	This is a land grab attempt by the council so they can build houses and further infrastructure without objections from the village. The North Bradley Neighbourhood plan clearly states that we want to maintain the land gap between the village and Trowbridge. Not to mention the extra traffic, pollution and destruction of the bats that are living in this area.	Volume of traffic generated, danger of the road, speeding, children's lives at risk on a daily basis.
11-54	Resident	Disagree	Recommendation 11.1 goes completely against the Neighbourhood Plan which is in part designed to keep the village of North Bradley as an entity separate from Trowbridge.	Hiving off part of North Bradley will bring no benefit to the residents of the area concerned which is already well served by the North Bradley Parish Council.
11-55	Resident	Disagree	I don't believe this reflects the identity and interests of the North Bradley community. The village has a distinctive character that it's managed to retain over the years. This appears to be a land grab by the Town Council to raise more funds from the proposed over-development of the area (20/03641/OUT). I wouldn't object to the Town Council changing the boundaries if an assurance was provided that the land would not be over-developed - keeping a good buffer between town and village. A small amount of affordable housing for young people and those who find it difficult to get onto the housing ladder is acceptable in my view. As a village community we must avoid the coalescence between Trowbridge and North Bradley or the village character will be lost forever.	This contravenes the North Bradley neighbourhood plan and if planning is approved for the proposed development (20/03641/OUT), would also go against the Housing Site Allocation plan.

11-56	Resident	Disagree	We disagree with the recommendation. It is important that North Bradley remains a village and keeps its identity and not absorbed into the town of Trowbridge.	We believe if this goes ahead it is the first step for the absorption of North Bradley into Trowbridge completely.
11-57	Resident	Disagree	I have know North Bradley for over 40 years since my parents retired to this idealic village. I moved to the area 30 years ago & have enjoyed village community life all this time. My 2 children attended the village school. My parents (whilst alive).& I have attended a village church. I am categorically opposed to any change to the village boundaries. Any such change would drastically interfere with the buffer zone between the village & Trowbridge. I would add that it seems extremely heavy-handed for Trowbridge Tons Council to feel that it has the right to override what I feel confident are the wishes of the villagers; ie. to remain an independent village with it's own way of life which is distinctly different from life in the bustling county town. If Trowbridge TC feels in such great need of space to build housing, then there are numerous brown field sites within the existing town boundaries.	The facts that a town is a town; 'a built-up area with a name, defined boundaries, and local government, that is larger than a village and generally smaller than a city.' & a village is a village; 'a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area'. I would especially draw attention to the village being a rural area.
11-58	Resident	Disagree	Disagree	Keep the village as it is. That's what attracted us to move here

11-59	Resident	Disagree	<p>I feel that the recommendation is contrary to 'A Community Governance Review must: Reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area.' North Bradley residents wish to retain their village identity and not be joined to Trowbridge, which is what will happen if the recommendations are implemented. The village has a long history, from the Domesday Book, of having a separate identity and history from Trowbridge which we wish to retain. It is a friendly area with an effective and hard working Parish Council, good community spirit, very active village halls, beautiful church and popular school.</p>	<p>The recommendations of the Governance Review are very aggressive as, if successful, the consequences for North Bradley are that nearly 25% of our parish will be taken over by Trowbridge Council, our Parish Council will be diminished and our village identity will be lost. I fully understand that Governance Review and the Wiltshire Core Strategy are separate areas. However, I feel that the recommendations of the Governance Review are, by their very nature, inextricably linked to the Wiltshire Core Strategy. At present North Bradley Parish Council and Villagers are making representations and striving to keep a buffer zone of green fields around the village to retain its identity.</p>
11-60	Resident	Disagree	<p>This recommendation would result in the erosion of a clear defined boundary between North Bradley village and Trowbridge leading to the loss of the village's unique and independent identity. This recommendation would also deny residents of North Bradley control over the future of green spaces - which function as recreational spaces and animal habitats as well as a buffer with the town - immediately bordering their homes. This proposed change is wholly unwanted and opposed by the community</p>	<p>Housing developments proposed relating to this land and the boundary change are incompatible with the North Bradley neighbourhood plan and would cause irreparable loss of green spaces and animal habitats (bats, foxes, rabbits deer and other species can be regularly seen in the areas recommended for transfer)</p>

