

**CGR Report and Appendices**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Wiltshire Council**

**Council**

**24 November 2015**

---

## **Community Governance Review**

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1. The purpose of the report is to make recommendations to full Council on the Community Governance Review (CGR), and to update members on other schemes where it is felt no decision can yet be reached.

### **2. Background**

- 2.1. A Community Governance Review is a review of the whole or part of the Council's area to consider one or more of the following:-
  - Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes
  - The naming of parishes and styles of new parishes
  - The electoral arrangements of parishes (including the number of councillors to be elected to the council and parish warding)
  - Grouping or de-grouping parishes
- 2.2. The Council appointed a Working Group to carry out this Review and to make recommendations to the Council in due course. The Working Group comprises a representative from each group of the Council (with a substitute permitted to attend). Individual members of the Working Party have been mindful of their position as local members in some cases, and have received advice and guidance in that respect from the Council's Monitoring Officer. In particular, it should be noted that following the consultation members of the Working Group withdrew from discussions on the formulation of recommendations affecting their respective divisional area. The Review has to ensure that the community governance arrangements within the areas under review reflect the identities and interests of the communities concerned and provide effective and convenient governance for local people. Further guidance can be found at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-governance-reviews-guidance>
- 2.3. In February 2015, Council resolved to discontinue further work on some schemes for which there was no longer a local appetite to proceed. These are appended for information only.
- 2.4. The Working Group is now in a position to bring forward a number of recommendations for community governance changes for approval by Council. These are appended to this report. In other cases, it is proposed that further consideration and consultation is required.

- 2.5. Each geographical area has a separate document pack and mapping pack.

### **3. Main Considerations for the Council**

3.1. In carrying out the review, and in formulating its recommendations, the Working Group has had regard both to its legal obligations under Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and to the statutory guidance issued jointly by the DCLG and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England which can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-governance-reviews-guidance>. In reaching a decision on these recommendations, the Council must have regard to the same criteria, which are therefore summarised below.

3.2. Section 93 of the 2007 Act requires the Council, when undertaking a review, to ensure that community governance within the area under review will be:-

- Reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area, and
- Effective and convenient

3.3. The Guidance gives further advice in relation to the two main criteria, as summarised below:-

#### Identities and Interests of Local Communities

- Communities need to be empowered to respond to challenging economic, social and cultural trends and to demographic change
- Parish Councils can perform a central role in community leadership
- How people perceive where they live - their neighbourhoods – is significant in considering the identities and interests of local communities. Neighbourhoods can be defined by the geography of an area, the make-up of the local community, a sense of identity and whether people live in a rural, suburban or urban area.
- Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest with their own sense of identity
- The feelings of the local communities and the wishes of local inhabitants are the primary considerations in considering this factor
- There may be a variety of different communities of interest within a Parish and any review should consider communities as offering a sense of place and of local identity for all residents

#### Efficient and Convenient Local Government

- Effective and convenient government is best understood in the context of a local authority's ability to deliver quality services economically and

efficiently and give users of services a democratic voice in the decisions that affect them.

- Local communities should have access to good quality local services, ideally in one place and a parish council may be best placed to do this
- Parish Councils should be viable in terms of providing at least some local services which need to be easy to reach and accessible to local people

3.4. The Guidance also provides that, when considering the two statutory criteria set out in paragraph 3.2 above, the Council should take into account a number of influential factors, including:

- The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion and
- The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

3.5. Further guidance is provided in relation to these two factors:-

*The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion*

- Community cohesion is about recognising and responding to changes in the make up of a community to enable different groups of people to integrate and get on well together. This includes developing a shared sense of belonging and developing positive relationships between people from different backgrounds. Cohesion is also about how people perceive the composition of their local community and what it represents.

*Size, Population and Boundaries*

- Size, population and boundaries are relevant considerations in deciding whether community governance arrangements are effective and convenient. Authorities should be based on natural communities reflecting people's expressed choices. A parish should be based on an area which reflects community identity and is of a size which is viable as an administrative unit of local government. Boundaries should reflect 'no man's land' between communities and be (and be likely to remain) easily identifiable, such as rivers, roads or railways.

3.6. When considering the proposals for changes to the structure or area of parish councils, the Working Group has been mindful of proposed developments that are likely to take place in those areas. The Guidance provides that, when considering the electoral arrangements for an area, the Council must also consider any changes to the number or distribution of electors that is likely to occur within the next five years. Therefore, where planned development is known, this had been taken into account.

3.7. Where, as a result of an alteration to parish boundaries, a property moves from one parish to another, this may well have an impact on the overall level of Council Tax payable by the occupants of that property, as the amount of precept levied by different parish councils will vary. However, as

can be seen from the guidance summarised above, this is not a relevant factor when considering whether it is appropriate to change the community governance arrangements in a particular area.

#### **4. Consultation**

- 4.1. The terms of reference for the Working Party provided that it would identify relevant consultees and determine the most appropriate and effective methods of communication. The terms of reference provided that any representations received as result of the consultation process would be considered by the Working Party and be taken into account in the formulation of recommendations to the Council.
- 4.2. Schemes were consulted upon, by one of two methods
  - 4.2.1. By individual letters to the residents and relevant town or parish councils. A copy was also sent to all local Wiltshire Councillors in the wider area affected. Both they and the parish or town council also received a property list.
  - 4.2.2. By arranging public meetings to discuss the proposals. Again, this has been communicated to the parish or town councils and local Wiltshire Councillors, with the same supporting information.
- 4.3. The following actions were taken in publicising the consultation:
  - Parish and Town Councils, and local members were circulated with details of proposed schemes and public meetings
  - Web site
  - Publication of full council report dated 28 September 2015 (also included on web site)
  - Press release week beginning 6 October - editorial coverage in the Wiltshire Times, Gazette & Herald and Salisbury Journal.
  - Published on the WC News Portal – this allows it to also sit on the front page of the WC website
  - Uploaded the release to all the Our Community Matters websites
  - Released to all Community Engagement Managers to promote the public meetings and the consultation generally
  - Promoted extensively on social media – Twitter and Facebook
  - Parish Newsletter – 6 October
  - Elected Wire and Electric Wire on Friday 10 October
  - The circulation of leaflets via local free newspapers was not always straightforward and/or in some cases timely. Additional public meetings were held in the Melksham area in response to request from the councils involved, and details of the further, third meeting were publicised in the 21 October edition of the Melksham News
- 4.4. Feedback was invited and received via:
  - Website, including the consultation portal

- Hard copy surveys from meetings
  - Hard copy surveys for letters to individual households in some areas
  - e-mails
  - Hard copy ad hoc letters
- 4.5. The review schemes are broken down into geographical areas. At the end of each area in the appendices to this report is a mapping “pack” and a documentation “pack”. Where e-mails contained relatively brief For or Against responses, these are simply listed on a summary sheet within each pack. Where the e-mails were more complex, they have been included in the documentation pack.

## **5. Timing**

### 5.1. Unitary Review

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) receives data from all councils annually to highlight significant levels of electoral inequality. This is defined as:

- more than 30% of its wards/divisions have an electoral imbalance (ratio of electors to members) of more than 10% from the average for the authority;
- and/or it has one ward/division with an electoral imbalance of more than 30%; and the imbalance is unlikely to be corrected by population change within a reasonable period.

The LGBCE have expressed interest in our figures for the last two years, but have now confirmed that Wiltshire will not feature in its work programme before 2017/18. This means that unitary divisions will not be affected by any parish alterations before that.

### 5.2. Parliamentary Review

Under current legislation the reference data for the review of Parliamentary boundaries will be the local authority boundaries (external, ward, and polling district) as they existed on 7 May 2015, and the Parliamentary electorate figures as they exist in the register to be statutorily published on 1 December 2015.

Whilst the alteration of parish boundaries and parish wards may cause some administrative difficulties, this need not derail the present CGR process.

### 5.3. Elections

It is a generally accepted rule that no major changes should be introduced within six months of any main election. The end date for any changes affecting parish elections should therefore be no later than the end of October 2016 at the latest. The operative date to give effect to any changes can be shown in the Order(s), e.g. 1 April 2017, and that would be sufficient to produce registers on new boundaries from 1 December 2016, albeit with many smaller polling district to recognise the boundaries as they existed at 7 May 2015.

#### **5.4. Precepts**

Depending on how many changes are approved by Council, there will be considerable work involved in reconciling property records to their new parish, both in respect of council tax and in many other departments. Further, parish councils would need an indication of their tax base for precepting purposes, and an introduction date of 1 April 2017 would seem to offer the best compromise.

### **6. Next steps**

6.1. Any changes to community governance arrangements that have been approved by the Council are brought into effect by means of a formal Order. However, before any order is made, it would also be necessary to consider whether there are any consequential changes that need to be made. For instance, where a boundary alteration results in a change in the number of electors in a parish, or the distribution of those electors within the parish, it may be appropriate to consider whether there needs to be changes to the warding arrangements within the parish, or to the number of councillors. If a parish is to be abolished, there would need to be consideration as to what is to happen to any assets held by that council. This would be considered as a separate exercise, following the decisions made at this meeting. Final orders will be brought back to council for formal approval.

### **7. Safeguarding Implications**

7.1. There are no safeguarding impacts arising from this report

### **8. Equalities Impact of the Proposal**

8.1. There are no equalities impacts arising from this report

### **9. Risk Assessment**

9.1. There are no significant risks arising from this report, although the situation with regard to boundaries and seats must be in place by no later than the end of October 2016 if the Unitary and Parish elections in May 2017 are not to be compromised. It will be necessary to ensure that sufficient resources are available to complete this work within the required timescale.

### **10. Financial Implications**

10.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report

### **11. Legal Implications**

11.1. This Review is being carried out by the Council under the powers in Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. It also has regard to the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews published by the DCLG. Details of this are set out in the report

### **12. Public Health Impact of the Proposals**

12.1. There are no public health impacts arising from this report.



### **13. Environmental Impact of the Proposals**

13.1. There are no environmental impacts arising from this report.

### **14. Recommendations**

**The Working Group recommends:-**

- 14.1. That Council approves the recommendations set out in the Appendices to this report in respect of the parishes that have been reviewed;**
- 14.2 That, where changes to the area or structure of parishes are approved, the Working Group gives further consideration to the consequential changes (if any) that may need to be made to the electoral arrangements for those parish councils, including any changes to warding and brings these back to Council for final approval.**

**Carolyn Godfrey  
Corporate Director**

---

Report Author: John Watling

Head of Electoral Services. Telephone 01249 706599.  
[John.watling@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:John.watling@wiltshire.gov.uk)

13 November 2015.

### **Background Papers**

Letters and documents appended from councils, other organisations and individuals

### **Appendices**

Schemes

Mapping pack for each scheme

Document pack for each scheme

EC LGBCE Guidance on Community Governance Reviews March 2010

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### **What is a Community Governance Review (CGR)?**

These reviews were previously called Parish Reviews and they are usually undertaken every 10-15 years to make sure that the boundaries and electoral arrangements of parishes within an area are working well.

A CGR must:-

- Reflect the identities and interests of the communities in that area; and
- be effective and convenient.

Consequently, a CGR must take into account:-

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

Therefore any changes made by a CGR must improve communities and local democracy in the parish or parishes concerned.

### **Why is the Council doing this now?**

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 transferred responsibility for these reviews to principal councils. A number of parishes and towns within the county have asked the council to review their boundaries.

### **Some information on this Review refers to parish or town wards – what are these?**

Some large parishes are divided into smaller sections, called wards, and these can reflect the character of a parish. For instance, if a parish contains two villages, with quite separate identities, then the parish might be split into two separate wards, with separate parish councillors for each ward.

### **How many councillors can a Parish Council have?**

There must not be fewer than five councillors on a parish council but there is no maximum number given. Ideally, the number of members on a parish council should reflect the size of the parish overall.

### **Will my post code change?**

No, Royal Mail has a separate process for setting postcodes, which do not correlate with parish boundaries.

### **Does changing a parish boundary make any difference to the likelihood of development occurring on the edge of settlements?**

No. The criteria, and the legislation that sits behind it, for determining whether or not parish boundaries should change bears no relation to the legislation that guides the determination of planning applications. In simple terms, if a proposal for development comes forward the parish within which that development sits has no direct relevance to the decision whether to grant planning permission or not.

### **Will this affect my council tax bill?**

Possibly. Most parish councils levy what is known as a precept to cover their costs. Typically the contribution toward your parish council is around 5% of the council tax you pay. There are variations between parish precepts so it is likely that this element of your council could change if your property moves into a different parish.

The 2014/15 and 2015/16 Council Tax band D charge and precept for all parishes can be seen at:

<http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/counciltaxhousingandbenefits/counciltax/ctaxhowmuch/counciltaxbanddandpreceptallparishes.htm>

It is not possible to say what the 2016/17 charges will be, and nor is it possible to predict the effect of the Community Governance proposals on these parish precepts.

### **Will I have to get official documents like my driving licence changed if my property moves from one parish to another?**

No. The key elements of your address for official purposes are your house name/number, street and postcode. There are many examples already of where a postal address records a property in a different town/parish than the one in which it is actually situated.

### **If my property moves from one parish to another, do I need to change my passport details?**

No. Your passport does not contain your address, therefore there is no requirement to update the details.

### **What sort of factors might be taken into account when looking at community identity?**

There is no set list of factors; the following offers a few suggestions:

- Where do you tell your friends you live?
- Where are your key services, e.g. shops, doctors, pub, sports club, social club?
- Where do you think the boundary with the next parish is?
- Do you know which parish you live in?
- Are there any natural physical boundaries such as a river, road, hill nearby?
- Are there any Community groups or associations in the area which help to indicate where communities begin and end?

### **Where can I read more about Community Governance Reviews and how they operate?**

The Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission have produced guidance on how to conduct reviews and what they should cover.

This can be seen at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-governance-reviews-guidance>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Community Governance Schemes.

### Area A1, A2 and B7- Salisbury and Surrounding Parishes

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
1	Properties within Britford Triangle	18	Britford	Salisbury
2	Properties within Bishopdown Farm (part)	334	Salisbury	Laverstock
3	Properties within Hampton Park (part)	982	Laverstock	Salisbury
4	Properties within Halfpenny Road Estate	144	Netherhampton	Salisbury
5	Properties near Skew Road/Wilton Road Junction	2	Salisbury	Quidhampton
6	The Avenue and Fugglestone Red Area	0	Salisbury	Wilton
7	New cemetery land - The Avenue and A360 Area	0	South Newton	Salisbury

1,480

Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
8	Woodford		Woodford	Salisbury
9	Durnford		Durnford	Salisbury
10	Clarendon Park		Clarendon Park	Salisbury
11	South Newton		South Newton	Salisbury
12	Britford (other than above)		Britford	Salisbury
13	Laverstock and Ford (other than above)		Laverstock and Ford	Salisbury
14	Netherhampton (other than above)		Netherhampton	Salisbury
15	Quidhampton (other than above)		Quidhampton	Salisbury
16	South Newton (other than above)		South Newton	Salisbury
17	Wilton (other than above)		Wilton	Salisbury

# Area A1, A2 and B7- Salisbury and Surrounding Parishes

## CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

### 1. Properties within Britford Triangle

#### Summary of proposal

To move the triangular area of residential land at the A354 Coombe Road / Old Blandford Road junction, excluding the adjacent open countryside, as shown hatched green on the attached Map 1, from Britford parish in to Salisbury parish .

Map: Scheme 1 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 1b

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

### Main Considerations

This proposal was one of a number originally submitted by Salisbury City Council, with a view to incorporating within the City all of the built-up areas that were considered to be contiguous with the current parish boundary and which, in their view, now formed an indistinguishable part of the urban settlement. The main arguments in favour of the proposal are that the land concerned contains properties that are effectively part of the adjacent residential area that is within Salisbury. The extension of the parish of Salisbury to include this area would create clear boundaries between the relatively urban parish of Salisbury and the more rural parish of Britford, and would also enable the more effective provision of local services.

No substantial objections, or arguments against this proposal have been received.

### Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

**That the area of land in the parish of Britford shown hatched and edged in green on Map 1b (Area A1,A2 & B7), being land between the A354 Coombe Road and Old Blandford Road, becomes part of the parish of Salisbury**

Reasons: The proposal, to which Britford Parish Council had no objection, would lead to a more logical boundary between the two parishes, reflecting the extent of the existing built development in that area.

## **2 and 3. Properties within Hampton Park (part) – two options.**

Suggestions were received for the Bishopdown Farm area from Laverstock and Ford Parish Council and Salisbury City Council, through which their common boundary passes. The two schemes seek to move Bishopdown Farm and Hampton Park properties into one parish or the other, hence consultation on the two proposals.

### Summary of proposals

Salisbury's scheme is to move the properties at Hampton Park in to Salisbury and is shown in the green hatched area on Map 3.

Laverstock and Ford's scheme is to move properties at Bishopdown Farm to Laverstock and Ford and is shown in the green hatched area on Map 2.

Maps: Scheme 2 and 3 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes  
Map 2

Scheme 2 and 3 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes  
Map 3

Consultation method: Public meeting. Website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

Whilst it is not easy to either construct a web review on more than one proposal at a time nor to respond to it, the trends from the responses can be broken down with reasonable accuracy, from a return of 127 responses.

Proposal	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Salisbury CC (Proposal 3)	2	34	
Laverstock and Ford PC (Proposal 2)	77	12	
Unknown			2
TOTALS	79	46	2

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

## **Main Considerations**

Both parish councils accept that there is an argument for changing the current boundary as it predates the recent residential development, with the result that the Bishopdown Farm estate is divided between the two parishes. Government guidance and good practice suggest that it is preferable for such residential areas to be within a single parish, in terms of community interest, the effective delivery of local services and clear identifiable boundaries.

The arguments for moving the whole of this area into Salisbury are set out in the City Council's submissions and are similar to those that apply to the inclusion of any of the surrounding areas into the City. These include:-

- increased financial strength, allowing for improved service delivery and greater efficiency, particularly with the City Council taking responsibility for the delivery of more services.
- The physical reality, which is that the area concerned is effectively a continuation of the city and that the boundaries of the parish should reflect this. This would also be fairer, as all those living within the city would be contributing to the services provided in the city
- Better democratic accountability as the city council has contested elections
- Many of these living in the area concerned identify themselves with the city, and it is possible to do so whilst also identifying themselves with other more local communities within the larger city community.

The arguments for the whole of this area becoming part of Laverstock and Ford are that the community in this area is distinct from that of Salisbury and that the majority of residents wish to remain in Laverstock and Ford parish. There is a concern that inclusion of the area into Salisbury would lead to less effective delivery of services to the community there, as there would be less focus on issues affecting the area.

### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendations**

**That the area of land in the parish of Salisbury shown hatched and edged in green on Map 2 (Area A1,A2 & B7), being land at Bishopdown Farm, becomes part of the parish of Laverstock and Ford**

**That the proposal for the area of land at Hampton Park in the parish of Laverstock and Ford, shown edged green on Map 3 (Area A1, A2 & B7), to become part of the parish of Salisbury be not supported**

Reasons:- The Working Group accepted that it would be more appropriate for the whole of the residential area concerned to be within the same parish. Of the two options under consideration, the Working Group preferred the one put forward by Laverstock & Ford Parish Council, as they felt that it better reflected the community identity of the area and had the support of the majority of those who responded to the consultation process.



#### **4. Properties within Halfpenny Road Estate**

##### Summary of proposal

To extend the Salisbury City boundary to between the edge of the Harnham trading estate and Halfpenny Road. (Map – “Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 4” refers)

Map: Scheme 4 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 4

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

#### **Main Considerations**

The considerations in this case are similar to those applying to proposal 1 for Britford, as it also involves an existing residential development on the edge of the City, which is considered by the City Council to form an indistinguishable part of the urban settlement of Salisbury. The extension of the parish of Salisbury to include this area would retain clear boundaries between the relatively urban parish of Salisbury and the more rural parish of Netherhampton, and would also enable the more effective provision of local services.

