

# AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

**Meeting:** Electoral Review Committee

**Place:** Kennet Room - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

**Date:** Tuesday 5 July 2022

**Time:** 2.00 pm

---

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 27 June 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](mailto: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](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

---

2 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 3 - 10)**

Minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2022.

6 **Community Governance Review 2021/22 (Pages 11 - 28)**

Consultation responses.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 29 June 2022
-----------------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

## Electoral Review Committee

---

**MINUTES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 31 MAY 2022 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNTY HALL, BYTHESEA ROAD, TROWBRIDGE, BA14 8JN.**

**Present:**

Councillor Ian Blair-Pilling (Chairman), Councillor Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Allison Bucknell, Councillor Ernie Clark, Councillor Jacqui Lay, Councillor Ian McLennan, Councillor Ashley O'Neill and Councillor Ian Thorn

---

10 **Election of Chairman**

Nominations for a Chairman for 2022/23 were sought.

Councillor Gavin Grant nominated Councillor Ian Blair-Pilling and was seconded by Councillor Ashley O'Neill.

As there were no other nominations, it was;

**Resolved:**

**That Councillor Ian Blair-Pilling was elected as Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee for 2022/23.**

*Councillor Ian Blair-Pilling in the chair.*

11 **Election of Vice-Chairman**

Nominations for a Vice-Chairman for 2022/23 were sought.

Councillor Ian Blair-Pilling nominated Councillor Gavin Grant and was seconded by Councillor Ashley O'Neill.

As there were no other nominations, it was;

**Resolved:**

**That Councillor Gavin Grant was elected as Vice-Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee for 2022/23.**

12 **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Oatway and Stuart Wheeler.

13 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 February 2022 were presented, it was,

**Resolved:**

**To approve and sign the minutes as a true and correct record.**

14 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Gavin Grant noted that as he was also a member of Malmesbury Town Council, he would not take part in the discussion or vote during consideration of St Paul Malmesbury Without area proposals, in his capacity as a Committee Member, but instead would speak and if appropriate answer any factual questions in his role as a Malmesbury Town Councillor.

Councillor Ian Thorn noted that as he was also a member of Calne Town Council he would not take part in the discussion or vote during consideration of the proposals relating to Calne Town, in his capacity as a Committee Member, but instead would speak and if appropriate answer any factual questions as a Local Member for Calne Town, and not as the Calne Town Council representative.

15 **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no announcements.

16 **Public Participation**

No questions or statements had been received within the timeframe set out in the agenda.

The Chairman noted that public speakers would be invited to address the Sub-Committee at the start of each agenda item.

17 **Electoral Division Variance Report**

A report was received on the councils' electoral divisions, and their variance from the average electorate per division. In establishing the divisions for the 2021 elections the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) sought to establish divisions which would be within 10% of the average electorate per division. This was based on projected electorates for 2024.

It was reported that 21 divisions currently had a variance greater than 10%, below the intervention criteria of the LGBCE, although there were currently a number of divisions with a variance of over 30%, which was also an intervention criteria. The LGBCE had confirmed that a review would not be carried out before the 2025 elections, and if the criteria were met would discuss further with

the council, as it might be that the variances would reduce within a reasonable time at that stage.

The Committee discussed the methodology for calculating electorate and projected electorate, noting this had difficulties for instance around military sites, but that the council was required to calculate by electorate and not population.

Legislation allowed for a partial review of the council's electoral divisions to be carried out in place of a full review of all 98 divisions. However, the LGBCE had advised that it would require a strong case to consider this approach

The Committee requested an annual update report highlighting areas approaching the threshold for a review, in order to consider possible solutions to avoid a full review.

### **Resolved**

**The Electoral Review Committee noted the Report.**

## 18 **Community Governance Review 2021/22**

### Public Participation

Mr Ioan Rees, the organiser of a petition, spoke in support of recommendation 7 (Calne without/Derry Hill & Studley)

Mr Keith Robbins as a petitioner spoke in support of recommendation 7 (Calne without/Derry Hill & Studley)

Mr John Bartholomew, representative of Brokenborough PC spoke in respect of Recommendation 8 (Malmesbury)

Mr Roger Bugden, representing St Paul Malmesbury without PC spoke in respect of recommendation 8 (Malmesbury)

Mr David Briggs representing St Paul Malmesbury without PC spoke in respect of recommendation 8 (Malmesbury)

The Committee considered the responses to the Draft Recommendations consultation which ran from 18 March 2022 – 5 May 2022.

### Charlton St Peter

The Committee discussed Draft Recommendation 1 (Charlton St Peter). No further responses had been received, and the Committee considered the reasoning and evidence for the proposal remained appropriate and confirmed its recommendation.

