

**IMPLEMENTATION EXECUTIVE
16 MARCH 2009**

AREA BOARD DEVELOPMENT PHASE: INTERIM REPORT
AREA BOARD BOUNDARIES AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES**Executive Summary**

The Area Board development phase is now drawing to a close and the Area Boards Development Team is mid-way through the task of evaluating the results. The project is progressing in accordance with the original timescales adopted by the Implementation Executive (IE) and it is anticipated that the final report will come before members in April. The purpose of this report is to seek early approval of the area board boundaries and associated matters. It is important that early decisions are made on these issues for two reasons: firstly, the need to formalise funding arrangements with the community area partnerships from 1st April and secondly, to expedite Wiltshire Constabulary's structural reorganisation. Finally, the report sets out recommendations regarding the Funding Agreement with the Community Area Partnerships and arrangements for the Partnerships to draw down core funding from 1st April 2009.

Recommendations:

- 1) That the Implementation Executive selects its preferred option for the Pewsey/Tidworth Area Board boundaries from the Options listed at Para.10 below (See options maps at Appendix 1b-1f).
- 2) That a single Area Board be created to serve the Mere, Tisbury and Wilton community areas as set out in the map attached as Appendix 1a.
- 3) That the Area Boards and community area boundaries be confirmed as set out in the map attached as Appendix 1a (amended in the light of the outcome of 1) and 2) above) and the Schedule attached as Appendix 2 and that these areas be only amended in future in the light of any subsequent periodic governance reviews that may be required.
- 4) That the names of the Area Boards be as set out in the Schedule attached as Appendix 2.
- 5) That the request to divide the Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area into two separate community partnership areas be not accepted at this stage and that the Community Area Partnership be encouraged to adopt the approach set out in paragraph 6 below.

- 6) That for representational and administrative purposes, each parish and town council be allocated a seat on the same Area Board as their elected unitary councillor.
- 7) That the Area Boards Handbook and the Community Area Partnership Agreement be drafted to ensure that parish and town councils (and other local organisations and individuals) are free to attend and participate in meetings, activities and events of neighbouring Boards and Partnerships where they so wish.
- 8) That the Community Area Partnership Agreement (as set out in Appendix 3) be approved
- 9) That offer letters be sent to each Community Area Partnership confirming their core funding together with the terms of the Community Area Partnership Agreement and notification of arrangement for drawing down this funding from 1st April 2009 (as attached at Appendix 4).
- 10) That the Pilot Area Boards be discontinued before 28th April to respect the political embargo leading up to the council elections and in order that the Area Boards Development Team can concentrate on implementation arrangements.

Reason for Proposal

These proposals seek to establish the boundaries of the Wiltshire Area Boards and resolve associated administrative matters prior to the commencement of Wiltshire Council on 1 April 2009

Author: Steve Milton, Team Leader Area Boards Development Phase

Contact Details: Tel: 01722 434255 Email: stevemilton@wiltshire.gov.uk

AREA BOARD DEVELOPMENT PHASE **INTERIM REPORT: AREA BOUNDARIES**

Purpose of Report

1. The Area Board development phase is now drawing to a close and the Area Boards Development Team has finished its initial evaluation of the results. The project is progressing in accordance with the original timescales adopted by the Implementation Executive (IE) and it is anticipated that the final report will come before members on 22 April. The purpose of this report is to seek early approval of the area board boundaries and associated matters. It is important that early decisions are made on these issues for two reasons: firstly, the need to formalise funding arrangements with the community area partnerships from 1st April and secondly, to expedite Wiltshire Constabulary's structural reorganisation. The report also sets out recommendations regarding the grant arrangements with the Community Area Partnerships and the process by which the Partnerships may draw down core funding from 1st April 2009. Finally, the report looks at the remaining stages of the project and recommends that the Pilot phase is now closed so that political restrictions leading up to the elections can be observed and the Area Boards Development Team can focus on delivering the implementation arrangements.

Background

2. The IE has previously agreed that the Area Boards Development phase should include a 'once and for all' review of the community area boundaries, seeking where possible to minimise changes to the existing community areas that have served Wiltshire well for over 10 years. The Team was also asked to achieve area boards with a minimum of four members and resist the fragmentation of electoral divisions between areas or the detachment of individual parishes. These views were supported by the Area Boards Scrutiny Review Group and have informed this report.
3. Informal consultation on the Area Board boundaries began in September 2008 – this involved discussions initiated by the Pilot Area Boards and soundings taken by the Area Boards Development Team in areas most likely to be affected (areas where electoral divisions did not align with the existing community areas). These soundings indicated that in most parts of Wiltshire, boundary changes would be relatively straightforward. However, it did highlight areas where a simple solution would not be so easy – Pewsey and Tidworth and, to a lesser degree, the Mere, Tisbury and Wilton area. Based on these informal soundings, the Area Boards Team undertook a full scale consultation exercise with county and district councillors, parish and town councils and other stakeholders between 20 December 2008 and 28 February 2009. The consultation paper contained a map setting out proposed boundaries and drew attention to specific questions in Pewsey/Tidworth and the Mere, Tisbury and Wilton areas. A total of 106 written responses were received (a summary of the

responses can be found at Appendix 5) and these responses have informed this report and the recommendations.

Main Considerations for the Implementation Executive

4. The consultation has highlighted a number of issues that require a formal response. Some of these are of a general nature, others are more specific.

5. **Parish Alignment**

Looking first at the general issues, several parishes have questioned their sense of connection with a particular community area. It is recognised that parishes located on or close to a boundary can have a strong connection with a neighbouring area. Some may even have an out-of-county focus. The Area Boards Development Team recognises this and proposes a pragmatic solution. It is considered that parish councils should be given some flexibility to align themselves to community areas in a way that best matches their local sense of community identity. It is proposed that all parishes should be allocated a formal seat on the same Area Board as their elected unitary representative, but be free to attend neighbouring Boards and Area Partnerships to promote the interests of their local residents. This can be expedited through the local community area networks that will emerge – local parishes (and other groups and individuals) will be able to sign up for notification of meetings, events and activities in any areas and encouraged to attend and speak at those meetings. In this way a parish may have a strong relationship with two or more boards. It is proposed that the same arrangement is put in place for community area partnerships, and this is now reflected in the draft Community Area Partnership Agreement (attached as Appendix 3).

6. **Community Areas**

A request has been received to divide the existing Wootton Bassett and Cricklade community area into two new areas – with each allocated funding in accordance with the previously adopted funding formula. The Area Boards Team has considered this issue very carefully because of the precedent that could be set and because smaller community areas might start to replicate the role of the Town and Parish councils. However, in the Wootton Bassett and Cricklade area the two towns have a very distinct identity and associated parish hinterland. The Team considers that these separate identities could be reflected within a single community area by establishing Town-centred theme groups and reflecting the priorities of both within a single community plan – this may develop a more collaborative approach than forming two separate and potentially competing partnerships.

7. The other potential problem of splitting partnerships is the question of funding. At present the IE has made it clear that no more than 20% of the discretionary funding delegated to areas boards should be used to support the running costs of the Community Area Partnerships. In Wootton Bassett and Cricklade this would mean each Partnership sharing around £10,000. The Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Pilot Board

recognised this as a problem and as a consequence asked that the IE double the amount of funding for the area - by either redistributing the existing funds or increasing the discretionary budget to £2m across Wiltshire. Once agreed, it is recommended that the area boundaries be retained and only amended in conjunction with periodic electoral (governance) reviews – this will provide operational stability for the Police, PCT, Fire and Rescue Service and the new Council's frontline services who are reorganising services to operate coterminously with the community areas.

