

## Council

---

### MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 9 SEPTEMBER 2020 AT ONLINE MEETING.

#### **Present:**

Cllr Richard Gamble (Chairman), Cllr James Sheppard (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Phil Alford, Cllr Ben Anderson, Cllr Pat Aves, Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling, Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Derek Brown OBE, Cllr Allison Bucknell, Cllr Andrew Bryant, Cllr Clare Cape, Cllr Trevor Carbin, Cllr Mary Champion, Cllr Pauline Church, Cllr Ernie Clark, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Anna Cuthbert, Cllr Kevin Daley, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Jane Davies, Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Matthew Dean, Cllr Tony Deane, Cllr Christopher Devine, Cllr Stewart Dobson, Cllr Bill Douglas, Cllr Mary Douglas, Cllr Peter Evans, Cllr Sue Evans, Cllr Nick Fogg MBE, Cllr Peter Fuller, Cllr Sarah Gibson, Cllr Gavin Grant, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Howard Greenman, Cllr Mollie Groom, Cllr David Halik, Cllr Ross Henning, Cllr Alan Hill, Cllr Sven Hocking, Cllr Nick Holder, Cllr Ruth Hopkinson, Cllr Atiqul Hoque, Cllr Jon Hubbard, Cllr Chris Hurst, Cllr Peter Hutton, Cllr Hayley Illman, Cllr Simon Jacobs, Cllr Tony Jackson, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Johnny Kidney, Cllr Carole King, Cllr Gordon King, Cllr Edward Kirk, Cllr Jerry Kunkler, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Brian Mathew, Cllr Laura Mayes, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Nick Murry, Cllr Paul Oatway QPM, Cllr Steve Oldrieve, Cllr Ashley O'Neill, Cllr Christopher Newbury, Cllr Stewart Palmen, Cllr Horace Prickett, Cllr Leo Randall, Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe MBE, Cllr Pip Ridout, Cllr Tom Rounds, Cllr Jonathon Seed, Cllr John Smale, Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cllr John Thomson, Cllr Ian Thorn, Cllr Jo Trigg, Cllr Tony Trotman, Cllr John Walsh, Cllr Bridget Wayman, Cllr Fred Westmoreland, Cllr Philip Whalley, Cllr Philip Whitehead, Cllr Suzanne Wickham, Cllr Christopher Williams and Cllr Robert Yuill

---

#### 61 **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Russell Hawker, Mike Hewitt, Jim Lynch, Melody Thompson, and Stuart Wheeler.

#### 62 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations.

#### 63 **Announcements by the Chairman**

The Chairman presented Councillor James Sheppard with a commemorative badge in recognition of his former role as Chairman of the Council.

The Chairman also noted the intended voting procedure for the meeting.

64 **Public Participation**

It was explained that as there would be separate debates and votes on each recommendation from the Electoral Review Committee under Agenda Item 7, up to three people had been able to register to speak in respect of each recommendation.

One question had been received for the meeting and would be considered under Recommendation 11.

65 **Notices of Motion**

No notices of motion had been received for the meeting.

66 **Members' Questions**

No questions from Members had been received for the meeting.

67 **Community Governance Review 2019-20**

The Chairman set out how the debate on the Final Recommendations of the Electoral Review Committee would be conducted. Following an introduction by the Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee each recommendation would be debated and voted upon in turn, and any public statements or questions taken under the relevant recommendation.

The Chairman also provided advice on the moving of any amendments, and confirmed that following guidance from the Monitoring Officer, the Council could only approve options which had been consulted upon. Any alternative options would need to be directed to be consulted upon before being determined at a later date.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, to present the council report and the Final Recommendations of the Electoral Review Committee.

Councillor Clewer set out the background to the Community Governance Review 2019-20, which had commenced on 1 November 2019. This had followed publication of the Final Recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) for the Electoral Review of Wiltshire Council, which had amended the unitary Divisions for the council. This had also made consequential changes to many parishes, and received parliamentary approval in March 2020, to take effect at the next elections in May 2021.

The Electoral Review Committee had received requests for changes to parish boundaries and governance arrangements and determined which areas should be reviewed in advance of the May 2021 elections. It was noted some issues arising from the decisions of the LGBCE would need to be addressed after the elections.

The process for the Community Governance Review was detailed, which had included periods of information gathering and discussion with potentially affected parishes, a pre-consultation survey of potentially affected residents including some public meetings, and a statutory period of consultation on Draft Recommendations of the Committee, which was extended due to Covid-19 and included writing to residents involved. Following consideration of responses from parishes, partners and the public, the Committee produced its Final Recommendations.

Councillor Clewer thanked the Committee and supporting officers for their work, which had involved attending a great many meetings and sessions, and consideration of a significant amount of information and consultation responses. In particular, he thanked Councillor Gavin Grant, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, for his work throughout the process.

Councillor Clewer also highlighted that because some of the proposals involved areas which had seen consequential changes to parishes as a result of changes to unitary Divisions, consent would be required of the LGBCE should Council approve the recommendations. The Committee had noted issues regarding parish council warding arrangements, the need for appropriately sized and viable wards, and that where a parish was split between multiple Divisions that the parish was required to be warded. Therefore, some parishes had been divided, and elements were included in a Division which might be considered of a different character, even if council did not approve the recommendations before it.

Councillor Clewer also confirmed that advice had been received clarifying that a Community Governance Review could transfer an area to another parish notwithstanding the existence or development of a Neighbourhood Plan, as further set out in the report.