11-61	Resident	Disagree	This development will further erode the very slight gap between Trowbridge and North Bradley and encourage further development of Woodmarsh.	The boundary between Trowbridge and North Bradley would lead to a nonsensical situation where people on opposite sides of the road from each other would live in different places.
11-62	Resident	Disagree	The plan does not reflect the identity and interests of the community. The 100year parish will be destroyed in its present form after c25% of its area removed. The whole action seems premature as at the moment the sites are not developed and not urban. Although some changes may need to be made, the insistance for transferrance before the May elections appears suspicious. The neighbourhood plan takes into account the need for more housing but this is under discussion and boundary changes do not need to be made now. Some of the oldest parts of the village would be removed and its integrity lost.	The value of neighbourhood plans and area planniing seems to be undermined

Recommendation 12 - Melksham Merger

12.1 - To NOT recommend a merger of Melksham and Melksham Without parishes

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Reasoning	Additional Comments
12-01	Resident	Agree	Decision appears to be in line with the relevant Guidance.	No
12-02	Resident	Agree	The proposal to merge the 2 councils was an egregious power grab with no concern for the very different requirements of urban versus rural communities.	No
12-03	Resident	Agree	Why change a tradition when it clearly works.	The two parishes cater for differing socio-economic groups.
12-04	Resident	Agree		
12-05	Resident	Agree	town and country have slightly different requirements.	No
12-06	Resident	Agree	Bowerhill is its own community and should be classed as such	
12-07	Resident	Agree	I think our local interests will be better served with separate parishes	None
12-08	Resident	Agree	Melksham without council offer residents of Bowerhill an excellent service and a lot of support. They are well run and I believe they offer a significantly better service to residents than the Town council do.	They have provided substantial long term support to the community action groups.
12-09	Resident	Agree		
12-10	Resident	Agree	I believe that what has been recommended is correct	
12-11	Resident	Agree		
12-12	Resident	Agree	Governance for the parishioners would not be improved by the proposed merging with the Town	The individual interests of the separate villages, comprising the Melksham Without Parish would be lost within the demands of the Melksham Town wards
12-13	Resident	Agree	12.1 I believe that by keeping Melksham and Melksham Without Parishes seperate we will continue to get the excellant service that is already in place than merging the two together which would be detrimental to the smaller Villages.	
12-14	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without is a community in its own right. It is not Urban but a collection of large and small villages and hamlets.	
12-15	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without is a community in its own right. It is not Urban but a collection of large and small villages and hamlets.	
12-16	Resident	Agree		
12-17	Resident	Agree	The villages have entirely different needs to the Town	

12-18	Resident	Agree	I feel both parishes need to have their own identity and Councillors to represent their individual needs	No
12-19	Resident	Disagree	I cannot understand the logic of two councils for such a small area and community of people. There are functions which are duplicated, albeit some only part time positions, but by combining both must generate some savings which will be better used providing services.	
12-20	Resident	Agree		
12-21	Resident	Agree	The two councils represent different types of community. By having two organisations where their interest meet, we can get better decision making by having views of both communities.	What we have works reasonably well, I see no advantage in changing to a single authority
12-22	Resident	Agree	I fully agree with the statement in clause 109 of the recommendations document that both existing parishes are viable and effective entities. Melksham Without PC was the 1st Quality Council in the County in 2003 and continues to be very efficient. Also, as clause 118 states, cooperation between the two parishes is perfectly possible without a merger, just as between any other adjacent parishes in the County. I agree that there would be no governance improvements sufficient to overcome the negative impact for several areas in relation to community identity. A significant area of buffer land remains between Bowerhill and Melksham, albeit reduced, and still also leaves A365 as a dividing factor. Bowerhill has a strong community identity distinct from the town and that identity aligns with other parts of the Melksham Without parish. Given the liabilities and assets of the two parishes, the processes needed to effect a merger could lead to a period of paralysis highly detrimental for the whole area.	A similar merger proposal was rejected by the full Wiltshire Council only in November 2015 and the circumstances are unchanged. Furthermore, no further expansion of the town is projected for the current plan period to 2026.