8. **Pewsey and Tidworth Area**

The Pewsey and Tidworth area has faced a challenge. Due to the lack of unitary councillors under the Boundary Committee's new electoral areas, the two community areas cannot achieve the minimum number of councillors to justify the creation of two area boards (IE and Overview and Scrutiny having both originally stipulated a minimum of 4 members). Extensive consultation has been undertaken in the area including a workshop at which a range of 8 options were considered and a subsequent meeting in Devizes on 28 February where the outcome of the consultation was discussed again. Both of the Pilot Boards and both of the Community Area Partnerships and the majority of parishes in the area feel very strongly that two separate Boards should be created and there is local support for a solution of two three-member boards. The Joint Overview and Scrutiny Transition Board considered this option on 28 February and agreed that in this area three-member boards should be trialled for a period of one year provided a minimum of three unitary councillors are present at each meeting.

9. In another related development, all but one (Shalbourne PC) of the parishes in the Burbage and the Bedwyns Electoral Division have requested that they be realigned with the Pewsey area (previously these parishes were within the Marlborough Community Area).

10. The main options that have emerged from the consultation would seem to be:

- **Option 1:** A single 6-member Board for Pewsey and Tidworth (comprising of Pewsey Vale; Pewsey; Burbage & The Bedwyns; Ludgershall & Perham Down; Tidworth; The Collingbournes & Netheravon) (Appendix 1b).
- **Option 2:** A 4-member Board for Pewsey (including Burbage and the Bedwyns Electoral Division) and the allocation of Tidworth and Ludgershall to the Amesbury Area Board. (Appendix 1c)
- **Option 3:** A 4-member Board for Pewsey and a revised 4 member Tidworth Board (comprising the Tidworth, Ludgershall, Bulford, Allington & Figheldean and Durrington Electoral Divisions). (Appendix 1d)

- **Option 4:** A 3-member Board for Pewsey (comprising Pewsey, Pewsey Vale and Burbage and the Bedwyns Electoral Divisions) and a 3-Member Board for Tidworth (comprising the Tidworth, Ludgershall and Collingbourne and Netheravon Electoral Divisions) – subject to the legal arrangements described in Para 13 below (Appendix 1e)
 - **Option 5:** A single 5 member Board for Tidworth and Pewsey with Burbage and the Bedwyns retained in the Marlborough Community Area. (Appendix 1f)
11. Each of the options has its own strengths and weaknesses. Option 1 would create a viable board with a significant budget and enough members to be robust. However, it would require the enlargement of the existing Pewsey Community Area Partnership. Option 2 preserves a viable Board in the Pewsey area and brings together the military areas around Tidworth, Bulford, Durrington and Amesbury. Option 3 is a compromise solution that seeks to create a new 4 member Tidworth Area Board encompassing the main MOD bases. Option 4 creates two 3-member Area Boards for Tidworth and Pewsey and although this does not meet the guideline set by the IE, the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Transition Board considers that it may be acceptable for a trial period. Option 5 has the benefits of option 1 without any change to the parishes within the Pewsey and Tidworth Community Area Partnerships and has no impact on the existing Marlborough Community Area.
 12. Options 2 and 3 are resisted by the Tidworth Pilot Board, the Community Area Partnership, local parishes and the MOD all of whom share the view that these options would create a Board too heavily dominated by military issues. Option 3 was also opposed by the Amesbury Pilot Board, the Bourne Valley Alliance of Parishes and Durrington Town Council. Option 5 is opposed by the majority of parishes within the Burbage and Bedwyns Electoral Division, although Shalbourne PC is strongly opposed to joining the Pewsey area. Only option 3 has received a significant level of local support (see Appendix 5). This option would preserve the existing partnerships (with some significant amendments) but would fall short of the 4 members originally stipulated by the IE.
 13. The question remains, is Option 4 a viable option with only 3 members on each Board? Joint Overview and Scrutiny Transition Board feels that provided the 3 unitary councillors are in attendance at each meeting, this would be acceptable. With careful meeting planning this should be achievable, except in the case of unforeseen illness or other unavoidable absence. To overcome this problem, it is suggested that if this option is preferred the Tidworth and Pewsey Area Boards will require a special administrative arrangement – to enable a member from either Board to attend and vote in the case of any member being unable to attend (due notice will be required). For legal purposes, this would mean that Pewsey and Tidworth would be constituted as a single Area Committee with two sub-committees (the two Boards) comprising the three members from the respective areas, each with three named deputies – drawn from the Neighbouring Board.

14. **Area Board Boundaries**

In the light of the above and subject to the identification of a preferred option for the Pewsey/Tidworth area, it is now recommended that the Area Boards boundaries be confirmed as set out in the map attached as Appendix 1a and the schedule attached as Appendix 2. It is further recommended that the names of the Area Boards be as set out in the Schedule (Appendix 2).

15. **Area Board Pilot Phase**

The Area Boards Development Team has now concluded its initial evaluation of the pilot phase. A full report will be produced bringing together the conclusions and recommendations from 13 Pilots Boards which will be available to the IE before 22 April. This final report will inform the Area Boards Handbook and necessary constitutional arrangements. Once complete, the Area Boards Development Team will need to proceed quickly with implementation arrangements in order to be ready for the first Board meetings towards the end of June. Some of the Pilot areas have enquired whether they can continue beyond April but it is considered that this will not be possible for two reasons; first, the Team will need to devote all of its resources to the implementation of the new system and secondly, the period of restricted political activity in the run-up to the elections which begins on 28 April. A further meeting of the Pilot Area Chairs will be organised to consider the final evaluation report.

16. The activities that need to be implemented between March and June is set out in summary below:

Area Boards: Implementation

<i>Ongoing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Establishment of Community Area Partnerships in South Wiltshire- Support for existing Community Area Partnerships through transition- Review of community planning processes county-wide- Preparation of Members' Induction and Training Programme
<i>1 March - 1 May</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Recruitment and induction of Community Governance Team (CGT)
<i>1 April - 6 June:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Training and development of the ABT, including orientation training with frontline services and partners agencies.
<i>22 April:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Consideration of the Pilot Area Boards Evaluation report
<i>22 April – 6 June</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Production of written materials, grants forms, posters, summary leaflets, etc.- Procurement of equipment and training of technical support staff.- Development of community area networks.
<i>6 June – 20 June</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Training of Chairs and new members including inaugural Area Chairs meeting.- Preparation of inaugural meeting agendas- Publicity and promotion.- Preparation of Area Boards' future work programmes.

17. Area Board Meeting Dates

Appendix 6 sets out the provisional dates for Area Board meetings from the end of June 2009 to March 2010. It is proposed that Area Boards should meet every 6 weeks with possibly one or two special meetings during the year if required. The frequency of these meetings will enable Democratic Services and the Community Area Managers to provide the necessary logistics and support. It is felt that if meetings are held more regularly there will be little time in between to tackle some of the local issues and priorities that Area Boards will be dealing with. It is also likely that there will be at least two Community Area events that Area Boards will be hosting, or involved in, which will add extra dates to the diaries but will be best agreed with partners in the Community areas.