Councillor Clewer then moved the proposed motion as set out in the report to approve each recommendation and delegate authority to the appropriate officers to enact any changes approved. Councillor Grant seconded the motion.

The Chairman provided the opportunity to Members of the Electoral Review Committee to comment on the process generally. Members commended the excellent leadership and hard work of Councillor Clewer as Chairman of the Committee, and noted the harmonious and successful operation of the Committee which involved all the political groups on the council. Those who had responded to the pre-consultation and consultation were thanked, and it was stated that the Committee had carefully considered all responses received in forming its recommendations. Officers were thanked for their work supporting the Committee, including Kieran Elliott, Senior Democratic Services Officer and Ian Gibbons, Director of Legal and Governance.

Group leaders were then given the opportunity to comment on the report and process generally.

Councillor Philip Whitehead thanked the Committee for their work on a very complex subject, and thanked Members and the public who had had input into the process. He emphasised that the Community Governance Review was not a political or executive matter, and he would not comment as group leader or Cabinet Member on any of the recommendations.

Councillor Ian Thorn also thanked the Committee and those who had contributed and looked forward to debate on each area.

Councillor Ernie Clark noted his own thanks for the level of work undertaken and confirmed he would not provide any further comment as a group leader.

Councillor Ian McLennan noted the inclusion of his group in the process through the Committee.

The Chairman therefore moved to consideration of the first recommendation of the Electoral Review Committee for the Community Governance Review 2019-20.

#### **67a) Recommendation 1 - Salisbury and Netherhampton**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 1 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer an area of land within the parish of Netherhampton to the parish of Salisbury, with associated governance changes.

The proposals aligned to the incoming Salisbury Harnham West unitary Division, and with slight amendment followed the line of an allocated housing site with outline permission for at least 650 dwellings. Both parishes supported the proposal, noting the scale of development would transform the small, rural parish of Netherhampton, and the character and interests of the community would be more appropriate with Salisbury, with full reasoning set out in the Final Recommendations document.

During debate it was stated there had been consultation and support for the proposals, and that it was appropriate to transfer the area proposed given its character and had not been objected to by the parish council.

Councillor Clewer responded to a query confirming that as the council was seeking to amend a parish boundary which had been subject to consequential warding changes by the Local Government Boundary Commission within the last five years, their consent would be required before it could be enacted.

#### **Resolved:**

- 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.**

*Reasons: Paragraphs 73, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

*Note: A recorded vote is attached to these minutes. There were 75 votes in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions.*

#### **67b) Recommendation 2 - Salisbury**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 2 of the Committee.

The proposal was to merge two incoming city council wards into a single ward, which would align with the incoming Salisbury Milford unitary Division. This would be in keeping with every other city ward, which were or would be coterminous with the associated unitary Division.

It was explained that as the decision to impose the two wards within the Division was only announced with the Final Recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), there had been no opportunity to comment on the proposal before it had been enacted. The Committee had regarded the situation as clearly anomalous, and the city had requested the change, with full reasoning set out in the Final Recommendations document.

During debate it was stated that coterminous boundaries between parish and unitary wards and divisions was sensible, although it was noted some did not agree with the boundaries of the unitary Division which the LGBCE had decided upon, although these could not now be changed.

At the conclusion of debate, it was,

#### **Resolved:**

**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.**

*Reason: Paragraph 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

*Note: A recorded vote is attached to these minutes. There were 75 votes in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions.*

#### **67c) Recommendation 3 - Chippenham, Lacock and Langley Burrell Without**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 3 of the Committee. The proposal was to

transfer areas of within the parishes of Langley Burrell Without and Lacock to the parish of Chippenham, with associated governance changes.

The proposals aligned to the incoming Chippenham Monkton, Chippenham Hardenhuish and Chippenham Lowden and Rowden unitary Divisions. Each broadly followed the line of allocated housing sites. All three parish and town councils supported the proposals, considering that the character and interests of the incoming communities as urban extensions of the town would be more appropriate within Chippenham, with full reasoning set out in the Final Recommendations document.

Councillor Clewer noted objections had been raised by residents of the Rowden Lane hamlet currently within the parish of Lacock, and the incoming Showell ward, which was a more rural area. However, on balance of the evidence and arguments, and in considering the statutory criteria for Community Governance Reviews and taking account of the changing nature of the area as a whole, the Committee had concluded it was appropriate to transfer the area. The need to create viable and appropriate wards also constrained available options. It was considered that whilst it was appropriate to transfer the Showell ward in advance of the May 2021 elections, the precise line of the wards and requesting an amendment of the Division line might be appropriate to consider in future.

During debate the proposals for Lacock were discussed, noting the changing situation for the area of the Showell ward within the period required to be considered during the review, and the particular character of the existing hamlet. It was suggested it could be recommended that the Committee examine the area again in future, when the boundary and development issues might have been clarified or changed.

Other comments raised connections of Rowden with Chippenham Town, and noting that the parish councils supported the proposals, and that it was appropriate that new housing developments on the edge of the town were transferred into the town.

The Chairman then moved a motion to suspend Paragraphs 22.6.2-22.6.4 of Part 4 of the Constitution, which would mean recorded votes would not be automatically taken on the items before the meeting. This was seconded by the Vice-Chairman.

Following a vote, the motion to suspend the above sections of the Constitution was carried.