The Committee determined to confirm Draft recommendation 1

### Calne & Surrounding Areas

The Committee considered Draft Recommendations 2 – 7, which related to Calne, Bremhill, Hillmarton, Compton Bassett, Cherhill, Heddington and Calne without (Derry Hill & Studley). Members of the public spoke as detailed above.

## Recommendation 2 - Calne Town

Councillor Ian Thorn spoke as local member and not in his capacity as Committee member.

Consultation responses relating to the Calne Town proposals were considered as attached to the report. Responses were predominantly in support, however there were requests to consider the views of residents in the proposed area A, Cherhill View estate. The Committee continued to consider the area was an urban extension of the town and should be transferred within it. A request from Calne Town Council to reconsider its proposal to transfer the Beversbrook sports facility was also discussed. The Committee noted there were no residential properties involved and did not consider evidence had been provided that governance or community reasons justified such a change.

The Committee determined to confirm Draft recommendation 2

## Recommendation 3 – Bremhill

The Committee noted the consultation responses relating to the Bremhill proposals, with an objection from Langley Burrell PC to the transfer of area E, although support had been received from residents within that area, currently a part Langley Burrell Without. The Committee continued to support the proposals to transfer the area to Bremhill as more reflective of the community identity and interests. There had been a mixed response from residents around Stanley Abbey Farm, and on balance the Committee upheld its initial recommendation as the most appropriate option.

The Committee considered and supported a request for an amendment to the boundary line to the south, to include within the parish of Calne Without (Derry Hill & Studley) a group of properties around Black Dog Holt, which were currently split across two parishes by the recommendation

The Committee noted that a further short consultation would be required and that a final recommendation for Bremhill would be considered at the next meeting once the consultation responses had been considered.

## Recommendation 4 – Hillmarton & Compton Bassett

The Committee noted the consultation responses, which indicated support by both parishes involved.

The Committee was in favour of confirming Draft Recommendation 4 (Hillmarton and Compton Bassett).

## Recommendation 5 – Cherhill

The Committee noted the consultation responses relating to the Cherhill proposals which were mostly supportive, subject to an amendment to the currently split Blackland area, to bring it wholly within a single parish, with most

responses proposing it be within the parish of Cherhill. Other suggestions had been to increase the number of wards and councillors for the expanded Cherhill

The Committee noted that a further short consultation would be required and that a final recommendation for Cherhill would be considered at the next meeting once the consultation responses had been considered.

#### Recommendation 6 – Heddington

The Committee noted the consultation responses relating to the Heddington proposals which were mostly supportive but had raised a request for an amendment around the Bowood Estate area, to bring it as a whole into one parish, rather than to split across two as was currently the proposal.

The Committee was advised that a map had been requested of the Bowood Estate to clarify the exact boundary of the estate.

Heddington parish council also supported the proposals subject to adjusting the name of the proposed new ward for Stockley.

The Committee supported the amendment requests and noted that a further short consultation would be required and that a final recommendation for Heddington would be considered at the next meeting once the consultation responses had been considered.

#### Recommendation 7 – Calne Without (Derry Hill & Studley)

The Committee noted the consultation responses relating to the Calne without (Derry Hill & Studley) proposals.

The proposals were in line with the original request of the petition to have Derry Hill & Studley un-warded, however, Calne Without Parish Council had submitted an amendment to the proposals, to ward the remaining area of Calne without, which would be renamed Derry Hill & Studley.

The Committee discussed the proposal and the responses, noting the parishes in the area were a mix of warded and unwarded. Taking note of the support of the parish council the committee supported the amendment request to ward the remainder of Calne without (Derry Hill & Studley). It proposed boundaries for those wards to include Sandy Lane and the Bowood Estate noted that a further short consultation would be required and that a final recommendation for Calne without (Derry Hill & Studley) would be considered at the next meeting once the consultation responses had been considered.

#### Malmesbury & Surrounding Areas

The Committee then considered Draft Recommendation 8 which related to Malmesbury & Surrounding areas.

Ward members Councillor Gavin Grant spoke as local member and not in his capacity as Committee member, and asked the Committee to support a deferral to the consideration of a final recommendation for Malmesbury and surrounding areas, to allow time for representatives of both councils to come together to discuss options, taking note of the responses which had been received including from surrounding parishes such as Charlton.

The St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council representatives in attendance were in support of the suggestion.

The Committee also noted the request for an amendment from Brokenborough Parish Council to the boundary line around Hyam Farm and associated buildings.

The Committee discussed the consultation responses which had indicated a high level of objection to the proposed transfers from residents of St Paul Malmesbury Without, and noted the revised suggestion from the parish council to transfer a smaller area to the town. It supported the request for a deferral to allow for further discussion between the two councils in a bid to achieve a revised proposal which was more acceptable.