No substantial objections or arguments against this proposal have been received.

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Netherhampton shown hatched and edged in green on Map 4 (Area A1,A2 & B7), being land between the edge of the Harnham Trading Estate and Halfpenny Road, becomes part of the parish of Salisbury**

Reasons:- No objections had been received to the proposal, which had the support of both parish councils concerned. It would provide a more appropriate defined boundary between the urban area of Salisbury and the more rural area of Netherhampton and would encompass the extent of the existing residential development in that area.

## **5. Properties near Skew Road/Wilton Road Junction**

### Summary of proposal

To move the parish boundary between Salisbury and Quidhampton so that Tower Farm Cottages at the Skew Road / Wilton Road junction (currently in Salisbury parish) become part of Quidhampton parish.

Map: Scheme 5 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 5

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

## **Main Considerations**

This is a minor proposal affecting two properties. It is argued that the properties have a greater community of interest with Quidhampton than with Salisbury and that this can be reflected in an alteration to the parish areas which will retain a clear identifiable boundary along Wilton Road and Skew Road.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Salisbury shown hatched and edged in green on Map 5 (Area A1,A2 & B7), being land near the Skew Road/Wilton Road junction, becomes part of the parish of Quidhampton**

Reasons:- This proposal, supported by the two parish councils concerned, would be a minor change affecting two properties which are considered to have a greater community affinity with Quidhampton than with Salisbury.

## **6. The Avenue and Fugglestone Red Area**

### Summary of proposal

To transfer an area of land between The Avenue and the Fugglestone Red site from Salisbury to Wilton.

Map: Scheme 6 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 6

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

## **Main Considerations**

This alteration was proposed in order to 'tidy up' the boundary between Wilton and Salisbury and to provide a further definitive green space between the two conurbations. There are no properties within the area concerned and there would therefore seem to be no issues regarding the effective provision of local services.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the proposal for the area of land at The Avenue and Fugglestone Red in the parish of Salisbury, shown edged green on Map 6 (Area A1,A2 & B7), to become part of the parish of Wilton be not supported and that there be no changes in this area**

Reasons:- The Working Group considered that the existing parish boundaries in this area were appropriate and that the proposal to alter them was not justified in terms of the relevant criteria.

## **7. New cemetery land - The Avenue and A360 Area**

### Summary of proposal

To transfer an area of land near The Avenue and A360 to Salisbury from South Newton for the new cemetery. There do not appear to be any residential properties affected by this proposal.

Map: Scheme 7 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 7

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. No forms were returned by hard copy.

## **Main Considerations**

Whilst there are no residential properties on the land concerned, it is proposed for use as a cemetery to service the city of Salisbury and surrounding area. The proposed cemetery is to be administered by Salisbury City Council and Wilton Town Council. The main consideration is, therefore, whether transfer of this land would improve the effective delivery of local services.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of South Newton shown hatched and edged in green on Map 7 (Area A1,A2 & B7), being land near the Avenue and A360, becomes part of the parish of Salisbury**

Reasons:- The proposal would bring land identified for a new cemetery into the parish of Salisbury. As the proposed cemetery would be administered by Salisbury City Council it was considered appropriate, in terms of the effective delivery of local services, for the area to be transferred to Salisbury.

<b>Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party</b>		<b><u>Current parish</u></b>	<b><u>To parish</u></b>
8	Woodford	Woodford	Salisbury
9	Durnford	Durnford	Salisbury
10	Clarendon Park	Clarendon Park	Salisbury
11	South Newton	South Newton	Salisbury
12	Britford (other than above)	Britford	Salisbury
13	Laverstock and Ford (other than above)	Laverstock and Ford	Salisbury
14	Netherhampton (other than above)	Netherhampton	Salisbury
15	Quidhampton (other than above)	Quidhampton	Salisbury
16	South Newton (other than above)	South Newton	Salisbury
17	Wilton (other than above)	Wilton	Salisbury

## Mapping

- Scheme 1 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 1b
- Scheme 2 and 3 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 2
- Scheme 2 and 3 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 3
- Scheme 4 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 4
- Scheme 5 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 5
- Scheme 6 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 6
- Scheme 7 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 7
- Scheme 8 - Salisbury City Council Proposed Changes (Woodford)
- Scheme 9 - Option 2 Durnford
- Scheme 9 - Salisbury City Council Proposed Changes (Durnford)
- Scheme 10 - Salisbury City Council Proposed Changes (Clarendon Park)
- Scheme 11 - Salisbury City Council Proposed Changes (South Newton)
- Scheme 12 - Option 2 Britford
- Scheme 12 - Option 3 Britford
- Scheme 13 - Option 2 Laverstock detailed Bishopdown area
- Scheme 13 - Option 2 Laverstock detailed following River Bourne
- Scheme 13 - Option 2 Laverstock detailed Potters Way area
- Scheme 13 - Option 2 Laverstock
- Scheme 14 - Option 2 Netherhampton
- Scheme 14 - Option 4 Netherhampton
- Scheme 14 - Option 5 Netherhampton
- Scheme 17 - Area A1, A2 and B7 Salisbury and surrounding parishes Map 6

### **Letters and other documents**

No	From	Date
1	Laverstock and Ford Parish Changes proposals revised 7 May 2012	7/5/12
2	Laverstock and Ford PC 240914	24/9/14
3	Laverstock and Ford PV 28 March 2014	28/3/14
4	Proposed extension of the boundary of Salisbury City 1927 ref F2 2019	7/5/12
5	Quidhampton boundary review 4 Feb 2014	4/2/15
6	Quidhampton boundary review 25 July 2014	25/7/15
7	Salisbury City Council Cllr_Andrew_Roberts_SCC_Boundary_Review_report 21 July 2014	21/7/15
8	Salisbury City Council DOC52756 13 October 2015	13/10/15
9	Notes of public meeting held on 15 October 2015	15/10/15
10	Wilton TC Proposed Wilton CP boundary March 2014	3/14

### **List of E-mails and hard copy**

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Mr Calydon	7/10/14	Against SCC
2	Mr C Froude	19/10/15	For SCC
3	Mr M Claydon	20/10/15	Against SCC
4	Mr and Mrs P Finlay	27/10/15	Against SCC, for L&F
5	Mr R Williams	28/10/15	
6	Mr R Hambling	29/10/15	Against SCC, for L&F
7	Mrs M Barnes	29/10/15	Against SCC, for L&F
8	Mrs P Baker	1/11/15	Against SCC, for L&F
9	Ms K Pettis	1/11/15	Against SCC
10	Mr and Mrs J Hodgkinson	1/11/15	Against SCC
11	Mr I Burke	2/11/15	Against SCC
12	Mr and Mrs P Nell	4/11/15	Against SCC
13	Ms A Palmer	5/11/15	Against SCC
14			
15			

## Area A3 and A4 - Trowbridge and Surrounding Parishes

### Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
18	Properties within Area 3c Halfway Close and Brook (Hilperton proposal part)	27	Hilperton	Trowbridge
19	Properties within Area 3a Wyke Road (Trowbridge Parish) (TTC Area 3a)	13	Trowbridge	Hilperton
20	Properties within Area 3a Wyke Road (Hilperton Parish) (TTC Area 3a)	8	Hilperton	Trowbridge
21	Properties within Shore Place (TTC Area 1)	28	Wingfield	Trowbridge
22	Properties within Area 3c Paxcroft Mead South of Hilperton Drive (TTC Area 3c) Trowbridge Proposal	264	Hilperton	Trowbridge
23	Properties within Area 3c Hulbert Road	634	Trowbridge	Hilperton
26	Old Farm (TTC Area 4a) (West Ashton to Trowbridge)	107	West Ashton	Trowbridge

**1,081**

### Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
24	Lady Down Farm (TTC Area 2) (Holt to Trowbridge)		Holt	Trowbridge
25	Hilperton Gap South (TTC Area 3b) (Hilperton to Trowbridge)		Hilperton	Trowbridge
27	West Ashton Road Employment Land (TTC Area 4b) (West Ashton to Trowbridge)		West Ashton	Trowbridge
28	Ashton Park Urban Extension (TTC Area 4c) (Southwick to Trowbridge)		Southwick	Trowbridge
29	Area 4d - White Horse Business Park (TTC Area 1) (North Bradley to Trowbridge)		North Bradley	Trowbridge

Please note there is duplication between 18, 22 and 23.



## **Area A3 and A4 - Trowbridge and Surrounding Parishes**

### **CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING**

#### **18. Properties within Area 3c Halfway Close and Brook (Hilperton proposal part)**

##### Summary of Proposal

At Paxcroft Mead, the present boundary between Hilperton and Trowbridge passes through residential estates, following a line approximately 250m to 300m south of the A361 road between the Hilperton roundabout and the roundabout on the A361/ Ashton Road junction.

Trowbridge Town Council and Hilperton Parish Council have both suggested schemes to rationalise the boundary in this area.

##### **Maps:**

Scheme 18 22 23 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 v2

Scheme 18 22 23 - Hilperton PC Proposal Area A3, A4

Scheme 18 22 23 - Trowbridge Town Council Proposal Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 150915

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

One response was received, from a resident of Hilperton who disagreed with the Trowbridge Town Council's proposal.

### **Main Considerations**

This is one of a number of proposals put forward for consideration to realign the boundary between Trowbridge and Hilperton parishes. As in other areas, the existing parish boundaries do not reflect subsequent residential developments. Therefore, one of the main considerations is whether the boundaries should be moved to properly reflect current community identities and, if so, where those boundaries should be. In the case of this proposal, it is argued by Trowbridge Town Council that the transfer of these areas of Hilperton into Trowbridge will enable the Town Council to provide a better service to those communities and that the residents in that part of Hilperton identify themselves with Trowbridge and make use of facilities within the town.

Objectors to the proposal argue that local residents consider themselves to be part of Hilperton, look to Hilperton for local services and do not want to be moved into Trowbridge.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)

## **19. and 20. Properties within Area 3a Wyke Road (Trowbridge Parish) (TTC Area 3a)**

### Summary of Proposal

This scheme is confined to the Wyke Road area. At the junction of Wyke Road with Horse Road and Canal Road, the part of Wyke Road which is south of that junction is partly in Hilperton and partly in Trowbridge. The properties on the eastern side are in Hilperton, and those on the western side are in Trowbridge

The proposal is to move the boundary between Trowbridge and Hilperton so that both sides of Wyke Road are in the same parish.

### Maps:

Scheme 19 and 20 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 2a  
Scheme 19 and 20 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 2b

Consultation method: Individual letter. Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

## **Main Considerations**

The issues in this proposal are similar to the others affecting the Trowbridge area, namely whether there is a need to amend the areas of Trowbridge and Hilperton, to properly reflect community identity and interests, to provide effective local services and have clear, identifiable boundaries between the two parishes.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)

## **21. Properties within Shore Place (TTC Area 1)**

### Summary of Proposal

Trowbridge Town Council have suggested an amendment to the boundary of Trowbridge with Wingfield in the area of Shore Place, Kingsley Place and Chepston Place.

The properties are currently in Wingfield, but other properties in the same roads are in the parish of Trowbridge.

Map: Scheme 21 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 1a

Consultation method: Individual letter. Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

## **Main Considerations**

As with many of the other proposals, the main issue here is that residential development has taken place across existing parish boundaries, so that they are now out of date. As a result, they do not reflect community identity and interests; do not enable the effective provision of local services and the boundaries are no longer clear or logical.

## **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)

## **26. Old Farm (TTC Area 4a) (West Ashton to Trowbridge)**

### Summary of Proposal

This concerns an area of developed land and adjacent floodplain at Old Farm, off the West Ashton Road, currently in West Ashton Parish. The proposal is for the parish boundary to be moved so that this area becomes part of Trowbridge and involves just over 100 properties.

Map: Scheme 26 - Trowbridge TC Area 4a Old Farm

Consultation method: Individual letter. Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

## **Main Considerations**

As well as the issues that are common to all of the Trowbridge area proposals (community identity, clear identifiable boundaries etc), this proposal also raises the issue of the effect of any alterations on the viability of West Ashton parish. The proposal, if approved, would lead to the loss of a significant number of properties from West Ashton ( approximately one third of the total) and it has been argued by West Ashton Parish Council that the resulting loss of precept would have a serious effect on the ability of the parish council to provide services to its community.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)



## **22. Properties within Area 3c Paxcroft Mead south of Hilperton Drive (TTC Area 3c)**

### Summary of Proposal

The proposal is to amend the boundary between Trowbridge and Hilperton in the area of Paxcroft Mead to the south of Hilperton Drive

### Maps:

Scheme 18 22 23 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 v2

Scheme 18 22 23 - Hilperton PC Proposal Area A3, A4

Scheme 18 22 23 - Trowbridge Town Council Proposal Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 150915

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

## **Main Considerations**

The main considerations are what would be the appropriate line of the boundary between the two parishes, having regard to the relevant criteria, including community of interests, effective provision of services and the desire for a clear boundary

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be**

**deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)

## **23. Properties within Area 3c Hulbert Road**

### Summary of Proposal

The proposal is to amend the boundary between Trowbridge and Hilperton in the area of Hulbert Road

### Maps:

Scheme 18 22 23 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 v2

Scheme 18 22 23 - Hilperton PC Proposal Area A3, A4

Scheme 18 22 23 - Trowbridge Town Council Proposal Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 150915

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

There are a total of 140 responses via the CGR website portal for all schemes in the Trowbridge area. With the exception of the West Ashton area (ten), most seem to refer to the Trowbridge / Hilperton area. 23 are in favour of the relevant proposals, and 24 are against, but 91 have ticked the box to say they would prefer to see an amendment.

Of those ten West Ashton responses, 2 agree with the Town Council's proposal, 5 disagree and 3 suggest amendment.

A number of responses may appear similar, but tend to follow the Town Council's advice on wording.

### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

## **Main Considerations**

The main considerations are what would be the appropriate line of the boundary between the two parishes, having regard to the relevant criteria, including community of interests, effective provision of services and the desire for a clear boundary

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That decisions on the proposals numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 26 for changes to the areas of Trowbridge and surrounding parishes be deferred for further consideration and consultation by the Working Group and that there also be consultation on proposal 27 (West Ashton Road Employment Land)**

Reasons:-There had been some lack of clarity regarding the specific proposals which had been put out to public consultation affecting the boundaries between Hilperton and Trowbridge. In addition, other options had been put forward during the consultation in respect of those areas, which merited further consideration and consultation. The Working Group consider that it would be more appropriate for all of the schemes in the Trowbridge area to be dealt with together and that therefore all of the proposals be deferred at this time. It is also felt that the proposal for alterations to parish boundaries in the vicinity of the West Ashton Road Employment Land (number 27), which had been put forward by Trowbridge Town Council but not supported for consultation by the Working Group, should now be included for consideration, as it was intrinsically linked with the Old Farm site (number 26)

**Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party**

		<b><u>Properties</u></b>	<b><u>Current parish</u></b>	<b><u>To parish</u></b>
24	Lady Down Farm (TTC Area 2) (Holt to Trowbridge)		Holt	Trowbridge
25	Hilperton Gap South (TTC Area 3b) (Hilperton to Trowbridge)		Hilperton	Trowbridge
27	West Ashton Road Employment Land (TTC Area 4b) (West Ashton to Trowbridge)		West Ashton	Trowbridge
28	Ashton Park Urban Extension (TTC Area 4c) (Southwick to Trowbridge)		Southwick	Trowbridge
29	Area 4d - White Horse Business Park (TTC Area 1) (North Bradley to Trowbridge)		North Bradley	Trowbridge

## Mapping

Scheme 18 22 23 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 v2  
 Scheme 18 22 23 - Hilperton PC Proposal Area A3, A4  
 Scheme 18 22 23 - Trowbridge Town Council Proposal Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 3 150915  
 Scheme 19 and 20 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 2a  
 Scheme 19 and 20 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 2b  
 Scheme 21 - Area A3, A4 Trowbridge and surrounding parishes Map 1a  
 Scheme 24 - Trowbridge TC Area 2 Lady Down Farm  
 Scheme 25 - Trowbridge TC Area 3b Hilperton Gap  
 Scheme 26 - Trowbridge TC Area 4a Old Farm  
 Scheme 27 - Trowbridge TC Area 4b West Ashton Road Employment Land  
 Scheme 28 - Trowbridge TC Area 4c Ashton Park Urban Extension v2  
 Scheme 28 and 29 Trowbridge TC Area 4c and 4d

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

## Letters and other documents

No	From	Date
1	1991 Parish Boundary Order West Wiltshire supplied by Trowbridge TC	1991
2	151001 Letter Sports Facilities Trowbridge Tigers FC	
3	151001 Letter Sports Facilities wasp 12 October 2015	12/10/15
4	151001 Letter Sports Facilities wasp	
5	151012 letter Sports Facilities headed paper Bath Lacrosse Club 12 Oct 15	12/10/15
6	Avon Valley Runners Community Governance Review	
7	Hilperton Parish Council - CGR 20 October 2015	20/10/15
8	Hilperton PC additional comments 30 July 2014	30/7/14
9	Hilperton PC Governance Review 28 July 2014	28/7/14
10	Letter from Ms Julie Baptista 14 October 2015	14/10/15
11	LETTER TO COUNCIL Natalie Hardy 12 October	12/10/15
12	North Bradley PC Letter to Eric Pickles Sept 14 final submission	24/9/14
13	PCLG Governance Review 060211 6 February 2011	6/2/11
14	Trowbridge Public Meeting Minutes - 13 October 2015	13/10/15
15	Trowbridge Rangers FC letter	
16	Trowbridge TC 4 November 2015a Response to Consultation CGR Trowbridge supplement Area3	4/11/15
17	Trowbridge TC 4 November 2015b Response to Consultation 4 November 2015	4/11/15
18	Trowbridge TC letter to residents Oct 2015	10/15
19	Trowbridge Town Council 101102 Governance Review Changes January 2011	
20	Trowbridge Town Council 140701 Updated report June 2014	6/2014

21	Trowbridge Town FC boundaries letter to cc for public meeting Oct 15	10/15
22	TTC 150923 Map Summary of Trowbridge Proposals _3_ _3_	23/9/15
23	TTC 150930 DISCOVER Trowbridge - a town council for all of the town _3_	30/9/15
24	West Ashton PC 2 October 2014 response to Trowbridge TC's proposals	2/10/14
25	Notes from Trowbridge CGR fact finding meeting 2 December 2014	2/12/14
26	Letter from Sport England 12 November 2015	12/11/15

### Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Ms T Mortimer	15/9/14	
2	Ms L Summerson	7/10/15	Supports TTC, inc W Ashton
3	Ms V Fahey	7/10/15	Supports TTC
4	Ms E Glover	8/10/15	Supports TTC, esp Paxcroft Brook
5	Mr J Ligo	9/10/15	Supports TTC
6	Mrs C Farnell	11/10/15	Supports TTC
7	Mr C Harris	12/10/15	
8	Mr K McCall	13/10/15	Finance queries
9	Mr and Mrs D Feather	26/10/15	Comment re consultation
10	Mr I Jamieson	7/11/15	Against TTC's Hilperton scheme only

	<b>Area A5 - Chippenham area</b>			
	Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted	Properties	<b>Current parish</b>	To parish
30	Chippenham			
31	Change of parish name at Chippenham Without (to Sheldon and Allington)	73	<b>Chippenham Without</b>	N/A



### **30. Chippenham**

#### Summary of Proposal

Various proposal to amend the boundaries between Chippenham and neighbouring parishes, in particular Chippenham Without and Bremhill have been put forward

#### Maps

(None at this stage)

Consultation method: None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

### **Main Considerations**

A number of proposals have been put forward for changes to the areas of Chippenham and surrounding parishes. The location of future residential development in the area, and its impact on community governance, is clearly a significant factor in consideration of those proposals, given the expected level of growth around the town. However, there is currently uncertainty regarding the location of this development, following the Inspector's directions during consideration of the Core Strategy. It is therefore likely to be premature to make any decisions regarding changes to community governance in this area.

### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That no decision be made at this stage on changes to the parish of Chippenham (other than proposal 42 below), pending conclusion of the Chippenham DPD process, following the directions given by the Core Strategy inspector**

Reasons:- It would be premature to consider changes to the area of Chippenham and surrounding parishes at this stage, as it was not yet possible to identify where major residential development would be likely to take place and therefore what effect there would be on community governance within those areas

### **31. Chippenham Without – Change of Name**

A request has been received to change the name of the parish of Chippenham Without to Sheldon and Allington.

The Working Group consider that this issue would best be dealt with as part of the general consideration of community governance arrangements for the Chippenham Area.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That consideration of any proposed name change for Chippenham Without parish be deferred pending further consideration of any other community governance arrangements in the Chippenham area.**

## Area A5 - Chippenham area (No Council maps)

### Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Bremhill_PC_submission_to_WGroup_v4 27 November 2014	24/11/14
2	Chippenham TC draft Map November 2014	11/14
3	Chippenham TC Planning Minutes 170714 Indicative map	17/7/14
4	Chippenham TC revised map 1 December 2014	1/12/14
5	Chippenham Without PC minutes Jan to Dec 2014	2014
6	Langley Burrell covering letter 3 December 2014	3/12/14
7	Langley Burrell suggestions 3 December 2014	3/12/14
8	PCG Fact Finding meeting notes - Chippenham 4 December 2014	4/12/14

### Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Mr and Mrs Hartnell	30/4/14	Does not want change at Bremhill
2	Chippenham Without PC	2/12/14	No reason to alter boundary
3	Council tax (Paul Southway)	13/7/15	Possible (small) boundary anomaly
4	Mr I James	Various	Bremhill boundaries

## Area A6 B6 Devizes area

### Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
32	Properties within Roundway Parish	2,340	Roundway	New
33	Properties within Devizes Parish	6,037	Devizes	New
34	Bishops Cannings and Roundway 1 (Le Marchant Area)	346	Roundway	Bishops Cannings
35	Bishops Cannings to Roundway (Broadway House southwards)	2	Bishop Cannings	Roundway
(35b)	Hopton Industrial Estate	-	Bishop Cannings	Roundway
(35c)	Bishops Cannings warding	-		

**8,725**

## **Area A6 B6 Devizes area**

### **CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING**

#### **32. and 33. Properties within Roundway and Devizes parishes**

Summary of Proposal

That the parishes of Devizes and Roundway be merged.

Map: Scheme 32 and 33 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Devizes and Roundway Map 1

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

### **Main Considerations**

Because of its shape Roundway Parish Council effectively surrounds much of Devizes. There is no geographical centre to Roundway

The main issue here is whether it is appropriate to transfer parts of the parish of Roundway into Devizes and, if so, what effect that would have on the viability of Roundway as an independent parish. It is acknowledged by both councils that it would be more effective, in terms of the delivery of services, for the more built-up parts of Roundway parish to become part of Devizes parish, as there is a clear common community identity. That would mean that the remaining part of Roundway would not be a viable parish. In the circumstances, Roundway has accepted this and agreed to a form of merger with Devizes.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the parish of Roundway be abolished and that the areas currently within Roundway parish become part of Devizes parish**

**That the Working Group consider and consult on the most appropriate way to give effect to this decision**

Reasons:- This proposal was supported by both of the parish councils concerned. It is considered that the existing structure does not lead to effective local government. The majority of Roundway parish residents live in the residential estates to the south of Devizes and have a clear community

link with the town. Transferring only those southern areas would result in the remaining Roundway parish being unviable. Some form of merger of the two parishes is considered to be logical and in the best interests of community governance in the area. Further consideration should be given as to how this can most effectively be achieved.

### **34. Bishops Cannings and Roundway 1 (Le Marchant Area)**

#### Summary of Proposal

To move the triangle of land currently in Roundway from Franklyn Road to Windsor Drive in to Bishops Cannings parish.

Map: Scheme 34 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Bishops Cannings and Roundway Map 2

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

### **Main Considerations**

As in other areas, the current parish boundary passes through recently-built residential developments, leading to houses in the same street being in different parishes. The proposal is to bring all of the Cannings Hill development into Bishops Cannings, so that all of the properties are within one parish and that there are clear boundaries.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Roundway shown hatched and edged in green on Map 2 (Bishops Cannings & Devizes), being land between Franklyn Road and Windsor Drive, becomes part of the parish of Bishops Cannings**

Reasons:- The current parish boundaries are anomalous and do not reflect the existing residential development in the area. The proposal would provide clear and logical boundaries for the parishes and would result in the whole of the residential area concerned being within the same parish, which would assist in the provision of effective local government.

### **35. Bishops Cannings to Roundway (Broadway House southwards)**

#### Summary of Proposal

to consider moving the parish boundary between Bishops Cannings and Roundway, so that land to the south of Brickley Lane / Broadway House becomes part of Roundway parish.

Map: Scheme 35 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Bishops Cannings and Roundway Map 3

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

#### **Main Considerations**

This is a proposal to realign the boundary so as to bring an area of land currently within Bishops Cannings into Roundway parish. There are only two properties affected by the proposal. The main issues are the effects on the provision of local services to those properties and whether the change would result in there being clear identifiable boundaries. Bishops Cannings Parish Council has objected to this proposal and have proposed an alternative that it considers better meets the relevant criteria.

#### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That further consideration be given by the Working Group to the proposal that the area of Bishops Cannings parish to the south of Brickley Lane/Broadway House become part of Roundway/Devizes parish**

Reasons:- The response from Bishops Canning Parish Council had questioned whether this proposal would lead to a logical boundary between the two parishes. They had submitted an alternative option which merited consideration.



### **35b. Bishops Cannings and Roundway 1 (Hopton Industrial Estate)**

#### Summary of Proposal

to move part of the Hopton Industrial Estate, currently within the parish of Bishops Cannings into Roundway.

Map: Scheme 35b - Hopton Boundary Changes 12 October 2015

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

### **Main Considerations**

Although there are no residential properties affected by the proposed changes, the existing parish boundary passes through the industrial estate and does not follow any logical line within it. The change proposed would result a clearly defined boundary and would benefit the business operating on the industrial estate.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Bishops Cannings shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 35b - Hopton Boundary Changes 12 October 2015, being land at Hopton Industrial Estate , becomes part of the parish of Roundway/Devizes**

Reasons:- The current parish boundaries predate the development of the industrial estate and do not now follow any logical lines. Whilst there are no residential properties involved, the proposal would put the whole of the industrial estate within one parish, which would assist in the provision of effective local government.

### **35c Bishops Cannings Warding**

#### Summary of Proposal

That there be only one ward within the parish of Bishops Cannings, instead of the current two wards

Map: (No map)

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

### **Main Considerations**

There are currently two electoral wards within the parish of Bishops Cannings – Bishops Cannings and Cannings Hill. The Parish Council considers that, as a result of population changes and developments within the Parish, the current warding arrangements are anomalous and that it would be preferable for there only to be one ward within the Parish

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That there should be a single electoral ward for the parish of Bishops Cannings, replacing the current two wards of Bishops Cannings and Cannings Hill**

Reason:- The Working Group accepts the arguments of Bishops Cannings Parish Council that the current warding arrangements do not reflect the current distribution of population within the parish and are unnecessary

## Mapping

- Scheme 32 and 33 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Devizes and Roundway Map 1
- Scheme 34 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Bishops Cannings and Roundway Map 2
- Scheme 35 - Area A6 and B6 Devizes area- Bishops Cannings and Roundway Map 3
- Scheme 35b - Hopton Boundary Changes 12 October 2015
- Scheme 35c – no map

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Bishops Cannings PC 21 September 2014	21/9/14
2	Bishops Cannings PC Map 21 September 2014	21/9/14
3	Devizes Public Meeting Minutes - 12 October 2015	12/10/15
4	Devizes TC - boundary review - 2 Sept 2010	2/9/10
5	Devizes TC Governance Review 2014 4 July 2014	4/7/14
6	Devizes TC Hopton Boundary Changes	10/15
7	Devizes TC Proposed Boundary Map 3 April 2014	3/4/14
8	Devizes TC Resolution - 31 March 2015	31/3/15
9	Devizes TC Windsor Drive Boundary Changes 26 October 2015	26/10/15
10	Meeting Devizes TC and Roundway PC 10 February 2015	10/2/15
11	Roundway PC Minutes 27 April 15 Item 337	27/4/15
12	Roundway PC Resolution 27 April 2015	27/4/15

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Bishops Cannings PC	17/7/13	Warding comment

## A7 Calne area

	<b>Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted</b>	<b><u>Properties</u></b>	<b><u>Current parish</u></b>	<b><u>To parish</u></b>
36	Sandpit Road area	0	Calne Without	Calne
37	Wenhill Heights area	0	Calne Without	Calne
38	John Bentley school area	0	Calne Without	Calne
39	The Knowle, Stockley Lane Area (4)	6	Calne Without	Calne

6

## **36 Sandpit Road area**

### **CONSULTATION BY LETTER**

#### Summary of Proposal

To consider amending the parish boundary between Calne and Calne without in the area of Sandpit Road, so that it aligns with the settlement boundary

Previous comments from the Calne Town council suggested there is no pressing need to alter the boundaries, other than if there are significant differences between the existing boundaries and the proposed settlement boundary.

There are only four small areas where the proposed settlement boundary crosses in to the parish of Calne Without

No residential properties affected

Map: Scheme 36 - Area A7- Calne Area Sandpit Road Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration with these areas is whether it is appropriate to amend the parish boundaries between Calne and Calne Without so that they are aligned with the existing settlement boundaries

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Calne Without in the Sandpit Road area shown hatched and edged in green on Map 1 (Area A7) becomes part of the parish of Calne**

Reasons:- The Working Group accepts that it would be appropriate to align the parish boundaries with the existing settlement boundaries

### **37. Wenhill Heights area – no residential properties affected**

#### Summary of Proposal

To consider amending the parish boundary between Calne and Calne without in the area of Wenhill Heights, so that it aligns with the settlement boundary

Map: Scheme 37 - Area A7- Calne Area Wenhill Heights Map 2

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration with these areas is whether it is appropriate to amend the parish boundaries between Calne and Calne Without so that they are aligned with the existing settlement boundaries

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Calne Without in the area of Wenhill Heights shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 37 - Area A7- Calne Area Wenhill Heights Map 2 becomes part of the parish of Calne**

Reasons:- The Working Group accepts that it would be appropriate to align the parish boundaries with the existing settlement boundaries

### **38. John Bentley school area – no residential properties affected**

#### Summary of Proposal

To consider amending the parish boundary between Calne and Calne without in the area of John Bentley School , so that it aligns with the settlement boundary

Map: Scheme 38 - Area A7- Calne Area John Bentley School Map 3

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

#### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration with these areas is whether it is appropriate to amend the parish boundaries between Calne and Calne Without so that they are aligned with the existing settlement boundaries

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Calne Without in the vicinity of John Bentley School shown hatched and edged in green on Scheme 38 - Area A7- Calne Area John Bentley School Map 3 becomes part of the parish of Calne**

Reasons:- The Working Group accepts that it would be appropriate to align the parish boundaries with the existing settlement boundaries

### **39. The Knowle, Stockley Lane Area this affects six properties on Stockley Lane**

The proposal is that the parish boundary between Calne and Calne without in the area of The Knowle, Stockley Lane be amended so that it aligns with the settlement boundary

Map: Scheme 39 - Area A7- Calne Area The Knowle Stockley Lane Map 4

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Six letters were sent, and one was returned, disagreeing with the proposal.

#### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration with these areas is whether it is appropriate to amend the parish boundaries between Calne and Calne Without so that they are aligned with the existing settlement boundaries

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Calne Without at The Knowle, Stockley Lane shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 39 - Area A7- Calne Area The Knowle Stockley Lane Map 4 becomes part of the parish of Calne**

Reasons:- The Working Group accepts that it would be appropriate to align the parish boundaries with the existing settlement boundaries



## Mapping

- Scheme 36 - Area A7- Calne Area Sandpit Road Map 1
- Scheme 37 - Area A7- Calne Area Wenhill Heights Map 2
- Scheme 38 - Area A7- Calne Area John Bentley School Map 3
- Scheme 39 - Area A7- Calne Area The Knowle Stockley Lane Map 4

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Calne Settlement Boundary Revised_town civil boundary 23 January 2015	23/1/15
2	Calne TC resolution	2/10/15
3	Calne Without PC Settlement 5 November 2015	5/11/15
4	Calne Settlement Boundary Revised_town civil boundary 23 January 2105	23/1/15

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Cllr A Hill	20/1/15	Future at High Penn
2	Calne Without PC	13/9/15	Query re The Knoll and Marden Farm development
3	Mr and Mrs Warnett	26/10/15	Against
4	Calne Without PC	23/9/15	Accepts proposals

## Area A8 - Corsham and Box

### Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
40	Properties within Rudloe exc Wadswick area (Corsham TC proposal)	445	Box	Corsham
41	Properties within Rudloe Estate (part) (Box PC proposal)	236	Corsham	Box
42	Properties within Land to east of A350	6	Corsham	Chippenham

**687**

## **Area A8 - Corsham and Box**

### **CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING**

#### **40. Properties within Rudloe excluding Wadswick area (Corsham Town Council proposal)**

#### **41. Properties within Rudloe Estate (part) (Box Parish Council proposal)**

##### Summary of Proposals:

The Corsham Town Council's revised proposal which excludes Wadswick (40). Under this option, approximately 445 properties which are currently in Box would transfer to Corsham parish.

The proposal from Box Parish Council (41). Under this option, approximately 236 properties which are currently in Corsham parish would transfer to Box.

##### Maps:

Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 2

Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 3 at 14000 scale

Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 3

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

##### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

Whilst the two schemes are not mutually exclusive, consideration of these proposals, and feedback, tends to be either in favour of one or the other, or more often, against one or the other.

Out of 46 responses on the CGR website portal, 39 are against the Corsham proposal, with 4 in favour and 3 with no preference. However, some of those then go on to say that they prefer the Box proposal. Very few, if any, seem to have commented on Proposal 41 direct though.

##### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the public meeting. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meeting.

Seven responses were received in connection with Corsham Town Council's proposal (40), and all seven were against the proposal. Two were received in respect of Box Parish Council's proposal, and both were in favour.

## **Main Considerations**

It is recognised that Rudloe is an identifiable community. Currently, part of Rudloe is within Corsham parish and part within Box. The first issue is, therefore, whether it is appropriate for the whole of Rudloe to be within the same parish. There are clear community governance benefits for doing so, in terms of community identity, the provision of effective and convenient services and having

a clear boundary between parish areas. If that is accepted, then the next issue is which parish Rudloe should come under. The arguments for it to come within Corsham are that it would then be part of a town with a larger population, giving it the opportunity to provide a greater level of local services. Box Parish Council, however, argues that Box is able to provide a good level of local services to the residents of Rudloe and that the residents would prefer to be within Box.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the proposal for the area of land at Rudloe in the parish of Box, shown edged green on Map Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 2 to become part of the parish of Corsham be not supported**

**That the area of land in the parish of Corsham shown hatched and edged in green on Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 3 being land at Rudloe, becomes part of the parish of Box**

Reasons:- The Working Group considers that it would be appropriate for the whole of the community of Rudloe to be within one parish, in terms of the provision of effective local government. Having considered the arguments put forward by both Corsham Town Council and Box Parish Council, and their respective supporters, the Working Group considers that the evidence indicates that the Rudloe community has a greater affinity and identity with the parish of Box and that effective and convenient local government services can be provided to that community by them being part of Box parish.

## **42. Properties within Land to the east of the A350 main road**

### Summary of Proposal

To transfer the land inside the A350 bypass between the A4 roundabout and the boundary with Lacock parish, near where the A350 crosses the B4528 road. This land is currently in Corsham and, if the proposal is approved, it would become part of Chippenham.

Map: Scheme 42 - Area A8 - Corsham and Chippenham A350 Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration here is whether the A350 is a more appropriate boundary between Chippenham and Corsham than the current one, taking into account any likely development in the near future

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Corsham shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 42 - Area A8 - Corsham and Chippenham A350 Map 1 being land to the east of the A350, becomes part of the parish of Chippenham**

Reasons:- The transfer of this area of land into Chippenham ( which is not opposed by Corsham Town Council) would provide a logical definitive boundary between the two parishes

## Mapping

- Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 2
- Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 3 at 14000 scale
- Scheme 40 and 41 - Area A8 - Corsham and Box Area Map 3
- Scheme 42 - Area A8 - Corsham and Chippenham A350 Map 1

## Summary of e-mails received

No	From	Date
1	Box PC 5 February 2014	5/2/14
2	Box PC letter 30 June 2014	30/6/14
3	Box PC letter to Corsham TC 10 July 2014	10/7/14
4	Box PC Proposal to move Rudloe estate into Box 22 December 2014	22/12/14
5	Box PC response Corsham's revised submission 22 December 2014	22/12/14
6	Corsham Public Meeting Minutes - 14 October 2015	14/10/15
7	Corsham TC CGR for Corsham Sept 15 (leaflet) - FINAL 060915	9/15
8	Corsham Vice Chairman notes 14 October 2015	14/10/15
9	E-mail from Rvd Dr Anderson Kackenzie and Mr I MacKenzie 27 July 2014	27/7/14
10	E-mail from the Springfield and Clift Close Residents Association – 12 July 2014	12/7/14
11	Extract from a second email form Mr P Turner 15 October 2015	15/10/15
12	Extract from an e-mail from Ainslie Goulstone 29 September 2015	29/9/15
13	Extract from an e-mail from Jane Browning 29 September 2015	29/9/15
14	Extract from an e-mail from Margaret Wakefield 1 October 2015	1/10/15
15	Extract from an e-mail from Mr and Mrs R Eaton 29 September 2015	29/9/15
16	Extract from an e-mail from Mr D Ibberson 29 September 2015	29/9/15
17	Extract from an e-mail from Mr L Dancey on 7 October 2015	7/10/15
18	Extract from an e-mail from Mr M Devon on 3 October 2015	3/10/15
19	Extract from an e-mail from Mr P Rayner 29 September 2015	29/9/15
20	Extract from an e-mail from Mr P Turner 10 October 2015	10/10/15
21	Extract from an e-mail from Mr R Alderman on 9 October 2015	9/10/15
22	Extract from and e-mail from Mr R Parry 14 October 2015	14/10/15

23	Extract from Corsham TC e-mail 24 July 2014	24/7/14
24	Extract from e-mail from Mr A Payne – 12 October 2015	12/10/15
25	Extract from email from Mr B Mennell 21 October 2015	21/10/15
26	Extract from e-mail from Mr T Jones – 29 September 2015	29/9/15
27	Extract from e-mail from Ms A Keat 22 August 2014	22/8/15
28	Extract from e-mail from Patricia Crowe 12 October 2015	12/10/15
29	Extract from second e-mail from Jane Browning on 10 October 2015	10/10/15
30	Extract of e-mail from Mr J Currant 12 October 2015.	12/10/15
31	Extract of e-mail from Mr R Duxbury 31 July 2014	31/7/14
32	Letter and email from Mr and Mrs D Brighten 13 October 2015	13/10/15
33	Letter from James Gray MP 30 April 2014	30/4/14
34	Letter from Mr and Mrs Allen 25 July 2014	25/7/14
35	Letter from Mr I Johnson 29 July 2014	29/7/14
36	Letter from Mr J Beeson 29 October 2015	29/10/15
37	Letter from Mr J Whitford 5 October 2015	5/10/15
38	Letter from Mr J Whitford to Baroness Scott 21 October 2015	21/10/15
39	Letter from Mr N Crocker 19 August 2014	19/8/14
40	Letter from Mrs E Arkell 19 August 2014	19/8/14
41	Letter from Mrs M Rousell 16 September 2014	16/9/14
42	Letter from Ms Sally Mitchell 15 October 2015	15/10/15
43	Letter of 21 July and email of 12 October 2015 from Mr G Jones	12/10/15
44	Mr A Paynes summary of public meeting held on 14 October 2015	14/10/15
45	Second email from Mr T Jones 15 October 2015	15/10/15
46		

#### **E-mails and hard copy**

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Mr C Ward	29/5/14	Request for information
2	Mr C Todd	16/6/14	Against Corsham
3	Ms A Lucas	14/7/14	Against Corsham
4	Mr J Peplar	16/7/14	Against Corsham
5	Mr and Mrs E Callaway	21/7/14	Objects to change
6	Mr P Smith to Box PC and Cllr Thomson	22/7/14	Against Corsham
7	Ms M Short	15/10/15	Why split MOD properties
8	Mr and Mrs J Connell	18/10/15	Against changes
9	Mrs C Ross	30 October 2015	Against Corsham

## Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without

### Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
43	Properties within Melksham Without (Snarlton Lane, Thyme Road area)	733	Melksham Without	Melksham
44	Whole parish	3,663	Melksham Without	New
45	Whole parish	6,908	Melksham	New
46	Re-draw north west boundary to align with the A365 and Dunch Lane junction	0	Melksham Without	Melksham
47	Southern boundary with Seend, Locking Close and the canal - Giles Wood	0	Seend	Melksham Without
48	Land between Berryfield Lane and the River Avon - LCP	0	LCP	Melksham Without

**11,304**



## **Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without**

### **CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING**

#### **44. and 45 (two references, but one scheme). Whole parish merger**

##### Summary of Proposal

A merger of the parishes of Melksham and Melksham Without.