At the conclusion of debate, it was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**3.1 That the area of the Barrow Farm Ward of Langley Burrell Without be transferred to Chippenham Town Council and merged with the Chippenham Hardenhuish Ward, to continue to contain three 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 Chippenham Monkton Ward, to continue to contain three councillors.**

**3.3 That the area of the Showell Ward of Lacock be transferred to Chippenham Town Council and merged with the Chippenham Lowden and Rowden Ward, to continue to contain three 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.**

*Reasons: Paragraphs 73, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews*

#### **67d) Recommendation 4 - Chippenham Without and Kington St Michael**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 4 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer a small area of land within the parish of Kington St Michael to the parish of Chippenham Without.

The proposals involved only a single property and was supported by both parish councils, with full reasoning as detailed in the Final Recommendations document.

No comments were received in debate on the proposal.

It was therefore,

#### **Resolved:**

**4.1 That the area including Cedar Lodge, Allington, as detailed in the Final Recommendations be transferred from Kington St Michael to Chippenham Without.**

*Reason: Paragraph 84 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

#### **67e) Recommendation 5 - Manningford and Woodborough**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 5 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer an area of land within the parish of Manningford to the parish of Woodborough.

The proposals involved a small area of built up land distant from the community in Manningford and close to Woodborough. The proposal was supported by

both parish councils, with full reasoning as detailed in the Final Recommendations document.

During opportunity for debate a comment was made that the local communities and the parish councils were supportive of the proposals, and it should therefore be approved.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**5.1 That the area shown as detailed and described in the Final Recommendations be transferred from the parish of Manningford to the parish of Woodborough.**

*Reason: Paragraph 84 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67f) Recommendation 6 - Pewsey**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 6 of the Committee. The proposal was to remove the warding arrangements for the parish of Pewsey, which would result in a council of 21 councillors with no wards.

It was stated that the parish council had requested the change, arguing that the warding arrangements were anomalous, and it was noted that there had been no objections raised during consultation.

No comments were received in debate on the proposal.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

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

*Reasons: Paragraphs 84, 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67g) Recommendation 7 - Wilcot and Pewsey**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 7 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer a small area of land within the parish of Pewsey to the parish of Wilcot. It would be proposed under Recommendation 8 that the parish of Wilcot be renamed Wilcot, Huish and Oare.

The proposals involved only one property and part of a property, where the parish boundary divided a line of houses. It was considered that the area in



question had far closer and more appropriate links with Wilcot, where the majority of the properties were located, than Pewsey. The proposal to unify the area was supported by both parish councils, with full reasoning as detailed in the Final Recommendations document.

if the proposal were approved, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England would be requested to amend the electoral Divisions of Pewsey Vale West and Pewsey to be conterminous with the parish boundary.

During opportunity for debate a comment was made that the proposal was logical, supported by local residents and the councils involved and as such should be approved.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**7.1 That the area shown as detailed in the Final Recommendations be transferred from the parish of Pewsey to the parish of Wilcot, Huish and Oare (see Recommendation 8.3 under Minute 67h).**

**7.2 To request 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.**

*Reason: Paragraph 84 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67h) Recommendation 8 - Wilcot and Huish**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 8 of the Committee. The proposal was to merge the parishes of Wilcot and Huish.

It was explained that following a request from Wilcot Parish Council to remove its warding arrangements, it had been determined that the parish of Huish, which has around 37 electors, had not been formally merged with Wilcot as they had thought was already the case, as the two were in a longstanding joint arrangement. The Committee therefore explored a merger of the two parishes to give effect to their request. It was considered that the communities were closely connected with combined interests, and in effect had been operating as a single parish for some time. The parish name was requested to be changed to reflect the nature of the communities.

The proposal to merge the parishes was supported by the parish council, with full reasoning as detailed in the Final Recommendations document.

During opportunity for debate a comment was made in support of the proposal as endorsed by the parish council.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**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.**

*Reasons: Paragraph 80, 81 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67i) Recommendation 9 - Calne Without: Derry Hill and Studley**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 9 of the Committee. The recommendation related to a petition which had been received requesting creation of a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley, currently part of the parish of Calne Without.

It was explained that the Committee had considered that a strong case under the statutory criteria had been made in support of creation of a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley, and a petition requesting that had received significant support. However, the Committee had noted the significant impact on the remainder of Calne Without parish should a new parish be formed, and received representations that it might not be viable as a cohesive community in that case, and perhaps could be divided with other parishes in the area if appropriate. As those areas were not included in the areas under review, the Committee had been unable to explore such an option during the 2019-20 Community Governance Review.

As a petition for a Community Governance Review was required to be determined within a year, the Committee therefore recommended that Council determine that a new parish not be created at this time, but that the Committee should undertake a further review when practicable, to include surrounding parishes, so that all options could be fully considered in context. This would mean no changes ahead of the May 2021 local elections.

The proposal for creation of a new parish was not supported by the current parish council, but it had supported the proposal for there to be a further review as recommended by the Committee, with full reasoning in the Final Recommendations document.

During a short debate a comment was made highlighting that the arguments in favour of a new parish had not been rejected by the Committee, which noted the high number of petition signatures and arguments made in support, but that appropriate solutions for parish arrangements in the area might require a wider review than had been able to be undertaken at the present time. Another comment supported the retention of the existing parish arrangements.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**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.**

*Reasons: Paragraphs 63, 73, 74, 80 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67j) Recommendation 10 - Calne Without: Warding**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 10 of the Committee. The recommendation involved amending the warding arrangements of the parish of Calne Without.

It was explained that the boundary between the existing Pewsham and West wards of the parish council were clearly anomalous and ineffective, and the Committee had sought to adjust the boundary line to a more logical one. The proposal was supported by the parish council, with full reasoning in the Final Recommendations document.