It was;

### **Resolved**

- 1) To confirm that Council be proposed to approve Draft Recommendations 1, 2 and 4**
- 2) To amend Recommendations 3,5,6 and 7 as detailed in the additional draft recommendations document.**
- 3) To delegate the preparation of an additional draft recommendations document to the Director, Legal and Governance, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.**
- 4) For an additional consultation to take place on recommendations 3,5,6 and 7, with the dates to be agreed by the Director, Legal and Governance, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.**
- 5) To defer making a Final Recommendation for Malmesbury until the next meeting, to allow time for discussions between Malmesbury Town Council and St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council.**

### **19 Future Community Governance Reviews**

The Committee considered the list of remaining schemes for review, in order to prioritise and agree areas to be included in the Draft Terms of Reference, as detailed at Appendix A, for the Community Governance Review (CGR) to take place sometime in 2022/23.



After a short discussion, it was;

**Resolved**

- 1) To delegate to the Director Legal and Governance, finalisation and approval of the Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review 2022/23, as attached at Appendix A, to include the timetable for the review after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee. The Director after consultation with the Chairman will have the authority to amend the terms of reference at any time if appropriate.
  
- 2) That the following areas be included in the review for 2022/23:
  - Netheravon
  - Figcheldean
  - Warminster
  - Fovant
  - Donhead St Mary
  - Monkton Farleigh/Grimstead
  - Biddestone
  - Yatton Keynell and Grittleton
  - Nettleton
  - Castle Coombe
  - Tidworth
  - Ludgershall
  - Westbury
  - Bratton
  - Heywood
  - Dilton Marsh
  
- 3) That the parish of Sedgehill and Semley would be elected to a single parish council of 9 members, unwarded at the next election.

20 **Date of the Next Meeting**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 5 July 2022.

21 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 9.30 am - 12.26 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Lisa Alexander of Democratic Services, direct line 01722 434560, e-mail [lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line ((01225) 713114 or email [communications@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:communications@wiltshire.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Wiltshire Council

### Electoral Review Committee

5 July 2022

---

#### Community Governance Review 2021/22 – Consultation on Additional Draft Recommendations

##### Purpose

1. To consider responses to the consultation on the Additional Draft Recommendations of the Committee.

##### Background

2. A Community Governance Review is a process wherein a principal authority can adjust the governance arrangements of parishes within its council area. This can include amending the number of councillors or wards, the external boundaries, or even the creation/merger/abolition/grouping of entire parishes.
3. The Electoral Review Committee (“The Committee”) has delegated authority from Full Council to oversee any review process in accordance with paragraphs 2.10.7-2.10.9 of Part 3B of the Wiltshire Council Constitution. This includes setting the scope for any review, its methodology, timescales, and preparing recommendations for consideration by Full Council.
4. On 21 September 2021 the Electoral Review Committee published terms of reference for a Community Governance Review to begin on 22 September 2022 (“The Review”). The timetable for the Review within the terms of reference was updated by the Director of Legal and Governance under delegated authority granted by the Committee, during the course of the review.
5. The parishes included within the Review were: Malmesbury and St Paul Malmesbury Without; Beechingstoke and surrounding parishes (Woodborough, North Newnton, Wilsford, Marden, Patney, Stanton St Bernard); Calne Without and surrounding parishes (Calne Without, Calne, Hilmarton, Cherhill, Compton Bassett, Heddington, Bremhill). Also included in the terms were any parishes surrounding those listed. This was in case any requests emerged from the listed parishes which would have an effect on a neighbouring parish.
6. In preparing any recommendations and making any decision the Committee and Full Council must take account of the statutory criteria for reviews and the need to ensure that community governance within the areas under review:
  - Reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
  - Is effective and convenient.
7. Council tax precept levels would not be a valid criterion to approve or disapprove of a proposal.

## **Main Considerations**

### Progress of the Review

8. During Stage One of the Review additional proposals for the areas set out in Paragraph 5 were sought. During Stage Two the Committee undertook pre-consultation information gathering. This included notes of sessions with unitary members and parish councils, from public meetings, emailed representations and over 300 responses to an online survey.
9. The Committee considered all the relevant information, and agreed Draft Recommendations to be consulted upon at its meeting on 8 February 2022.
10. A consultation was therefore held from 18 March 2022 – 5 May 2022. Public meetings were held on 5 April and 21 April in Calne and Malmesbury respectively.
11. At its meeting on 31 May 2022 the Committee considered all the relevant information responding to the Draft Recommendations. This included parish council session notes, public meeting notes, and details of parish and public representations, including over 229 online survey responses.
12. The Committee resolved to approve some of its recommendations, defer others, and make amendments to others. As it is a requirement that any option resolved by Full Council must be consulted upon, the Committee agreed to undertake a consultation on Additional Draft Recommendations relating to several recommendations in the Calne Community Area, where the original proposals had been slightly amended.

