

AGENDA

Meeting: Electoral Review Committee

Place: Council Chamber - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

Date: Tuesday 8 February 2022

Time: 2.30 pm

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Lisa Alexander, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01722 434560 or email lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225) 713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Membership:

Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (Chairman)
Cllr Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Allison Bucknell
Cllr Ernie Clark
Cllr Jacqui Lay

Cllr Ian McLennan
Cllr Ashley O'Neill
Cllr Antonio Piazza
Cllr Ian Thorn
Cllr Stuart Wheeler

Substitutes:

Cllr Adrian Foster
Cllr Peter Hutton

Cllr Ricky Rogers
Cllr Derek Walters

Recording and Broadcasting Information

Wiltshire Council may record this meeting for live and/or subsequent broadcast. At the start of the meeting, the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded. The images and sound recordings may also be used for training purposes within the Council.

By submitting a statement or question for an online meeting you are consenting that you will be recorded presenting this, or this may be presented by an officer during the meeting, and will be available on the public record. The meeting may also be recorded by the press or members of the public.

Any person or organisation choosing to film, record or broadcast any meeting of the Council, its Cabinet or committees is responsible for any claims or other liability resulting from them so doing and by choosing to film, record or broadcast proceedings they accept that they are required to indemnify the Council, its members and officers in relation to any such claims or liabilities.

Details of the Council's Guidance on the Recording and Webcasting of Meetings is available on request. Our privacy policy can be found [here](#).

Parking

To find car parks by area follow [this link](#). The three Wiltshire Council Hubs where most meetings will be held are as follows:

County Hall, Trowbridge
Bourne Hill, Salisbury
Monkton Park, Chippenham

County Hall and Monkton Park have some limited visitor parking. Please note for meetings at County Hall you will need to log your car's registration details upon your arrival in reception using the tablet provided. If you may be attending a meeting for more than 2 hours, please provide your registration details to the Democratic Services Officer, who will arrange for your stay to be extended.

Public Participation

Please see the agenda list on following pages for details of deadlines for submission of questions and statements for this meeting.

For extended details on meeting procedure, submission and scope of questions and other matters, please consult [Part 4 of the council's constitution](#).

The full constitution can be found at [this link](#).

For assistance on these and other matters please contact the officer named above for details

AGENDA

Part I

Items to be considered when the meeting is open to the public

1 **Apologies**

To receive any apologies or substitutions for the meeting.

2 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (*Pages 5 - 6*)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2021.

3 **Declarations of Interest**

To receive any declarations of disclosable interests or dispensations granted by the Standards Committee.

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

To receive any announcements through the Chair.

5 **Public Participation**

Statements

If you would like to make a statement at this meeting on any item on this agenda, please register to do so at least 10 minutes prior to the meeting. Up to 3 speakers are permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes each on any agenda item.

Please contact the officer named on the front of the agenda for any further clarification.

Questions

To receive any questions from members of the public or members of the Council received in accordance with the constitution.

Those wishing to ask questions are required to give notice of any such questions in writing to the officer named on the front of this agenda no later than 5pm on **1 February 2022** in order to be guaranteed of a written response. In order to receive a verbal response questions must be submitted no later than 5pm on **3 February 2022**. Please contact the officer named on the front of this agenda for further advice. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.

Details of any questions received will be circulated to Committee members prior to the meeting and made available at the meeting and on the Council's website.

6 **Parish Name Change Review** (*Pages 7 - 12*)

To receive a report from the Monitoring Officer on proposals to change the name of the parishes of Biddestone and Charlton.

7 **Community Governance Review 2021/22** (*Pages 13 - 296*)

To receive a report from the Monitoring Officer on the ongoing Community Governance Review.

8 **Date of the Next Meeting**

To confirm the date of the next meeting as 19 May 2022 (date may be subject to change).

9 **Urgent Items**

Any other items of business which the Chairman agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

Part II

Items during consideration of which it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed.