No comments were received in debate on the proposal.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**10.1 To amend the boundary between the West and Pewsham Wards of Calne Without Parish Council as detailed in the Final Recommendations.**

*Reasons: Paragraph 84, 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

**67k) Recommendation 11 - Trowbridge and North Bradley**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 11 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer two areas of land within the parish of North Bradley to the parish of Trowbridge, with associated governance changes.

The proposals aligned to the incoming Trowbridge Park and Trowbridge Drynham unitary Divisions, and with slight amendment broadly followed the line of allocated housing sites with, in some instances, outline planning permission for significant urban extension, including up to 2500 dwellings. North Bradley Parish Council strongly objected to the proposals. It was stated that nearly all consultation responses received had been in objection to the proposals. Full

reasoning for the proposals was set out in the Final Recommendations document.

The Committee had considered that the character and interests of the areas in question would increasingly align more to the town within the period required to be considered according to information received, a transfer would provide a more effective and convenient governance arrangement with simpler warding arrangements, and that to not transfer the area would, among other effects, see the parish increasingly dominated by urban expansion rather than the village respondents to the consultation had stated they wished it to remain.

The Committee had considered all responses and factors, and on balance of the current evidence had not agreed that the proposals were premature as some had suggested. It also noted that the outcome of the Community Governance Review would not affect the delivery of housing within the area, and that the Committee had considered issues of governance and community, not issues of support or objection for plans for housing development.

Attention was drawn to the report detailing advice regarding the use and proper consideration of electorate projections for the area within a five-year period from the commencement of the review. It was also emphasised that incoming or adopted Neighbourhood Plans did not prevent, if appropriate, the transfer of an area from one parish to another, nor would such a transfer invalidate or otherwise affect the plan. Members were also reminded that council tax was not a relevant consideration.

Given the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) had initially proposed including a larger section of North Bradley within the Trowbridge Drynham unitary Division, among other considerations as detailed fully in the report, the Committee did not consider that it was viable to seek amendment of the Division which would be required to transfer a different area. This was relevant in particular regarding a very small number of properties accessed off the road of Woodmarsh which were within the incoming Trowbridge Drynham unitary Division, and therefore the area proposed to be transferred. However, the Committee did consider the precise line could possibly be looked at again in future, though to delay a transfer now would be inappropriate given the impact on the rest of the proposed area.

A question was then received from Amanda Bocker as detailed in the Agenda Supplement, who made an additional comment. Councillor Clewer provided details of how the line of the allocated housing site had been amended following an Inspector's decision, after the LGBCE had already made its decision regarding Electoral Divisions.

Statements were then received from Roger Evans, Chairman of North Bradley Parish Council, Russell Willsmer, a Member of North Bradley Parish Council, and Karin Elder, Clerk to North Bradley Parish Council, all in opposition to the recommendation of the Committee. In response to points raised Councillor Clewer drew attention to the Committee's consideration of Community Infrastructure Levy issues as detailed in the Final Recommendations, and noted

the impact on the village community of the growth of the town urban area, and that to retain those areas would negatively impact the identity of North Bradley as a distinct community from the town.

Council then debated the proposals.

Comments in support of the proposal included noting that the Trowbridge Drynham Division did include a very small number of properties which might more appropriately be retained within North Bradley, however if the White Horse ward of North Bradley which lay within that Division were not transferred in advance of the 2021 local elections this would be an inappropriate and ineffective arrangement, and the majority of that area was appropriate to transfer. The precise line could be reviewed again in the future. It was also noted that in other decisions the Council had already agreed with the approach of including new urban developments on the edge of towns to be included within those towns as they shared or would share community interest.

Comments in opposition to the motion included that while land might be allocated this did not mean that it would be built on in a timely fashion. Some Members stated that local electors should be consulted before being transferred.

An amendment was then moved by Councillor Horace Prickett, seconded by Councillor Christopher Newbury, to replace recommendations 11.1-11.3 with the following:

*To undertake a further Community Governance Review when practicable to include the wards of Trowbridge Drynham, Trowbridge Park and North Bradley Parish Council (White Horse Ward).*

In moving the amendment, it was stated that the parish council spoke for the community in opposing the proposals. It was stated that the proposal would result in an anomalous narrow strip of land between the Park Division and the parish boundary, with mention of a proposed relief road across the area. Reference was made to the Neighbourhood Plan of North Bradley which, nearing adoption, was required to be given significant weight. It was stated that while allocated housing sites north of the A363 could reasonably be regarded as aligning with Trowbridge, the land south of the road and the business park could not. There should therefore be a further review of the area as moved in the amendment before the matter was determined.

Comments in support of the amendment included that there were more suitable boundaries between the town and the parish, and the detail of the recommendations was not appropriate in some instances. It was stated that particularly as development was ongoing a decision could be delayed to a later date when it could be more appropriate.

Reference was made to comments made by one of the public speakers about purported lack of consultation and clarity was sought on that point, and others sought to support the views of residents who objected to the proposal. There

were also comments relating to council tax, and that Council was able to take a different view to the Committee's recommendations if it considered this appropriate.

Comments in opposition to the amendment included that it was appropriate to include consideration of future housing, and that the situation should be settled before residents arrived so there was no ambiguity regarding the situation, with examples provided of confusion in some areas where a parish line was not amended prior to development. Some considered that local objections would not change if the matter was delayed and there was no benefit to the communities in doing so.