### Consultation on the Additional Draft Recommendations

13. An online consultation was therefore held from 7 June 2022 – 28 June 2022 on the amended proposals.
14. 24 responses were received on the online consultation portal during the consultation period. These responses are included within Appendix A.
15. It is acknowledged that the level of responses to the latest consultation is quite low, and includes a number of duplications. It should be noted, however, that the pre-consultation was carried out via the same method and received 85 responses. The Committee then wrote to all residents of Calne Without and received 47 responses during the initial consultation.
16. The current consultation was the third engagement exercise conducted for Calne Without within 6 months, and the fifth within the last 2 years. It is therefore the case that significant and extended consultation on various options have been considered at various stages.
17. Additional representations regarding the Malmesbury area proposals considered at the 31 May 2022 meeting are also included at **Appendix B**.

### **Safeguarding Implications**

18. There are no safeguarding implications.

### **Public Health Implications**

19. There are no public health implications.

### **Procurement Implications**

20. There are no procurement implications.

### **Equalities Implications**

21. There are no equalities implications.

### **Environmental and Climate Change Implications**

22. There are no environmental implications.

### **Workforce Implications**

23. There are no workforce implications.

### **Financial Implications**

24. Additional consultation could incur additional resources, in particular in relation to the cost of using an external provider to physically mail out to those affected in certain areas if appropriate.

### **Legal Implications**

25. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gives the Council the power to undertake CGRs and sets out the criteria for such reviews. There is also statutory guidance on the conduct of such reviews that the Council would have to comply with.

### **Risks**

26. A failure to consult appropriately or provide appropriate reasoning for any decision to change governance arrangements would be potentially vulnerable to challenge.

### **Options**

27. The Committee may confirm its additional draft recommendations for consideration by Full Council, it may remove some recommendations and refer the remainder to Full Council for consideration, or it may amend its recommendations. If amending its recommendations, the Committee would need to undertake additional consultations before Full Council could consider approving those recommendations.

### **Proposal**

28. That the Committee consider the responses to the Additional Draft Recommendations consultation.

29. To delegate to the Director, Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Chairman, the preparation of a detailed Final Recommendations document for consideration by Full Council.

### **Perry Holmes – Director, Legal and Governance**

---

Report Author: Kieran Elliott, Democracy Manager (Democratic Services), 01225 718504, [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Survey Responses

Appendix B – Additional representations

## **Background Papers**

[Terms of reference of the Community Governance Review](#)

[Additional Draft Recommendations](#)

[Guidance on Community Governance Reviews](#)

[Terms of Reference of the Electoral Review Committee](#)

Bremhill - Recommendation 3

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree/Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons	Other Comments
3.01	A resident of the parish of Bremhill	Agree		It is logical to improve the boundary as suggested, particularly in the area around Rose Cottage, Stanley	
3.02	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		Agree that the houses at Blavk Dog Halt should remain with Derry shill and Studley	
3.03	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
3.04	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
3.05	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
3.06	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
3.07	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
3.08	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
Page 15 3.09	A representative of a parish or town council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected (please specify which council in your response)	Disagree		Having regard to recommendation 3.1 Calne Without Parish Council does not believe that the proposed boundaries around the Stanley Abbey Farm area. The councillors still believe that the canal and former railway line are a natural boundary between Bremhill and Calne Without and should not be altered as part of this review.	
3.10	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Suggest amended	I agree with most of the proposals but feel that the Stanley Abbey properties and those accessed from the A4 around Chilvester Hill are better related to Studley and Derry Hill rather than Bremhill.		
3.11	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Disagree		I agree with almost all of the proposals but the 4 houses around Stanley Abbey Farm are surely part of Studley s matter of 500m away the new boundary looks contrived and whilst i would support the bizarre finder of land being part of Bremhill thereare no good governance reasons for moving The Stanley Abbey Farm group pf houses into Bremhill.It would also leave Studley Bridgei in Bremhill	

Cherhill - Recommendation 5

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree/ Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons	Other Comments
5.01	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Suggest Amended	I am in full agreement with recommendation 5 with the exception of the proposed number of councillors in the Lower Compton Ward. I believe that the recommendation to have 3 councillors will not give the people of Lower Compton an equitable level of representation compared to the other wards. Lower Compton's population is roughly the same as Cherhill - which will have 5 councillors.	I do not believe that there can be effective local governance if some areas of the parish are under represented.	
5.02	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
5.03	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
5.04	A resident of the parish of Cherhill	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
5.05	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
5.06	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
5.07	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
5.08	A representative of a parish or town council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected (please specify which council in your response)	Agree		Calne Without Parish Council welcomes the acceptance of our proposal to move Blackland in its entirety into Cherhill parish council but note that the proposed boundary should be as the warding map in the document not the map j which appears to be in error.	
5.09	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree			
5.10	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree			



