

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Amesbury

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
A1	10/09/20	Resident	Agree	It keeps the Woodford Parishes together.
A2	11/09/20	Resident	Agree	Till Valley has a natural link to Amesbury
A3	11/09/20	Representative	Agree	It is the naturally cohesively linked area
A4	24/09/20	Resident	Agree	Provides a more representative area for Amesbury
A5	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Moving the Amesbury East current dividing line places me into Amesbury west, I don't believe that the Archers gate/ Kings Gate to the south of the town has the capacity to draw a similar population to Amesbury East as is extant, even including Bulford, therefore the southern boundary to Ames East should be adjusted to balance the 3 parts of Amesbury
A6	13/10/20	Representative	Agree	Seems a sensible conclusion

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Bradford-on-Avon

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
B1	13/10/20	Resident	Amendment	Area Boards should be reformed to become democratic assemblies of all elected representatives in the area - unitary, town and parish.

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Calne

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
C1	15/09/20	Business	Disagree	I'm not sure if it is important but Sutton Benger Surgery is a branch surgery of Patford House Partnership, which is based in Calne. Sutton Benger residents who are registered with Patford House Partnership access some of their care through the main surgery in Calne. There are over 2800 patients registered at Sutton Benger surgery. This might need to be taken into consideration perhaps when thinking about this boundary.
C2	20/10/20	Resident	Agree	

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Chippenham

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
D1	15/10/20	Representative	Agree	At the Full Council meeting held on 23 September 2020, the Chief Executive was delegated authority to complete the Area Board Boundary Review consultation on behalf of Chippenham Town Council in favour of the draft recommendations to bring the Area Board boundaries in line with the Electoral Divisions.

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Corsham

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
E1	11/09/20	Representative	Agree	The right decision. Well done.
E2	23/09/20	Representative	Agree	It incorporates all parishes in the Corsham Area
E3	23/09/20	Representative	Agree	

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Devizes

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
F1	09/09/20	Representative	Agree	
F2	09/09/20	Representative	Agree	This fairly represents the communities which look towards Devizes as their market town and is balanced in terms of populations. It is also an improvement on the existing boundaries where there are some manifest anomalies (e.g. Poulshot, in sight of Devizes, being part of the Melksham Community Area. It corrects the tenuous connection between Potterne and Rowde/Bromham.
F3	10/09/20	Resident	Agree	The Area Bored now reflects the parishes which considers Devizes to their principal town
F4	23/09/20	Resident	Agree	We are well represented
F5	24/09/20	Resident	Agree	most appropriate
F6	25/09/20	Resident	Agree	geographically sensible
F7	08/10/20	Representative	Agree	Devizes Town Council accepts Wiltshire Council's proposed changes to the Devizes Area Board as they reflect what they consider to be the community area.
F8	14/10/20	Interested Party	Disagree	Do not understand why All Cannings is being moved to Pewsey when it is linked to Etchilhampton geographically, historically, in church matters and joint schooling/playgroups
F9	15/10/20	Representative	Agree	Recognises local sentiments regarding identity of villages whilst sensibly grouping electoral divisions
F10	22/10/20	Resident	Amendment	I think that Seend should be included in MAB as the village uses Melksham as its nearest town much more than Devizes and maintains strong links to MAB formed over several years.
F11	27/10/20	Representative	Agree	Worton Parish Council have no comment to make either way

F12	28/10/20	Resident	Agree	I have lived in Seend since 1995 and have always felt that Devizes is our area. My three children all went to Seend Primary School and then to Lavington School. It simply feels right to formally be part of the Devizes Area Board and I therefore totally agree with the proposal. Thank you.
-----	----------	----------	-------	--

**Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses**

**Malmesbury**

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
G1	10/09/02	Resident	Agree	



## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Marlborough

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
H1	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Geographically it makes no sense as Pewsey is much further away and we have nothing connected to Pewsey. Our councillors will have to travel more than twice as far and all the work done to upgrade our road safety will have to be started again from scratch.
H2	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	All of our links are with marlborough area and we have no association with pewsey vale east amenities. Our surgery is in ramsbury and we are very closely associated with ramsbury amenities and people.. This link has existed to my knowledge for many decades.
H3	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	We are part of the Whitton group of churches which comprises Ramsbury Axford Chilton foliot Aldbourne Baydon and Froxfield. There are many longstanding cultural associations from this grouping . In addition we use the same doctors surgery and garage repair facilities.The close link with Ramsbury is particularly strong.The proposal is totally contrary to our long established links. We have no association at all with Pewsey ,its people or its amenities.
H4	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Marlborough has served us well in the past and the new area is too big and too far for volunteers to travel
H5	30/09/20	Representative	Disagree	Froxfield has historical Parochial connections to Aldbourne and Ramsbury and not to villages south. We also share many concerns about traffic and road safety with Marlborough as the village straddles the A4. The A4 and issues around traffic in general are one of the main concerns of the Parish Council and we have been working with the Marlborough CATG to bring about traffic calming. We would lose this continuity of approach by being moved to the Pewsey Vale East district.

H6	14/10/20	Representative	Agree	The changes do not affect Aldbourne parish.
H7	14/10/20	Representative	Agree	
H8	20/10/20	Resident	Agree	Should simplify matters and cost less.
H9	29/10/20	Representative	Disagree	[Marlborough Town Council] Members noted that where there was a risk of not being quorate there was the potential to bring in Councillors from neighbouring Area Boards (Pewsey and Tidworth were mentioned). There was agreement to strongly object to this use of substitutes. If there were cases where there had to be substitution, Members felt that only Pewsey was appropriate. There was also concern about maintaining a balance to avoid potential manipulation along political lines, particularly where financial decisions were involved. It was noted that up to a fixed financial limit of £5,000 the Community Engagement Officer could use delegated powers to make financial decisions.

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Melksham

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
I1	09/09/20	Resident	Amendment	Should still include Atworth but not Steeple Ashton
I2	13/09/20	Resident	Agree	Where I live has historic links with the villages in the south of the area proposed, and Melksham is the closest town. All alternative proposals seem much less satisfactory.
I3	24/09/20	Representative	Agree	Semington is an integral part of, and has cultural, economic and employment links with, Melksham and must remain within Melksham Area Board.
I4	22/10/20	Resident	Amendment	I think that Seend should be included in MAB as the village uses Melksham as its nearest town much more than Devizes and maintains strong links to MAB formed over several years.
I5	26/10/20	Resident	Amendment	Seend and seend Cleeve should remain within the melksham Area board. The village has very little connection with Devizes as suggested by the review. We are 2 miles from Melksham and over 4 miles from Devizes. We can see Melksham from some parts of the village but Devizes is way out of view. I have no idea how the Area Boundary review Committee thinks we as a village are in any way connected mainly with Devizes.
I6	31/10/20	Resident	Amendment	I believe that the Melksham Area Board should continue to include Seend, a parish which is nearer to Melksham than to Devizes. Much of this Area Board constitutes rural parishes, into which category Seend definitely falls. I do not understand why Seend should be included in an Area dominated by a town when in the past it has been well served by the Melksham Area Board.

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Pewsey

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
J1	23/09/20	Representative	Agree	
J2	23/09/20	Representative	Disagree	Froxfield is one of the most Eastern villages on the Wiltshire County boundary, some 10 minutes drive from Marlborough but at least 25 minutes from Pewsey (having to drive through Marlborough to . We are only 380ish residents and have always enjoyed a close working relationship with Marlborough for CATG and MAB and our County Councillor James Shepperd who has personally been involved in projects in our village. To say we are angry and dismayed to be made to move to Pewsey is an understatement!!! It just doesn't make any sense at all for anyone here in the village although obviously makes sense for the bean counters at WCC who do not have to live with the impact this will have on us in the future. We would please IMPLORE you to reconsider this as a matter of urgency and explain what the rationale is for this ridiculous decision.
J3	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Froxfield has no shared interest with the other areas and is more closely aligned to Marlborough due to the A4.
J4	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	It's too far for our volunteers to travel . Please allow us to stay with Marlborough
J5	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Froxfield parish council has explained that: a) it has close ties with the current area board; b) it has ongoing business with Marlborough area board, in particular longstanding consultations about very important speed-limiting proposals; and c) Froxfield is closer to Marlborough for the many meetings councillors attend.