18. Community Area Partnership Agreements (CAPA)

The IE has previously agreed the arrangements for calculating and distributing funding to community areas and has stated that no more than 20% of this funding should be used as a grant to support the core operating costs of the Community Area Partnerships (although the CAP can apply for funds for specific projects – including community planning activities). In order to formalise this arrangement and to restate the respective commitments, roles and responsibilities of Partnerships and the new Council, a draft CAPA was produced. Importantly, the CAPA restates the Council's commitment to the continuation and development of local partnerships across the County. The CAPA has been considered by Pilot Boards, Community Area Partnerships, by Scrutiny and the Wiltshire Forum of Community Area Partnerships (WFCAP). Generally it has been well received. Following this consultation, a revised CAPA is now submitted for approval (Appendix 3), together with arrangements for drawing down this core funding (Appendix 4).

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

19. The decentralisation of decision making and community governance arrangements is in accordance with the aims of the Sustainable Communities Strategy for Wiltshire 2007-2016.

Equality and Diversity Impact of the Proposal

20. The decentralisation of decision making and the new community governance arrangements in Wiltshire are aimed to improve access to the Council, its services and the democratic process. Further proposals that will be brought to the IE in April will set out how the area governance arrangements will tackle specific problems associated with social inclusion, equality and diversity.

Risk Assessment

21. This report addresses the project risks set out in the Project Initiation Document adopted by the Community Leadership and Governance Steering Group as part of the overarching One Council Programme. In particular it addresses the reputation risk associated with the failure to

deliver robust and effective area governance proposals as set out in the unitary bid.

Financial Implications

22. There are no budget implications associated with this report. The IE has previously agreed the funding arrangements for the area governance proposals.

Legal Implications

23. This report seeks to achieve the aims of the One Council Programme; future reports will cover constitutional and ethical governance arrangements.

Options Considered

24. Options are set out in this paper for consideration

Conclusion

25. The adoption of the recommendations set out in this report will represent a significant step towards achieving the community governance proposals set out in the bid for unitary status.

Background Papers

Responses to the consultation exercise are available for inspection upon request from the Service Director for Community Leadership and Governance.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Maps Showing the Proposed Area Board Boundaries (five options)
- Appendix 2: Schedule showing Electoral Divisions and Parishes allocated to new Board Areas (five options)
- Appendix 3: Community Area Partnership Agreement 2009/2010
- Appendix 4: Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire's Community Area Partnerships – Funding and Monitoring Arrangements 2009/10
- Appendix 5: Summary of Consultation Responses
- Appendix 6: Schedule of Area Board Meetings 2009/2010

Appendix 2: Area Boards: Electoral Division and Parish Allocations

Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Area Board

Electoral Divisions 6

Cricklade and Latton ED
Purton ED
Wootton Bassett East ED
Wootton Bassett North ED
Wootton Bassett South ED
Lyneham ED

Parishes

Lyneham and Bradenstoke CP
Wootton Bassett CP

Lydiard Tregoze CP
Lydiard Millicent CP
Purton CP
Marston Maisey CP
Clyffe Pypard CP
Broad Town CP
Braydon CP
Cricklade CP
Latton CP
Tockenham CP

Malmesbury Area Board

Electoral Divisions 4

Minety ED
Brinkworth ED
Mlamesbury ED
Sherston ED

Parishes

Ashton Keynes CP
Brinkworth CP
Brokenborough CP
Charlton CP
Crudwell CP
Dauntsey CP
Easton Grey CP

Great Somerford CP
Hankerton CP
Lea and Cleverton CP
Leigh CP
Little Somerford CP
Luckington CP
Malmesbury CP
Minety CP
Norton CP
Oaksey CP
Sherston CP
Sopworth CP
St. Paul Malmesbury without CP

Chippenham Area Board

Electoral Divisions 9

By Brook ED
Chippenham Cepen Park & Redlands ED
Chippenham Hardenhuish ED
Chippenham Monkton ED
Chippenham Queens Asheldon ED
Chippenham Hardens and England ED
Chippenham Lowdon and Rowden ED
Chippenham Pewsham ED
Kington ED

Parishes

Grittleton CP
Biddestone CP

North Wraxall CP
Chippenham CP
Chippenham without CP
Langley Burrell without CP
Nettleton CP
Castle Combe CP
Kington St. Michael CP
Kington Langley CP
Stanton St. Quintin CP
Hullavington CP
Sutton Benger CP
Seagry CP
Yatton Keynell CP
Christian Malford CP

Corsham Area Board

Electoral Divisions

Box and Colerne ED
Corsham without & Box Hill
Corsham Pickwick and Rudloe ED
Corsham Town ED

Parishes

Box CP
Corsham CP
Colerne CP
Lacock CP

Calne Area Board

Electoral Divisions 5

Calne Rural ED
Calne North ED
Calne Chilvester & Abberd ED
Calne Central ED
Calne South & Cherhill ED

Parishes

Calne without CP
Bremhill CP
Hilmarton CP
Heddington CP
Cherhill CP
Compton Bassett CP
Calne CP

Melksham Area Board

Electoral Divisions 5

Melksham without North ED
Melksham without South ED
Melksham North ED
Melksham Central ED
Melksham South ED

Parishes

Melksham without CP
Atworth CP
Broughton Gifford CP
Melksham CP

Bradford on Avon Area Board

Electoral Divisions 4

Holt & Staverton ED
Winsley & Westwood ED
Bradford on Avon North ED
Bradford on Avon South ED

Parishes

Limpley Stoke CP

Winsley CP
Monkton Farleigh CP
Bradford-on-Avon CP
Holt CP
South Wraxall CP
Wingfield CP
Westwood CP
Staverton CP

Trowbridge Area Board

Electoral Divisions 9

Hilperton ED
Trowbridge Addcroft ED
Trowbridge Lambrook ED
Trowbridge Central ED
Trowbridge Grove ED
Trowbridge Paxcroft ED
Trowbridge Park ED
Trowbridge Drynham ED
Summerham & Seend ED

Parishes

Bulkington CP
Great Hinton CP
Hilperton CP
Keevil CP
North Bradley CP
Poulshot CP
Seend CP
Semington CP
Southwick CP
Steeple Ashton CP
Trowbridge CP
West Ashton CP

Westbury Area Board

Electoral Divisions 4

Ethandune ED
Westbury East ED
Westbury North ED
Westbury West ED

Parishes

Edington CP
Dilton Marsh CP
Westbury CP
Bratton CP
Coulston CP Heywood CP

Warminster Area Board

Electoral Divisions 4

Warminster Broadway ED
Warminster East ED
Warminster West ED
Waminster without ED

Parishes

Bishopstrow CP
Boyton CP
Brixton Deverill CP
Chapmanslade CP
Chitterne CP
Codford CP
Corsley CP

Heytesbury CP
Horningsham CP
Kingston Deverill CP
Knook CP
Longbridge Deverill CP
Maiden Bradley with Yarnfield CP
Norton Bavant CP
Sherrington CP
Stockton CP
Sutton Veny CP
Upton Lovell CP
Upton Scudamore CP
Warminster CP

Devizes Area Board

Electoral Divisions 7

The Lavingtons & Erlestoke ED
Bromham, Rowde and Potterne ED
Urchfont & The Cannings ED
Roundway ED
Devizes East ED
Devizes North ED
Devizes & Roundway South ED

Parishes

All Canning CP
Bishops Cannings CP
Bromham CP
Cheverell Magna

Cheverell Parva
Devizes CP
Easterton CP
Erlestoke CP
Etchilhampton CP
Market Lavington CP
Marston CP
Pottern CP
Rowde CP
Stert CP
Urchfont CP
West Lavington CP
Worton CP

Marlborough Area Board (Option 5)