Others comments included that the areas in question would be clear extensions of the urban area of the town distinct from the character of the village, and it was appropriate to look to the future, with the Divisions being a good indication of the shared character and interests of those areas to which the parishes should align, as the character would be very different to the village. A comment was made that the larger settlements in Wiltshire were being considerably expanded, utilising the facilities of those settlements, and should be recognised as part of those settlements.

The thorough and detailed consultation was also referenced, and some considered that the Committee had undertaken detailed and complex work to make its recommendations considering all factors and evidence, which should be supported.

Some felt there could be a negative impact on the two communities and potentially though not certainly on the effectiveness of the incoming wards, if a decision was not made at the meeting, which would leave the incoming wards unamended.

As mover of the amendment Councillor Prickett stated that the A363 would form a clearer and more reasonable demarcation between the town and the parish, and the proposals as recommended included unacceptable anomalies due to the nature of the lines. He referenced the history of the North Bradley community, a planned burial ground for the village that was intended for the proposed area, and that a delay in the Community Governance Review would not delay housing delivery. It was stated 25% of the parish would be transferred under the proposals.

As mover of the original motion Councillor Clewer responded to the points raised in debate on the amendment.

In relation to consultation the extensive information gathering that had taken place including engagement with the town and parish councils and local unitary members was detailed, also noting the pre-consultation survey which had been sent to residents in the affected area and a public meeting, and a further consultation on draft recommendations including once again writing out to those affected and an online survey. There had also been publicly accessible committee meetings in March and August 2020, and all representations

received were considered, including a significant number of responses from North Bradley.

Councillor Clewer noted that statutory guidance required consideration of the situation as it existed and also the situation with five years of the commencement of the review including based on planning assumptions, as set out in the report following legal guidance, so that a review did not reflect a single moment but took account of expected population movements in the short to medium term. Considering the entirety of the guidance in context it was therefore not out of order for council to consider whether it was appropriate to transfer an area which would be altering in the near future before additional houses were built. It was noted that Council had already made such decisions in relation to both Chippenham and Salisbury earlier in the meeting based on the evidence available at the present time.

It was stated that while there was some concern raised regarding the precise lines of the proposal this was not a major issue and the impact of not endorsing the proposal was higher. The history of the area was noted but it was stated reviews are also about the communities as they exist today or shortly will exist. It was stated that the many respondents had wanted the parish to remain as a distinct village, and the Committee agreed and that to transfer the areas in question this would protect the identity of the village. It was also noted that objection had been made to losing 25% of the area of the parish, but also accepted much of the area as being transferred, which would still be a significant portion. Small areas of land remaining in the parish making an unusual shape for the parish was also not at all unusual for parishes in the country.

Councillor Clewer emphasised that it was incorrect to suggest Neighbourhood Plans prevented amendment to parish boundaries, and while a factor did not in view of the Committee outweigh the arguments in favour of a transfer in this instance. It was also considered there would be no benefit to a delay in a decision.

Following a vote, the details of which are attached to the minutes, the amendment was lost.

There being no further comments, Councillor Clewer as mover of the motion concluded the debate and urged Members to support the proposal.

Therefore, it was,

**Resolved:**

**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.**

*Reasons: Paragraphs 54, 73, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85 and 170 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

*Note: Recorded votes for the proposed amendment and the resolution are attached to these minutes.*

*In relation to the amendment the vote was as follows: 14 in favour, 58 against, 4 abstentions.*

*In relation to the resolution the vote was as follows: 56 in favour, 11 against, 8 abstentions.*

#### **67I) Recommendation 12 - Melksham Merger**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 12 of the Committee. The Committee had considered proposals to merge the parishes of Melksham and Melksham Without.

The Committee was recommending the merger, or any partial merger, not be supported. It did not consider that sufficient grounds had been provided to justify such a proposal under the statutory criteria, with strong reasons to reject the proposal in particular noting the effective and viable governance of the existing parishes, which retained their own identities.

It was noted in the report that the suggestion of merging the two parishes had also been reviewed in 2015-16.

A statement was then received from Richard Wood, Chairman of Melksham Without Parish Council, in opposition to any merger proposal.

During debate several comments were made supporting the intention to not merge the parishes, which it was said was not supported by residents of Melksham Without. Other comments agreed with the Committee's view that there should not be a further review of the area for a considerable time and the situation changed significantly. It was noted that those areas on the edge of the town which might appropriately be joined with the town were to be considered under Minute 67m.

It was stated by some Members that the Town Council had informally discussed the proposal in recent months and would not be supporting a merger any further at this time.



At the conclusion of debate, it was,

**Resolved:**

**12.1 To not recommend a merger of Melksham and Melksham Without Parishes.**

**67m) Recommendation 13 - Melksham and Melksham Without**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, presented Final Recommendation 13 of the Committee. The proposal was to transfer two areas of land within the parish of Melksham Without to the parish of Melksham, with associated governance changes.

The proposals aligned the incoming Melksham East unitary Division with the parish by transferring the incoming Hunters Wood ward of Melksham Without. This followed the line of an allocated housing site and incoming development which was an extension of the existing development in Melksham. The proposals also sought to transfer an area previously referred to as the 'Land north of Sandridge Common' which was also an allocated housing site and partially constructed development which formed part of the wider conurbation. As this was not part of the incoming Melksham East Division, to transfer it as part of that Division and town ward would require consent of the Local Government Boundary commission for England, which could be declined. If accepted, it would then be requested that the Division be made coterminous with the parish. There were also associated governance changes to both councils as a result.