J6	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Froxfield does not come under Pewsey in a geographical sense and is naturally aligned to Marlborough. As we are so close to the Berkshire boarder we already experience disadvantages regarding roads and transport. Our bidding system would have to start over again.
J7	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Froxfield has no natural connections with Pewsey Vale. If this proposal goes ahead it will ruin our natural relationship with the Whitton Benefice in Ramsbury. It will also affect our close relationship with Ramsbury Surgery and the surrounding villages north of the A4. This appears to be a merely cosmetic exercise that will cause a great deal of resentment. We were forced to join a Unitary Authority that Wiltshire Council appears to be unable to cope with and is now in the process of rearranging. Therefore, previous experience suggests that if it ain't broke, don't fix it!
J8	23/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Projects in our village have taken a long time to get going - years. I am especially concerned about the speed of traffic through the village. We have started, through Marlborough council to get some calming measures in place. It is very important that these continue to progress. Alignment with a new council will mean starting all over again. We live close to Marlborough and as such, council meetings are doable for our councillors not to mention the relationship forged over many years. The whole village is very upset about these proposed changes. There is no gain to this move, losses only.
J9	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	Our Parish Council has built up good relationships with the Marlborough Council, we are much nearer to Marlborough than to Pewsey and this looks like 'Fiddling while Rome burns' to me.
J10	24/09/20	Resident	Disagree	It would make far more sense for Froxfield to continue to be aligned with Marlborough
J11	29/09/20	Resident	Disagree	I see no reason to change what is already working well

J12	01/10/20	Resident	Disagree	having lived in Froxfield for over 40 years, I see no reason for the change. Its just another silly decision . We are with Marlborough and that's where we shold be. Our parish councillors and resident's do not want this..
J13	01/10/20	Resident	Disagree	Froxfield has enough trouble getting projects passed, to have change area etc would cause massive problems administratively, pleas leave us alone as we are.
J14	14/10/20	Resident	Agree	I consider this is the best and most efficient way to meet the needs of the parishes within the board area.
J15	14/10/20	Representative	Agree	The current AB functions well and these proposals should not affect its efficiency
J16	15/10/20	Resident	Disagree	I am not convinced these are the best ideas
J17	16/10/20	Representative	Amendment	P.52 Pewsey Area board Section/Parishes List - Conock hamlet sits along with Chirton Village as a PC in Pewsey Vale Division. The Geographic Area shows Conock, however it is not Listed N.B CONOCK Should be Listed or as part of Chirton & Conock PC

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
K1	10/09/20	Resident	Agree	It seems to be the same as at present
K2	10/09/20	Representative	Agree	Logical progression to uniformity
K3	10/09/20	Representative	Agree	The only real change is the additiion of Broad Hinton and Winterbourne Bassett PC, which has been included in the Lyneham Division. The Division cannot be split so it is the only realistic option
K4	11/09/20	Resident	Agree	It doesn't seem to have changed
K5	23/10/20	Representative	Disagree	On two different occasions the Parish Council of Broad Hinton and Winterbourne Bassett spoke firmly against leaving West Selkley are to join Lyneham. In each case our representations were ignored. This arera has so much more in common with West Selkley and we request that this decision is revisited and changed.

# Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

## Salisbury

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
L1				

No comments were received on the proposals



## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### South East Wiltshire (Southern)

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
M1	10/09/20	Representative	Agree	
M2	10/09/20	Resident	Agree	
M3	11/09/20	Representative	Agree	
M4	01/10/20	Resident	Agree	I know there is some concern in Porton and Idmiston concerning a move from the Amesbury area board. Renaming the area board the South East Area Board may soften these concerns as a move to a new area board, rather than just being lumped in with the Southern Area Board.
M5	02/10/20	Resident	Agree	
M6	02/10/20	Representative	Agree	There is a need to redefine the boundaries, one comment received that Newton Tony is quite far out and may feel a little isolated
M7	03/10/20	Resident	Agree	It seems a sensible area
M8	11/10/20	Resident	Disagree	Would prefer to retain the title Southern Area Board as more reflective of the geography of this area
M9	13/10/20	Representative	Agree	That the whole Civil Parish of Laverstock and Ford will be in one Area Board instead of being split between two Area Boards.
M10	21/10/20	Representative	Agree	Makes sense to reflect the new Electoral Division Boundaries, although the geographic size of the SE Area Board is now reaching the limits of what may be defined as 'local.'
M11	27/10/20	Resident	Agree	
M12	29/10/20	Representative	Agree	Full council[Pitton and Farley]in agreement with proposal
M13	30/10/20	Representative	Agree	There is no change for Britford so happy to stay as is.