Electoral Divisions 5

Aldbourn & Ramsbury ED
Burbage & The Bedwyns
Marlborough East ED
Marlborough West ED
West Selkley ED

Parishes

Aldbourn CP
Avebury CP
Baydon CP
Berwick Bassett CP
Broad Hinton CP
Burbage CP
Buttermere CP
Chilton Foliat CP
East Kennett CP

Froxfield CP
Fyfield CP
Grafton CP
Great Bedwyn CP
Ham CP
Little Bedwyn CP
Marlborough CP
Mildenhall CP
Ogbourne St. Andrew CP
Ogbourne St. George CP
Preshute CP
Ramsbury CP
Savernake CP
Shalbourne CP
West Overton CP
Winterbourne Bassett CP
Winterbourne Monkton CP

Marlborough Area Board (Options 1 - 4)

Electoral Divisions 4

Aldbourn & Ramsbury ED
Marlborough East ED
Marlborough West ED
West Selkley ED

Parishes

Aldbourn CP
Avebury CP
Baydon CP
Berwick Bassett CP
Broad Hinton CP
Chilton Foliat CP

East Kennett CP
Froxfield CP
Fyfield CP
Marlborough CP
Mildenhall CP
Ogbourne St. Andrew CP
Ogbourne St. George CP
Preshute CP
Ramsbury CP
Savernake CP
West Overton CP
Winterbourne Bassett CP
Winterbourne Monkton CP

Pewsey Area Board (Option 2)

Electoral Divisions 4

Pewsey Vale ED
Pewsey ED
Burbage & The Bedwyns ED
The Collingbournes & Netheravon ED

Parishes

Alton CP
Beechingstoke CP
Charlton CP
Chirton CP
Easton CP
Huish CP
Manningford CP
Marden CP
Milton Lilbourne CP
North Newnton CP
Patney CP
Pewsey CP
Rushall CP
Stanton St. Bernard CP

Upavon CP
Wilcot CP
Wilsford CP
Woodborough CP
Wootton Rivers CP
Burbage CP*
Buttermere CP*
Grafton CP*
Ham CP*
Great Bedwyn CP*
Little Bedwyn CP*
Shalbourne CP*
Netheravon CP**
Enford CP**
Fitleton CP**
Everleigh**
Collingbourn Kington CP**
Collingbourn Ducis CP**
Tidcombe and Fosbury**
Chute CP**
Chute Forest CP**

Pewsey Area Board (Option 4)

Electoral Divisions 3

Pewsey Vale ED
Pewsey ED
Burbage & The Bedwyns ED

Parishes

Alton CP
Beechingstoke CP
Charlton CP
Chirton CP
Easton CP
Huish CP
Manningford CP
Marden CP
Milton Lilbourne CP
North Newnton CP

Patney CP
Pewsey CP
Rushall CP
Stanton St. Bernard CP
Upavon CP
Wilcot CP
Wilsford CP
Woodborough CP
Wootton Rivers CP
Burbage CP*
Buttermere CP*
Grafton CP*
Ham CP*
Great Bedwyn CP*
Little Bedwyn CP*
Shalbourne CP*

Pewsey and Tidworth Area Board (Option 1)

Electoral Divisions

Pewsey Vale ED
Pewsey ED
Burbage & The Bedwyns ED
The Collingbournes & Netheravon ED
Tidworth ED
Ludgershall & Perham Down ED

Parishes

Alton CP
Beechingstoke CP
Charlton CP
Chirton CP
Easton CP
Huish CP
Manningford CP
Marden CP
Milton Lilbourne CP
North Newnton CP
Patney CP
Pewsey CP
Rushall CP
Stanton St. Bernard CP

Upavon CP
Wilcot CP
Wilsford CP
Woodborough CP
Wootton Rivers CP
Tidworth CP
Ludgershall CP
Burbage CP*
Buttermere CP*
Grafton CP*
Ham CP*
Great Bedwyn CP*
Little Bedwyn CP*
Shalbourne CP*
Netheravon CP**
Enford CP**
Fitleton CP**
Everleigh**
Collingbourne Kington CP**
Collingbourne Ducis CP**
Tidcombe and Fosbury**
Chute CP**
Chute Forest CP**

Pewsey and Tidworth Area Board (Option 5)

Electoral Divisions 5

Pewsey Vale ED
Pewsey ED
The Collingbournes & Netheravon ED
Tidworth ED
Ludgershall & Perham Down ED

Parishes

Alton CP
Beechingstoke CP
Charlton CP
Chirton CP
Easton CP
Huish CP
Manningford CP
Marden CP
Milton Lilbourne CP
North Newnton CP
Patney CP

Pewsey CP
Rushall CP
Stanton St. Bernard CP
Upavon CP
Wilcot CP
Wilsford CP
Woodborough CP
Wootton Rivers CP
Tidworth CP
Ludgershall CP
Netheravon CP
Enford CP
Fitleton CP
Everleigh
Collingbourne Kington CP
Collingbourne Ducis CP
Tidcombe and Fosbury
Chute CP
Chute Forest CP

Tidworth Area Board: Option 2

Electoral Divisions: 4

Tidworth ED
Ludgershall & Perham Down ED
Durrington & Larkhill ED
Bulford, Allington & Figheldean ED

Parishes

Chute CP
Chute Forest CP
Collingbourne Ducis CP
Collingbourne Kingston CP
Enford CP
Everleigh CP

Fittleton CP
Ludgershall CP
Netheravon CP
Tidcombe and Fosbury CP
Tidworth CP
Allington CP+
Newton Tony CP+
Cholderton CP+
Bulford CP+
Milston CP+
Figheldean CP+
Durrington CP++

Tidworth Area Board (Option 4)

Electoral Divisions: 3

Tidworth ED
Ludgershall & Perham Down ED
Collingbournes & Netheravon ED

Parishes

Chute CP
Chute Forest CP
Collingbourne Ducis CP
Ludgershall CP

Collingbourne Kingston CP
Enford CP
Everleigh CP
Fittleton CP
Ludgershall CP
Netheravon CP
Tidcombe and Fosbury CP
Tidworth CP

Amesbury Area Board (Options 1,4 & 5)

Electoral Divisions 6

Amesbury East ED
Amesbury West ED
Till & Wylde Valley ED
Durrington & Larkhill ED
Bulford, Allington & Figheldean ED
Bourne & Woodford Valley ED

Parishes

Bulford
Allington CP
Amesbury CP
Berwick St. James CP
Bulford CP
Cholderton CP
Durnford CP

Durrington CP
Figheldean CP
Great Wishford CP
Idmiston CP
Milston CP
Newton Tony CP
Orcheston CP
Shrewton CP
Stapleford CP
Steeple Langford CP
Tilshead CP
Wilsford cum Lake CP
Winterbourne CP
Winterbourne Stoke CP
Woodford CP
Wylde CP

Amesbury Area Board (Option 2)

Electoral Divisions 8

Amesbury East ED
Amesbury West ED
Till & Wylie Valley ED
Durrington & Larkhill ED
Bulford, Allington & Figheldean ED
Bourne & Woodford Valley ED
Tidworth ED
Ludgershall & Perham Down ED

Parishes

Bulford
Allington CP
Amesbury CP
Berwick St. James CP
Bulford CP
Cholderton CP
Durnford CP

Durrington CP
Figheldean CP
Great Wishford CP
Idmiston CP
Milston CP
Newton Tony CP
Orcheston CP
Shrewton CP
Stapleford CP
Steeple Langford CP
Tilshead CP
Wilsford cum Lake CP
Winterbourne CP
Winterbourne Stoke CP
Woodford CP
Wylie CP
Tidworth CP~
Ludgershall CP~