##### Maps:

Scheme 44 and 45 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 5

Scheme 44 and 45 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 6

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

##### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

24 responses were received via the CGR website portal. Of those, 3 were in favour of the merger and 17 were against. The remaining four were categorised as amendments by the survey software, but an analysis of the wording used clearly indicates that two favoured the merger, and the other two were against it.

This makes a total of 5 in favour of a merger, and 19 against.

##### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the three public meetings. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meetings.

Four hard copy response forms were received, 3 against the merger, and 1 in favour.

### **Main Considerations**

The proposal by Melksham Town Council is that Melksham and Melksham Without be replaced by a single parish. The main argument in favour of this is that this would create a stronger, more resilient parish, which would be better able to provide services to its residents, both now and in the future. A larger parish would be able to take on additional responsibilities, for the benefit of the local community. The counter-argument, put forward by Melksham Without Parish Council, is that the two parishes have separate identities which would be lost in a merger and that the interests of the residents of Melksham Without do not always coincide with those of Melksham.

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That there be no change to the structure of Melksham and Melksham Without parishes and that they remain as separate parishes**

Reasons:- The existing structure is considered to provide effective and convenient local government, with both of the parish councils working effectively to provide services to their respective parish communities. The Working Group did not consider that there was sufficient justification for a merger of the two parishes.

### **43. Properties within Melksham Without (Snarlton Lane, Thyme Road area)**

The Council consulted on two options for the general Melksham area. The first option was for a large scale merger of the parishes of Melksham and Melksham Without, and this is shown at schemes 44 and 45.

There are four smaller schemes in the second option. The largest is a proposal to move the boundary between Melksham and Melksham Without so that approximately 733 relatively newly built properties become part of Melksham. Currently they are situated outside the Town boundaries and are part of Melksham Without.

Map: Scheme 43 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 1

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the three public meetings. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meetings.

Two responses were received, both in favour of the proposal.

### **Main Considerations**

The proposal is to alter the boundary to include within Melksham all of the new residential development inside the proposed new spine road. The new road would become the boundary. The main issue in this proposal is whether the proposed changes will provide a more suitable boundary between the two parishes and whether the alterations will lead to more effective governance and community identity.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Melksham Without shown hatched and edged in green on Scheme 43 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 1, being land in the vicinity of Snarlton Lane and Thyme Road, becomes part of the parish of Melksham**

Reasons:- The proposed new boundary line provided a clear division between the two parishes and that the community in the area to be transferred would have clear affinity with Melksham

#### **46. Re-draw north west boundary to align with the A365 and Dunch Lane junction**

##### Summary of Proposal

This is a proposal to align part of the north western boundary of Melksham with Melksham Without, so that it is aligned with the A365 road and Dunch Lane in the area of their junction.

No residential properties appear to be affected by this proposal, although a large number of new dwelling are due to be constructed there..

##### Map:

Scheme 46 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 2

Scheme 46 - Streets - George Ward School from MWOPC

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

##### Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

One comment appeared under the Corsham section of the website, suggesting that there should be just one parish at Melksham

##### Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the three public meetings. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meetings.

Two completed response forms were received, both in favour of the proposal.

#### **Main Considerations**

The current parish boundary in this location does not follow any easily identifiable route and passes through land allocated for housing development. Moving the boundary to the line of the A365 would provide a clearly defined division between the parishes and would ensure that all properties built on the site would be within the same parish, which would lead to improved community governance.

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Melksham Without shown hatched and edged in green on Scheme 46 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 2, being land in the vicinity of Dunch Lane and the A365 becomes part of the parish of Melksham**

Reasons:- The existing boundary had become anomalous following development in the area and that the community would benefit from the whole area being within one parish and it was logical that this should be Melksham

#### **47. Southern boundary with Seend, Locking Close and the canal - Giles Wood**

##### Summary of Proposal

This is a proposal to move part of the boundary with Seend in a southerly direction to meet the Kennet and Avon canal. This would mean that the path between Locking Close and the canal would become part of the Melksham Without parish.

No residential properties appear to be affected by this proposal.

Map: Scheme 47 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 3

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

Six responses were received via the CGR website portal. Three were in favour of the proposal and three were against it.

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the three public meetings. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meetings.

One response was received (from somebody ticking the “interested party” box, rather than “resident”) and this was in favour of the proposal.

#### **Main Considerations**

There are two main issues here. Firstly, whether moving the boundary between Seend and Melksham Without to the line of the canal in this location makes a more appropriate dividing line between the two parishes. Secondly, there is a picnic site on the land the management of which is currently largely funded by Melksham Without Parish Council. It is the view of Melksham Without PC that it would be more convenient for this site to be within its parish, as that would remove complications regarding the management of the picnic site.

Seend Parish Council oppose the proposal as they have concerns about the future use of the area and do not consider the current management arrangements for the picnic site to be a sufficient justification for any change. They consider that the area has a strong community identity with Seend parish.

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Seend, shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 47 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 3 being land in the vicinity of Locking Close and Giles Wood becomes part of the parish of Melksham Without**

Reasons:- the proposal would provide a clearer boundary between the two parishes and it seemed sensible for the picnic area to be within Melksham Without, given the existing maintenance arrangements for that area

#### **48. Land between Berryfield Lane and the River Avon – LCP**

##### Summary of Proposal

This is a proposal to rationalise the boundary of land common to both parishes (LCP) using the river as the proposed boundary line. This would involve the small area of land between Berryfield Lane and the River Avon being transferred from Broughton Gifford Parish Council to Melksham Without Parish Council.

No residential properties appear to be affected by this proposal.

Map: Scheme 48 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 4

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Copies of the survey were attached to the agenda for the three public meetings. Whilst the feedback is set out below, this is obviously from residents who may also have commented at the meetings.

One response was received, from a parish representative, in favour of the proposal.

#### **Main Considerations**

This area of land is currently shared in common between the two parishes, which is a historical anomaly. It is considered appropriate that this be rectified by transferring the land to one of the parishes. The issue then is which is the more appropriate, given the nature of the area the area be transferred and the resulting boundaries. Transferring it to Melksham Without would lead to the parish boundary following the line of the river in that area.

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the area of land common to the parishes of Broughton Gifford and Melksham Without, shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 48 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 4, being land in the vicinity of Berry Lane becomes part of the parish of Melksham Without**

Reasons:- the proposal would remove the anomaly of an area being common to two parishes and it was logical for the boundary to follow the line of the river

## Mapping

- Scheme 43 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 1
- Scheme 44 and 45 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 5
- Scheme 44 and 45 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 6
- Scheme 46 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 2
- Scheme 46 - Streets - George Ward School from MWOPC
- Scheme 47 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 3
- Scheme 48 - Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without Map 4

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Community Action Whitley and Shaw CAWS letter to Melksham Without PC 25 October 2015	25/10/15
2	Development and Streets - Former George Ward School November 2015	11/15
3	Extract from Melksham Town Council e-mail 19 February 2014	19/2/14
4	Extract from Melksham Town Council e-mail 30 July 2014	30/7/14
5	Extract from Melksham Without PC e-mail to Broughton Gifford PC 22 December 2014	22/12/14
6	Extract from Melksham Without PC e-mail to Seend PC 22 December 2014	22/12/14
7	Letter from Broughton Gifford PC 5 October 2015	5/10/15
8	Letter to Melksham Without PC 4 April 2014	4/4/14
9	Melksham Seniors Updated Boundary 2 November 2015	2/11/15
10	Melksham Public Meeting Minutes - 4 November 2015	4/11/15
11	Melksham Public Meeting Minutes - 20 October 2015	20/10/15
12	Melksham Public Meeting Minutes - 21 October 2015	21/10/15
13	Melksham TC letter 1 July 2013	1/7/13
14	Melksham Without PC letter 23 July 2014	23/7/14
15	Melksham Without PC letter 28 March 2014	28/3/14
16	Melksham Without PC Response on CGR 12 October 2015	12/10/15
17	Extract of email from Mr P Davis 11 November 2015	11/11/15

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Melksham Without PC	21/10/15	MWOPC "headlines" for residents



## Area B1- Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
49	Properties within Preston exc Thickthorn Area	15	Lyneham and Bradenstoke	Clyffe Pypard
50	Properties within Thickthorn Area	7	Lyneham and Bradenstoke	Clyffe Pypard

22

**Area B1- Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard**  
**CONSULTATION BY LETTER**

**49. Properties within Preston excluding Thickthorn Area**

Summary of Proposal

Subject to Proposal 50 being approved, this is a proposal that properties at Preston (currently in Lyneham) should also become part of the parish of Clyffe Pypard.

Map: Scheme 49 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 2

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

There was an element of overlap with the responses coming back in hard copy for the two elements of these schemes. 22 letters were sent out to residents of Thickthorn and Preston and a total of 12 came back. Six were in favour of the proposals and six were against. These were generally ticked to indicate comments were applicable to the combined schemes (49 and 50) and it has not been possible to isolate the "Thickthorn only" comments.

**Main Considerations**

The main issue here ( and in proposal 50 below) would seem to be whether, applying the relevant criteria, particularly those relating to community identity, there are sufficient reasons to justify making a change to the boundaries in this area. The proposals involve the transfer of properties at Thickthorn from Lyneham & Bradenstoke to Clyffe Pypard. There is no clear consensus among those who have responded to the consultation.

**Community Governance Working Group Recommendation**

**That the proposals for areas of Lyneham and Bradenstoke parish, shown edged green on Maps Scheme 49 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 2, and Scheme 50 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 1 (Area B1), to become part of the parish of Clyffe Pypard be not supported and that there be no changes in this area**

Reasons:- there was no clear community support for the proposal amongst those would be affected by it and there did not appear to be any significant justification for making any change to the existing governance arrangements

## **50. Properties within Thickthorn Area**

### Summary of Proposal

This is a proposal that the boundary between the parishes of Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard should be moved so that properties at Thickthorn become part of Clyffe Pypard, rather than Lyneham.

Map: Scheme 50 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

There was an element of overlap with the responses coming back in hard copy. 22 letters were sent out to residents of Thickthorn and Preston and a total of 12 came back. Six were in favour of the proposals and six were against. These were generally ticked to indicate comments were applicable to the combined schemes (49 and 50) and it has not been possible to isolate the "Thickthorn only" comments.

## **Main Considerations**

See comments on proposal 49 above

## **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:-**

**That the proposals for areas of Lyneham and Bradenstoke parish, shown edged green on Maps Scheme 49 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 2, and Scheme 50 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 1 (Area B1), to become part of the parish of Clyffe Pypard be not supported and that there be no changes in this area**

Reasons:- there was no clear community support for the proposal amongst those would be affected by it and there did not appear to be any significant justification for making any change to the existing governance arrangements

## Mapping

- Scheme 49 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 2
- Scheme 50 - Area B1 - Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard Map 1

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Lyneham and Bradenstoke PC	14/12/11
2	Original List of Properties Mr Morison	
3	Original Proposed Change Mr Morison	
4	PCG Fact Finding meeting notes - Lyneham 4 December 2014	4/12/14
5	LBPC 11 December 2014 Council resolution	11/12/14

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	(None)		

<b>Area B2- Bishopstrow</b>				
	<b>Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted</b>	<b><u>Properties</u></b>	<b><u>Current parish</u></b>	<b><u>To parish</u></b>
51	Properties within Sutton Veny (A36 area)	2	Sutton Veny	Bishopstrow
52	Properties within Barrow House Area	6	Warminster	Bishopstrow
(52b)	Bishopstrow. Grange Lane and Home Farm area.			
		<b>8</b>		

## **Area B2- Bishopstrow**

### **CONSULTATION BY LETTER**

#### **51. Properties within Sutton Veny (A36 area)**

It was proposed that a more logical line for part of the southern boundary of Bishopstrow parish would be the line of the A36 Warminster to Salisbury road

Map: Scheme 51 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 2

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Two letters were sent out, and none were received back

### **Main Considerations**

The main consideration in this proposal is whether moving the parish boundary to the A36 is justified in terms of providing a clear identifiable boundary between parishes and whether there are any implication in terms of community identity or service provision for the two properties affected

### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Sutton Veny, shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 51 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 2 being land in the vicinity of the A36 becomes part of the parish of Bishopstrow**

Reasons:- the extension of the area of Bishopstrow so that the A36 became the parish boundary seems to be a logical change, resulting in a clearer delineation between the two parishes.

## **52. Properties within Barrow House Area**

The parish boundary between Bishopstrow and Warminster leaves a few properties around Barrow House (south of the River Wyllye) in the parish of Warminster. A proposal put forward to the CGR Working Party suggests that there is more affinity of these properties with Bishopstrow than Warminster, and the suggestion is that the boundary line should be moved slightly northwards to follow the line of the river.

Map: Scheme 52 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Six letters were sent out, and one was received back. The wording of the response was slightly ambiguous, but the writer was in favour of the proposal.

### **Main Considerations**

As with similar proposals the main issues here are whether it is more appropriate to move the parish boundary to follow a defined physical feature and whether there are benefits for the community identity or governance for the six properties concerned. It is considered in this case that the properties do have more of an affinity with Bishopstrow than Warminster and that it would be logical for the boundary to be moved to the line of the river.

### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Warminster, shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 52 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 1 being land in the vicinity of Barrow House becomes part of the parish of Bishopstrow**

Reasons:- the properties within the area to be altered would seem to have a closer affinity with Bishopstrow than with Warminster. The alteration would therefore result in more effective and convenient local government for the small number of residents involved.

**52b Bishopstrow. Grange Lane and Home Farm area..**

At the fact finding meeting held in 2014, the CGR were asked to consider transferring land in the area of Bishopstrow House, Grange Lane and Home Farm, which is currently in Warminster parish, to Bishopstrow.

Having considered the matter, the CGR Working Party were of the view that this was not a scheme on which they would seek further consultation, as there did not appear to be good governance reasons to support the proposal.

Map: Scheme 52b - Bishopstrow Proposed Change between Warminster and Bishopstrow

Consultation method: None.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

**Main Considerations**

The main consideration is whether there are any clear community governance grounds for moving the parish boundary in this location

**Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That no changes be made to the areas of Bishopstrow and Warminster in the vicinity of Grange Lane and Home Farm**

Reasons:- the Working Group could not identify any community governance grounds to justify making the change proposed



## Mapping

- Scheme 51 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 2
- Scheme 52 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 1
- Scheme 52b - Bishopstrow Proposed Change between Warminster and Bishopstrow

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Bishopstrow Boundary Review paper 2014 - FINAL	2014
2	Bishopstrow Boundary Review paper 2014 Sheila Thomson	2014
3	Bishopstrow Parish meeting letter including map 29 April 2009	29/4/09
4	Warminster TC minutes 17 November 2014 Minute number 296 refers	17/11/14
5	Notes from Bishopstrow CGR fact finding meeting 2 December 2014	2/12/14

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Bishopstrow PM	16/12/10	
2	Cllr C Newbury	15/7/14	Supports change at river
3	Sutton Veny PC, via Bishopstrow PM	6/12/14	No objection to boundary with Sutton Veny
4	Bishopstrow PM	6/12/14	Suggest 2009 map should not be used.
5	Cllr C Newbury	28/8/15	Points out possible house numbering conflicts
6	Bishopstrow PM	28/8/15	Proposals would still leave anomalies

## Area B3- Nomansland (Redlynch and Landford)

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
53	Properties within Nomansland Proposal Only 1	287	Redlynch	Landford
54	Properties within Hamptworth only Proposal	53	Redlynch	Landford

**340**

## **Area B3- Nomansland (Redlynch and Landford)**

### **CONSULTATION BY LETTER**

#### **53. Properties within Nomansland Proposal Only**

Nomansland is currently in the parish of Redlynch, but there is a proposal that it has more affinity with the neighbouring parish of Landford than it has with the rest of the parish of Redlynch and the boundary should be moved.

Map: Area B3 – Redlynch and Landford Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

Five responses were received via the web portal, but there was a high response to the individual letters sent to residents. These five were all in favour of proposals 53 and/or 54.

Hard copy survey response (summary):

287 letters were sent to residents affected by this proposal and 39 were returned. Of that 39, 37 were in favour of the proposal and 2 were against.

Taken with proposal 54, this means a total of 340 letters were sent out, 53 were returned, of which 48 were in favour and 5 were against.

### **Main Considerations**

There is clear support for this and for proposal 54 from those who made representations. The main issue is whether the properties concerned have a close community identification with Langford than with Redlynch, taking into account the geography of the area and the relative location of the settlements

### **Community Governance Working Party Recommendation**

**That the area of land in the parish of Redlynch shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 53 - Area B3 - Redlynch and Landford Map 1 being land at Nomansland becomes part of the parish of Landford**

Reasons:- the Working Group accepted that the community within the area concerned had a greater affinity with Landford than with the rest of Redlynch and that proposed change was justified in terms of community identity and interest. The proposal was also supported by the overwhelming majority of the residents who responded to the consultation.

#### **54. Properties within Hamptworth**

If the option to move Nomansland in to Landford is approved, there is a second proposal to consider also moving Hamptworth and its environs in to Landford as well.

Map: Scheme 53 - Area B3 - Redlynch and Landford Map 2  
Scheme 54 Redlynch and Landford Hamptworth Estate  
Scheme 54 Redlynch and Landford with National Park area

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

Five responses were received via the web portal, but there was a high response to the individual letters sent to residents. These five were all in favour of proposals 53 and/or 54.

Taken with proposal 53, this means a total of 340 letters were sent out, 53 were returned, of which 48 were in favour and 5 were against.

Hard copy survey response (summary):

53 letters were sent to residents affected by this proposal and 14 were returned. Of that 14, 11 were in favour of the proposal and 3 were against.