Heddington - Recommendation 6

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree/ Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons	Other Comments
6.01	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Disagree		The Cherhill View Estate built by Redrow is referred to as Marden Farm but the map is completely out of date and does not show the internal roadways. The road running from Beacon Drive to The Rise is blocked to all vehicular traffic and the entire development has just a single access road from Stockley Lane. It was developed and marketed by Redrow as a rural estate, not as an extension of Calne town. The proposal to include it as part of Calne Town is inappropriate as many residents see it as a rural environment and its identity is focussed on the local rural area and landscape.	The proposal to absorb Cherhill View is a concerning development as it suggests Calne Town will use this approach to extend its operations over any new housing developments near the town boundaries and thereby squeeze out adjacent rural parishes. These external parishes have a right to exist by dint of history and local governance. The Cherhill View Estate (Marden Farm Estate) should form part of the Stockley Ward within the new Heddington Parish Boundary, not Calne Town.
6.02	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
6.03	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
6.04	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		Strongly agree with the Recommendation 06. We have lived in Broads Green over 29 years & have always felt that we were living in 'a part of Heddington'.	
6.05	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
6.06	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
6.07	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
6.08	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree		The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	

6.09	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Suggest Amended	<p>My suggested amendment is that Rookery Farmhouse which is currently in Calne Without should be integrated into Calne Town and not Heddington. I note that this has already been reviewed by the Committee and a decision was made on the basis that a farm has a "distinct rural character" compared with the urban area of Cherhill View Estate. However this decision seems to be based on the view that Rookery Farmhouse is a working farm when it in fact ceased to be a working farm some time in the 1970's. The site is now entirely residential. The key desire to be part of Calne Town rather than Heddington is that access and all services and facilities (post, bins, road, telephone, internet, water, electricity, bus service, street lighting) are all routed through Cherhill View and any changes in these services are entirely within Calne Town. Without being part of Calne Town Ward, Rookery Farmhouse has no voice in any council related matters. Changes in services in the newly expanded Heddington ward would not impact on Rookery Farmhouse at all. I am not certain whether this response should be correctly in Q14, Q15 or Q16 - but I hope you understand the basis of our request and thank you for your consideration</p>	See Q14 above	
6.10	A representative of a parish or town council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected (please specify which council in your response)	Agree		Calne Without Parish Council welcomes that their proposal has been accepted in respect of the historic Bowood estate,	
6.11	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree			
6.12	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Disagree		<p>As a resident of the Cherhill View estate, I strongly object to the proposal for the estate to be taken into Calne Town Ward. Under clause 55, the Committee decided that Cherhill View is more suited to a built up area and therefore belongs to Calne Town. This completely ignores the fact that 40% of the estate is meadow land and wild life havens. Considerable expense falls on the residents of the estate to maintain these areas to standards imposed upon them by Wiltshire Council !! This is neither fair nor equitable as these rural amenities are extensively used by non-estate walkers etc. The committee has swept this issue under the carpet and passed the buck onto residents and in future Calne Town Council. A case of Wiltshire Council having their cake and eating it. This will be strongly resisted!! It is quite obvious by looking at the proposed parish boundary for Stockley Heddington Ward that the Cherhill View estate bulges into that Ward and does not belong with Calne Town.</p>	Any other points are contained in my previous submission .

6.13	A resident of the parish of Calne Without	Agree			
------	---	-------	--	--	--

Calne Without - Recommendation 7

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree / Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons	Other Comment
7.01	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		Much more logical structure for local governance	
7.02	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		Looks reasonable	
7.03	A resident of a part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be transferred to another parish	Agree		I believe that the proposed boundaries of the parish and warding arrangements will boost community identity and interests and stop the smaller villages from being dominated by Derry Hill and Studley.	
7.04	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
7.05	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		More appropriate geographic representation	
7.06	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		I feel that this restructured parish council will be more representative of the population it covers and able to focus more efficiently and effectively on their relevant matters, concerns and interests.	
7.07	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	DH & Studley should be unwarded and include Abbey Farm. At most, no more than a 2nd ward for Pewsham & Sandy Lane combined.	We need to promote DH & Studley as ONE community	