The Committee considered both areas, as new urban development, would be more appropriately located within the town, and this was supported by the town council and the parish council, with the full reasoning set out in the Final Recommendations document.

A statement was received from Alan Baines, a Member of Melksham Without Parish Council, supporting the recommendations of the Committee.

No comments were received in debate on the proposal.

It was therefore,

**Resolved:**

**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 in the report 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.**

*Reasons: Paragraph 73, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85 of the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.*

68 **Community Governance Review 2019-20**

At the conclusion of debate on the Community Governance Review and taking account of the outcomes of the votes on the above recommendations, it was therefore,

**Resolved:**

- 1) To approve the changes to community governance arrangements as set out below as recommended and detailed by the Electoral Review Committee in the Final Recommendations:**
  - i. Recommendation 1 - Salisbury and Netherhampton;**
  - ii. Recommendation 2 - Salisbury;**
  - iii. Recommendation 3 - Chippenham, Langley Burrell Without and Lacock;**
  - iv. Recommendation 4 - Kington St Michael and Chippenham Without;**
  - v. Recommendation 5 - Manningford and Woodborough;**
  - vi. Recommendation 6 - Pewsey;**
  - vii. Recommendation 7 - Wilcot and Pewsey;**
  - viii. Recommendation 8 - Wilcot and Huish;**
  - ix. Recommendation 9 - Calne Without: Derry Hill and Studley;**
  - x. Recommendation 10 - Calne Without: Warding;**
  - xi. Recommendation 11 - North Bradley and Trowbridge;**
  - xii. Recommendation 12 - Melksham;**
  - xiii. Recommendation 13 - Melksham Without and Melksham.**
- 2) To authorise the Solicitor of the Council to take all necessary measures to make and approve the Community Governance Order(s) to bring into effect for 1 April 2021 all of the changes detailed under Resolution 1, subject to any required consents by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England;**
- 3) To authorise the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary changes to polling districts to bring them into line with the agreed governance changes, to be reported to the Electoral Review Committee.**

69 **Parish Name Change Review**

Councillor Richard Clewer, Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee, introduced a report on proposals to amend the names of three parishes or parish councils. Each request had been made by the relevant parish council and a survey made available for any responses, details of which were provided in the report.

Councillor Clewer moved that the proposals be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Gavin Grant, Vice-Chairman of the Electoral Review Committee.

Group leaders were given the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

During a short debate support was expressed for the proposals to change the name of Fittleton to recognise the larger settlement of Haxton, that as the settlement of Lockeridge was not included in the name of the current joint parish council of Fyfield and West Overton then a new name of Kennet Valley was appropriate to encompass all three, and that there was no objection to amending the name of Cheverell Parva.

At the conclusion of debate, it was,

**Resolved:**

- 1) To approve name changes for the following parishes and parish councils:**
  - a) Fittleton to be changed to Fittleton cum Haxton;**
  - b) Fyfield and West Overton Parish Council to be changed to Kennet Valley Parish Council;**
  - c) Cheverell Parva to be changed to Little Cheverell.**
  
- 2) To authorise the Solicitor to the Council to make any necessary legal orders and notifications to enact the above changes.**

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 3.25 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Kieran Elliott of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718504, e-mail [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank

**Recommendation 1 - Recorded Vote - 75 For, 0 Against, 2 Abstentions**

First Name	Surname	Vote
Ben	Anderson	For
Pat	Aves	For
Chuck	Berry	For
Ian	Blair-Pilling	For
Richard	Britton	For
Derek	Brown	For
Allison	Bucknell	For
Clare	Cape	For
Trevor	Carbin	For
Mary	Champion	For
Pauline	Church	For
Ernie	Clark	For
Richard	Clewer	For
Anna	Cuthbert	For
Kevin	Daley	For
Brian	Dalton	For
Jane	Davies	For
Andrew	Davis	For
Matthew	Dean	For
Tony	Deane	For
Christopher	Devine	For
Stewart	Dobson	For
Mary	Douglas	For
Peter	Evans	For
Sue	Evans	For
Peter	Fuller	For
Richard	Gamble	Abstain
Sarah	Gibson	For
Gavin	Grant	For
Jose	Green	For
Mollie	Groom	For
David	Halik	For
Alan	Hill	For
Sven	Hocking	For
Nick	Holder	For
Ruth	Hopkinson	For
Atiquil	Hoque	For
Jon	Hubbard	For
Chris	Hurst	For
Peter	Hutton	For
Tony	Jackson	For
Simon	Jacobs	For
George	Jeans	For
Johnny	Kidney	For
Carole	King	For
Gordon	King	For
Edward	Kirk	For
Jerry	Kunkler	For

Jacqui	Lay	For
Brian	Mathew	For
Laura	Mayes	For
Ian	McLennan	For
Nick	Murry	For
Christopher	Newbury	For
Paul	Oatway	For
Steve	Oldrieve	For
Ashley	O'Neill	For
Leo	Randall	For
Fleur	de Rhé-Philipe	For
Pip	Ridout	For
Tom	Rounds	For
James	Sheppard	Abstain
John	Smale	For
Hayley	Illman	For
Toby	Sturgis	For
John	Thomson	For
Ian	Thorn	For
Jo	Trigg	For
Tony	Trotman	For
John	Walsh	For
Bridget	Wayman	For
Fred	Westmoreland	For
Philip	Whalley	For
Philip	Whitehead	For
Suzanne	Wickham	For
Christopher	Williams	For
Robert	Yuill	For