Electoral Review Committee

MINUTES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 21 SEPTEMBER 2021 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNTY HALL, BYTHESEA ROAD, TROWBRIDGE, BA14 8JN.

Present:

Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (Chairman), Cllr Gavin Grant (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Ian McLennan and Cllr Antonio Piazza

11 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Allison Bucknell, Ernie Clark, Jacqui Lay, Ashley O'Neill, Paul Sample JP, Stuart Wheeler.

12 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2021 were presented for consideration, and it was,

Resolved:

Subject to a correction to Minute 2 to change reference from 'Chairman' to 'Vice-Chairman', to approve and sign the minutes of the meeting as a true and correct record.

13 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations.

14 **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no announcements

15 **Public Participation**

There were no statements or questions submitted.

16 **Community Governance Review 2021/22**

A report was received setting out proposed terms of reference for a Community Governance Review, in accordance with the prioritisation of requests as discussed at the meeting on 12 July 2021.

The Committee confirmed that it would progress a review involving Malmesbury/St Paul Malmesbury Without, Beechingstoke and surrounding

parishes, and Calne Without and surrounding parishes, in accordance with the draft terms of reference.

The importance of consultation at appropriate stages was discussed, and it was agreed that pre-consultation information gathering would involve online surveys, briefing notes and physical meetings in review areas, and that all Committee members would be involved at all stages of the process.

At the conclusion of discussion, it was,

Resolved:

- 1) To approve the Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review as detailed at Appendix A of the report, to formally commence on 22 September 2021.**
- 2) To confirm that any requests in respect of changing the names of the parishes, including that from Biddestone Parish Council, be progressed under S75 of the Local Government Act 1972 at an appropriate time.**

17 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 2.30 - 2.45 pm)

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

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line ((01225) 713114 or email communications@wiltshire.gov.uk

Wiltshire Council

Electoral Review Committee

8 February 2022

Parish Name Change Review

Purpose

1. To consider proposals to change the names of two parishes.

Background

2. Changing the name of a parish or parish council can be done through a Community Governance Review process in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
3. However, such a change may also be progressed under s.75 of the Local Government Act 1972.
4. As the latter would be a simpler process in terms of structure, consultation and decision, the Committee at its meeting on 21 September 2021 resolved that where a request was received solely regarding a parish name change, the s.75 process would be followed
5. This report relates to requests from the following parishes:
 - Biddestone;
 - Charlton.

Main Considerations

6. In order to change the name of a parish, a decision would be required by Full Council, who would then notify the Secretary of State, Director General of the Ordnance Survey, and the Registrar General, along with a parish name change order.
7. There are no specific consultation requirements where a change of parish name is being considered under s.75, only proscribed notifications after the event as detailed under Paragraph 6 above.
8. However, the Council must have reasonable grounds for making a change that has been proposed by a parish council. On this basis, a briefing note was sent to all Wiltshire Council Members and parishes in the council area on 12 November 2021. An online survey was launched on the same date, which remained open until 31 December 2021. Several reminder emails were sent to the parish councils involved to publicise the suggestion. Charlton was not included in that briefing note as the request from the parish arrived after publication of the briefing note. However, this was provided to the parish council for circulation on 26 November 2021 following their previous inclusion in a Community Governance Review. The council's webpage on reviews was updated to include both name change surveys.
9. S.75 allows the Council to change the name of a parish at the request of a parish council (or parish meeting if there is no council). This means that the Council may only approve or not approve that suggested name, and cannot substitute some other

proposal. For instance should a new suggestion arise as a result of a survey, unless the parish council had indicated formal consent for that alternative proposal.

Biddestone

10. Biddestone Parish Council requested that the name of the parish be changed to Biddestone & Slaughterford Parish Council. The reason for the request was:

Biddestone Parish consists of two villages, Biddestone village and the much smaller Slaughterford village, with outlying rural farms and cottages. For many years the parish council has unofficially called itself the Biddestone & Slaughterford Parish Council to reflect the fact that the residents of both villages are of equal importance. The Parish Council would now like to formally request the change of name from Biddestone Parish to Biddestone & Slaughterford Parish.