12-23	Resident	Amendment	I previously submitted a detailed case in favour of the 'merger' option. A copy is attached separately. I recognise this case has partially overtaken by events that have occurred during 2020. Hence my suggestion that a decision be deferred for further consideration.	I believe that a number of new factors need to be taken into account in consideration of the Recommendation 12. There are: - (1) the attention of local people have been deflected by other concerns arising from the COVID19 'lock-down' to give proper attention to this consultation - and their ability to ask questions and engage has been severely restricted; (2) the government has announced substantial funding for a by-pass around Melksham, effectively creating a new community boundary incorporating Bowerhil, Berryfield and East of Melksham within the town; (3) a draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan covering both the Town and Parish communities has been published and is undergoing Regulation 14 consultation; (4) recent experiences arising from COVIS-19 local down has demonstrated the very substantial and significant interdependence between the town and parish communities; (5) the population continues to grow (+30,000) with new applications in the pipeline; (6) Wiltshire Council is undertaking a review of its own Core Strategy.
12-24	Resident	Agree	To preserve the more rural nature of MWPC.	
12-25	Representative	Agree	MWPC have provided a comprehensive answer to the previous consultations on this point, and believe that they already provide Effective and Convenient Local Governance" that would be to the detriment, not improvement if the merger took place, as the current model reflects the Community Identity and Interests of the 5 distinct communities in the parish	The two councils work well together on joint projects without being one entity, the joint Neighbourhood Plan, the joint project to develop Shurnhold Fields and the Melksham Community Response offering during Covid-19 are shining examples
12-26	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without is fine just the way it is and I don't trust the competency of Melksham Parish.	It's completely unnecessary.
12-27	Resident	Agree	I love in Bowerhill and many residents including myself feel proud of what we have achieved without the need to be merged, and would live to keep it that way.	I don't feel that this is warranted
12-28	Resident	Agree	I am very happy with recommendation 12.1 Not to merge Melksham and Melksham without Parishes	
12-29	Resident	Agree	Current organisation works well	
12-30	Resident	Agree	it is my wish that Melksham Without Council continues as a separate authority	no
12-31	Resident	Disagree	We are living in a more elderly area and worry that funds available to us now will go to other areas.	
12-32	Resident	Agree	I want Melksham Without Parishes to remain a separate entity.	No.

12-33	Resident	Disagree	Melksham is a single community consisting of 2 neighbouring parishes. Amalgamating the two parishes would make local governance more effective and convenient. Melksham and Melksham without share a common identity. If you ask someone who lives in Melksham Without where they live they will say "Melksham" not 'Melksham Without'. Community facilities are shared regardless of whichever of the two parishes one lives in.	To me, merging the two parishes is common sense. I hope the decision not to merge hasn't be influenced by a campaign run by 'interested parties'.
12-34	Resident	Agree	Two completely different areas (urban and rural) require a completely different style of management.	No.
12-35	Resident	Agree	So that local voices can be represented properly. there is a huge cultural difference between the town of Melksham and the surrounding rural communities and villages and they should have fair representation.	
12-36	Resident	Agree	So that local voices can be represented properly. there is a huge cultural difference between the town of Melksham and the surrounding rural communities and villages and they should have fair representation.	
12-37	Resident	Agree	Melksham without should remain a separate parish and serve the needs of Melksham without residents	
12-38	Resident	Agree	Effective and convenient governance exists now. A lot of work is done for the people of Melksham Without, and to combine the two councils would inevitably mean that the interests and needs of the rural community would become secondary.	No
12-39	Resident	Disagree	As a resident of Melksham Without, I am strongly in favour of merging Melksham Town Council & Melksham Without. To have separate councils is an archaic legacy of the past and is not logical. Melksham has grown significantly over the past 30 years and is a large town with a single identity. Although I live on the outskirts of the town, I certainly identify with living in Melksham where the vast majority of the shops and amenities which I use are located. Having two councils incurs additional costs which in my opinion cannot be justified in the current climate. I fail to see any sensible reason for resisting the proposed merger.	No

