

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting: Electoral Review Committee

Place: Council Chamber - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

Date: Tuesday 31 May 2022

Time: 9.30 am

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 23 May 2022. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Lisa Alexander, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01722 434560 or email lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

9 **Community Governance Review 2021/22 (Pages 3 - 10)**

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 27 May 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

BROKENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL---RESPONSE to Draft Recommendations of WILTSHIRE COUNCIL Community Governance Review : RECOMMENDATION 8

(A) As to area P --Hyam Farm (part)

We have considered this proposal and consulted with relevant parishioners and St. Paul's and Malmesbury Without Council. We consider it is sensible to incorporate Hyam Farmhouse and the farm buildings plus the balance of Hyam farm into Brokenborough Parish. The Joynson family who own and farm the 500 acres there are now committed to an organic mixed farm to the 4th generation. The first two generations are buried in Brokenborough graveyard and the family have always pointed towards and regarded Brokenborough as their village, supporting the Church and village functions. As the committee has identified the principal access is to and with Brokenborough. St Paul's Without apparently do not oppose this move.

Hyam House (the old farmhouse) is now in separate ownership but the only access is to Brokenborough .That is within the existing proposal.

However, we submit the boundary needs to be redrawn to logically incorporate the farm as a whole to the river line but to incorporate the replaced family farmhouse which is sited in the 40 acres of the farm to the south of the river Avon. This boundary is clearly defined by the river and field lines. Revised proposed detailed plans will be submitted to you as soon as possible.

(B) As to area O--

In the 7th April 2022 Microsoft Teams consultation with Brokenborough Parish Council the Committee asked us to consider area O and whether we had any views as to whether any part of O should be attached to Brokenborough. The area falls broadly into two parts. The southern part is Milborne. We have no historical or geographical affinity with Milborne and there is no logical reason to incorporate that settlement into Brokenborough. On electorate alone we would be considerably outnumbered and we have no direct knowledge as to their requirements for governance.

As to the northern part of O we have considered this carefully. Referring first to the linear stretch of housing to the north of Filands across the B4014 from the new development, we believe this does not have any particular relation to Brokenborough. Two of the families along there do support Brokenborough Church but we are not likely to be able to create community adhesion or

sensible governance on that outlying area. It “belongs” to St. Paul’s and Malmesbury Without or possibly otherwise could go with Malmesbury. As to the remainder of the area (northern O) which is largely agricultural, there is some logic to ask Charlton to take in the area as the land forms part of the Charlton Park Estate. But Charlton has refused. There is less sense in Brokenborough volunteering and no special community cohesion or governance which could be provided. We are a very small parish with six Councillors and we would be stretched to now take in this extra Brokenborough has a defined historical boundary bounded by the Fosse Way- (itself the County boundary -) and the B4014 plus the scattered rural string development either side of the Sherston Road B4040. There is an existing cohesion in the boundary as it stands. We submit that this country area O as a whole should remain with St. Paul’s and Malmesbury Without Parish and that the Committee was correct in rejecting the suggestion it should be transferred to Malmesbury Town Council.

(C) As to area M

The potential reduction of St. Paul’s Without (contemplated by the proposals) to half its size has ramifications for the surrounding area including Brokenborough not least because cohesively the three parishes - including Malmesbury- together formed and created the continuing local Neighbourhood Plan. Hence we comment on area M.

Both Cowbridge and Burton Hill are essentially ribbon developments outside Malmesbury’s natural boundary and we believe should be left with St. Paul’s and Malmesbury Without. From Cowbridge there is no connection to Malmesbury without driving unless one circumnavigates or takes life and limb in hand to cross the huge roundabout. There is a marginally stronger argument to incorporate Burton Hill within Malmesbury but it is a moot point and not a popular view of the majority of the residents apparently. The expansion of the hilltop town of Malmesbury has been pushed as far as it should be. Burton Hill and Cowbridge are essentially in the country and should remain so. St. Paul’s and Malmesbury Without has a clear historical rationale which continues today. It is a very efficient and well run council. Even though it is a collection of a separate albeit contiguous settlements it works well together. The enthusiasm and efficiency of governance create community cohesion which should not be lost.

To dismember St. Paul's and Malmesbury Without Parish would certainly reduce the efficiency and local engagement which the parishioners have come to expect and appreciate. We gained the impression at the Town Hall consultation on 21 April 2022 that the opinions of those affected have little effect on the outcome. Whilst we accept that strictly speaking this is not a referendum, local opinions were very evident at the meeting (and apparently in earlier consultations) and should carry weight. To disregard strong feelings of parishioners to preserve the status quo would be, we submit, contrary to the two criteria which you explained are to guide you namely community cohesion and efficient local governance.

St Paul's, with Brokenborough, surrounds Malmesbury and there is a readily understandable distinction between country and town whereby a cohesive and consistent approach can be taken. We use Malmesbury facilities and contribute to their economy in retail and employment terms. In turn we provide rural access and surrounds and welcome the walkers runners and cyclists who exercise and enjoy the countryside. This has increased and remains a marked facet as a legacy of the pandemic.

In summary, if it isn't broken it does not need fixing. We thank the committee for all their time and effort in consulting widely.

Dated 3 May 2022

Brokenborough Parish Council

(Ref RT/JBB)

This page is intentionally left blank

Attn: LISA ALEXANDER

MAY 2022


BROKENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL
RESPONSE to CGR, dated 3/5/22.

— Please see attached

(a) Colour Plan of proposed new
boundary line in red

(b) Black+White Plan to show
geographical features used for red line.

John Bartholomew - Brokenborough
JBBARTHOLOMEW Councillor



BROKENBOWNE PARISH COUNCIL — PROPOSED NEW
PARISH BOUNDARY FOR AREA "P"
(Recommendation 8.5 of C.G.R.)

— See PARISH RESPONSE 3/5/22