Amesbury Area Board (Option 3)

Electoral Divisions 4

Amesbury East ED
Amesbury West ED
Till & Wylie Valley ED
Bourne & Woodford Valley ED

Parishes

Amesbury CP
Berwick St. James CP
Durnford CP
Great Wishford CP

Idmiston CP
Orcheston CP
Shrewton CP
Stapleford CP
Steeple Langford CP
Tilshead CP
Wilsford cum Lake CP
Winterbourne CP
Winterbourne Stoke CP
Woodford CP
Wylie CP

Salisbury Area Board

Electoral Divisions 8

Salisbury St Francis & Stratford ED
Salisbury Bemerton ED
Salisbury Fisherton & Bemerton Village ED
Salisbury St Paul's ED
Salisbury St Mark's & Bishopdown ED
Salisbury St Edmund & Milford ED

Salisbury St Martin's & Cathedral ED
Salisbury Harnham ED

Parish

Salisbury CP
(including part of Laverstock & Ford CP)

Southern Wiltshire Area Board

Electoral Divisions 5

Winterslow ED
Alderbury & Whiteparish ED
Redlynch & Landford ED
Downton & Ebble Valley ED
Laverstock & Ford ED

Parishes

Coombe Bissett CP
Downton CP
Britford CP

Redlynch CP
Odstock CP
Alderbury CP
Grimstead CP
West Dean CP
Clarendon Park CP
Pitton and Farley CP
Firsdown CP
Winterslow CP
Landford CP
Laverstock and Ford CP, Whiteparish CP

Mere, Tisbury and Wilton Area Board

Electoral Divisions 5

Mere ED
Nadder & East Knoyle ED
Tisbury ED
Fovant & Chalke Valley ED
Wilton & Lower Wylde ED

Parishes

Alvediston CP
Ansty CP
Barford St. Martin CP
Berwick St. John CP
Berwick St. Leonard CP
Bishopstone CP
Bower Chalke CP
Broad Chalke CP
Burcombe without CP
Chicklade CP
Chilmark CP
Compton Chamberlayne CP
Dinton CP
Donhead St. Andrew CP
Donhead St. Mary CP
East Knoyle CP
Ebbesborne Wake CP
Fonthill Bishop CP
Fonthill Gifford CP
Fovant CP
Hindon CP
Kilminster CP
Mere CP
Netherhampton CP
Quidhampton CP
Sedgehill and Semley CP
South Newton CP
Stourton with Gasper CP
Stratford Toney CP
Sutton Mandeville CP
Swallowcliffe CP
Teffont CP
Tisbury CP
Tollard Royal CP
West Knoyle CP
West Tisbury CP
Wilton CP
Zeals CP

Appendix 3: Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire's Community Area Partnerships – Community Area Partnership Agreement (CAPA) 2009/2010

1. Principles

- (1) Partnerships are independent and autonomous
- (2) Partnerships are inclusive of, and accountable to, the wider community
- (3) Partnerships have a voluntary relationship with the Council and public agencies
- (4) Partnerships form the foundation of strong, resilient, empowered communities
- (5) The existence of strong independent and inclusive partnerships is central to Wiltshire Council's community governance proposals

2. Desired Outcomes

- (1) Strong independent partnerships working to achieve the maturity (or similar development) model developed by WFCAP
- (2) Independently produced and influential community plan for each of Wiltshire's 20 community areas, produced to consistent and robust standards
- (3) Effective community representation at Area Boards
- (4) Effective communications and engagement network established in each community area
- (5) Partnerships effectively accessing inward investment to support local priorities
- (6) Area Boards and Partnerships collaborating effectively to deliver local action linked to community plan priorities
- (7) More local people actively engaged and participating in identifying and addressing local issues and solving local problems
- (8) Public funding and services focused more accurately on priority concerns
- (9) Partnerships influencing strategic policy and the Local Agreement for Wiltshire
- (10) Partnerships becoming an effective delivery vehicle for strategic outcomes

3. Commitments – Wiltshire Council

- (1) Wiltshire Council commits to consult, involve, engage, listen to and act on the advice of local partnerships
- (2) Wiltshire Council will provide financial, technical and professional support to Partnerships, including core funding, socio-economic profiles, external funding advice and service performance data...
- (3) Wiltshire Council will work with local partnerships, public agencies and the Wiltshire Forum of Community Area Partnerships to strengthen and enhance the role of partnerships in Wiltshire
- (4) Wiltshire Council will work with and support local partnerships to engage the community, highlight local issues and concerns and to identify and deliver actions to address those

concerns

- (5) Wiltshire Council will work with the Community Area Partnerships to establish and maintain effective communications networks within each community area
- (6) Wiltshire Council will support and work with Community Area Partnerships to develop influential community plans to consistent and robust standards.
- (7) Wiltshire Council will have regard to the priorities set out in community plans when planning and delivering its services, allocating resources and when negotiating with partners and national agencies.
- (8) Wiltshire Council will respect the independence of Partnerships.
- (9) Wiltshire Council will work with the Wiltshire Forum of Community Area Partnerships (WfCAP), attend its meetings to listen to its views and concerns and support it in developing mechanisms to monitor and improve the effectiveness of Community Area Partnerships.
- (10) Wiltshire Council will provide a seat for each Community Area Partnership on its local Area Board and invite WfCAP to attend meetings of the Area Board Chairs

4. Commitments - Community Area Partnerships

- (1) To establish and maintain a Partnership, Steering Group and Thematic Groups, as necessary
- (2) To engage and communicate systematically with all sections of the community and to maintain a contacts register of key organisations and volunteers.
- (3) To consult widely on a range of socio-economic issues including the holding of regular public engagement events and activities.
- (4) To prepare and regularly review an assessment or plan of the major economic, social and environmental issues facing the community area, together with an action plan for addressing the identified issues. This will help to shape and respond to the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Local Area Agreement for Wiltshire.
- (5) To work with the Community Area Manager to refer matters between the Partnership to the Area Board for consideration as appropriate.
- (6) To champion local issues and help with the project planning and delivery of priority projects, including fundraising and community volunteering where appropriate.
- (7) To contribute to the services and activities provided by the Wiltshire Forum of Community Area Partnerships, including attendance by members at relevant networking and training Events.
- (8) To engage a Project Officer/ Community Agent, as necessary, to run and administer the Partnership and to work with the Council's Community Area Manager for the area.
- (9) To be open to and inclusive of the wider community and to encourage attendance and participation by groups and organisations from neighbouring community areas where they may be affected by an issue.
- (10) To account to and seek affirmation from the wider community and the Area Board for its actions, activities and forward plans on an annual basis.

Appendix 4: Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire's Community Area Partnerships – Funding and Monitoring Arrangements 2009/10

Stage 1 – March 2009:	Offer letter issued to Community Area Partnership with details of core funding and grant conditions for 2009/10
Stage 2 – end April 2009:	Formal acceptance by Community Area Partnership of grant offer and conditions
Stage 3 – end April 2009:	Claim for first 4 months core funding at 33% of total agreed sum, payable on 1 st April upon receipt of outline details of CAP running costs*
Stage 4 – July 2009 onwards:	Claim for project costs** agreed by Area Board, payable upon receipt of Small Project Fund application
Stage 5 – September 2009:	Claim for second 8 months core funding at 66% of total agreed sum, payable on 1 st October upon receipt of 6 monthly progress monitoring report and consideration by the appropriate Area Board.
Stage 6 – February 2010:	Core Funding for 2010/11 agreed and notified to Community Area Partnership
Stage 7 – March 2010:	Claim for first 6 months core funding at 50% of total agreed sum, payable on 1 st April upon receipt of annual report on CAP activities for 2009/10
Financial Year 2010/11:	Review outcomes, modify and repeat process

(* Running costs to include essential costs of staff costs, partnership/ steering/ theme group meetings, refreshments, office costs, promotion and publicity, consumables etc.