12-40	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without Parish Council is very supportive of the communities surrounding Melksham, and a larger council including both Melksham Town and Melksham Without areas would be too unwealdy to allow the smaller villages currently in Melksham Without a voice.	
12-41	Resident	Agree	I agree and would like to thank the council officers for recommending NOT to merge Melksham and Melksham Without Parishes.	No.
12-42	Resident	Agree	lived here for forty years and believe the current situation has held up and performed well	
12-43	Resident	Disagree	Unnecersary Financial burden on two councils - ONE named council is better for the community to identify with - aims and objectives under one authority	Future expansion of Melksham will be better served by ONE council - less bureaucracy - consideration in how other small authorities have succeeded in amalgamations
12-44	Resident	Disagree	I believe the 2 councils should have merged-it would have saved money in my opinion.	no
12-45	Resident	Agree	I believe that effective and convenient local governance are best met by not merging Melksham and Melksham Without Parishes. I further believe that Melksham Without Parish community identity and interests are best served by not merging these two parishes.	I am most grateful that the proposed recommendation is not to merge these two parishes.
12-46	Resident	Agree	The current arrangement serves the needs of both Town and Parish residents.	
12-47	Resident	Agree		
12-48	Resident	Agree	Increase costs and loss of local accountability.	
12-49	Interested Party	Amendment	Disagree that area north of Sandridge Common should be transferred as it is too far from the others transferrable to Melksham East Ward and as such should remain in Melksham Without.	
12-50	Resident	Disagree	A merger of Melksham and Melksham Without Parishes makes common sense. The geographical boundary is becoming less clear. The needs/services of both are near identical. More cost effective to have the one Council. The identity of one Melksham will be more effective within the County. Yes, merge the two parishes.	
12-51	Resident	Agree	MWPC focus on many local focus activities, requirements and get results. The bigger the Council the less likely of activities they currently address will be tackled. MWPC are very good and a credit, whilst the bigger Wiltshire Council cover "bigger" matters also successfully - thus we have a good set up. Don't change what's working.	
12-52	Resident	Agree		

12-53	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without has different characteristics and rural communities from the urban town there is no affinity between the two, and there are natural and manmade barriers/definitions between the two.	
12-54	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without has different characteristics and rural communities from the urban town there is no affinity between the two, and there are natural and manmade barriers/definitions between the two.	
12-55	Resident	Agree	We feel that a merger would have inevitably lead to a conflict of interests and that the voice of our parish council would no longer have been heard, because urban town councils have different minorities. It is significant that the proposed merger was put forward by the town council who recommended a central community hub. In our opinion, this would have been incompatible with community interests as a whole and the effect would have been that of a takeover, rather than a merger.	We consider that we are currently very well served by our parish council and that the proposed merger would have nrough not advantages but a genuine risk of being swallowed up in a larger authority.
12-56	Resident	Disagree		
12-57	Resident	Agree	The villages around Melksham should retain their individual identities and rural feel without being absorbed by the town.	No
12-58	Resident	Agree	It is more efficient to keep the area around Melksham with its own local governance. They do a magnificent job for us and I wish to keep them looking after our community's interests.	
12-59	Resident	Agree	Better support for the residents in these parishes	none
12-60	Resident	Agree	I don't want to merge with melksham, shaw is a separate village	No
12-61	Resident	Agree	I don't want to meet with Melksham, Shaw is a separate village	
12-62	Resident	Disagree	Melksham Parish Council does not even have elections [unclear word] [unclear word] [unclear word] on planning	Stronger Council, Melksham Town Council cannot expand - more administration saving, land to expand into, housing/jobs. let people have their say at local elections by voting for it.
12-63	Resident	Agree	In my experience of chairing a Parish Council for many years, the more remote the decision makers the more difficult it is to get effective action for local issues. This gets with the propose formation of a Residents Association for the SN12 7GB area.	The rapid increase in building in the Melksham Without Parish
12-64	Resident	Agree	My sisters live on Bowerhill and I know they do not want Bowerhill to be looked after by the Town Council. Melksham Without will do an excellent job.	