7.08	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	Whilst I am delighted with the proposal to form a separate Derry Hill and Studley parish I see no compelling case to form separate wards within it. Doing so will have the opposite effect to that which it is hoped to achieve and will divide communities rather than uniting. Derry Hill and Studley are very much at the core of this community and provides for all the community's amenities, school, shop, village hall and pubs. The most effective way for local governance is through one unwanted council. Creating internal boarders will only have a detrimental impact.	As explained above I am delighted with the revised proposal to form a separate Derry Hill and Studley parish and recognising the central role Derry Hill and Studley plays within this rural community. But forming separate wards will provide no benefits to the need for Effective and Convenient Local Governance. It will only complicate what has the potential to be a clear and easily managed parish.	
7.09	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Disagree		Wards should not be specified. The area is small and dividing it, means i.m.o. an over zealous policy of bureaucracy. Keep it simple.	
7.10	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The establishment of a Derry Hill & Studley Parish council is sensible. But the creation of wards is questionable and the inclusion of properties on the south side of the A4 in the Sandy Lane and Bowood ward, including Rumsey House, the Barn and (our property) the Coach House, is indefensible. We are part of Studley. Try reading the road sign!	Explained above	
Page 21 7.11	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The new parish should be unwarded in order to give best representation for the residents	The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
7.12	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The new parish should be unwarded in order to give best representation for the residents	The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
7.13	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The new parish should be unwarded in order to give best representation for the residents	The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	
7.14	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The new parish should be unwarded in order to give best representation for the residents	The change will enable better representation of the residents of that area	

7.15	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Agree		Recommendation 7 is sensible and is roughly in line with what I have wanted to see done for many years	
7.16	A representative of a parish or town council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Suggest Amended	Calne Without Parish Council voted to support the new ward names however they had some suggested amendments to the wards. It was voted to request that the Properties to the south of Church Road should be within the Derry Hill and Studley Ward, with the exception of the Golden Gates House. It was felt that these properties looked out onto the Derry Hill and Studley Ward and would as such feel more identity with this ward. It was voted to request that the properties on Devizes Road remain in the Pewsham ward as these properties share the same road (A342) and therefore road issues as those properties in Pewsham Ward.		
7.17	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	I'm grateful for all the work Wiltshire Council has put onto making some very good decisions but the decision to create two wards in the new parish is not a good one. There is no need for wards in such a geographically compact new council and the ward boundaries chosen are splitting off houses from The villages of Derry Hill and Studley. Before the 2021 elections boundary changes were made to bring about 40 houses in Derry Hill & Studley into West Ward where they should always have been, now the new boundaries proposed split off houses on Church Rd from the village they are at the heart of. Almost all of the houses in Bowood are more related to Derry Hill and Studley than Sandy Lane,. All the houses on Devizes Rd area actually signed as being in Derry Hill and have no connection with Pewsham. Many of the houses that access from The A4 are now being proposed to be in Sandy Lane not Studley or Derry Hill where their true links and connections lie.. The proposals seem very close to a form of Gerrymandering to create two wards that cannot be justified without pulling in houses from Derry Hill and Studley including many at the heart of the village including the Golden Gate itself. Please reflect on the fact that the hundreds of residents who signed the petition for a separate parish also asked for it to be unwarded with 9 councillors - that was a conscious choice to have a council without divisive wards and a limited number of councillors that would increase the likelihood of contested elections , which is good for democracy. Please go back to your original recommendation of an unwarded parish		
7.18	A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley	Suggest Amended	The Parish should not be renamed but should continue as Calne Without	There is no reason to rename and lose the historic parish based on the Bowood Estate, and it would remind councillors that the Parish is not just Derry hill and studley	

A resident of the part of the parish of Calne Without proposed to be renamed to Derry Hill and Studley