** Project Costs to include consultation and research leading to the preparation or refresh of a Community Area Plan. Operational details of Small Projects Fund to be agreed.)

Appendix 5: Summary of Consultation Responses

Amesbury Area

1.	Bulford Parish Council	04/01/2009	Expressing preference to be represented on the Amesbury Area Board.	Only option 3 would see Bulford moved into the Tidworth area.
2.	Netheravon Parish Council	23/01/2009	Stating preference for parish to be in Amesbury CA or as a second choice a combined Pewsey and Tidworth Area Board or as third choice remaining in the Pewsey CA.	None of the options propose aligning Netheravon with Amesbury (although Para 5 and Proposal 2 address this question). Option 1 – 3 and 5 address the other preferences.
3.	Cllr John Noeken, SDC and WCC	30/01/2009	Various observations and suggestions regarding the Amesbury CA. Supports continuation of Amesbury CA but wishes to see a satisfactory outcome in Tidworth and Pewsey.	Noted
4.	Bourne Valley Alliance Parishes (2)	01/02/2009	Resisting the transfer of Bulford area to Tidworth and submitting correspondence between the Alliance and the Boundary Committee.	Only option 4 proposes changes. Electoral arrangements were not within the remit of this review.
5.	Cllr Alan Wood, KDC and Fittleton PC	02/02/2009	Questioning receipt of information from Wiltshire Democracy (Mr Alan Hill) and objecting to the content.	Replied 02/02/09 explaining that Wiltshire Democracy has no official role in the review other than as a consultee
6.	Wylve Parish Council	08/02/2009	Expressing concern about being allocated to the Amesbury CA, claiming stronger links to Salisbury, Wilton or Warminster.	Proposal 2 and Para 5 in the main report addresses issues of parish alignment
7.	Amesbury Pilot Area Board	26/02/2009	Expressed preference for Amesbury to be retained on its existing CA boundary	Only option 4 proposes changes.
8.	Cllr Stan Stubbs	26/02/2009	Resisting the transfer of Bulford area to Tidworth.	Only option 4 proposes changes.
9.	Cllr Alan Wood, KDC and Fittleton PC	02/03/2009	Setting out the views of Fittleton PC and Netheravon PC which is opposed to inclusion with Tidworth area and expressing a preference to be joined with the Amesbury CA.	This position is contrary to the views of most parishes in the ED. There is currently no proposal that unites these parishes with the Amesbury CA, however it is proposed to allow parishes to attend and speak at neighbouring Area Boards and CAPs as they so wish.
10.	Cllr Alan Wood, KDC and Fittleton PC	20/12/2009	Notification of a meeting of local parish councils in the areas to discuss the boundary options.	Acknowledgment and further information sent 22/12/09
11.	Cllr Graham Wright	27/12/2009	Preferring options with a minimum of four members, opposing the loss of parts of the Amesbury CA to form enlarged Tidworth CA.	The question of the minimum number of councillors is addressed under Para 13 of the main report.

12.	Figheldean Parish Council	30/12/2009	Requesting clarification regarding alignment of parish.	Proposal 2 and Para 5 in the main report addresses this issue.
-----	---------------------------	------------	---	--

Burbage and the Bedwyns

13.	Burbage Parish Council	13/01/2009	Expressing strong desire for Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to be transferred to Pewsey ED	Address in all but Option 5.
14.	Alton Barnes Parish Council	23/01/2009	Requesting the creation of a three-member Pewsey Area Boards including Burbage and the Bedwyns ED	Options 1 – 4 address this request
15.	Tim Summers, Chair Little Bedwyn & Chisbury Parish Council.	05/02/2009	Council resolved on 4th February 2009 "that the Burbage and Bedwyn Division should be reallocated to the Pewsey Area Board" letter sets out concerns about the Marlborough community area and the over-dominant influence of Marlborough.	All except option 5 propose moving the Burbage and the Bedwyns ED into Pewsey CA.
16.	Lesley Green (4)	05/02/2009	Raising objections to the proposed transfer of Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to Pewsey CA. Questioning the validity and conduct of the consultation process. Explaining Shalbourne PCs strong sense of identity and affinity with Marlborough.	Option 5 addresses this concern. Para 5 and Proposal 2 in the main report seeks to address issues of Parish alignment.
17.	Grafton Parish Council	05/02/2009	Requesting Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to be transferred to the Pewsey CA	Option 1-4 meet this requirement
18.	Great Bedwyn Parish Council	06/02/2009	Supporting the transfer of Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to the Pewsey CA	Options 1-4 address this preference.
19.	Cllr Stewart Wheeler	06/02/2009	Supporting the transfer of Burbage and the Bedwyn ED to Pewsey CA and confirming support from Buttermere PC and Little Bedwyn PC.	Options 1-4 address this preference
20.	Cllr Chris Humphries, Chair Marlborough Area Board	09/02/2009	Drawing attention to Shalbourne PC opposition to the Burbage and the Bedwyns ED being moved into the Pewsey CA and supporting the points raised.	Parish alignment is discussed in Para 5 and covered in Proposal 2 of the report. Option 5 provides for Burbage and the Bedwyns to be retained in the Marlborough CA.
21.	Cllr Chris Humphries, Chair Marlborough Area Board	09/02/2009	Confirming preference for status quo in respect of Marlborough CA	Option 5 addresses this issue.
22.	Ham Parish Council	10/02/2009	Supporting the transfer of Burbage and the	Options 1-4 address this preference

			Bedwyn ED to Pewsey CA.	
23.	Mrs Jennifer Blake	11/02/2009	Requesting Shalbourne and Burbage and the Bedwyns ED remain in Marlborough ED, raising concerns about the validity of the consultation.	Option 5 addresses this concern.
24.	Cllr Chris Humphries, Chair Marlborough Area Board	12/02/2009	Raising concerns about the removal of Burbage and the Bedwyns from the Marlborough CA – the dominance this would give to Marlborough Town over the rural area and the changes to the policing arrangements that would be required.	Option 5 addresses this issue.
25.	Burbage Parish Council	13/02/2009	Requesting allocation of Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to Amesbury	Options 1 – 4 address this request
26.	Inspector Andrew Noble, Wiltshire Constabulary	19/02/2009	Confirming that overall police service provision would be unaffected by a transfer of the Burbage and the Bedwyns ED to Pewsey CA.	Options 1-4 adopt this proposal.
27.	David Verey and Residents of 'The Grange' Shalbourne	28/02/2009	Requesting that Shalbourne and Burbage and the Bedwyns ED is retained in the Marlborough CA	Option 5 proposes such a solution.
28.	Marlborough Community Pilot Area Board	03/03/2009	Voted against the removal of the Bedwyn and Burbage ED from the Marlborough CA.	All of the parishes in the Division except Shalbourne PC have requested to join the Pewsey CA, however under Option 5 the ED remains within the Marlborough CA

Southern Wiltshire (previously Downton Area)