11. 18 responses were received to the parish council's proposal. 17 were in favour, with 1 against. Details are included at **Appendix A**.

Charlton

12. Charlton is located near Pewsey and is one of two parishes named Charlton in Wiltshire. It is currently represented by Charlton and Wilsford Parish Council.
13. Charlton has also been included in the separate Community Governance Review due to an anomaly with its status with Wilsford as a joint parish council. This is where the two parishes have been treated as one entity for electoral purposes, when they should be electing parish councillors to each parish, who then sit on the same joint parish council. As part of that review the name could be changed as requested (see below), however this would not take effect until May 2025, whereas an order under S.75 would enable a change to be made in 2022.
14. The proposal from the Charlton and Wilsford parish council is to change the name of the parish of Charlton to 'Charlton St Peter', and to change the name of the parish council to 'Charlton St Peter and Wilsford Joint Parish Council'.

The reason for the suggestion is that this is the name widely used for Charlton and by which the parish is recognised, and how the parish council is referred to at present.

15. No responses were received on the online survey specifically regarding the name change. However, the survey on the wider Community Governance Review, which includes confirming the joint parish council being called 'Charlton St Peter and Wilsford Joint Parish Council', received 8 responses, all in favour.
16. Additionally, the Committee had previously recommended to Council to make a change to a parish name at request of a parish council. This was the parish of Cheverall Parva, where no responses were received to an online survey, as the Committee was satisfied the reasoning offered and support of the parish council justified this.
17. The Committee could therefore recommend the change be approved.

Safeguarding Implications

18. There are no safeguarding implications.

Public Health Implications

19. There are no public health implications.

Procurement Implications

20. There are no procurement implications.

Risk Assessment

21. There are no risk issues arising from this report.

Equalities Implications

22. There are no equalities implications.

Environmental and Climate Change Implications

23. There are no environmental implications.

Workforce Implications

24. There are no workforce implications.

Financial Implications

25. There are no financial implications.

Legal Implications

26. This report is consistent with the requirements of s.75 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Options

27. The Committee may recommend that Full Council approve the proposed name changes for the parishes as listed, decline to make any recommendation to Full Council at this time, or seek consent of the parish councils as listed to recommend an alternative name to Full Council if appropriate.

Proposal

28. To consider whether to recommend Full Council approve the following name changes:

- 1) The Parish of Biddestone be changed to the Parish of Biddestone & Slaughterford;
- 2) The Parish of Charlton be changed to the Parish of Charlton St Peter;
- 3) The Joint Parish Council of Charlton and Wilsford be changed to the Joint Parish Council of Charlton St Peter and Wilsford.

Perry Holmes - Director of Legal and Governance

Report Author: Kieran Elliott, Democracy Manager (Democratic Services), 01225 718504, kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix A – Responses to s.75 parish name change survey

Background Papers

None

Appendix A

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree/Amend	Reasons
1	Resident	Disagree	It's not broken, don't need to fix it.
2	Resident	Agree	This should have happened last century
3	Resident	Agree	It would give Slaughterford equal standing in the formal naming of the parish. The names of both villages are already used informally when referring to the parish.
4	Representative	Agree	I agree as Slaughterford is within the jurisdiction of Biddestone parish council, and changing to the proposed name offers clarity.
5	Resident	Agree	Because the PC represents both villages
6	Resident	Agree	I would like both villages to be recognised
7	Resident	Agree	It will give parity to the residents of Slaughterford and Biddestone villages
8	Resident	Agree	because the parish council includes Slaughterford and the new title will clearly show this
9	Resident	Agree	
10	Resident	Agree	Makes sense to be inclusive of both villages
11	Resident	Agree	The Name change seems logical: and represents the reality
12	Resident	Agree	Its more inclusive and accurately represents the area covered
13	Interested Party	Agree	If the local community wish to have a name change then it should be supported by adjacent Parishes
14	Interested Party	Agree	If the local community wish to have a name change then it should be supported by adjacent Parishes
15	Interested Party	Agree	If the local community wish to have a name change then it should be supported by adjacent Parishes
16	Interested Party	Agree	If the local community wish to have a name change then it should be supported by adjacent Parishes
17	Interested Party	Agree	If the local community wish to have a name change then it should be supported by adjacent Parishes
18	Resident	Agree	Because the Council is generally referred to as 'Biddestone and Slaughterford Parish Council' It is important to recognise the inclusion of Slaughterford in the parish