Suggest Amended

I agree that some of the changes are helpful, including uniting the whole of the historic part of the estate surrounding Bowood House into the the new Derry Hill & Studley parish as well as including the two houses at Black Dog Halt. Unfortunately the Review Committee is now recommending that the new Derry Hill & Studley council should have wards rather than be 'unwarded' as was requested by 769 voters in Derry Hill, Studley, Old Derry Hill and the surrounding rural area that signed the petition. The change follows a request by only a very small number of residents who supported warding and backed by a majority of Parish Councillors. Warding as proposed (3 wards - Pewsham, Sandy Lane and Derry Hill & Studley) needlessly introduces a number of boundary problems where residents of some houses that are clearly in the villages of Derry Hill and Studley will find themselves yet again not being able to vote for councillors to represent their own village. All the houses in the Bowood Estate, even the 4 cottages on the Bowood side of Church Road and the Golden Gate in the heart of Derry Hill, have been put into the Sandy Lane Ward. imilarly the 17 houses on Devizes Road opposite the Lansdowne Pub will be in the Pewsham Ward. The Lodge on Old Rd has also been placed in Sandy Lane. Whilst the consultation maps are not entirely clear, houses in Studley including two houses at Black Dog Halt and others on the south side of the A4 may bizarrely be in the new enlarged Sandy Lane Ward. There are a number (20+) of residential properties within the Bowood Estate including those at the main house Buckhill that have no links to Sandy Lane and access is vain Derry Hill or the A4 Residents of all these properties have little or no direct links to Sandy Lane or Pewsham and have been grouped in these wards purely to bolster the voter numbers up to a level that could justify separate wards for both Sandy Lane and Pewsham. If there is to be warding I believe that the vast majority of properties within the Bowood Estate and all of those on Devizes Rd and the A4 should be in a Derry Hill and Studley Ward. These properties are within the signed village boundaries or have such close connections to Derry Hill & Studley that the villages are the focus of residents day to day activities. The national guidance on Community Governance reviews (paragraph 162) is very clear that principal councils like Wiltshire "should take account of community identity and interests in an area, and consider whether any particular ties or linkages might be broken by drawing of particular ward boundaries". I think it's very clear that Wiltshires latest proposal for "warding" does break ties and linkages that residents of several dozen houses have with the villages of Derry Hill & Studley.

I would urge the Electoral Review Committee to go back to their original recommendation of an unwarded parish, meaning that all councillors are elected by the whole of the parish to serve the whole parish. There is a growing trend for parishes to be unwarded which improves community cohesion, reduces divisiveness and completely removes ward boundary issues and the common problem where there are contested elections in some wards and vacant seats in adjoining wards where not enough candidates stand. The losing candidate very often (which has happened here several times) then, understandably in some ways, does not want to be co-opted as a councillor to fill the vacancies in the neighbouring ward where they do not live. The fear amongst those relatively few supporters of warding, that Pewsham & Sandy Lane might not be properly represented in an unwarded parish is unfounded. This has been demonstrated in the past, in that despite having far fewer voters than Derry Hill, Studley has always had more than its fair share of villagers elected even though it does not have its own separate ward. Even in an unwarded parish, individual councillors can still be given particular responsibility for particular parts of the parish and can easily act as a contact point for residents. In the past there have been major electoral inequalities between wards in Calne Without, with Derry Hill & Studley being significantly underrepresented in comparison with Pewsham and particularly Sandy Lane which was grossly over represented. In an unwarded parish such inequalities between wards are completely removed, which is in marked contrast to the proposed warding, that tries to artificially create electoral equality by bolstering voter numbers in Pewsham & Sandy Lane by incorporating significant parts of Derry Hill and Studley into those wards. In truth, without the properties on the A4, Devizes Road and in the Bowood Estate, Sandy Lane only has 30 or so houses with little more than 60 voters. Pewsham and Old Derry Hill has only around 120 voters. Although an unwarded parish is a much better arrangement, if it were felt that wards were absolutely essential, a single ward of 180 or so voters for Pewsham & Sandy Lane would be far more preferable to having parts of Derry Hill & Studley. Seven or eight councillors could then collectively represent the 1200 to 1300 voters in the remaining part of the new parish. At a time when many people feel that the fantastic Jubilee celebrations organised in our villages have made our communities more cohesive than ever before, it would be a great shame to introduce divisive warding with major boundary issues breaking long established ties and linkages. I would urge the Electoral Review Committee to revert to an unwarded parish for Derry Hill & Studley which was supported by the petitioners including the vast majority of the Pewsham Ward. I'm unsure if this has recorded my full response so I will email the full text to Keiran Elliott



## **Appendix B – Further Representations to the Electoral Review Committee**

### Malmesbury 1

Dear Cllr Blair-Pilling,

Please forgive me contacting you directly but I recognise you from the public meeting held in Malmesbury Town Hall recently and am also unsure to whom I should direct my concerns (presumably the secretary to your committee)?

I listened intently to the various views expressed during that meeting and repeatedly heard you and others say that the precept should not be a consideration in any decision taken by the committee. Ordinarily, this may be viewed as an acceptable position to take; however, we are all living in extraordinary times, facing daily unprecedented increases in the cost of living, placing serious financial challenges on an ever increasing number of households, including those in MSPWPC.

It seems clear to me that aside from the fact that there do not appear to be any compelling reasons to alter the status quo (indeed nothing significant was exposed at the meeting to justify the change), the increased charges in precept associated with the proposed change would pile ever more misery on households struggling with the daily impacts of rising costs of living. Hopefully your committee will not be persuaded to alter the status quo but if not, I would urge you and your committee to also exceptionally consider the financial impact that your decisions would have on households affected.

Thank you for considering this request.