12-65	Resident	Agree	It would make the ward too big, and that if recommendation 13- 13.1 - 13.2 - 13.3 - 13.4 and 13.5 went ahead	
12-66	Resident	Agree	Because I believe that staying as an individual parish will be better to stay on its own and not with Melksham Town Council	
12-67	Resident	Disagree	It best to keep things individual	
12-68	Resident	Agree	I agree with the arguments put forward in the Draft Recommendations that Melksham Without should maintain its own identity.	
12-69	Resident	Agree	I wish Bowerhill to remain a separate community from Melksham.	No
12-70	Resident	Agree	I wish Bowerhill to remain a separate community from Melksham.	No
12-71	Resident	Agree	I agree with the decision because the two entities cover quite different areas, one is urban whilst Melksham Without Parishes cover non urban areas. The local councilors for Melksham Without Parishes know their local residents concerns and are best placed to deal with any such matters as they arise, both now and in the future.	
12-72	Resident	Agree	I agree that we should not merge as the emphasis of decisions would be led by the town centre needs and requirements	Maybe you should consider using the A350 as a natural demarcation line and align us within the proposed new Shaw and Whitley ward
12-73	Resident	Agree	Two parishes work well now and more likely to be effective continuing unchanged.	
12-74	Resident	Agree	Melksham & the surrounding villages often have different needs & priorities. A merger would therefore be detrimental to the villages with the probability that Melksham's needs being prioritised.	It would be desirable to keep clear spaces between the town & villages to ensure clear demarcation & ensure seerate identities are upheld.

12-75	Resident	Agree	I beleive it is vital for areas such as Melksham Without to maintain its separate identity from that of the Town area, in order to preserve the integrity, independence and more rural aspect. The individual characters of these areas cannot be well represented by any Council which is dictated by more 'Town centred issues and indeed would be the main focus of their work.The creation of one large 'Melksham Area Unitary Council' would see all the diversity we have around us merging into one great URBAN SPRAWL which benefits no one. Melksham Without Parish Council need to be able to move on now with their very good work, with certainty that this matter has been addressed once and for all, not with the uncertainty of mergers snapping at their heels. Needless to say I fully support the recommendation NOT to merge. My thanks Robert Palin	I think my above comments cover this as well
12-76	Resident	Agree	The current arrangements for the parishes provide effective local governance and certainly give clear community identity and look after the residents' interest so why change what effective.	
12-77	Resident	Agree	Melksham Without parish Council continue to work hard for the smaller areas of Melksham as well as working with Melksham Town Council. I agree that the merger should NOT take place.	
12-78	Resident	Agree	I believe that by retaining the two Councils a greater degree of scrutiny is maintained over proposals that affect both communities.	
12-79	Resident	Agree	I agree with the recommendation not to merge the Melksham town council with the parish councils of Melksham Without. I live in Berryfield, which has its own identity and community, with village hall facilities currently being developed for the villagers of Berryfield. I would not wish to see the Melksham Without civil parishes lose their individual identities by being merged into an urban mass, the overseeing of which would not understand the nuances of each of those outlying parishes and their more rural nature and requirements	Melksham town is expanding, but to join together all of the parishes with the town would be to take away the individuality of each outlying, mostly more rural area. In the end Melksham would be one homogenous mass of residents and housing, losing the interesting geography and history that make it what it is. Wiltshire is quite a unique county in having small market towns surrounded by semi-rural villages. Once that identity was lost, it couldn't be restored.