#### **Main Considerations**

As proposal 53 above

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:**

**That, subject to proposal 53 above being approved, the area of land in the parish of Redlynch shown hatched and edged in green on Map Scheme 53 - Area B3 - Redlynch and Landford Map 2 being land at Hamptworth becomes part of the parish of Landford**

Reasons:- if proposal 53 is accepted, then there is a clear logic in this further area becoming part of Landford, in terms of both community identity and effective local governance. This proposal was also supported by a large majority of respondents to the consultation.

## Mapping

- Map: Area B3 – Redlynch and Landford Map 1 - Properties within Nomansland Proposal Only
- Map: Area B3 – Redlynch and Landford Map 2 - Properties within Hamptworth
- Scheme 54 Redlynch and Landford Hamptworth Estate
- Scheme 54 Redlynch and Landford with National Park area

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Extract from e-mail from Cllr Randall 5 May 2013	5/5/13
2	Extract from e-mail from Cllr Randall 25 July 2014	25/7/14
3	Notes of fact finding meeting Nomansland 19 November 2014	19/11/14
4		

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Cllr L Randall	22/1/14	Link between Hamptworth and Nomansland
2	Mr D Anderson	1/9/15	Will supply alternative map for Hamptworth estate. Subsequently received in hard copy

## Area B4 - Tisbury and West Tisbury

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

		<u>Properties</u>	<u>Current parish</u>	<u>To parish</u>
55	Properties within Tisbury	1,198	Tisbury	Unknown
56	Properties within West Tisbury	269	West Tisbury	Unknown
		<b>1,467</b>		

## **55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury**

For several years, there have been discussions locally about the boundary between Tisbury and West Tisbury, as development straddles the parish boundary between the two parishes.

Previous suggestions have ranged from a revision of the boundary in the built up area, to a re-organisation based on either streets or post codes. The possibility of a merger has also been discussed. No clear option has been put to the Council at this time.

### **Maps**

Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 1  
Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 2  
Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 3

Consultation method: Individual letter. None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

### **Main Considerations**

#### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:**

**That no changes be made to the governance arrangements in the Tisbury area at this stage**

Reasons:- No clear or firm proposals for change have been put forward for consideration at this time, but both parish councils are engaged in active discussions.

## Maps

Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 1  
Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 2  
Scheme 55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Boundaries 3

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Extract from Tisbury PC e-mail 6 July 2014	6/7/14
2	Extract from West Tisbury PC e-mail 22 October 2015	22/10/14
3	Letter from Mr J Pope 18 May 2010	18/5/10
4	Letter from West Tisbury PC 8 March 2014	8/3/14
5	Map to accompany extract from e-mail from West Tisbury PC 22 October 2015	22/10/15
6	Notes of Tisbury fact finding meeting 19 November 2014	19/11/14
7	Tisbury PC 18 June 2015	18/6/15
8	West Tisbury PC 5 July 2014	5/7/14
9	West Tisbury PC 17 June 2015	17/6/15
10		

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	Mrs T Austreng	30/6/14	Against merger
2			
3			



## **56b Tidworth warding**

Considerable residential development has significantly affected the ratio of electors to councillors in the wards of the town council which were created in 2004.

Map: Scheme 56b - Tidworth 2004 Map with Order

Consultation method: None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

### **Main Considerations**

At present, there are ten Councillors for the East Ward (east of the A338 road), seven for the West Ward and two for the Perham Down Ward.

The West Ward is currently having / or has had 100 properties built by Wimpey. The East Ward is currently having 600 built by Persimmon. Within the next two years, another 322 will be built by the Army (not part of Army Basing but a long-term requirement). This means that East Ward will have an additional 822 properties more than the West Ward so the East Ward is in danger of being under represented when compared to the West Ward

The local councillor has suggested that Tidworth Town Council should remain at 19 members, but changes should be made to reflect the alterations in property and elector numbers.

No formal consultation has been held yet with the Town Council or its residents.

### **Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:**

**To consider this matter further and report back to Council with a recommendation**

## Mapping

Map: Scheme 56b - Tidworth 2004 Map with Order

## Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Tidworth 2004 Order Text	

## Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	(No recent e-mails)		

**Schemes discontinued by Council on 25 February 2015, presented here for information only.**

Many of the original schemes contained in the Terms of Reference were either long standing casual requests for information, or were schemes for which there is no longer any local support. In February 2015, the Council supported the Working Party's recommendation that there should be no further action on the following schemes, and these are now resolved items.

	<b><u>Area</u></b>	<b><u>Ref</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
57	Durrington (although the army re-basing may result in a review of the area in due course)	B5	Resolved item - No further action
58	Compton Chamberlayne	C1	Resolved item - No further action
59	Horningsham and the Deverills	C2	Resolved item - No further action
60	All areas - potential for amalgamation of parishes	C3	Resolved item - No further action
61	Sutton Mandeville	C4	Resolved item - No further action
62	Grafton	C5	Resolved item - No further action
63	Idmiston	C6	Resolved item - No further action
64	Gt Somerford	C7	Resolved item - No further action
65	Urchfont	C8	Resolved item - No further action

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### **What is a Community Governance Review (CGR)?**

These reviews were previously called Parish Reviews and they are usually undertaken every 10-15 years to make sure that the boundaries and electoral arrangements of parishes within an area are working well.

A CGR must:-

- Reflect the identities and interests of the communities in that area; and
- be effective and convenient.

Consequently, a CGR must take into account:-

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

Therefore any changes made by a CGR must improve communities and local democracy in the parish or parishes concerned.

### **Why is the Council doing this now?**

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 transferred responsibility for these reviews to principal councils. A number of parishes and towns within the county have asked the council to review their boundaries.

### **Some information on this Review refers to parish or town wards – what are these?**

Some large parishes are divided into smaller sections, called wards, and these can reflect the character of a parish. For instance, if a parish contains two villages, with quite separate identities, then the parish might be split into two separate wards, with separate parish councillors for each ward.

### **How many councillors can a Parish Council have?**

There must not be fewer than five councillors on a parish council but there is no maximum number given. Ideally, the number of members on a parish council should reflect the size of the parish overall.

### **Will my post code change?**

No, Royal Mail has a separate process for setting postcodes, which do not correlate with parish boundaries.

### **Does changing a parish boundary make any difference to the likelihood of development occurring on the edge of settlements?**

No. The criteria, and the legislation that sits behind it, for determining whether or not parish boundaries should change bears no relation to the legislation that guides the determination of planning applications. In simple terms, if a proposal for development comes forward the parish within which that development sits has no direct relevance to the decision whether to grant planning permission or not.

### **Will this affect my council tax bill?**

Possibly. Most parish councils levy what is known as a precept to cover their costs. Typically the contribution toward your parish council is around 5% of the council tax you pay. There are variations between parish precepts so it is likely that this element of your council could change if your property moves into a different parish.

The 2014/15 and 2015/16 Council Tax band D charge and precept for all parishes can be seen at:

<http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/counciltaxhousingandbenefits/counciltax/ctaxhowmuch/counciltaxbanddandpreceptallparishes.htm>

It is not possible to say what the 2016/17 charges will be, and nor is it possible to predict the effect of the Community Governance proposals on these parish precepts.

### **Will I have to get official documents like my driving licence changed if my property moves from one parish to another?**

No. The key elements of your address for official purposes are your house name/number, street and postcode. There are many examples already of where a postal address records a property in a different town/parish than the one in which it is actually situated.

### **If my property moves from one parish to another, do I need to change my passport details?**

No. Your passport does not contain your address, therefore there is no requirement to update the details.

### **What sort of factors might be taken into account when looking at community identity?**

There is no set list of factors; the following offers a few suggestions:

- Where do you tell your friends you live?
- Where are your key services, e.g. shops, doctors, pub, sports club, social club?
- Where do you think the boundary with the next parish is?
- Do you know which parish you live in?
- Are there any natural physical boundaries such as a river, road, hill nearby?
- Are there any Community groups or associations in the area which help to indicate where communities begin and end?

### **Where can I read more about Community Governance Reviews and how they operate?**

The Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission have produced guidance on how to conduct reviews and what they should cover.

This can be seen at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-governance-reviews-guidance>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Guidance on community governance reviews



The  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England

## Guidance on community governance reviews

March 2010

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England



Department for Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU  
Telephone: 0303 444 0000  
Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright, 2010

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: [licensing@opsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@opsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Communities and Local Government Publications  
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

March 2010

ISBN: 978 1 4098 2421 3



# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Section 1</b>	
Introduction	6
The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and community governance reviews	6
Aim of this guidance	6
Issues covered in this guidance	7
Statutory provisions	7
Structure of Guidance	8
Further information	8
<b>Section 2</b>	
Undertaking community governance reviews	9
Why undertake a community governance review?	9
Terms of reference for community governance reviews	10
Timing of community governance reviews	11
Undertaking community governance reviews	13
Public petitions to trigger community governance reviews	15
<b>Section 3</b>	
Making and implementing recommendations made in community governance reviews	17
Context of parishes in the wider community	17
Defining a parish	17
Criteria for undertaking a community governance review:	18
The identities and interests of local communities	19
Effective and convenient local government	20
Factors for consideration	21
The impact on community cohesion of community governance arrangements	21
Size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish	23

Parish meetings and parish councils	25
Recommendations and decisions on the outcome of community governance reviews	26
Implementation of community governance reviews by order	28
Maps of parish changes and mapping conventions	29
<b>Section 4</b>	
Other aspects of community governance reviews	30
Parish names and alternative styles for parishes	30
Grouping or degrouping parishes	31
Abolishing parishes and dissolving parish councils	32
Rural areas	33
London	34
Other urban areas	34
Charter trustee areas	35
Other (non-parish) forms of community governance	35
<b>Section 5</b>	
Electoral arrangements	39
Introduction	39
What are electoral arrangements?	39
Ordinary year of election	39
Council size	40
Parish warding	41
The number and boundaries of parish wards	42
The number of councillors to be elected for parish wards	42
Names of parish wards	43
Electorate forecasts	44
Consent/protected electoral arrangements	44
<b>Section 6</b>	
Consequential recommendations for related alterations to the boundaries of principal councils' wards and/or divisions	46

## Foreword

This document comprises guidance issued by the Secretary of State and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England under section 100 of the Local Government and Public Involvement and Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act) on undertaking, and giving effect to recommendations made in, community governance reviews and on making recommendations about electoral arrangements respectively.

The Implementation Plan for the Local Government White Paper, *Strong and Prosperous Communities*<sup>1</sup> (the 2006 White Paper), sets out Communities and Local Government's future approach to guidance. It proposes that guidance must be short, clear and practical, and that an open and inclusive approach to its preparation should be followed, involving the range of stakeholders who will be affected by or have an interest in it.

This guidance follows that approach. It is an updated version of guidance originally published in 2008 prepared by a partnership of Communities and Local Government and the Electoral Commission with stakeholders including DEFRA, the Local Government Association, County Councils Network, London Councils, the National Association of Local Councils, and the Society of Local Council Clerks. It aims to be clear and practical but also to encourage innovative and flexible local action. The main change to the guidance has been to reflect the establishment of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which is responsible for the boundary-related functions previously exercised by the Electoral Commission and the Boundary Committee for England.

A model community governance reorganisation order is available on the Department's website.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Strong and Prosperous Communities*, the Local Government White Paper, The Stationery Office, October 2006(Cm 6969).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/modelreorganisationorder>

## Section 1: Introduction

### The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and community governance reviews

1. Chapter 3 of Part 4 of the 2007 Act devolves the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to local government and local communities in England.
2. The Secretary of State therefore has no involvement in the taking of decisions about recommendations made in community governance reviews and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's (LGBCE) involvement is limited to giving effect to consequential recommendations for related alterations to the electoral areas of principal councils.
3. From 13 February 2008, district councils, unitary county councils and London borough councils ('principal councils') have had responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews and have been able to decide whether to give effect to recommendations made in those reviews. In making that decision, they will need to take account of the views of local people.
4. Principal councils are required, by section 100(4) of the 2007 Act, to have regard to this guidance which is issued by the Secretary of State, under section 100(1) and (3), and the LGBCE under section 100(2).
5. This guidance is not an authoritative interpretation of the law (as that is ultimately a matter for the courts) and it remains the responsibility of principal councils to ensure that any actions taken by them comply with the relevant legislation. They should seek their own legal advice where appropriate.

#### Aim of this guidance

6. This guidance is intended to provide assistance to principal councils on:
  - a) undertaking community governance reviews;
  - b) the making of recommendations for electoral arrangements for parish councils and the making of consequential recommendations to the LGBCE for related alterations to the boundaries of electoral areas of principal councils; and

- c) giving effect to recommendations made in community governance reviews.

### Issues covered in this guidance

7. The guidance supports and helps to implement key aspects of the 2006 White Paper. The 2007 Act requires that local people are consulted during a community governance review, that representations received in connection with the review are taken into account and that steps are taken to notify them of the outcomes of such reviews including any decisions.
8. The matters covered by the guidance include:
  - a) duties and procedures in undertaking community governance reviews (Chapter 2), including on community governance petitions; the document gives guidance on a valid petition, and for the requirement for petitions to meet specific numerical or percentage thresholds signed by local electors;
  - b) making and implementing decisions on community governance (Chapter 3): the 2007 Act places a duty on principal authorities to have regard to the need to secure that any community governance for the area under review reflects the identities and interests of the local community in that area, and that it is effective and convenient; relevant considerations which influence judgements against these two principal criteria include the impact on community cohesion, and the size, population and boundaries of the proposed area;
  - c) other forms of community governance not involving parishes (Chapter 4) for example, residents' associations, community forums, tenant management organisations, area committees;
  - d) considerations on whether parish meetings and parish councils would be most appropriate, and electoral arrangements (Chapter 5);
  - e) consequential recommendations for related alterations to ward and division boundaries (Chapter 6).

### Statutory provisions

9. In addition to the 2007 Act, legislation relating to parishes can also be found in the Local Government Act 1972 (in particular, provision about parish meetings and councils, the constitution of a parish meeting, the constitution and powers of parish councils and about parish councillors) and the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (reviews of, and recommendations about,

electoral areas by the LGBCE), as well as in other enactments.

## Structure of guidance

10. This document is published jointly and is divided into two parts. Chapters 2 to 4 deal with those matters which the Secretary of State may issue guidance on and the issues raised in Chapters 5 and 6 are those on which the LGBCE may issue guidance. Having conducted a community governance review, unless in certain circumstances there are no implications for electoral arrangements, principal councils will need to consider both parts of this guidance together.

## Further information

11. Further information about electoral arrangements for parishes and any related alterations to district or London borough wards, or county divisions should be sought from the LGBCE's website [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).



## Section 2: Undertaking community governance reviews

### Why undertake a community governance review?

12. Community governance reviews provide the opportunity for principal councils to review and make changes to community governance within their areas. It can be helpful to undertake community governance reviews in circumstances such as where there have been changes in population, or in reaction to specific or local new issues. The Government has made clear in the 2006 White Paper and in the 2007 Act its commitment to parish councils. It recognises the role such councils can play in terms of community empowerment at the local level. The 2007 Act provisions are intended to improve the development and coordination of support for citizens and community groups so that they can make the best use of empowerment opportunities.
13. The 2007 Act is intended to streamline the process of taking decisions about giving effect to recommendations made in a community governance review, such as recommendations for the creation of new parishes and the establishment of parish councils, and about other matters such as making changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements. By devolving the powers to take these decisions from central government to local government, the 2007 Act is intended to simplify the decision-making process and make it more local.
14. Parish and town councils are the most local tier of government in England. There are currently about 10,000 parishes in England – around 8,900 of which have councils served by approximately 70,000 councillors. There is a large variation in size of parishes in England from those with a handful of electors to those with over 40,000 electors.
15. In many cases making changes to the boundaries of existing parishes, rather than creating an entirely new parish, will be sufficient to ensure that community governance arrangements to continue to reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government. For example, over time communities may expand with new housing developments. This can often lead to existing parish boundaries becoming anomalous as new houses are built across the boundaries resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours. In such circumstances, the council should consider undertaking a community governance review, the terms of reference

of which should include consideration of the boundaries of existing parishes.

16. A community governance review offers an opportunity to put in place strong, clearly defined boundaries, tied to firm ground features, and remove the many anomalous parish boundaries that exist in England. Reviews also offer the chance to principal councils to consider the future of what may have become redundant or moribund parishes, often the result of an insufficient number of local electors within the area who are willing to serve on a parish council. Some of these issues are considered elsewhere in this guidance (see chapter 3 about parish councils and parish meetings and chapter 4 regarding grouping parishes and dissolving parish councils and abolishing parishes).
17. Since new boundaries may be used to provide the building blocks for district and London borough ward and/or county division boundaries in future electoral reviews of district, London borough, unitary and county councils, it is important that principal councils seek to address parish boundary anomalies when they arise. Principal councils should therefore consider carefully changes to parish boundaries as these can have consequential effects on the boundaries for other tiers of local government.
18. Community governance reviews may also be triggered by local people presenting public petitions to the principal council. This is explained in more detail in paragraphs 39 to 43 on public petitions to trigger community governance reviews.

### Terms of reference for community governance reviews

19. The 2007 Act allows principal councils to determine the terms of reference under which a community governance review is to be undertaken. It requires the terms of reference to specify the area under review and the principal council to publish the terms of reference. If any modifications are made to the terms of reference, these must also be published.
20. Terms of reference will need to be drawn up or modified where a valid community governance petition has been received by the principal council. Local people will be able to influence the terms of reference when petitioning (see paragraphs 24 and 39 to 43 for more information).
21. As the 2007 Act devolves power from central to local government and to local communities, it is inappropriate to prescribe a “one size fits

all” approach to terms of reference for community governance reviews applied by principal councils. However, the Government expects terms of reference to set out clearly the matters on which a community governance review is to focus. The local knowledge and experience of communities in their area which principal councils possess will help to frame suitable terms of reference. The terms should be appropriate to local people and their circumstances and reflect the specific needs of their communities.

22. In areas for which there is both a district council and a county council, district councils are required under section 79 of the 2007 Act to notify the county council of their intention to undertake a review and of their terms of reference. County councils play a strategic role in the provision of local services, and they can offer an additional dimension to any proposal to conduct a review, particularly as the terms of reference are being formulated. The bodies which the principal council must consult under section 93 of the 2007 Act include other local authorities which have an interest in the review. Such local authorities would include any county council for the area concerned. In such circumstances the district council should seek the views of the county council at an early stage.
23. Local people may have already expressed views about what form of community governance they would like for their area, and principal councils should tailor their terms of reference to reflect those views on a range of local issues. Ultimately, the recommendations made in a community governance review ought to bring about improved community engagement, better local democracy and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

### Timing of community governance reviews

24. A principal council is under a duty to carry out a community governance review if it receives a valid community governance petition for the whole or part of the council’s area. However, the duty to conduct a review does not apply if:
  - a) the principal council has concluded a community governance review within the last two years which in its opinion covered the whole or a significant part of the area of the petition; or
  - b) the council is currently conducting a review of the whole, or a significant part of the area to which the petition relates.
25. Where a review has been conducted within the last two years the principal council still has the power to undertake another review if it so wishes. Where a review is ongoing, the council can choose to

modify the terms of reference of the ongoing review to include the matters within the petition, or to conduct a second review.