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### South West Wiltshire

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
N1	11/09/20	Representative	Agree	
N2	17/09/20	Resident	Disagree	South Newton has much stronger links/closer affiliation with Wilton than Amesbury
N3	28/09/20	Representative	Amendment	The JSA stats for Wilton Area suggest a far more urban characteristic than the very rural south west
N4	20/10/20	Representative	Agree	The proposal is in-line with what was asked for by the Parish Council.

N5	31/10/20	Representative	Agree	<p>Steeple Langford Parish Council can find no reason to object: However; 1. We are disappointed that after the first review - when we were to rebrigaded from Till and Wyle Valley to Warminster (which we did not object to), that a second change was not directly communicated to us by Wiltshire council in a timely fashion; rather - the round robin plan was dispatched. This is poor in term of Wiltshire Councils relationship and stakeholder engagement with its Parish Councils. 2. Steeple Langford Parish is geographically in the Wylve Valley and naturally faces either Wilton/Salisbury or Warminster; it is physically dislocated from the Nadder Valley group - separated by the Great Ridge/Groveley Wood feature. Not insurmounatble - but the Parish is unarguably 'the other side of the hill'. 3. We have gone to great lengths to foster close and effective working relationships with our current Parish Steward; we would wish t keep taht alignment. 4. We would seek reassurance that Area Board funding which we might bid upon remains proportionate and that we are not disadvantaged. 5. We would expect Nader Valley and South West Wiltshire Area Board to proactively integrate Steeple Langford PArish Council. 6. We recommend and expect that Wiltshire Council will correspond directly with Steeple Langford Parish Council on any further proposed changes and as this review progresses. As we appear to being used a regulator and regrouped with little direct proactive and bilateral consultation we should be explicitly consulted in the future and not simply be on a list in Wiltshire wide note and expected to identify further changes by wading through detail.</p>
----	----------	----------------	-------	---

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Tidworth

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
O1	09/09/20	Representative	Agree	
O2	11/09/20	Resident	Agree	
O3	11/09/20	Resident	Agree	I think it evens out the population in each area
O4	23/09/20	Resident	Agree	
O5	17/10/20	Resident	Disagree	I feel that the Ludgershall North & Rural is too large an area to be managed by one Councillor.
O6	20/10/20	Representative	Agree	The revised Tidworth Area Board is the natural community area with Netheravon and Enford returning to their natural home of Amesbury Community Area. The arrangement with Pewsey has worked well and adding Marlborough will mean each of the tree areas will keep their own Area Boards for their unique community areas.
O7	21/10/20	Representative	Agree	At last night's Engagements Meeting Cllr G Paine motioned the need for another Wiltshire Councillor, as Tidworth will be split into 2 areas, Tidworth North and East, and Tidworth South and West. With the ever increasing population in the area, there is too much responsibility for one Councillor. A 2nd Wiltshire Councillor was proposed by Cllr D Wright, seconded by Cllr E Stead, Cllr M Connolly abstained, carried.
O8	29/10/20	Representative	Agree	The Council agrees with the proposal Tidworth Area Board be made up of three members (Tidworth North and West, Tidworth East and Ludgershall South and Ludgershall North and Rural. The Council also supports the proposal that the Tidworth, Pewsey and Marlborough Area Boards operate a substitute arrangement between them.
O9	30/10/20	Representative	Agree	A sensible rebalancing of the structure and organisation of the Tidworth Area Board.

# Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

Trowbridge

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
P1				

No comments were received on the proposals

## Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses

### Warminster

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
Q1	10/09/20	Representative	Agree	It includes all the villages that circle Warminster Town and use the towns facilities
Q2	15/10/20	Resident	Agree	The village has good links with Warminster and there is no need to change
Q3	27/10/20	Representative	Agree	There would be no effect on the parish of Upper Deverills (Brixton, Monkton and Kingston Deverill)

**Appendix B - Online Consultation Responses**

**Westbury**

Ref	Date Received	Sender	Agree/Disagree	Comments
R1	05/10/20	Resident	Agree	
R2	24/10/20	Representative	Agree	No Change