Any other comments
What about Giddeahall?
No
Agree
I thought that was the name already
None
No
if the proposed boundary change between Yatton Keynell and Biddestone and Slaughterford goes ahead Giddea Hall will not be in the name of the PC
Sensible proposal
Sensible proposal
Sensible proposal
Sensible proposal
Sensible proposal
Sensible proposal

Wiltshire Council

Electoral Review Committee

8 February 2022

Community Governance Review 2021/22 – Draft Recommendations

Purpose

1. To agree provisional draft recommendations for the areas included in the Community Governance Review.

Background

2. A Community Governance Review is a process whereby a principal authority can adjust the governance arrangements of parishes within its council area. This can include amending the number of councillors or wards, the external boundaries, or even the creation/merger/abolition/grouping of entire parishes.
3. The Electoral Review Committee (“the Committee”) has delegated authority from Full Council to oversee any review process in accordance with paragraphs 2.10.7-2.10.9 of Part 3B of the Wiltshire Council Constitution. This would include setting the scope for any review, its methodology and timescales, as well as preparing recommendations for consideration by Full Council.
4. At its meeting on 21 September 2021, the Committee agreed terms of reference for a Community Governance Review to begin on 22 September 2021 (“the Review”). The timetable for the Review within the terms of reference was updated by the Director of Legal and Governance under delegated authority granted by the Committee, in November 2021 and January 2022, to adjust the timetable for future stages. The terms of reference are included as part of the information pack included with this report.
5. The parishes included within the Review were: Bremhill, Calne, Calne Without, Cherhill, Compton Bassett, Heddington, Hilmarton, Malmesbury, St Paul Malmesbury Without, Stanton St Bernard, Patney, Marsden, Wilsford, Beechingstoke, North Newnton, Woodborough, or any parishes surrounding those listed.
6. During the first phase of the review additional proposals for the areas set out in Paragraph 5 were received from parishes. Where these were received before the pre-consultation phase began, they were included within the pre-consultation information gathering. The information gathering also included:
 - Sessions between representatives of the Committee and affected unitary members and parishes;
 - Online public meetings;
 - An online survey of received proposals, with over 300 responses validly received;
 - Details of emailed representations.
7. A workshop was held for Committee members on 25 January 2022 to receive details of the gathered information and public representations received. An updated version of

that information pack compiling the relevant materials, including session notes, proposal details, parish council responses and public representations by email, post or online survey, has been included as a background paper to this report at **Appendix A**. Except where providing the formal response of a body or group, responses have been anonymised.

Survey Summaries

8. Summaries of the initially submitted proposals are included within Appendix A on pages X, X, X, and X. The Committee is not restricted to recommending only those proposals surveyed as part of the online surveys.

Main Considerations

9. The Committee is asked to prepare draft recommendations for each area of the Review for appropriate public consultation where needed, such as where changes are recommended. This consultation is planned to take place between 1 March 2022 to 22 April 2022 if possible.
10. In line with the Committee's previous discussions, it is recommended that, where this is appropriate and possible during the Covid-19 pandemic, public meetings be held in areas where changes are recommended, and those areas subject to proposals of being transferred from one parish to another be contacted in writing
11. Following any consultation, the Committee will consider any responses and determine whether it wishes to amend its recommendations and/or undertake further consultation. It will then prepare final recommendations for consideration by Full Council. Full Council is scheduled to meet on 19 July 2022.

Statutory Criteria

12. In preparing draft recommendations the Committee must take account of the statutory criteria for reviews and the need to ensure that community governance within the areas under review:
 - Reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
 - Is effective and convenient.