26. Otherwise, the 2007 Act provides for a principal council to conduct a community governance review at any time. Principal councils will want to keep their community governance arrangements under review, and they should ensure that they consider on a regular basis whether a review is needed. A review may need to be carried out, for example, following a major change in the population of a community or as noted earlier in this chapter (see paragraph 15) to re-draw boundaries which have become anomalous, for example following new housing developments being built across existing boundaries. Principal councils should exercise their discretion, but it would be good practice for a principal council to consider conducting a review every 10-15 years – except in the case of areas with very low populations when less frequent reviews may be adequate.
27. In the interests of effective governance, the principal council should consider the benefits of undertaking a review of the whole of its area in one go, rather than carrying out small scale reviews in a piecemeal fashion of two or three areas. However, it is recognised that a full-scale review will not always be warranted, particularly where a review of the whole area or a significant part of the principal council's area has been carried out within the last few years. Occasionally, it may be appropriate to carry out a smaller review, for example, to adjust minor parish boundary anomalies.
28. Principal councils should use their knowledge and awareness of local issues when deciding whether to undertake a review. However, principal councils should avoid starting a community governance review if a review of district, London borough or county council electoral arrangements is being, or is about to be, undertaken. Ideally, community governance reviews should be undertaken well in advance of such electoral reviews, so that the LGBCE in its review of local authority electoral arrangements can take into account any parish boundary changes that are made. The LGBCE can provide advice on its programme of electoral reviews.
29. Where the LGBCE bases its new district or London borough ward boundaries on parish boundaries the Parliamentary Boundary Commission will then use these boundaries to determine parliamentary constituency boundaries (parliamentary constituencies use district and London borough wards as their building blocks). This illustrates the importance of keeping parish boundaries under review and ensuring they accurately reflect local communities.
30. Reorganisation of community governance orders (explained further in

this chapter under implementation) creating new parishes, abolishing parishes or altering their area can be made at any time following a review. However for administrative and financial purposes (such as setting up the parish council and arranging its first precept), the order should take effect on the 1 April following the date on which it is made. Electoral arrangements for a new or existing parish council will come into force at the first elections to the parish council following the reorganisation order. However, orders should be made sufficiently far in advance to allow preparations for the conduct of those elections to be made. In relation to a new parish council, the principal council may wish to consider whether, during the period between 1 April and the first elections to the parish council, it should make interim arrangements for the parish to be represented by councillors who sit on the principal council.

31. Parish council elections should normally take place every four years at the same time as the elections for the district or London borough ward or, in areas outside of London which have no district council, the county division in which a parish, or part of a parish, is situated. However, where a new parish is to be created, it may be necessary to alter the date of the next parish election, particularly if the next elections to the ward or division are not scheduled to take place for some time. To achieve this, section 98 of the 2007 Act allows principal councils to modify or exclude the application of sections 16(3) and 90 of the Local Government Act 1972, so that the first election to the new parish council is held in an earlier year. This results in councillors serving either a shortened or lengthened first term to allow the parish council's electoral cycle to return to that of the unitary, district or London borough ward at the next election.

### Undertaking community governance reviews

32. Section 93 of the 2007 Act allows principal councils to decide how to undertake a community governance review, provided that they comply with the duties in that Act which apply to councils undertaking reviews.
33. Principal councils will need to consult local people and take account of any representations received in connection with the review. When undertaking the review they must have regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identities and interests of the community in the area under review, and the need to secure that community governance in that area is effective and convenient. Further information on making recommendations is in Chapter 3.
34. Under the 2007 Act principal councils are required to consult both

those local government electors in the area under review, and others (including a local authority such as a county council) which appears to the principal council to have an interest in the review. In the case of a community governance review where a parish council already exists, as a local authority, it too should be consulted. Other bodies might include local businesses, local public and voluntary organisations - such as schools or health bodies. The principal council must take into account any representations it receives as part of a community governance review.

35. Principal councils must consider the wider picture of community governance in carrying out their reviews. In some areas there may be well established forms of community governance such as local residents' associations, or community forums which local people have set up and which help make a distinct contribution to the community. Some principal councils may also have set up area committees which perform a specific role in the local community.
36. In undertaking a review, section 93(5) requires principal councils to take these bodies into account. Potentially, as representatives of their community, these bodies may be considered as foundations for or stages towards the creation of democratically elected parishes (further information about other non-parish forms of community governance can be found in Chapter 4).
37. Principal councils are required to complete the review, including consequential recommendations to the LGBCE for related alterations to the boundaries of principal area wards and/or divisions, within 12 months of the start of the community governance review. The review begins when the council publishes terms of reference of the review and concludes when the council publishes the recommendations made in the review<sup>3</sup>. The Government stated in the 2006 White Paper that they wanted the process for undertaking community governance (formerly parish reviews) to be simplified and speeded up. Given that there is no longer the need to make recommendations to Central Government prior to implementing any review recommendations, the 2007 Act makes it easier for principal councils to reach decisions on community governance reviews. Whilst a community governance review will depend on a number of factors, such as the number of boundary changes, the Government believes it should be feasible to accomplish reviews within 12 months from the start.

---

<sup>3</sup> See section 102(3) of the 2007 Act for the interpretation of 'begin' and 'conclude' in relation to a review.

38. Principal councils will need to build into their planning process for reviews reasonable periods for consultation with local electors and other stakeholders, for the consideration of evidence presented to them in representations, as well as for decision-making (see Chapter 3 on making and implementing recommendations made in community governance reviews). Implementation of reviews by Order and the requirement for the principal council to publicise the outcome of a community governance review are covered in paragraphs 98 to 103.

### Public petitions to trigger community governance reviews

39. In recent years, the Government has been keen to encourage more community engagement. The 2006 White Paper confirmed this development further stressing the intention to build on the existing parish structure improving capacity to deliver better services, and to represent the community's interests.
40. Under the 2007 Act, local electors throughout England can petition their principal council for a community governance review to be undertaken. The petition must set out at least one recommendation that the petitioners want the review to consider making. These recommendations can be about a variety of matters including:
- the creation of a parish
  - the name of a parish
  - the establishment of a separate parish council for an existing parish
  - the alteration of boundaries of existing parishes
  - the abolition of a parish
  - the dissolution of a parish council
  - changes to the electoral arrangements of a parish council
  - whether a parish should be grouped under a common parish council or de-grouped.
  - a strong, inclusive community and voluntary sector;
  - a sense of civic values, responsibility and pride; and
  - a sense of place – a place with a 'positive' feeling for people and local distinctiveness.
  - reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
  - effective and convenient.

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
  - the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.
  - People from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities
  - People knowing their rights and responsibilities
41. For a petition to be valid it must meet certain conditions. The first of these conditions is that a petition must be signed by the requisite number of local electors. It is recommended that petitioners aim to collect the requisite number of signatures based on the most recently published electoral register. It should be against this register that the petition thresholds (set out below) will be assessed. The three thresholds are:
- a) for an area with less than 500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 50% of them;
  - b) for an area with between 500 and 2,500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 250 of them;
  - c) for an area with more than 2,500 local electors, the petition must be signed by at least 10% of them.
42. These thresholds have been chosen to ensure that the minimum number of signatures to be obtained is neither so high that it will be impossible in most cases to collect that number nor so low as to allow a very small minority of electors to trigger a review. So, in areas with higher populations the threshold is not so high as to prevent a genuine desire for a review not being realised. Equally, in areas with smaller numbers of electors, this means that a handful of electors cannot initiate a review against the wishes of the majority of their fellow electors. The thresholds therefore help to ensure that the local democratic process is properly maintained.
43. The petition should define the area to which the review relates, whether on a map or otherwise, and refer to identifiable fixed boundaries. Where a proposed boundary is near an individual property, the petition must make clear on which side of the boundary the property lies. The petition must specify one or more proposed recommendations for review.
44. Where a petition recommends the establishment of a town or parish council or parish meeting (see paragraph 88) in an area which does not currently exist as a parish, the petition is to be treated as including



a recommendation for a parish to be created even if it does not expressly make such a recommendation<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Section 80 (8) of the 2007 Act

## Section 3: Making and implementing recommendations made in community governance reviews

45. As stated in the 2006 White Paper parish councils are an established and valued form of neighbourhood democracy and management. They are not only important in rural areas but increasingly have a role to play in urban areas. We propose to build on the existing parish structure, so as to improve its capacity to deliver better services and represent the community's interests.

### Context of parishes in the wider community

46. Communities and Local Government is working to help people and local agencies create cohesive, attractive and economically vibrant local communities, building on the Government's Sustainable Communities' strategy.
47. An important aspect to approaching sustainable communities is allowing local people a say in the way their neighbourhoods are managed. One of the characteristics of a sustainable community is the desire for a community to be well run with effective and inclusive participation, representation and leadership. This means:
  - a) representative, accountable governance systems which both facilitate strategic, visionary leadership and enable inclusive, active and effective participation by individuals and organisations; and
  - b) effective engagement with the community at neighbourhood level including capacity building to develop the community's skills, knowledge and confidence;
48. Central to the concept of sustainable communities is community cohesion. The impact of community governance on cohesion is an issue to be taken into account when taking decisions about community governance arrangements, and this is discussed further below.

### Defining a parish

49. Parish and town councils vary enormously in size, activities and circumstances, representing populations ranging from less than 100 (small rural hamlets) to up to 70,000 (large shire towns – Weston-Super-Mare Town Council being the largest). The majority of them are small; around 80% represent populations of less than 2,500. Small parishes with no parish council can be grouped with

neighbouring parishes under a common parish council (see paragraphs 112 to 115).

50. Parish councils continue to have two main roles: community representation and local administration. For both purposes it is desirable that a parish should reflect a distinctive and recognisable community of place, with its own sense of identity. The views of local communities and inhabitants are of central importance.
51. The identification of a community is not a precise or rigid matter. The pattern of daily life in each of the existing communities, the local centres for education and child care, shopping, community activities, worship, leisure pursuits, transport facilities and means of communication generally will have an influence. However, the focus of people's day-to-day activities may not be reflected in their feeling of community identity. For instance, historic loyalty may be to a town but the local community of interest and social focus may lie within a part of the town with its own separate identity.

### Criteria for undertaking a community governance review

52. Section 93 of the 2007 Act requires principal councils to ensure that community governance within the area under review will be:
53. When considering the criteria identified in the 2007 Act, principal councils should take into account a number of influential factors, including:
54. In considering this guidance, the impact on community cohesion is linked specifically to the identities and interests of local communities. Size, population and boundaries are linked to both but perhaps more specifically to community governance being effective and convenient.

### The identities and interests of local communities

55. Parish councils have an important role to play in the development of their local communities. Local communities range in size, as well as in a variety of other ways. Communities and Local Government is working to help people and local agencies create cohesive, attractive and economically vibrant local communities. The aim for communities across the country is for them to be capable of fulfilling their own potential and overcoming their own difficulties, including community conflict, extremism, deprivation and disadvantage. Communities need to be empowered to respond to challenging economic, social, and cultural trends, and to demographic change.
56. Parish councils can contribute to the creation of successful

communities by influencing the quality of planning and design of public spaces and the built environment, as well as improving the management and maintenance of such amenities. Neighbourhood renewal is an important factor to improve the quality of life for those living in the most disadvantaged areas. Parish councils can be well placed to judge what is needed to build cohesion. Other factors such as social exclusion and deprivation may be specific issues in certain areas, and respect is fundamental to the functioning of all places and communities. The Government remains committed to civil renewal, and empowering citizens to work with public bodies, including parish councils, to influence public decisions.

57. 'Place' matters in considering community governance and is a factor in deciding whether or not to set up a parish. Communities and Local Government's vision is of prosperous and cohesive communities which offer a safe, healthy and sustainable environment. One aspect of that is strong and accountable local government and leadership. Parish councils can perform a central role in community leadership. Depending on the issue, sometimes they will want to take the lead locally, while at other times they may act as an important stakeholder or in partnership with others. In either case, parish councils will want to work effectively with partners to undertake the role of 'place-shaping', and be responsive to the challenges and opportunities of their area in a co-ordinated way.
58. It is clear that how people perceive where they live - their neighbourhoods - is significant in considering the identities and interests of local communities and depends on a range of circumstances, often best defined by local residents. Some of the factors which help define neighbourhoods are: the geography of an area, the make-up of the local community, sense of identity, and whether people live in a rural, suburban, or urban area.
59. Parishes in many cases may be able to meet the concept of neighbourhoods in an area. Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity. Like neighbourhoods, the feeling of local community and the wishes of local inhabitants are the primary considerations.
60. Today, there may well be a variety of different communities of interest within a parish; for example, representing age, gender, ethnicity, faith or life-style groups. There are other communities with say specific interests in schools, hospitals or in leisure pursuits. Any number of communities of interest may flourish in a parish but they do not necessarily centre on a specific area or help to define it.

61. Building a sense of local identity may make an important contribution to cohesion where a local area is facing challenges arising from rapid demographic change. In considering the criteria, community governance reviews need to home in on communities as offering a sense of place and of local identity for all residents.

### Effective and convenient local government

62. The Government believes that the effectiveness and convenience of local government is best understood in the context of a local authority's ability to deliver quality services economically and efficiently, and give users of services a democratic voice in the decisions that affect them.
63. Local communities should have access to good quality local services, ideally in one place. A parish council may be well placed to do this. With local parish and town councils in mind, effective and convenient local government essentially means that such councils should be viable in terms of providing at least some local services, and if they are to be convenient they need to be easy to reach and accessible to local people.
64. In responding to the requirement for effective and convenient local government, some parish councils are keen, and have the capacity to take on more in the provision of services. However, it is recognised that not all are in position to do so. The 2007 Act provides a power of well-being to those parish councils who want to take on more, giving them additional powers to enable them to promote the social, economic and environmental well being of their areas. Nevertheless, certain conditions must be met by individual parish councils before this power is extended to them.
65. Wider initiatives such as the Quality Parish Scheme and charters agreed between parish councils and principal councils also help to give a greater understanding of securing effective and convenient local government. In such cases, parish and town councils which are well managed and good at representing local views will be in a better position to work closely with partner authorities to take more responsibility for shaping their area's development and running its services.

### Factors for consideration

66. When reviewing community governance arrangements, principal councils may wish to take into account a number of factors, to help inform their judgement against the statutory criteria.

*The impact on community cohesion of community governance arrangements*

67. Setting up parishes and parish councils clearly offers the opportunity to strengthen community engagement and participation, and generate a positive impact on community cohesion. In conducting community governance reviews (whether initiated by itself or triggered by a valid petition), the principal council should consider the impact on community cohesion when deciding whether or not to set up a parish council.
68. Britain is a more diverse society – ethnically, religiously and culturally – than ever before. Today’s challenge is how best to draw on the benefits that migration and diversity bring while addressing the potential problems and risks to cohesion. Community cohesion is about recognising the impact of change and responding to it. This is a fundamental part of the place-shaping agenda and puts local authorities at the heart of community building.
69. In its response to the recommendations of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion the Government has defined community cohesion as what must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another.
70. The Government’s vision of an integrated and cohesive community is based on three foundations:
  - People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly
71. And three key ways of living together:
  - A shared future vision and sense of belonging
  - A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity
  - Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds.
72. The Commission on Integration and Cohesion’s report, *Our Shared Future*, is clear that communities have expert knowledge about their own circumstances and that actions at the local level contribute to achieving integration and cohesion, with local authorities well placed to identify any pressures. The Commission reports that policy makers and practitioners see civic participation as a key way of building integration and cohesion – from ensuring people have a stake in the community,

to facilitating mixing and engendering a common sense of purpose through shared activities. The 2006 White Paper's proposals for stronger local leadership, greater resident participation in decisions and an enhanced role for community groups contribute to promoting cohesion.

73. Community cohesion is about local communities where people should feel they have a stake in the society, and in the local area where they live by having the opportunity to influence decisions affecting their lives. This may include what type of community governance arrangements they want in their local area.
74. The 2007 Act requires principal councils to have regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identity and interests of local communities; the impact on community cohesion is linked strongly to it. Cohesion issues are connected to the way people perceive how their local community is composed and what it represents, and the creation of parishes and parish councils may contribute to improving community cohesion. Community governance arrangements should reflect, and be sufficiently representative of, people living across the whole community and not just a discrete cross-section or small part of it. It would be difficult to think of a situation in which a principal council could make a decision to create a parish and a parish council which reflects community identities and interests in the area and at the same time threatens community cohesion. Principal councils should be able to decline to set up such community governance arrangements where they judged that to do so would not be in the interests of either the local community or surrounding communities, and where the effect would be likely to damage community cohesion.
75. As part of a community governance review a principal council should consider whether a recommendation made by petitioners will undermine community cohesion in any part of its area.
76. Challenges to community cohesion are often very local in nature and because of their knowledge of local communities, local authorities are in a good position to assess these challenges. As for the other considerations set out in this guidance, principal councils will wish to reach a balanced judgement in taking community cohesion into account in community governance arrangements.

*Size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish*

77. Size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish are

linked to aspects of both principal criteria as identified in the 2007 Act, but perhaps more specifically to community governance being effective and convenient. Often it is factors such as the size, population and boundaries which influence whether or not it is going to be viable to create a parish council. Parishes must fall within the boundaries of a single principal council's area.

78. The Local Government Commission for England in its 1993 Report *Renewing Local Government in the English Shires* makes the point that there is a long history of attempts to identify ideal minimum and maximum sizes for local authorities. Instead its preference was for authorities to be based on natural communities and reflecting people's expressed choices. This is even truer today, particularly at the most local level of government. Nevertheless, the size of communities and parishes remains difficult to define.
79. Parish councils in England currently vary greatly in size from those with a handful of electors with some representing hamlets of around 50 people to those in towns with well over 40,000 electors. Geography and natural boundaries; population size; and to an extent 'council size' (the term used by the LGBCE to describe the number of councillors who are elected to a local authority) may influence how small or large a parish council can be.
80. The general rule should be that the parish is based on an area which reflects community identity and interest and which is of a size which is viable as an administrative unit of local government. This is generally because of the representative nature of parish councils and the need for them to reflect closely the identity of their communities. It is desirable that any recommendations should be for parishes or groups of parishes with a population of a sufficient size to adequately represent their communities and to justify the establishment of a parish council in each. Nevertheless as previously noted, it is recognised that there are enormous variations in the size of parishes, although most parishes are below 12,000 in population.
81. A parish council should be in a position to provide some basic services and many larger parishes will be able to offer much more to their local communities. However, it would not be practical or desirable to set a rigid limit for the size of a parish whether it is in a rural or urban area, although higher population figures are generally more likely to occur in urban areas. Equally, a parish could be based on a small but discrete housing estate rather than on the town within which the estate lies.
82. There may be cases where larger parishes would best suit the needs



of the area. These might include places where the division of a cohesive area, such as a Charter Trustee town (see paragraphs 133 to 134), would not reflect the sense of community that needs to lie behind all parishes; or places where there were no recognisable smaller communities.

83. As far as boundaries between parishes are concerned, these should reflect the “no-man’s land” between communities represented by areas of low population or barriers such as rivers, roads or railways. They need to be, and be likely to remain, easily identifiable. For instance, factors to consider include parks and recreation grounds which sometimes provide natural breaks between communities but they can equally act as focal points. A single community would be unlikely to straddle a river where there are no crossing points, or a large area of moor land or marshland. Another example might be where a community appeared to be divided by a motorway (unless connected by walkways at each end). Whatever boundaries are selected they need to be, and be likely to remain, easily identifiable.
84. In many cases a boundary change between existing parishes, or parishes and unparished areas, rather than the creation of an entirely new parish, will be sufficient to ensure that parish arrangements reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government. For example, over time, communities may expand with new housing developments. This can often lead to existing parish boundaries becoming anomalous as new houses are built across them resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours.
85. A review of parish boundaries is an opportunity to put in place strong boundaries, tied to firm ground detail, and remove anomalous parish boundaries. Since the new boundaries are likely to be used to provide the building blocks for district ward, London borough ward, county division and parliamentary constituency boundaries in future reviews for such councils, it is important that principal councils seek to address parish boundary issues at regular intervals.