12-80	Resident	Agree	It is quite correct that both existing parishes are viable and effective entities. Cooperation between them can continue without any need for a merger. There would be no improvement in Local Governance or Community Identity for the rural villages if part of a large merged council. The villages have more in common with each other and surrounding places than with the town. Any merger process would undoubtedly be complex and give rise to a period of instability due to conflicting requirements to the detriment of the whole area.	
12-81	Resident	Agree	There is no advantage to being merged with Melksham Town Council. Melksham Without Parish Council do a very good job of looking after the villages involved.	
12-82	Resident	Agree	The various communities within Melksham Without Parish Council have their own identities, with the Parish Council having the interests of its residents at its core, looking after the interests of its residents effectively.	

Recommendation 13 - Melksham Without

13.1 -That the area of the Hunters Wood Ward be transferred to the parish of Melksham as part of the Melksham East Ward.

13.2 - That the area known as the 'Land north of Sandridge Common' as shown above be transferred to the parish of Melksham as part of the Melksham East ward.

13.3 - That the Melksham East Ward continue to contain four town councillors.

13.4 -To request that the LGBCE amend the Melksham East Division to be coterminous with the proposed revised Melksham East Ward.

13.5 - That the Beanacre, Shaw and Whitley Ward be increased to four parish councillors, and be renamed Beanacre, Shaw, Whitley and Blackmore.

Reference	Status of Respondent	Agree/Disagree/Amendment	Amendment Detail	Reasoning	Additional Comments
13-01	Resident	Agree		Decision appears to be in line with the relevant Guidance.	None
13-02	Resident	Agree		These are evolutionary and incremental changes to reflect reality and therefore sensible.	No
13-03	Resident	Agree		It makes sense that the newly built-up areas on the edge of town become part of the town governed by the Town Council.	No.
13-04	Resident	Amendment	That 13.2 be revisited as remaining within the perview of Melksham Without	N/A	N/A
13-05	Resident	Disagree		I believe that transferring Land north of Sandridge common to Melksham parish would mean building more houses	
13-06	Resident	Agree		Too many parishes results in more disagreement.	No
13-07	Representative	Agree			
13-08	Resident	Agree		One more councillor should allow more aspects of any local issue to be considered without making decision making more difficult.	No
13-09	Interested Party	Agree		These areas fall more easily within the boundary for the Melksham Town Council and are viewed by residents as being part of the Town.	The Town Council will benefit from the additional income generated
13-10	Interested Party	Disagree		I DO NOT agree Recommendation 13.5. I believe adding an additional parish councillor will involve additional council tax costs for the councillor, support and infrastructure required. To the best of my knowledge, there has not been a substantial increase in the population or infrastructure in these areas so I question the need for more bureaucracy	
13-11	Resident	Agree			
13-12	Resident	Agree		Shaw & Whitley are rural villages and it is fine grouped in with Beanacre and Blackmore.	no
13-13	Representative	Agree		The housing areas involved fit much better with the Town.	
13-14	Resident	Disagree		I believe the recommendation would cause an unnatural balance within the area	
13-15	Interested Party	Agree			