13. Council tax precept levels would not be valid criteria to approve or disapprove of a proposal.

Electorate Forecasting

14. The guidance on Community Governance Reviews has been included as a background paper. That guidance makes clear that the principal council '*must also consider any change in the number or distribution of electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years beginning with the day when the review starts*'. Therefore, the Committee is required to consider the likely position of these factors as they would exist by 2026, but not beyond that period.
15. The guidance further states that '*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’.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE)

16. Where the Local Government Boundary Commission for England made consequential changes to parish arrangements when implementing the changes to Wiltshire Council divisions for the May 2021 elections, they would need to consent to any further proposed change to that parish’s arrangements within the next five years. Therefore, consideration would need to be given to the likelihood of consent being granted.
17. In particular, if a parish is proposed to be split between electoral divisions, a ward would need to be established. In line with previous LGBCE advice, a minimum of 75 electors would need to be projected to be in any such ward by the May 2025 local elections.
18. Where a ward could not be created, consideration would need to be given to whether the LGBCE would consent to amend the division boundary itself, and this would also need to be consulted upon.

Next Steps

19. Considering the guidance and all the information provided, the Committee will need to make provisional draft recommendations and reasoning for the areas included within the Review.
20. The Committee should include details of any necessary or recommended consequential matters, such as warding and councillor numbers, to accompany that recommendation.

Safeguarding Implications

21. There are no safeguarding implications.

Public Health Implications

22. There are no public health implications.

Procurement Implications

23. There are no procurement implications.

Equalities Implications

24. There are no equalities implications.

Environmental Implications

25. There are no environmental implications.

Financial Implications

26. Consulting on the draft recommendations will incur resources, in particular in relation to the cost of physically mailing those affected in certain areas if appropriate.

Legal Implications

27. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gives the Council the power to undertake CGRs and sets out the criteria for such reviews. There is also statutory guidance on the conduct of such reviews with which the Council would have to comply.

Risks

28. A failure to consult appropriately or provide appropriate reasoning for any decision to change governance arrangements would be potentially vulnerable to challenge. The Committee successfully undertook appropriate consultation in May-July 2020 during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Options

29. The Committee may recommend changes to any aspect of the governance arrangements of a parish or area subject to review.

30. This includes recommending changes which have not been suggested by any parish, group or individual at this stage, if the Committee considers it appropriate based on the evidence it has gathered.

31. The Committee may also recommend that no changes are made.

32. Where recommending the transfer of an area from one parish to another, or merger of parishes, any recommendation consulted upon would need to include details of consequential matters such as the warding arrangements of the parish(es) in question.

33. If recommending a change which would split a parish between unitary divisions, the Committee may also recommend requesting that the LGBCE amend those divisions to be coterminous with the parishes, if appropriate. It would need to consult upon such a request as well as the parish level change.

Proposal

34. That the Committee make provisional draft recommendations for each area of the Review, and delegate to the Director of Legal and Governance in consultation with the Chairman the preparation of a detailed draft recommendations document, including reasons for any change, to be consulted upon.

Perry Holmes - Director of Legal and Governance

Report Author: Kieran Elliott, Democracy Manager (Democratic Services), 01225 718504, kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix A – CGR Information Pack (including electorate forecasts, initial proposals and pre-consultation responses)

Background Papers

[Guidance on Community Governance Reviews](#)

[Terms of Reference of the Electoral Review Committee](#)

[Information Gathered for the 2019/20 Review including Calne Without CGR Final Recommendations 2019/20 including Calne Without](#)

Electoral Review

Draft Information Pack

8 February 2022

Updated from 25 January 2022

1 **Spatial Information Maps** (*Pages 25 -28*)

Spatial Planning maps detailing new housing development (over 10 dwellings) within the CGR areas, current or approved up to 2026:

- Calne
- Malmesbury

Note: There was no known development in Beechingstoke.