[Malmesbury Resident]

### Calne Without 1

I agree that some of the changes are helpful, including uniting the whole of the historic part of the estate surrounding Bowood House into the the new Derry Hill & Studley parish as well as including the two houses at Black Dog Halt.

Unfortunately the Review Committee is now recommending that the new Derry Hill & Studley council should have wards rather than be 'unwarded' as was requested by 769 voters in Derry Hill, Studley, Old Derry Hill and the surrounding rural area that signed the petition. The change follows a request by only a very small number of residents who supported warding and backed by a majority of Parish Councillors.

Warding as proposed (3 wards - Pewsham, Sandy Lane and Derry Hill & Studley) needlessly introduces a number of boundary problems where residents of some houses that are clearly in the villages of Derry Hill and Studley will find themselves yet again not being able to vote for councillors to represent their own village. All the houses in the Bowood Estate, even the 4 cottages on the Bowood side of Church Road and the Golden Gate in the heart of Derry Hill, have been put into the Sandy Lane Ward. Similarly the 17 houses on Devizes Road opposite the Lansdowne Pub will be in the Pewsham Ward. The Lodge on Old Rd has also been placed in Sandy Lane. Whilst the consultation maps are not entirely clear, houses in Studley including two houses at Black Dog Halt and others on the south side of the A4 may bizarrely be in the new enlarged Sandy Lane Ward. There

are a number (20+) of residential properties within the Bowood Estate including those at the main house Buckhill that have no links to Sandy Lane and access is via Derry Hill or the A4

Residents of all these properties have little or no direct links to Sandy Lane or Pewsham and have been grouped in these wards purely to bolster the voter numbers up to a level that could justify separate wards for both Sandy Lane and Pewsham. If there is to be warding I believe that the vast majority of properties within the Bowood Estate and all of those on Devizes Rd and the A4 should be in a Derry Hill and Studley Ward. These properties are within the signed village boundaries or have such close connections to Derry Hill & Studley that the villages are the focus of residents' day to day activities.

The national guidance on Community Governance reviews (paragraph 162) is very clear that principal councils like Wiltshire ***"should take account of community identity and interests in an area, and consider whether any particular ties or linkages might be broken by drawing of particular ward boundaries"***.

I think it's very clear that Wiltshire's latest proposal for "warding" does break ties and linkages that residents of several dozen houses have with the villages of Derry Hill & Studley. I would urge the Electoral Review Committee to go back to their original recommendation of an unwarded parish, meaning that all councillors are elected by the whole of the parish to serve the whole parish.

There is a growing trend for parishes to be unwarded which improves community cohesion, reduces divisiveness and completely removes ward boundary issues and the common problem where there are contested elections in some wards and vacant seats in adjoining wards where not enough candidates stand. The losing candidate very often (which has happened here several times) then, understandably in some ways, does not want to be co-opted as a councillor to fill the vacancies in the neighbouring ward where they do not live.

The fear amongst those relatively few supporters of warding, that Pewsham & Sandy Lane might not be properly represented in an unwarded parish is unfounded. This has been demonstrated in the past, in that despite having far fewer voters than Derry Hill, Studley has always had more than its fair share of villagers elected even though it does not have its own separate ward. Even in an unwarded parish, individual councillors can still be given particular responsibility for particular parts of the parish and can easily act as a contact point for residents.

In the past there have been major electoral inequalities between wards in Calne Without, with Derry Hill & Studley being significantly underrepresented in comparison with Pewsham and particularly Sandy Lane which was grossly over represented. In an unwarded parish such inequalities between wards are completely removed, which is in marked contrast to the proposed warding, that tries to artificially create electoral equality by bolstering voter numbers in Pewsham & Sandy Lane by incorporating significant parts of Derry Hill and Studley into those wards.

In truth, without the properties on the A4, Devizes Road and in the Bowood Estate, Sandy Lane only has 30 or so houses with little more than 60 voters. Pewsham and Old Derry Hill has only around 120 voters. Although an unwarded parish is a much better arrangement, If it were felt that wards were absolutely essential, a single ward of 180 or so voters for Pewsham & Sandy Lane would be far more preferable to hiving of parts of Derry Hill & Studley. Seven or eight councillors could then collectively represent the 1200 to 1300 voters in the remaining part of the new parish.

At a time when many people feel that the fantastic Jubilee celebrations organised in our villages have made our communities more cohesive than ever before, it would be a great shame to introduce divisive warding with major boundary issues breaking long established ties and linkages.

I would urge the Electoral Review Committee to revert to an unwarded parish for Derry Hill & Studley which was supported by the petitioners including the vast majority of the Pewsham Ward

Ioan Rees – lead Petitioner

This page is intentionally left blank