29.	Cllr Richard Britton	07/01/2009	Proposed name change of the Downton Community Area	Agreed to amend the name to 'Southern Wiltshire Community Area' this proposal supported by SDC Southern Area Committee.
30.	Cllr John King, SDC	07/01/2009	Requesting early progress in establishing Southern Wiltshire CAP and supporting Laverstock and Ford alignment to the South.	Meetings arranged to take forward SWCAP proposals and Laverstock and Ford allocated to SWAB
31.	Tony Reynolds, Landford PC	10/01/2009	Questioning arrangements South of Salisbury	3 subsequent meetings have been arranged for parishes in this area to discuss the formation of the Board and CAP
32.	Councillor Julian Johnson, WCC	15/01/2009	Requesting further information regarding the Southern Wiltshire Area Boards and CAP proposals.	Meeting held to discuss the issues.
33.	Cllr Mary Douglas	22/01/2009	Requesting clarification of the Salisbury and Laverstock PC boundary and requesting early	Confirmed that part of the Laverstock CP includes parts of Hampton Park housing estate

			resolution of the City Boundary issue.	which are within the Salisbury St Marks and Bishopdown ED in the Salisbury Area Board – suggested early electoral review of City boundary.
34.	Bev Ford, Downton PC	05/02/2009	Opposing inclusion of Laverstock PC within the Southern Wiltshire CA	This view was not supported by the majority of members and parishes at the Southern Area Committee meeting on 10/02/09
35.	Angela Wheeler, Britford PC	13/02/2009	Questioning arrangements for the Southern Wiltshire Area Board and Partnership.	3 subsequent meetings have been arranged for parishes in this area to discuss the formation of the Board and CAP
36.	Landford Parish Council	14/02/2009	Expressing concern that no pilot Area Board was trialled in the Southern Wiltshire CA and requesting early attention to the issue.	Three meetings subsequently held in the area for parish councils, councillors, partners and the public to explain the proposals and initiate the CAP
37.	Cllr Richard Britton	19/12/2009	Clarification regarding parish schedule	Parish schedule amended (see attached Appendix 2)
38.	Cllr Ian McLennan, SDC	20/12/2009	Pointing out an error on the parish schedule circulated with the consultation papers.	Schedule corrected
39.	Cllr Richard Britton	22/12/2009	Clarification regarding location of Laverstock ED	Confirmed Laverstock to be included within the Southern Wiltshire Community Area
40.	Cllr Ian McLennan, SDC	22/12/2009	Requesting Laverstock and Ford ED to be included in the Southern Wiltshire CA and stating that the name should not be Downton CA.	Proposals accepted

Tidworth and Pewsey

41.	Cllr Mark Connolly	23/12/2008	Reiterating support for the creation of an Area Board for Tidworth and resisting options that combine Pewsey and Tidworth or move Tidworth and Ludgershall into the Amesbury Area. Also opposing the merger of Tidworth and Bulford areas.	Option 4 addresses these concerns.
42.	Everleigh Parish Council	15/01/2009	Supporting the creation of separate area boards for Tidworth and Pewsey.	Addressed in Options 3 and 4.
43.	Everleigh Parish Council	15/01/2009	Supporting separate Boards for Pewsey and Tidworth	Options 3 and 4 address this preference
44.	Chute Forest PC	16/01/2009	Requesting separate Boards for Pewsey and	Option 3 and 4 meet this requirement

			Tidworth	
45.	Savernake PC	17/01/2009	Supporting the creation of separate Area Boards for Pewsey and Tidworth	Options 4 and 5 address this preference.
46.	Cllr Chris Williams, Chair Tidworth Pilot Area Boards	19/01/2009	Supporting the creation of an Area Board for Tidworth and resisting the merger with Pewsey on the grounds of community identity.	Option 4 addresses this issue and proposes a solution to the representational issues
47.	Tidworth Pilot Board	19/01/2009	Formal request for a separate Area Board for the Tidworth area and setting out objections to combining with Pewsey or being aligned with Amesbury.	Option 4 addresses this issue and proposes a solution to the representational issues
48.	Pewsey Area Community Planning Partnership	20/01/2009	Requesting a separate Area Board for Pewsey	Options 1-4 address this request
49.	Rushall PC	30/01/2009	Opposed to Pewsey and Tidworth Boards will less than four members.	IE previously suggested four members as a minimum. Options 1, 2, 3 and 5 achieve this number.
50.	Richard Tilbury, Chair Rushall PC	31/01/2009	Concerned about the lack of members on the Pewsey Area Board	Option 4 proposes a three member Area Board, with arrangements to ensure that three members will always be present.
51.	Ludgershall Town Council	04/02/2009	Recommending the creation of a separate Board for Tidworth and resisting a merger with the Pewsey CA.	Options 3 and 4 address these concerns.
52.	Collingbourne Ducis Parish Council	04/02/2009	Supporting the creation of two separate Area Boards for Pewsey and Tidworth.	Options 3 and 4 address this preference
53.	Pewsey Parish Council	04/02/2009	Requesting the creation of a dedicated Area Board for Pewsey	Options 1- 4 address this request
54.	Cllr Robert Hall	06/02/2009	Supporting the creation of separate Boards for Tidworth and Pewsey. Accepts the addition of Burbage and the Bedwyns ED into the Pewsey CA	This is addressed in Options 3 and 5.
55.	Geoffrey Tilney (former Chair of TCAP)	09/02/2009	Recommending the creation of a separate Tidworth Area Board that preserves the Tidworth Community Area Partnership	Options 3 and 4 best address this concern, although in all options the TCAP could be preserved (with modified area)
56.	Cllr Charles Howard	23/02/2009	Supporting the creation of separate Boards for Pewsey and Tidworth but suggesting a shared member solution that would keep the parishes with their existing CA	Option 4 addresses this proposal and sets out a mechanism that avoids the need for a shared member.
57.	Cllr Mark Connolly	24/02/2009	Objecting to single combined Board for Pewsey and Tidworth and supporting creation of a	Option 4 addresses this concern

			separate Area Board for Tidworth.	
58.	David Wildman	24/02/2009	Opposing Option 3 (combining parts of the Amesbury CA with Tidworth and Ludgershall to form an enlarged Tidworth CA.	Option 4 proposes an alternative solution.
59.	Ludgershall Town Council	24/02/2009	Recommending the creation of a separate Board for Tidworth and resisting a merger with the Pewsey CA and opposing any merger with Amesbury CA.	Options 3 and 4 address these concerns.
60.	Tidworth Town Council	24/02/2009	Recommending the creation of a separate Board for Tidworth and resisting a merger with the Pewsey CA and opposing merger with Amesbury CA.	Options 3 and 4 address these concerns.
61.	Alan Butterworth	25/02/2009	Supporting the creation of an Area Board for Tidworth, resisting merger with Pewsey and drawing attention to the possibility of a 2-member quorum	Option 4 proposes a solution in line with this view and the quorum issue is addressed at Para 13 above)
62.	David Wildman, Vice Chair Tidworth CAP	26/02/2009	Supporting the creation of an Area Board for Tidworth, resisting merger with Pewsey and drawing attention to population projections for the area.	Options 3 and 4, allow for the creation of an Area Board for Tidworth.
63.	Col P J Tabor MVO	26/02/2009	Supporting the creation of a separate Area Board for Tidworth	Options 3 and 4 address this preference
64.	Cllr Humph Jones, Tidworth Town Council	02/03/2009	Supporting the creation of separate Boards for Tidworth and Pewsey.	This is addressed in Options 3 and 5
65.	Caroline Brailey, CAM Pewsey	03/03/2009	Referring views from Pewsey area parishes in support of a separate Board.	Separate Pewsey Board proposed under three options

