

Appendix 1

Cllr Clark

Why not just fix wards that are above / below 10% variance?

Unfortunately, this is not possible. This has a knock on effect on other areas, as to make a wrong area right, you have to give or take from another area – this then puts that area out and so on. (Response to Cllr Conley's comment provides an example of this)

Cllr Bower

Against rural / urban mix,

Re: Corsley & Upton Scudamore with Warminster West.

Unfortunately there is no option on this as it will effect other areas (Response to Cllr Conley's comment provides an example of this)

Upton Scudamore Parish Council

Re: Corsley, Upton Scudamore, Dilton Marsh & Chapmanslade.

Upton Scudamore

Wanted Map 1, which keeps them rural with Dilton Marsh & Chapmanslade.

Against rural / urban mix

(No responses received from Corsley, Dilton Marsh, Chapmanslade Parishes.)

Unable to do this (see Cllr Conley response below)

Cllr Conley

Requested Dilton Marsh, Chapmanslade & Upton Scudamore together (As per maps 1 & 2) as "makes good local sense and preserves local identities".

We were unable to do this because:

Adding Dilton Marsh, Chapmanslade & Upton Scudamore	= 2360	9%
Corsley into Shearwater	= 2670	20%
Move Bishopstrow & Norton Bavant into Mid Wylde.		
Shearwater then becomes	= 2455	13%
Mid Wyle Valley is then	= 2317	8%

This would make all variances very high – with Shearwater being over 10%.

Cllr Fortescue : Supported by Steeple Ashton, West Ashton, Semington, Bulkington.

Rural areas of Bulkington, Keevil, Steeple Ashton, West Ashton, Great Hinton & Semington ALL have strong links, i.e. same Vicar, parish magazine.

It was felt that Hilpertton and Staverton had fewer links to the above parishes.

We reviewed this area and we were able to amend to suit this with the exception of Southwick – which had to be added to Trowbridge to make the numbers work. (Please note that NO comments have been received from Southwick Parish Council regarding any of the proposals at this time). This is Option B of the 48 Councillor proposal.

Additional Comments from West Ashton

Wanted:

Bulkington, Keevil, Steeple Ashton, West Ashton, Great Hinton, Semington, North Bradley & Southwick together. This comes to 5733 projected electorate, which would give a variance of -12% with 3 Councillors and 25% with 2 Councillors.

Unfortunately, as the variance needs to be less than 10% or above -10%, neither 2 or 3 Councillors would work.

Also suggested:

Westwood & Wingfield be placed in the same ward.

This had already been done in all three proposals.

Hilpertton & Staverton to be put in with Trowbridge.

Option B for 48 Councillors allows Hilpertton, Staverton and Holt to remain as one ward without including them in with Trowbridge

Heywood Parish Council (Chairman's Response)

Although a warded parish is not ideal, it is felt the 48-option is better but would like Heywood to be brought back in as one parish again if possible.

This was looked at and is possible. It would put the variance at 12%, but would be a good argument to put to the Boundary Committee so this has been included in the Option B proposal.

Cllr Osborn

Against rural/urban mix. Can't see that including North Bradley and/or Southwick in with a Trowbridge urban area would work for either side.

This will be addressed at Full Council Meeting 14th September where Councillors will choose between Option A and B on the 48 Councillor Proposals.

Cllrs Manasseh, Oakman & Cox

Single member wards for Westbury & Melksham (5 Councillors for each District).

This will be addressed at Full Council Meeting 14th September when Councillors decide on single or multi member wards

General Parish/Town Council Comments

Most parishes would "prefer" a council size of 44 but felt that the 48 option best-suited needs to avoid rural/urban mix

Bradford on Avon Council

District wards must relate to the Town and Parish wards where possible. It would be difficult for BOA District Councillors to represent mixed town and small parish interests, which may sometimes, conflict.

Westbury Town Council

Due to timescale, unable to get collective view from Council as whole but recommendation is for single member wards for Westbury.

Codford

Satisfied with existing parishes that it currently identifies with.

Upton Lovell

Would prefer to maintain current status quo and not be included in with any urban areas.