**Recommendation 2 - Recorded Vote - 75 For, 0 Against, 2 Abstentions**

First Name	Surname	Vote
Ben	Anderson	For
Chuck	Berry	For
Ian	Blair-Pilling	For
Derek	Brown	For
Andrew	Bryant	For
Allison	Bucknell	For
Clare	Cape	For
Trevor	Carbin	For
Mary	Champion	For
Pauline	Church	For
Ernie	Clark	For
Richard	Clewer	For
Anna	Cuthbert	For
Kevin	Daley	For
Brian	Dalton	For
Jane	Davies	For
Andrew	Davis	For
Matthew	Dean	For
Tony	Deane	For
Christopher	Devine	For
Stewart	Dobson	For
Mary	Douglas	For
PeterB	Evans	For
Sue	Evans	For
Peter	Fuller	For
Richard	Gamble	Abstain
Sarah	Gibson	For
Gavin	Grant	For
Jose	Green	For
Mollie	Groom	For
David	Halik	For
Ross	Henning	For
Alan	Hill	For
Sven	Hocking	For
Nick	Holder	For
Ruth	Hopkinson	For
Atiqul	Hoque	For
Jon	Hubbard	For
Chris	Hurst	For
Peter	Hutton	For
Tony	Jackson	For
Simon	Jacobs	For
George	Jeans	For
Johnny	Kidney	For
Gordon	King	For
Carole	King	For
Edward	Kirk	For
Jerry	Kunkler	For

Jacqui	Lay	For
Brian	Mathew	For
Laura	Mayes	For
Ian	McLennan	For
Nick	Murry	For
Christopher	Newbury	For
Paul	Oatway	For
Steve	Oldrieve	For
Ashley	O'Neill	For
Horace	Prickett	For
Leo	Randall	For
Fleur	de Rhé-Philipe	For
Pip	Ridout	For
Tom	Rounds	For
James	Sheppard	Abstain
John	Smale	For
Hayley	Illman	For
Toby	Sturgis	For
John	Thomson	For
Ian	Thorn	For
Jo	Trigg	For
John	Walsh	For
Bridget	Wayman	For
Fred	Westmoreland	For
Philip	Whalley	For
Philip	Whitehead	For
Suzanne	Wickham	For
Christopher	Williams	For
Robert	Yuill	For



**Recommendation 11 - Recorded Vote - Amendment - 14 For, 58 Against, 4 Abstentions**

First Name	Surname	Vote
Ben	Anderson	Against
Pat	Aves	Against
Chuck	Berry	Against
Ian	Blair-Pilling	Against
Richard	Britton	Against
Derek	Brown	Against
Andrew	Bryant	Against
Allison	Bucknell	Against
Trevor	Carbin	Against
Mary	Champion	Against
Pauline	Church	Against
Ernie	Clark	For
Richard	Clewer	Against
Anna	Cuthbert	For
Kevin	Daley	Against
Brian	Dalton	Against
Andrew	Davis	Against
Matthew	Dean	Against
Stewart	Dobson	Against
Bill	Douglas	For
Mary	Douglas	For
Peter	Evans	Against
Sue	Evans	For
Peter	Fuller	Against
Richard	Gamble	Abstain
Sarah	Gibson	Against
Gavin	Grant	Against
Howard	Greenman	Against
Mollie	Groom	Against
David	Halik	For
Ross	Henning	Against
Alan	Hill	Against
Sven	Hocking	Against
Nick	Holder	Against
Ruth	Hopkinson	Against
Atiquil	Hoque	For
Jon	Hubbard	Against
Chris	Hurst	Against
Peter	Hutton	For
Hayley	Illman	Against
Simon	Jacobs	Against
Johnny	Kidney	Abstain
Carole	King	Against
Gordon	King	Against
Edward	Kirk	For
Jerry	Kunkler	Against
Jacqui	Lay	Abstain
Brian	Mathew	Against

Laura	Mayes	Against
Ian	McLennan	Against
Nick	Murry	For
Christopher	Newbury	For
Paul	Oatway	Against
Steve	Oldrieve	Against
Ashley	O'Neill	Against
Stewart	Palmen	Against
Horace	Prickett	For
Leo	Randall	For
Fleur	de Rhé-Philipe	Against
Pip	Ridout	For
Tom	Rounds	Against
James	Sheppard	Abstain
John	Smale	Against
Toby	Sturgis	Against
John	Thomson	Against
Ian	Thorn	Against
Jo	Trigg	Against
Tony	Trotman	Against
John	Walsh	Against
Bridget	Wayman	Against
Fred	Westmoreland	Against
Philip	Whalley	Against
Philip	Whitehead	Against
Suzanne	Wickham	Against
Christopher	Williams	Against
Robert	Yuill	Against

**Recommendation 11 - Recorded Vote - Motion - 56 For, 11 Against, 8 Abstentions**

First Name	Surname	Vote
Ben	Anderson	For
Pat	Aves	For
Chuck	Berry	For
Ian	Blair-Pilling	For
Richard	Britton	For
Derek	Brown	For
Andrew	Bryant	For
Allison	Bucknell	For
Trevor	Carbin	For
Mary	Champion	For
Pauline	Church	For
Ernie	Clark	Against
Richard	Clewer	For
Anna	Cuthbert	Against
Brian	Dalton	For
Andrew	Davis	For
Matthew	Dean	For
Stewart	Dobson	For
Bill	Douglas	Against
Mary	Douglas	Against
Peter	Evans	For
Sue	Evans	Against
Peter	Fuller	For
Richard	Gamble	Abstain
Sarah	Gibson	For
Gavin	Grant	For
Howard	Greenman	For
Mollie	Groom	For
David	Halik	Against
Ross	Henning	For
Alan	Hill	For
Sven	Hocking	For
Nick	Holder	For
Ruth	Hopkinson	For
Atiqul	Hoque	Abstain
Jon	Hubbard	For
Chris	Hurst	For
Peter	Hutton	For
Hayley	Illman	For
Simon	Jacobs	For
Johnny	Kidney	Abstain
Carole	King	Abstain
Gordon	King	Abstain
Edward	Kirk	Against
Jerry	Kunkler	For
Jacqui	Lay	Abstain
Brian	Mathew	For
Laura	Mayes	For