Mere, Tisbury and Wilton

66.	Cllr Tony Deane	19/01/2008	Requesting confirmation that Area Boards will be formally constituted as 'area committees' in accordance with the LGA 2000.	Confirmation provided but explained that the committees will be called 'Area Boards.'
67.	Cllr Tony Deane	17/02/2008	Commenting on proposals to include Wilton within the South West Wiltshire Area Board	Wilton TC and neighbouring parishes have subsequently discussed and agreed that they wish to become part of SWWAB.
68.	Swallowcliffe Parish Council	11/01/2009	Supporting proposed boundary of the South West Wiltshire Area Board.	No comment required.
69.	Cllr Michael Fowler, SDC	13/01/2009	Supports a single Board for Mere, Tisbury and	Agreed

			Wilton CAs	
70.	Cllr George Jeans, SDC	14/01/2009	Raising no objections but indicating that Maiden Bradley PC may wish to comment separately on the proposal to move the PC from Mere to Warminster CA.	Noted
71.	Bishopstone PC	19/01/2009	Detailed response raising questions about the size of the proposed SWWAB and the alignment of the CAPs, suggesting the need for a CAP for the Ebble Valley villages.	Single Board proposed for Wilton, Tisbury and Mere. CAP alignment currently on existing CA boundaries – Bishopstone PC aligned with Wilton. However, proposals to allow PCs to attend neighbouring AB and CAP as necessary.
72.	Cllr Tony Deane	20/02/2009	Discussing the possibility of creating a new CA for the Ebble Valley parishes within the SWWAB	The question of creating additional CAs is discussed in Paras 6 and 7 of the main report.
73.	Wilton Town Council	28/02/2009	Expressed preference to be included in the SWWAB (views taken at public meeting, 26/2)	Agreed
74.	Quidhampton Parish Council	28/02/2009	Expressed preference to be included in the SWWAB (views taken at public meeting, 26/2)	Agreed
75.	South Newton Parish Council	28/02/2009	Expressed preference to be included in the SWWAB (views taken at public meeting, 26/2)	Agreed

Trowbridge

76.	Trowbridge Town Council	15/01/2009	Objecting to the separation of Pewsey and Tidworth into separate Area Boards, questioning the Area Board funding arrangements, pointing out overlaps between the Bradford on Avon and Trowbridge CA, requesting dual membership councillors for Holt and Staverton and Winsley and Westwood EDs and opposing the loss of Staverton and Wingfield from the Trowbridge CA	The question of parish alignment is addressed under Para 5 and Proposals to as set out in the main report. It is suggested that an electoral (governance) review of the Trowbridge area would be required to address the overlap of urban areas into neighbouring parishes.
77.	Steeple Ashton Parish Council	10/02/2009	No comment on the proposals	Noted
78.	Jonathon Seed (3)	04/03/2009	Strongly opposing inclusion of the Summerham and Seend ED in the Trowbridge CA, explaining alignment of the parish councils and suggesting a more logical alignment with Melksham. Suggests creation of a smaller rural CA for the neighbouring EDs	No strong preferences from local parishes. Para 5 and Proposal 2 addresses the issue of parish alignment. Creation of a new CA not supported – see Para 7 of the main report.
79.	Cllr Ernie Clarke	19/12/2009	Pointing out that Staverton PC has more affinity	Parish alignment is discussed in Para 5 and

			with Trowbridge than Bradford on Avon and objecting to the inclusion of rural EDs within the Trowbridge CA	Proposal 2 of the main report.
80.	Cllr Ernie Clarke	22/12/2009	Seeking clarification regarding councillors' right to attend neighbouring Area Boards when issues affecting their parishes are discussed.	Proposal 2 in the main report addresses this concern.

Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

81.	Cllr Alison Bucknell	19/12/2008	Raising no objection to changes to the Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area but questioning viability of Boards with less than four members.	The issue of Area Boards with less than four members is addressed in this report (Para 13 above)
82.	Ashton Keynes Parish Council	05/02/2009	Supporting the transfer of Ashton Keynes into the Malmesbury CA.	Noted.
83.	Wootton Bassett & Cricklade Pilot Board	20/02/2009	Agreeing transfer of Ashton Keynes and Leigh to Malmesbury CA but requesting split of the remaining area into two CA	Addressed in Paras 6 and 7 of the main report.
84.	Leigh Parish Council	19/12/2009	Supporting the transfer of Leigh PC to the Malmesbury CA.	Agreed.
85.	Cricklade Town Council	29/02/09	Supporting the creation of two separate community areas within the Wootton Bassett and Cricklade CA.	This is discussed in Para. 6 and 7 of the main report.

Parish and Miscellaneous responses.

86.	Tony Couttes- Britton	23/12/2009	Objecting to the name 'Ethandune ED'	This is a matter for the Electoral Commission and is not within the remit of this review
87.	Wiltshire Democracy (Mr Alan Hill)	24/01/2009	Proposing a range of revised arrangements	No support for these proposals has been forthcoming from any other consultees.
88.	Francis Morland	05/02/2009	Resisting changes to the original 20 community areas originally defined by Dr Chandler.	Largely a consequence of the Electoral Commission's review of Wiltshire and a necessity to achieve good and efficient administration of public services in Wiltshire. Attempts have been made to minimise the changes.
89.	Wiltshire		Resisting future changes to community	It is recognised that the Police and other

	Constabulary		areas in view of the Constabulary's need to finalise and retain agreed operational boundaries. Indicates that the Constabulary operational arrangements can accommodate removal of Burbage and the Bedwyns into Pewsey	Frontline Services will be re-shaping services around the new community areas and it is agreed that future changes should be strongly resisted to provide operational stability and continuity. Proposal 5 and Para 7 address this concern.
90.	Richard Gamble	22/12/2009	Pointing out omission of Devizes from parish schedule	Omission corrected
91.	Corsham Town Council	21/01/2009	Raising no objection to the proposed boundaries of the Corsham Area Board.	No comment required.
92.	Grittleton Parish Council	23/01/2009	Seeking clarification of location of ED	Clarification provided
93.	Charles Boyle, Atworth PC	16/01/2009	Questioning why Atworth was included on the parish schedule	Schedule corrected and Atworth PC included in the Melksham CA.
94.	Charles Boyle, Atworth CA	19/01/2009	Questioning if Atworth could join Calne CA	As above, although under proposals in this report Atworth CP will be able to attend neighbouring Boards and CAP as they consider necessary
95.	Wilcot and Huish PC	19/01/2009	Questioning alignment of parish with ED	This is more properly a matter for the Electoral Commission.
96.	Cllr Trevor Carbin, WWDC	23/02/2009	Questioning why parishes cannot be detached from EDs to align with neighbouring Boards.	This would mean that their elected Unitary Councillors could not provide voting representation for the parish council. However. Para 5 and Proposal 2 in the main report addresses the issue of parish alignment.
97.	Bill Buxton, Winterbourne Monkton PC	30/12/2009	Query regarding Area Board boundary.	Reply 30/12/09, explaining the location of the PC
98.	Cllr John Walsh, SDC	04/01/2009	Requesting further information and hard copies of the maps	Information provided.
99.	Cllr Mary Spender	04/01/2009	Objecting to the ED name 'West Selkley'	A matter for the Electoral Commission.
100.	Fyfield and West Overton PC	05/02/2009	Supporting the alignment of West Selkley ED with Marlborough.	Noted