13-16	Resident	Agree		The proposals seem a reasonable manner in which to proceed i view of the ever expanding township and firm boundary idetification	For consideration Recommendation 13.5 the combination of Blackstock with Beanacre, Shaw and Whitley Should be renamed as Beanacre, Blackstock , Shaw and Whitley
13-17	Resident	Agree		I agree that the proposals in question would be better suited if changed to the recommendations.	
13-18	Interested Party	Amendment		Disagree that area north of Sandridge Common should be transferred as it is too far from the others transferrable to Melksham East Ward and as such should remain in Melksham Without	
13-19	Resident	Agree		As Melksham develops and expands the proposals are practical and make sense.	
13-20	Resident	Agree			
13-21	Resident	Agree		Melksham Without has different characteristics and rural communities from the urban town there is no affinity between the two, and there are natural and manmade barriers/definitions between the two.	
13-22	Resident	Agree		Melksham Without has different characteristics and rural communities from the urban town there is no affinity between the two, and there are natural and manmade barriers/definitions between the two.	
13-23	Resident	Disagree		This is areas of natural beauty and should remain as it is for the enjoyment of the residents and visitors to Melksham,	
13-24	Resident	Agree		These parts are contiguous with the town and are not a true part of the rural area around Melksham.	
13-25	Resident	Agree		These parts are contiguous with the town and are not a true part of the rural area around Melksham.	
13-26	Resident	Agree			
13-27	Resident	Agree		I live in a village setting and believe I should be represented by like minded Councillors.	
13-28	Resident	Agree		That Shaw Whitley and Beanacre and Blackmore remains separate from Melksham	
13-29	Resident	Agree		The primary reason for responding here is to fully support the decision NOT to transfer Giles Wood (and the BRAG picnic area) from Seend into Melksham.	
13-30	Interested Party	Agree		Believe it to be best for the areas in question	No
13-31	Resident	Disagree		Continual adjustments to wards, transfer from Melksham Without to Melksham Town, will be on-going with all the new developments and adoption of Recommendation 12 with an appropriate number of councillors would be a more logical, efficient solution. si	

13-32	Resident	Disagree			
13-33	Resident	Agree		These changes morfe effectively differentiate the features of the two communities,	
13-34	Interested Party	Agree		13.1 I agree with reasons given in clause 125 of the recommendations document that the new development in the Hunters Wood ward should be transferred to Melksham town parish. It is clearly an expansion of the urban area of the town itself. 13.2 The area known as the 'Land north of Sandridge Common' comprises the new development of 'Sandridge Place' and is also an extension of the town urban area and should be part of Melksham town parish. I agree that it fits best with the adjacent developments in the East division, but it could alternatively be placed in the Forest division. 13.4 I fully support requesting the LGBCE to amend the unitary division boundaries to include this area in a Melksham Town division. Community identity should over-ride arbitrary variances in electorate numbers. 13.5 The LGBCE determined that Melksham Without PC should continue to have 13 members and the Bowerhill division should be a parish ward represented by 7 members. This allows for the addition of the eastern part of the old Blackmore ward. If the Hunters Wood ward is transferred from the parish, then it is appropriate that the councillor seat should be added to the 'northern' ward to take account of the addition of the western part of the old Blackmore ward. The proposed ward name is entirely appropriate.	The Core Strategy to 2026 and the draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan do not suggest any further expansion of the town into the rural parish.
13-35	Resident	Agree		With so many houses we have being built, there is a good need to change the wards to bring them up to date with amount of housing we now have	
13-36	Resident	Agree			
13-37	Interested Party	Agree		The new developments in 13.1 and 13.2 are clearly both extensions of the urban area and should be intergrated into the town itself, just as other areas of expansion have been in the past.	As there is no further expansion of the town suggested up to 2026, this boundary revision will suffice for some considerable time.
13-38	Resident	Disagree		I believe that both Melksham Town and Melksham Parish Councils should be abolished and a new integrated Melksham Council should be created.	The various issues described in answer to Recommendation 12 also apply here.
13-39	Interested Party	Agree		It makes sense for these developments to be part of Melksham Town	

13-40	Representative	Agree		MWPC have already submitted a comprehensive proposal for 13.1 and 13.2 as have Wiltshire Council, and MTC concur. MWPC recognise where new developments sit better in the urban context of the town parish and therefore have recommended this change to reflect the Community Identity and Interests of the new development sitting better in town than with the rural villages	
13-41	Resident	Agree			