Ian	McLennan	For
Nick	Murry	Against
Christopher	Newbury	Against
Paul	Oatway	For
Steve	Oldrieve	For
Ashley	O'Neill	For
Stewart	Palmen	For
Horace	Prickett	Against
Leo	Randall	Against
Fleur	de Rhé-Philipe	For
Pip	Ridout	Abstain
Tom	Rounds	For
James	Sheppard	Abstain
John	Smale	For
Toby	Sturgis	For
John	Thomson	For
Ian	Thorn	For
Jo	Trigg	For
Tony	Trotman	For
John	Walsh	For
Bridget	Wayman	For
Fred	Westmoreland	For
Philip	Whalley	For
Philip	Whitehead	For
Suzanne	Wickham	For
Christopher	Williams	For
Robert	Yuill	For

**Full Council Meeting – 9 September 2020 – Members Attendance**

<b>Councillor Name</b>	<b>Time In</b>	<b>Time Out</b>
Phil Alford	10:30	15.25
Ben Anderson	10:30	15.25
Pat Aves	10:30	15.25
Chuck Berry	10:30	15.25
Ian Blair-Pilling	10:30	15.25
Richard Britton	10:30	15.25
Derek Brown	10:30	15:03
Andrew Bryant	10:30	15.25
Allison Bucknell	10:30	15.25
Clare Cape	10:30	15.25
Trevor Carbin	10:30	15.25
Mary Champion	10:30	15.25
Pauline Church	10:30	15.25
Ernie Clark	10:30	15:10
Richard Clewer	10:30	15.25
Mark Connolly	Apologies	Apologies
Christine Crisp	Apologies	Apologies
Anna Cuthbert	10:30	15.13
Kevin Daley	10:30	15.25
Brian Dalton	10:30	15.25
Jane Davies	10:30	15.25
Andrew Davis	10:30	15.25
Matthew Dean	10.30	13:35
Tony Deane	10:30	14.30
Christopher Devine	10:30	15.25
Stewart Dobson	10:30	15.25
Bill Douglas	10:30	14:48
Mary Douglas	10:30	15.25
Peter Evans	10:30	15.25
Sue Evans	10:30	15.25
Nick Fogg	10:45	14.30
Peter Fuller	10:30	15.25
Richard Gamble	10:30	15.25
Sarah Gibson	10:30	15.08
Gavin Grant	10:30	15.25
Jose Green	10:30	15.25
Howard Greenman	13.55	15.25
Mollie Groom	10:30	15.25
David Halik	10:30	15.25
Russell Hawker	Apologies	Apologies
Ross Henning	10:30	15.25
Mike Hewitt	Apologies	Apologies
Alan Hill	10:30	15.25

Sven Hocking	10:30	15.25
Nick Holder	10:30	15.25
Ruth Hopkinson	10:30	15.25
Atiquel Hoque	10:30	15.25
Jon Hubbard	10:30	15.25
Chris Hurst	10:30	15.25
Peter Hutton	10:30	15.25
Hayley Illman	10:30	15.25
Tony Jackson	10:30	14.30
Simon Jacobs	10:30	15.25
George Jeans	10:45	15.25
Bob Jones		
Johnny Kidney	10:30	15.25
Carole King	10:30	15.25
Gordon King	10:30	15.25
Edward Kirk	10:30	15.25
Jerry Kunkler	10:30	15.25
Jacqui Lay	10:30	15.25
Jim Lynch		
Brian Mathew	10:30	15.25
Laura Mayes	10:30	15.25
Ian McLennan	10:30	15.25
Nick Murry	10:30	15.25
Christopher Newbury	10:30	15.25
Ashley O'Neill	10:30	15.25
Paul Oatway	10:30	15.25
Steve Oldrieve	10:30	15.25
Stewart Palmen	12:00	15.25
Andy Phillips		
Horace Prickett	10:30	15.25
Leo Randall	10:30	15.25
Fleur de Rhe Philipe	10:50	15.25
Pip Ridout	10:30	15.25
Ricky Rogers		
Tom Rounds	10:30	15.25
Jonathon Seed	10:30	15.25
James Sheppard	10:30	15.25
John Smale	10:30	15.25
Toby Sturgis	10:30	15.25
Melody Thompson	Apologies	Apologies
John Thomson	10:30	15.25
Ian Thorn	10:30	14:50
Jo Trigg	10:30	15.25
Tony Trotman	10:30	15.25
John Walsh	10:30	15.25
Bridget Wayman	10:30	15.25

Fred Westmoreland	10:30	15.25
Philip Whalley	10:30	15.25
Stuart Wheeler	Apologies	Apologies
Philip Whitehead	10:30	15.25
Suzanne Wickham	10:30	15.25
Christopher Williams	10:30	15.25
Graham Wright		
Robert Yuill	10:30	15.25

This page is intentionally left blank