Comments from Councillors after 19th August deadline

Cllr Mudge

Melksham Parish and Town Councils are very different. Melksham Parish Council has qualified as a Super Parish Council and would hate to lose their special identity.

Against combining town and rural. Expansion is likely to be towards Devizes so Bowerhill should not be merged with Melksham town.

Cllr Cunliffe-Jones

Manor Vale would be bigger (geographically) – drawback of rural wards is a widely scattered population. Against rural and urban mixes as the needs of villages and towns are different.

Cllr Rosier

Preferred community identity areas as it put right some of the things that were wrong at the last review. Heywood is now part of Westbury and North Bradley and Hilperton part of Trowbridge.

Cllrs Clegg

Would prefer 5 Councillors in Westbury but keep it as per the existing two wards. To have 3 Councillors for Westbury Ham and 2 Councillors for Westbury Laverton. This would also work for the town council as they could have 7 Councillors for the Laverton ward and 9 Councillors for the Ham ward retaining the total of 16 Councillors.

This would cause the least disruption and would avoid any problems with Polling Stations.

Would like the ward boundaries to go behind houses rather than down the centre of a road.

This will be addressed at Full Council Meeting 14th September where single and multi-member wards are decided for the towns.

Comments received from Town and Parish Councils after 19th August deadline

Hilperton Parish Council

Against multi member wards of 3 to 4 Councillors as too large for active and accurate local representation. Also against urban and rural mix for the same reason.

This has already been addressed in Option B

Broughton Gifford Parish Council

Concerned that another review is being done. Horrified that a movement in the parish ward boundary could split the parish. Although thinks this will not happen, they would strongly object to their parish being warded.

We have only “warded” one parish which is Melksham Without and this is subject to agreement by Councillors at Full Council when they decide on single or multi member wards. All other Parishes have not been warded as so many people were against this option.

Sherrington Parish Council

No strong feelings but would prefer to keep rural and urban separate.

Edington Parish Council

No time for Council to meet but Chairman feels Parish's view would be that none of proposals make any great difference to the present arrangements for Edington.

Mary Jarvis (Broughton Gifford Parish Councillor)

Broughton Gifford has far more affinity with Holt than Melksham. Needs to be one district councillor to serve a ward of Broughton Gifford and Holt.

Holt and Broughton Gifford are combined as regards to C of E churches and parish and they work together for youth projects etc.

Would otherwise prefer comments made by Melksham Without parish Council but with one councillor for a district combined with Berryfield and not 2 Councillors for one huge rural area.

Melksham Without Parish Council

General need for better parishing in Melksham Without. Concerned to see the Melksham Community area boundary retained i.e. there should not be a district ward straddled across two community areas.

Propose that Bowerhill be included with the Spa as greater affinity community wise.

The new Snarlton (including the proposed development of 750 houses) could be warded so not to become part of town.

If these 2 wards were created they could be combined into one district ward with 2 councillors.

The remaining part of Bowerhill and Beanacre could be split to make one new parish out of Berryfield and one new Beanacre and Sandridge Ward.

Broughton Gifford could then be combined with the two new wards of Berryfield and Beanacre and Sandridge. Atworth and Shaw and Whitley ward could be combined.

Alternatively, the whole of the rural area for Melksham without (excluding Bowerhill) and the proposed new development could become one ward.

Also wish to comment that re-warding is long overdue and that Woodrow has never really integrated into town. Should be 5 wards for Melksham town with one district councillor for each and 3 town councillors for each.

Melksham Without – Beanacre and Bowerhill

Bowerhill to form a 2 member ward with the new development at Snarlton Lane.

The remainder of Beanacre and Bowerhill ward, together with Shaw and Whitley and also Atworth and Broughton Gifford to create a 2-member ward.

Create a new Berryfield ward and add Beanacre to the Shaw and Whitley ward. Increase number of parish councillors to 15 members to cater properly for existing settlements and projected developments.

This will be addressed at Full Council Meeting 14th September where single and multi-member wards are decided for the towns and Melksham Without