### Parish meetings and parish councils

86. Under the Local Government Act 1972 all parishes, whether or not they have a parish council, must have a parish meeting. In many parishes the requirement to have a parish meeting takes the form of at least one annual meeting, or more often several meetings during each year, organised (where one exists) by the parish council or if not by the parish meeting itself. The parish meeting of a parish consists of the local government electors for the parish, and as such local

electors are invited to attend these meetings. Parish meetings have a number of functions, powers and rights of notification and consultation. The trustees of a parish meeting hold property and act on its behalf. Depending on the number of local government electors in the parish, there are different rules about whether or not a parish council must be created for the parish, or whether it is discretionary.

87. Where principal councils are creating new parishes, the 2007 Act requires them to make recommendations about whether or not a new parish should be constituted in their area. New parishes can be constituted in a number of different ways, including by creating a parish in an area that is not currently parished, amalgamating two or more parishes and separating part of a parish, with or without aggregating it with parts of other parishes.
88. Section 94 of the 2007 Act applies in relation to these recommendations. It places principal councils under a duty to recommend that a parish should have a council in parishes which have 1000 electors or more. In parishes with 151 to 999 electors the principal council may recommend the creation of either a parish council or a parish meeting. In parishes with 150 or fewer electors principal councils are unable to recommend that a parish council should be created and therefore only a parish meeting can be created. The aim of these thresholds is to extend the more direct participatory form of governance provided by parish meetings to a larger numbers of electors. Equally, the thresholds help to ensure that both the population of a new parish for which a council is to be established is of sufficient size to justify its establishment and also that local people are adequately represented.
89. One of the reasons for these differing thresholds is that the Government recognises the difficulty which sometimes exists in small parishes, in particular, in managing to get sufficient numbers to stand for election to the parish council. However, the thresholds identified above do not apply to existing parish councils. If the community governance review concludes that the existence of the parish council reflects community identities and provides effective and convenient local government, despite the small number of electors, then it can recommend that the parish council should continue in existence. So, where an existing parish of 150 or less electors already has a parish council with the minimum number of five parish councillors it can continue to have a parish council.
90. If a principal council chooses to establish a parish council, or if an existing parish whose boundaries are being changed has a parish council, the principal authority must consult on, and put in place the

necessary electoral arrangements for that parish. (See Chapter 5 Electoral Arrangements.)

## Recommendations and decisions on the outcome of community governance reviews

91. Community governance reviews will make recommendations on those matters they have considered, as defined by the terms of reference set at the start of the review.
92. A principal council must make recommendations as to:
  - a) whether a new parish or any new parishes should be constituted;
  - b) whether existing parishes should or should not be abolished or whether the area of existing parishes should be altered; or
  - c) what the electoral arrangements for new or existing parishes, which are to have parish councils, should be.
93. It may also make recommendations about:
  - a) the grouping or degrouping of parishes;
  - b) adding parishes to an existing group of parishes; or
  - c) making related alterations to the boundaries of a principal councils' electoral areas.
94. In deciding what recommendations to make the principal council must have regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area and is effective and convenient. The 2007 Act provides that it must also take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions) that have already been made, or that could be made, for the purposes of community representation or community engagement.
95. The recommendations must take account of any representations received and should be supported by evidence which demonstrates that the recommended community governance arrangements would meet the criteria set out in the 2007 Act. Where a principal council has conducted a review following the receipt of a petition, it will remain open to the council to make a recommendation which is different to the recommendation the petitioners wished the review to make. This will particularly be the case where the recommendation is not in the interests of the wider local community, such as where giving effect to it would be likely to damage community relations by dividing communities along ethnic, religious or cultural lines.

96. In making its recommendations, the review should consider the information it has received in the form of expressions of local opinion on the matters considered by the review, representations made by local people and other interested persons, and also use its own knowledge of the local area. It may be that much of this information can be gained through the consultation which the council will have held with local people and also the council's wider engagement with local people on other matters. In taking this evidence into account and judging the criteria in the 2007 Act against it, a principal council may reasonably conclude that a recommendation set out in a petition should not be made. For example, a recommendation to abolish or establish a parish council, may negatively impact on community cohesion, either within the proposed parish area, or in the wider community within which it would be located, and therefore should not be made.
97. The aim of the 2007 Act is to open up a wider choice of governance to communities at the most local level. However, the Government considers that there is sufficient flexibility for principal councils not to feel 'forced' to recommend that the matters included in every petition must be implemented.
98. Under the 2007 Act the principal council must both publish its recommendations and ensure that those who may have an interest are informed of them. In taking a decision as to whether or not to give effect to a recommendation, the principal council must have regard to the statutory criteria (see paragraph 51). After taking a decision on the extent to which the council will give effect to the recommendations made in a community governance review, the council must publish its decision and its reasons for taking that decision. It must also take sufficient steps to ensure that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of the decision and the reasons for it. Who should be informed will depend on local circumstances. Publicising the outcome of reviews is dealt with in the next section on implementation.

#### *Implementation of community governance reviews by order*

99. There are a number of steps that a principal council must take to publicise the outcome of any review it has conducted, and to provide information about that outcome to the bodies it must notify following any reorganisation order it makes to implement the review. Community governance reviews should be conducted transparently so that local people and other local stakeholders who may have an interest are made aware of the outcome of the decisions taken on them and the reasons behind these decisions.

100. If the council implements the recommendations made in its review, there are other steps it is required to undertake. These include depositing copies of the reorganisation order<sup>5</sup> which the principal council will need to draw up to give effect to its decisions. Besides depositing at its main office a copy of the reorganisation order, it should also deposit a map showing the effects of the order in detail which should be available for inspection by the public at all reasonable times (i.e. during normal working hours). The 2007 Act also requires the council to make available a document setting out the reasons for the decisions it has taken (including where it has decided to make no change following a community governance review) and to publicise these reasons.
101. The principal council must publicise how the council has given effect to the review, and that the order and map are available for public inspection as set above. Other means of publicity it may wish to consider are through publication on the council's website, in local newspapers, on notice boards in public places, and in local libraries, town halls or other local offices. In addition, after a principal council has made a reorganisation order, as soon as practicable, it must inform the following organisations that the order has been made:
- a) the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
  - b) the LGBCE
  - c) the Office of National Statistics
  - d) the Director General of the Ordnance Survey
  - e) any other principal council (e.g. a county council) whose area the order relates to.
102. The Audit Commission has statutory responsibility for appointing external auditors to all local councils in England. For the purposes of its audit appointment functions the Commission needs to be aware of changes emerging from community governance reviews. Therefore, principal councils should inform the Audit Commission of any reorganisation orders made to implement the recommendations of community governance reviews.
103. Section 97 of the 2007 Act provides for regulations to make incidental, consequential, transitional or supplementary provision for

---

<sup>5</sup> A copy of a model reorganisation order with different examples of recommendations can be viewed on the Communities and Local Government website. It may help principal councils to draw up reorganisation orders which could be adapted to their own needs and circumstances. Principal councils are not obliged to follow this example. It is offered on an advisory basis and principal councils will want to seek their own legal advice that any orders they produce meet the necessary legal requirements.

the purposes of, or in consequence of, reorganisation orders. Two sets of regulations have been made under the 2007 Act, which apply to reorganisation orders - both came into force on 8 April 2008. The first of these, the Local Government (Parishes and Parish Councils) (England) Regulations 2008 No.625 make provisions in relation to matters such as the distribution of property and the rights and liabilities of parish councils affected by a reorganisation order. The second set, the Local Government Finance (New Parishes) Regulations 2008 No.626 deal with the setting of precepts for new parishes.

104. Section 99 of the 2007 Act provides for public bodies affected by reorganisation following a community governance review to make agreements about incidental matters and what those agreements may provide for. So as to ensure that a reorganisation order has effect subject to the terms of any such agreement, principal councils should make provision for this in the reorganisation order. An example provision has been included in the model reorganisation order which can be found on the Communities and Local Government website (see footnote 2).

## Maps of parish changes and mapping conventions

105. To assist those who will have an interest in any recommendations made by the principal council when conducting a community governance review and to accompany the reorganisation order, clear high quality maps should be produced to a standard equivalent to using Ordnance Survey large scale data as a base. Maps can be graphically presented at a reduced scale for convenience but preferably no smaller than 1:10,000 scale. Each recommendation and order should be depicted on a map or maps. The mapping should clearly show the existing parish ward, parish, district or London borough boundaries and all proposed parish ward and parish boundaries in the area(s) affected, or given effect to in a reorganisation order.
106. It can be useful to include some positional information to identify the location of the area(s) in relation to the complete area of the principal council. A colour key can be included to clearly identify each boundary type. Where there are only proposed changes to an existing parish boundary alignment it can be helpful to show in translucent colour any areas to be transferred from one parish to another. This indicates clearly the extent of the proposed change. It can also be beneficial to add unique references to all areas of transfer to create a

cross reference to the re-organisation order document. Applying a reference to each order map should also be considered so that a link is created with the re-organisation order.

## Section 4: Other aspects of community governance reviews

### Parish names and alternative styles for parishes

- 107.** Prior to the 2007 Act, a parish could be given the status of a town under section 245 of the Local Government Act 1972. “Town” status continues to be available to a parish. In addition, the 2007 Act inserted sections 12A and 12B into the 1972 Act to offer a further choice of alternative styles for a parish: community, neighbourhood and village. However, for as long as the parish has an alternative style, it will not also be able to have the status of a town and vice versa.
- 108.** The ‘name’ of a parish refers to the geographical name of the area concerned and can be changed independent of a review by a principal council at the request of a parish council or parish meeting (where there is no parish council)<sup>6</sup>. A change in the status or ‘style’ of a parish allows for that area to be known as a town, community, neighbourhood or village, rather than as a parish. The status or style of the parish will be reflected in the name of any council of the parish, the parish meeting, any parish trustees, and the chairman or vice-chairman of the parish meeting or of any parish council. So, for example, the council of a parish which uses the style ‘village’ will be known as the ‘village council’ and its councillors as the ‘village councillors’, etc.
- 109.** References in legislation to a ‘parish’ should be taken to include a parish which has an alternative style, as is the case in relation to a parish which has the status of a town. The same applies in relation to references in legislation to a ‘parish meeting’, ‘parish council’, ‘parish councillor’, ‘parish trustees’, etc in connection with a parish which has an alternative style.
- 110.** The Government recognises that in long established parishes, particularly in rural areas, local people may wish to retain the name of their parish and the existing style of their parish councils, - although others may prefer “village” or another style. Following a community governance review, in areas previously unparished where a new parish is being created, people living there may wish for the style of their parish council to reflect the local community in a different way and may prefer one of the alternative styles. This may well be the case for those living in urban areas. Local authorities will wish to take

---

<sup>6</sup> Section 75 Local Government Act 1972



account of these preferences in deciding the name of the parish and the chosen style.

111. Where the review relates to a new parish, it is for the principal council, in the first instance, to make recommendations as to the geographical name of the new parish, and as to whether or not it should have one of the alternative styles. So far as existing parishes under review by principal councils are concerned, the review must make recommendations as to whether the geographical name of the parish should be changed, but it may not make any recommendations for the parish about alternative style. It will be for the parish council or parish meeting to resolve whether the parish should have one of the alternative styles.
112. In relation to a group of parishes, provision about alternative styles for the group may be made by the principal council in a reorganisation order that forms that group, adds a parish to an existing group or de-groups a parish or group. A grouping containing a mixture of styles is not permitted under section 11A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972. Where an individual parish is removed from a group through a de-grouping order the parish must retain the style it had when it was part of the group until such time as the parish council or meeting resolves to adopt an alternative style. Provision about alternative styles in relation to groups will normally be made independently of a community governance review.

### Grouping or degrouping parishes

113. Section 91 of the 2007 Act provides for a community governance review to recommend the grouping or degrouping of parishes by principal councils. As mentioned in chapter 3, (paragraph 87) unless they already exist as functioning parish councils smaller new parishes of less than 150 electors will be unable to establish their own parish council under the 2007 Act.
114. In some cases, it may be preferable to group together parishes so as to allow a common parish council to be formed. Degrouping may offer the reverse possibilities perhaps where local communities have expanded. Such proposals are worth considering and may avoid the need for substantive changes to parish boundaries, the creation of new parishes or the abolition of very small parishes where, despite their size, they still reflect community identity. Grouping or degrouping needs to be compatible with the retention of community interests. It would be inappropriate for it to be used to build artificially large units under single parish councils.
115. Section 91 also requires a review to consider the electoral arrangements

of a grouped parish council or of a parish council established after a parish is de-grouped. Each parish in a group must return at least one councillor.

116. When making a recommendation to group or de-group parishes, the principal council may make a request to the LGBCE to make a related alteration to the boundaries of district or London borough wards or county divisions. For example, if a principal council decided to add an additional parish to a group, because of their shared community identities, it may wish to recommend that all of the parishes in the group be included in the same district ward (see Chapter 6 for more details).

### Abolishing parishes, and dissolving parish councils

117. While the Government expects to see a trend in the creation, rather than the abolition, of parishes, there are circumstances where the principal council may conclude that the provision of effective and convenient local government and/or the reflection of community identity and interests may be best met, for example, by the abolition of a number of small parishes and the creation of a larger parish covering the same area. If, following a review, a principal council believes that this would provide the most appropriate community governance arrangements, then it will wish to make this recommendation; the same procedures apply to any recommendation to abolish a parish and/or parish council as to other recommendations (see paragraph 90 -97). Regulations<sup>7</sup> provide for the transfer of property, rights and liabilities of a parish council to the new successor parish council, or where none is proposed to the principal council itself.
118. Section 88 of the 2007 Act provides for a community governance review to recommend the alteration of the area of, or the abolition of, an existing parish as a result of a review. The area of abolished parishes does not have to be redistributed to other parishes, an area can become unparished. However, it is the Government's view that it would be undesirable to see existing parishes abolished with the area becoming unparished with no community governance arrangements in place.
119. The abolition of parishes should not be undertaken unless clearly justified. Any decision a principal council may make on whether to abolish a parish should not be taken lightly. Under the previous parish review legislation, the Local Government and Rating Act 1997, the Secretary of State considered very carefully recommendations made

<sup>7</sup> The Local Government (Parishes and Parish Councils) (England) Regulations 2008 No.625.

by principal councils for the abolition of any parish (without replacement) given that to abolish parish areas removes a tier of local government. Between 1997 and 2008, the Government rarely received proposals to abolish parish councils, it received only four cases seeking abolition and of these only one was approved for abolition by the Secretary of State.

120. Exceptionally, there may be circumstances where abolition may be the most appropriate way forward. Under the 2007 Act provisions, the principal council would need to consider local opinion, including that of parish councillors and local electors. It would need to find evidence that the abolition of a parish council was justified, and that there was clear and sustained local support for such action. A factor taken into account by the Government in deciding abolition cases, was that local support for abolition needed to have been demonstrated over at least a period equivalent to two terms of office of the parish councillors (i.e. 8 years), and that such support was sufficiently informed. This means a properly constituted parish council should have had an opportunity to exercise its functions so that local people can judge its ability to contribute to local quality of life.
121. Where a community governance review is considering abolishing a parish council we would expect the review to consider what arrangements will be in place to engage with the communities in those areas once the parish is abolished. These arrangements might be an alternative forum run by or for the local community, or perhaps a residents' association. It is doubtful however, that abolition of a parish and its council could ever be justified as the most appropriate action in response to a particular contentious issue in the area or decision of the parish council.
122. In future, principal councils will wish to consider the sort of principles identified above in arriving at their decisions on whether or not to abolish a parish council. In doing so, they will be aware that decisions about community governance arrangements, including decisions for the abolition of a parish council, may attract a challenge by way of judicial review.
123. The 2006 White Paper underlined the Government's commitment to parish councils as an established and valued form of neighbourhood democracy with an important role to play in both rural, and increasingly urban, areas.
124. Section 10 of the Local Government Act 1972 makes provision for the dissolution of parish councils in parishes with very low populations, but not for the de-parishing of the area. Recommendations for the

dissolution of a parish council which is not in this position are undesirable, unless associated either with boundary changes which amalgamate parishes or divide a parish or with plans for a parish to be grouped with others under a common parish council (see paragraphs 112 to 115). Recommendations for changing a parish area (or part of a parish area) into an unparished area are also undesirable unless that area is amalgamated with an existing unparished urban area.

## Rural areas

125. About 90% of the geographical area of England is covered by a parish, and this is mostly in rural or semi-rural areas. So, most populated rural areas already have a structure of local government that includes parishes and many of these have been in existence for hundreds of years. It is desirable that any changes do not upset historic traditions but do reflect changes that have happened over time, such as population shift or additional development, which may have led to a different community identity.
126. The focus of community feeling will differ from place to place and between different types of settlement. A scatter of hamlets may have a feeling of community within each hamlet, meriting a separate parish for each one, or amongst a number of hamlets, for which one parish covering all may be appropriate. Where a number of hamlets surround a village a parish could be based on the village and its environs, provided that the sense of individual identity is not lost.
127. In rural areas, the Government wants to encourage the involvement of local people in developing their community and having a part to play in shaping the decisions that affect them. A parish can be a useful and democratic means of achieving this.

## London

128. The London Government Act 1963 abolished parishes existing at the time within London. When the boundaries for Greater London were established, they were adjusted to allow the surrounding shire counties to keep parishes that were in the fringe areas. Since then, London has been the only part of England not to have parishes or parish councils.
129. The Government's view is that Londoners should have the same rights as the rest of the country. The 2007 Act corrects this anomaly to allow London boroughs the possibility to exercise the same community governance powers as other principal councils including being able to set up parishes and parish councils. Similarly, local

electors in London boroughs are, as elsewhere in England, able to petition for a community governance review.

130. In London, there is the same possibility to choose a style for a parish perhaps to reflect better the local urban area like “community” or “neighbourhood”. Whilst some parts of London are populated by people who may be more transient or mobile than elsewhere, there are equally areas of the capital where there are stable populations who may wish to see the creation of a parish council for their local area.

#### *Other urban areas*

131. There are parts of rural or semi-rural England which are unparished, but the opportunities for establishing new parishes are increasingly to be found in urban and suburban areas. It is possible that identifying the community upon which a parish might be based may be more difficult to discern in some urban areas. A “community” perhaps already represented by a voluntary organisation or a community endeavour, such as a Neighbourhood Watch area or a residents’ association, may indicate a suitable area on which to base proposals for a new or altered parish, (see paragraphs 135 -145).
132. Much of the information described in Chapter 3 on the identities and interests of local communities is applicable to urban areas. There are parishes in parts of some large cities or unitary authorities, as well as a number of parishes in the metropolitan boroughs of the larger conurbations. Some of these parishes have been created under the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 Act, but in most metropolitan boroughs these are on the more sparsely populated peripheries (the originals having been transferred, as part of former rural districts, to the metropolitan counties in 1974).
133. The lower population limits and grouping mentioned above are more relevant to rural areas than to urban areas, although both are applicable in law. The general rule is that the parish is based on an area which reflects community identity and interest and which is viable as an administrative unit. In urban areas this may mean, for example, that a parish should be based on a housing estate rather than on the town within which the estate lies. The larger the town, the greater will be the scope for identification of distinct communities within it.

#### *Charter trustee areas*

134. Charter trustees were established following the local government reorganisations in the early 1970s and 1990s to preserve the historic

identity of former boroughs or cities, most with relatively large populations. To this end, charter trustees have the power to carry out ceremonial functions. They were not intended to act as administrative units. Proposals to create a parish or parish council covering all or part of a charter trustee area need to be judged in particular against the following considerations:

- a) the effect on the historic cohesiveness of the area;
  - b) what are the other community interests in the area? Is there a demonstrable sense of community identity encompassing the charter trustee area? Are there smaller areas within it which have a demonstrable community identity and which would be viable as administrative units?
135. These issues need to be taken into account in those areas with certain cities or boroughs which will be affected by any consequent reorganisation from the structural and boundary changes in the 2007 Act.

### Other (non-parish) forms of community governance

136. In conducting a community governance review, principal councils must consider other forms of community governance as alternatives or stages towards establishing parish councils. Section 93(5) of the 2007 Act states that 'In deciding what recommendations to make [in the community governance review] the principal council must take into account any other arrangements... that have already been made or that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review'. The following paragraphs consider other types of viable community representation which may be more appropriate to some areas than parish councils, or may provide stages building towards the creation of a parish council. There is sometimes evidence locally of an existing community governance infrastructure and of good practice which are successfully creating opportunities for engagement, empowerment and co-ordination in local communities.
137. However, what sets parish councils apart from other kinds of governance is the fact they are a democratically elected tier of local government, independent of other council tiers and budgets, and possess specific powers. This is an important distinction to make. Parish councils are the foundation stones for other levels of local government in England. Their directly elected parish councillors represent local communities in a way that other bodies, however worthy, cannot since such organisations do not have representatives directly elected to those bodies.

138. The 2006 White Paper recommended that local communities should be able to take more responsibilities for local issues affecting their area. Key to this approach is community empowerment, and the ability of various existing organisations themselves to see through specific projects to tackle local issues. Structures such as local residents' associations, community or neighbourhood forums and area committees have an important role to play in local community governance.
139. At the neighbourhood level, there are various initiatives in existence, which through being representative and accountable can effectively empower local people. They have varying degrees of power and influence, and commensurate levels of transparency and accountability.

#### *Area committees*

140. Area committees are part of the structure of some principal councils (e.g. district, unitary and London borough), where they choose to have them. Area committees are a key initiative for enabling local government to fulfil community governance roles and also to deliver government policy on issues affecting social inclusion in local communities. Principal councils also provide resources for area committees, and their councillors are commonly integral to their constitution. Area committees can cover large areas and exist to advise or make decisions on specific responsibilities that can include parks, off-street parking, public toilets, street cleaning, abandoned vehicles and planning applications amongst others. Also, more widely, they contribute to shaping council services and improving local service provision.

#### *Neighbourhood management*

141. Neighbourhood management programmes are similarly set up by principal councils and may be led by one of a number of bodies. The expansion of neighbourhood management was promoted in the 2006 White Paper as a tool to enable local authorities to deliver more responsive services through their empowerment of citizens and communities. Their purpose is to create the opportunity for residents to work with local agencies, usually facilitated by a neighbourhood manager, to improve services at the neighbourhood level.
142. Neighbourhood management arrangements aim to improve 'quality of life' through implementation of (rather than advising or making decisions on) better management of local environment, increasing community safety, improving housing stock, working with young people, and encouraging employment opportunities, supported

strategically by relevant stakeholders and Local Strategic Partnerships. They tend to cover smaller populations than area committees. The 2006 White Paper recommends that take up of neighbourhood management should be encouraged and that Government should work with local authorities pioneering the approach, to raise the profile of achievements and promote adoption elsewhere.

#### *Tenant Management Organisations*

143. The 2006 White Paper makes a series of proposals that facilitate the empowerment of residents through Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs). Tenant Management Organisations are established by the local housing authority; they usually function on urban housing estates and can take responsibility for housing services (such as collecting rents and service charges and organising repairs and maintenance) from the local housing authority under the Housing (Right to Manage) (England) Regulations 2008. The 2006 White Paper promoted the role of TMOs and recommended simplifying and extending their scope; enabling them to take on additional services and undertake further representation of residents within neighbourhoods. A TMO is an independent legal body and usually elects a tenant-led management committee to the organisation; they can also enter into a legal management agreement with landlords.

#### *Area/Community Forums*

144. Area or community forums (including civic forums) can be set up by the principal council, or created by local residents to act as a mechanism to give communities a say on principal council matters or local issues. Sometimes forums are set up to comment on a specific project or initiative that will impact upon the local area, and so may be time-limited. They increase participation and consultation, aiming to influence decision making, rather than having powers to implement services. They vary in size, purpose and impact, but membership usually consists of people working or living in a specific area. Some forums also include ward councillors, and representatives from the council and relevant stakeholders can attend meetings.

#### *Residents' and Tenants' Associations*

145. Residents' and Tenants' associations enable local people to participate in local issues affecting their neighbourhood or housing estate, including the upkeep of the local environment, crime, sometimes dealing with anti-social behaviour matters, or on some estates, housing management. They can be set up by any group of people living in the same area and can choose who members will be;



how they will be represented and what they want to achieve. In the case of tenants' and residents' associations on estates, they may be established with direct support from the principal council, as a mechanism for communicating with the tenants and residents on its estates. To engage effectively with other organisations, residents' and tenants' associations must be able to show that they are accountable and represent the views of the whole community, rather than narrow self interests of just a few local people.

#### *Community Associations*

146. Community associations offer a particular and widespread democratic model for local residents and local community-based organisations in a defined neighbourhood to work together for the benefit of that neighbourhood. They can use a model constitution registered with the Charity Commission. The principal council may also be represented on the association's committee. They usually manage a community centre as a base for their activities. Membership is open to everyone resident in the area.

## Section 5: Electoral arrangements

### Introduction

147. The purpose of a review undertaken by a principal council, or a petition from the electorate, is likely primarily to concern the administrative boundaries of a new or existing parish. As discussed earlier (Chapter 2), this might be in the light of growth from within an existing parish or a locally identified need for a new form of community governance. However, in addition to these primary concerns, principal authorities will also need to consider the governance of new or altered parishes. The principal council must have regard to the need for community governance within the area under review to reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area, and to ensure that the governance is effective and convenient. Further information on electoral arrangements is available from the LGBCE's website [www.LGBCE.org.uk](http://www.LGBCE.org.uk)

### What are electoral arrangements?

148. Electoral arrangements in relation to an existing or proposed parish council are defined in the 2007 Act and are explained in detail below:
- a) ordinary year of election – the year in which ordinary elections of parish councillors are to be held;
  - b) council size – the number of councillors to be elected to the council, or (in the case of a common council) the number of councillors to be elected to the council by local electors in each parish;
  - c) parish warding – whether the parish should be divided into wards for the purpose of electing councillors. This includes considering the number and boundaries of any such wards, the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward and the name of any such ward.

### Ordinary year of election

149. Ordinary parish elections are held once every four years with all councillors being elected at the same time. The standard parish electoral cycle is for elections in 2011, 2015 and every four years after 2015, but parish elections may be held in other years so that they can coincide with elections in associated district or London borough wards or county divisions and share costs. For example, all London borough ward elections take place in 2010, 2014 and so on. We would therefore expect parish elections in London to take place in these years.

150. New or revised parish electoral arrangements come into force at ordinary parish elections, rather than parish by-elections, so they usually have to wait until the next scheduled parish elections. They can come into force sooner only if the terms of office of sitting parish councillors are cut so that earlier parish elections may be held for terms of office which depend on whether the parish is to return to its normal year of election.
151. For example, a parish that had elections in 2007 could wait until its next scheduled elections in 2011 for new parish wards to come into force. Alternatively, the new parish wards could have come into force at elections in 2009 if the terms of office of the councillors elected in 2007 were cut to two years. If the elections in 2009 were for two-year terms of office then the parish council could return to its normal electoral cycle in 2011.
152. Alternatively, if new or revised parish electoral arrangements are to be implemented in the third year of sitting councillors' term of office, provision can be made to cut short the term of office of existing councillors to three years. Elections could then take place with all councillors serving a five-year term of office, enabling the parish to return to its normal year of election.

### Council size

153. Council size is the term used to describe the number of councillors to be elected to the whole council. The 1972 Act, as amended, specifies that each parish council must have at least five councillors; there is no maximum number. There are no rules relating to the allocation of those councillors between parish wards but each parish ward, and each parish grouped under a common parish council, must have at least one parish councillor.
154. In practice, there is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. That variation appears to be influenced by population. Research by the Aston Business School Parish and Town Councils in England (HMSO, 1992), found that the typical parish council representing less than 500 people had between 5 and 8 councillors; those between 501 and 2,500 had 6 to 12 councillors; and those between 2,501 and 10,000 had 9 to 16 councillors. Most parish councils with a population of between 10,001 and 20,000 had between 13 and 27 councillors, while almost all councils representing a population of over 20,000 had between 13 and 31 councillors.
155. The LGBCE has no reason to believe that this pattern of council size to population has altered significantly since the research was

conducted. Although not an exact match, it broadly reflects the council size range set out in the National Association of Local Councils Circular 1126; the Circular suggested that the minimum number of councillors for any parish should be 7 and the maximum 25.

156. In considering the issue of council size, the LGBCE is of the view that each area should be considered on its own merits, having regard to its population, geography and the pattern of communities. Nevertheless, having regard to the current powers of parish councils, it should consider the broad pattern of existing council sizes. This pattern appears to have stood the test of time and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have provided for effective and convenient local government.
157. Principal councils should also bear in mind that the conduct of parish council business does not usually require a large body of councillors. In addition, historically many parish councils, particularly smaller ones, have found difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to stand for election. This has led to uncontested elections and/or a need to co-opt members in order to fill vacancies. However, a parish council's budget and planned or actual level of service provision may also be important factors in reaching conclusions on council size.

### Parish warding

158. Parish warding should be considered as part of a community governance review. Parish warding is the division of a parish into wards for the purpose of electing councillors. This includes the number and boundaries of any wards, the number of councillors to be elected for any ward and the names of wards.
159. In considering whether or not a parish should be divided into wards, the 2007 Act requires that consideration be given to whether:
- a) the number, or distribution of the local government electors for the parish would make a single election of councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
  - b) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented.
160. Accordingly, principal councils should consider not only the size of the electorate in the area but also the distribution of communities within it. The warding of parishes in largely rural areas that are based predominantly on a single centrally-located village may not be justified. Conversely, warding may be appropriate where the parish

encompasses a number of villages with separate identities, a village with a large rural hinterland or where, on the edges of towns, there has been some urban overspill into the parish. However, each case should be considered on its merits, and on the basis of the information and evidence provided during the course of the review.

161. There is likely to be a stronger case for the warding of urban parishes, unless they have particularly low electorates or are based on a particular locality. In urban areas community identity tends to focus on a locality, whether this be a housing estate, a shopping centre or community facilities. Each locality is likely to have its own sense of identity. Again, principal councils should consider each case on its merits having regard to information and evidence generated during the review. (See also under Chapter 3, paragraphs 54 to 60).

*The number and boundaries of parish wards*

162. In reaching conclusions on the boundaries between parish wards the principal council should take account of community identity and interests in the area, and consider whether any particular ties or linkages might be broken by the drawing of particular ward boundaries. Principal councils should seek views on such matters during the course of a review. They will, however, be mindful that proposals which are intended to reflect community identity and local linkages should be justified in terms of sound and demonstrable evidence of those identities and linkages.
163. The principal council should also consider the desirability of parish warding in circumstances where the parish is divided by district or London borough ward and/or county division boundaries. It should be mindful of the provisions of Schedule 2 (electoral change in England: considerations on review) to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 in relation to reviews of district or London borough and county council electoral arrangements. These provide that when the LGBCE is making changes to principal council electoral arrangements, no unwarded parish should be divided by a district or London borough ward or county division boundary, and that no parish ward should be split by such a boundary. While these provisions do not apply to reviews of parish electoral arrangements, the LGBCE believes that, in the interests of effective and convenient local government, they are relevant considerations for principal councils to take into account when undertaking community governance reviews. For example, if a principal council chooses to establish a new parish in an area which is covered by two or more district or London borough wards or county division boundaries it may also wish to consider the merit of putting

parish warding in place to reflect that ward and/or division.

164. When considering parish ward boundaries principal councils should ensure they consider the desirability of fixing boundaries which are, and will remain, easily identifiable, as well as taking into account any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

*The number of councillors to be elected for parish wards*

165. If a principal council decides that a parish should be warded, it should give consideration to the levels of representation between each ward. That is to say, the number of councillors to be elected from each ward and the number of electors they represent.
166. It is an important democratic principle that each person's vote should be of equal weight so far as possible, having regard to other legitimate competing factors, when it comes to the election of councillors. There is no provision in legislation that each parish councillor should represent, as nearly as may be, the same number of electors. However, the LGBCE believes it is not in the interests of effective and convenient local government, either for voters or councillors, to have significant differences in levels of representation between different parish wards. Such variations could make it difficult, in workload terms, for councillors to adequately represent the interests of residents. There is also a risk that where one or more wards of a parish are over-represented by councillors, the residents of those wards (and their councillors) could be perceived as having more influence than others on the council.
167. The LGBCE offers no specific guidelines for what might constitute significant differences in levels of representation; each case will need to be considered on its merits. Principal councils should be mindful that, for the most part, parish wards are likely to be significantly smaller than district or London borough wards. As a consequence, imbalances expressed in percentage terms may be misleading, disguising the fact that high variations between the number of electors per councillor could be caused by only a few dozen electors.
168. Where a community governance review recommends that two or more parishes should be grouped under a common parish council, then the principal council must take into account the same considerations when considering the number of councillors to be elected by each parish within the group.

*Names of parish wards*

169. In considering the names of parish wards, the principal council should give some thought to existing local or historic places so that, where appropriate, these are reflected and there should be a presumption in favour of ward names proposed by local interested parties.

**Electorate forecasts**

170. When considering the electoral arrangements for a parish, whether it is warded or not, the principal council must also consider any change in the number or distribution of the electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years beginning with the day when the review starts. The most recent electoral register should be used to gain an accurate figure for the existing electorate. Planning assumptions and likely growth within the area, based on planning permissions granted, local plans or, where they are in place, local development frameworks should be used to project an accurate five year electorate forecast. This ensures that the review does not simply reflect a single moment but takes account of expected population movements in the short- to medium-term.
171. Electorate forecasts should be made available to all interested parties as early as possible in the review process, ideally before the formal commencement of the review so that they are available to all who may wish to make representations.

**Consent/Protected electoral arrangements**

172. If, as part of a community governance review, a principal council wishes to alter the electoral arrangements for a parish whose existing electoral arrangements were put in place within the previous five years by an order made either by the Secretary of State, the Electoral Commission, or the LGBCE, the consent of the LGBCE is required. This includes proposals to change the names of parish wards.
173. The principal council must write to the LGBCE detailing its proposal and requesting consent. The LGBCE will consider the request and will seek to ensure that the proposals do not conflict with the original recommendations of the electoral review, and that they are fair and reasonable.
174. Where a request for consent is made to the LGBCE, it will expect to receive evidence that the principal council has consulted with electors in the relevant parish(es) as part of the community governance review and will wish to receive details of the outcome of that review.
175. For changes to the number or boundaries of parish wards, the

principal council will also need to provide the LGBCE with an existing and five-year forecast of electors in the parish(es) affected. Five-year forecasts should be accurate from the day that the review began. Both existing and forecast figures should be provided for the existing parish (and parish wards where relevant) and the proposed parish (and parish wards where relevant).

176. If the LGBCE consents to the changes it will inform the principal council which can then implement the proposed changes by local order. No LGBCE order is required. Conversely, if the LGBCE declines to give consent, no local order may be made by the local authority until the five-year period has expired.



## Section 6: Consequential recommendations for related alterations to the boundaries of principal council's wards and/or divisions

177. As part of a community governance review, principal councils may wish to consider whether to request the LGBCE to make changes to the boundaries of district or London borough wards or county divisions to reflect the changes made at parish level.
178. There are three instances when a principal council may wish to consider related alterations to the boundaries of wards or divisions following:
- the creation, alteration or abolition of a parish
  - the establishment of new or altered parish ward boundaries
  - a grouping or de-grouping of parishes.
179. In the interests of maintaining coterminosity between the boundaries of principal authority electoral areas and the boundaries of parishes and parish wards, principal councils may wish to consider as part of a community governance review whether to make consequential recommendations to the LGBCE for related alterations to the boundaries of any affected district or London borough wards and/or county divisions. The Commission may agree to make related alterations to ensure coterminosity between the new parish boundary and the related ward and/or division boundary. If so, the Commission will make an order to implement the related alterations. The Commission will not normally look to move ward or division boundaries onto new parish ward boundaries. However, it will consider each proposal on its merits.
180. In addition, when making a recommendation to group or de-group parishes, (see paragraph 108 to 111 for more details) the principal council may make a request to the LGBCE to make a related alteration of district or London borough ward or county division boundaries. For example, if a principal council decided to add an additional parish to a group it may wish to recommend that all of the parishes be included in the same district or London borough ward and/or county division. Recommendations for related alterations should be directly consequential upon changes made as part of a community governance review.
181. It will be for the LGBCE to decide, following the receipt of proposals, if

a related alteration should be made and when it should be implemented. Only the LGBCE can make an order implementing any alterations to the district or London borough ward or county division boundary. No order will be made to implement related alterations until the order changing the boundary of the relevant parish(es) or parish ward(s), or the order grouping or de-grouping parishes, has been made. Rather than make related alterations that would create detached wards or divisions or that would have a disproportionate impact on ward or division electoral equality, the LGBCE may decide to programme an electoral review of the principal council area.

182. If, in liaison with the district or London borough council and/or the county council, the LGBCE decides to make related alterations to ward and/or division boundaries at a different time, it will consider whether there would be any adverse effects for local people in the holding of elections while the boundaries are not coterminous. However, changes to wards and divisions come into force at district or London borough and county ordinary elections in the electoral areas on either side of the electoral boundary change, so a period of non-coterminosity until the scheduled parish, district or London borough and county elections have taken place may be preferable to unscheduled elections. Unscheduled elections will be necessary to bring into force changes between adjacent parishes or wards whose scheduled elections never normally coincide.
183. In two tier areas, district councils are advised to seek the views of the county council in relation to related alterations to division boundaries.
184. A principal council may decide that it does not wish to propose related alterations to ward or division boundaries. Where this results in boundaries no longer being coterminous, principal councils will need to be satisfied that the identities and interests of local communities are still reflected and that effective and convenient local government will be secured. Principal councils will also wish to consider the practical consequences, for example for polling district reviews, of having electors voting in parish council elections with one community but with a different community for district or London borough and/or county elections.
185. Where proposals for related alterations are submitted to the LGBCE, it will expect to receive evidence that the principal council has consulted on them as part of a community governance review and the details of the outcome of that review. Principal councils may wish to undertake this consultation at the same time as they consult on proposals to alter the boundaries of parishes or establish new parishes. They must complete the community governance review,

including making any consequential recommendations to the LGBCE for related alterations, within a period of one year. Sufficient time should be given to the LGBCE to consider the proposals in advance of the election year in which the principal council proposes they be implemented.

186. The principal council will need to take into account the number of registered electors in any district or London borough ward or county division affected when the review starts, and a forecast of the number of electors expected to be in the areas within five years, and provide this information to the LGBCE. This information should be used to establish a total electorate figure for each district or London borough ward and/or county division affected by the recommendations, both for the current electorate and for expected electorate five years after the start of the review. These totals should also be provided to the LGBCE.
187. When submitting proposals to the LGBCE the principal council should illustrate the proposed changes on maps of a suitable scale, using different coloured lines and suitable keys to illustrate the required changes.
188. If the LGBCE decides not to implement the proposed related alterations, then the existing ward and/or division boundaries will remain in force. The LGBCE has no power to modify any recommendations submitted to it; it may only implement or reject the recommendations.
189. In most cases, related alterations to district or London borough ward and/or county division boundaries tend to be fairly minor in nature and simply tie the ward and/or division boundary to the affected parish boundary. However, if an authority has altered several parish and/or parish ward boundaries and proposes several related alterations to district or London borough ward and/or county division boundaries, the cumulative effect of these could affect electoral equality at district or London borough and/or county level. This could be particularly acute if a number of parishes were transferred between district or London borough wards or county divisions to reflect grouped parishes. In such circumstances, the LGBCE will wish to consider conducting an electoral review of the principal council area or an electoral review of a specified area within it. The timing of such reviews would be dependent on the LGBCE's review programme commitments.