2 **Information Sheets and Scheme Proposals** (*Pages 29 - 66*)

First Stage Information sheets produced for each of the schemes to be considered during the review for 2021/22

Information sheets:

- Beechingstoke (Initiated by Wiltshire Council)
- Calne Without 1 (Previously considered petition proposals and proposals arising from it)
- Calne Without 2 (Calne TC proposals and Compton Bassett Proposals)
- Malmesbury (Including proposals of Malmesbury TC & St Paul Malmesbury Without)

[Link to 2019/20 Review recommendations in respect of Calne Without, including links to original petition and responses](#)

3 **Surveyed Scheme Requests and Additional Information** (*Pages 67 - 68*)

The below is a list of the proposals received by the council for inclusion in the online surveys.

Beechingstoke Area

B1 – Change to Parish Meeting

This would mean the parish would no longer have elections to a parish council. Instead, any elector of the parish could call a meeting to consider proposals on limited matters. There are approximately 20+ parish meetings in Wiltshire out of over 250 parishes. An example would be the parish of East Kennett.

B2 – Grouping with another Parish

This would mean Beechingstoke would retain its status as a parish, but would be represented by a joint parish council which covered more than one parish. An example would be Kennet Valley Joint Parish Council, representing the parishes of Fyfield, and West Overton.

B3 – Merger with another Parish

This would mean Beechingstoke would no longer be a parish in its own right, but would form a single parish of multiple communities and a single parish council. An example would be Wilcot, Huish and Oare, which was formerly the separate parishes of Wilcot, and Huish.

Transfers

Regardless of whether any of the options above are approved, the boundaries of the parish are also able to be amended if appropriate. One proposal has been suggested at this stage.

B4 – Transfer of Land around Bottlesford to North Newnton

Representatives of North Newnton Parish Council have suggested that the community of Bottlesford is currently divided between Beechingstoke and North Newnton, and that unifying the community could be considered.

Other

B5 - Charlton & Wilsford

Create a Joint Parish to rectify an anomaly (email attached)

Calne Area

Calne Without 1 – CW

A petition with over 650 signatures was submitted to Wiltshire Council requesting that a new parish be established at Derry Hill and Studley, with no wards and nine councillors, on the boundaries of the then wards of Pewsham Ward and West Ward of Calne Without Parish Council.

CW1 - New Parish Derry Hill and Studley - that a new parish be established at Derry Hill and Studley, with no wards and nine councillors, on the boundaries of the then wards of Pewsham Ward and West Ward of Calne Without Parish Council

CW2 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, the remainder of Calne Without to continue to exist

CW3 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, to dissolve the remainder of

Calne Without and transfer its area to other parishes as set out in the maps below

CW4 – To transfer the areas shown in the maps below from Cherhill and Calne Without the Compton Bassett

Calne Without 2 – CWTC

Calne Town Council submitted a number of requests for transfers of land from surrounding parishes to their own.

CWTC1 – To extend the North Town boundary to incorporate Beaversbrook Sports Facility and Allotments.

CWTC2 – To extend the Town boundary to the East to include the new development off Low Lane.

CWTC3 – To extend the South West Town boundary to incorporate Cherhill View Allotments, Cherhill View Housing Estate & Rookery Farm.

CWTC4 – To extend the Town boundary to the East to connect the A4 in the South to the A3102 and to the West by Kingsbury Green Academy, to incorporate Penhill Farm to Abberd Lane, Land to the West of Kingsbury Green Academy and land to the North of Quemerford.

Malmesbury Area

M1 – Proposed by Malmesbury TC

M1 (1) - For an extension to the parish boundary to include Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Milbourne and Foxley/ Common Road, and the area north of Filands, Kings Heath and Cole Park.

M1 (2) - For the parish to be divided into seven wards being Backbridge Farm, Burton Hill and Cowbridge, Common Rd (Common Rd, Foxley Rd, and Kinds Heath), Malmesbury South, Malmesbury North, Malmesbury West, and Milbourne.

M1 (3) - Change the number of Councillors for the Parish from 16 to 20 as proposed, in support of the proposed wards (namely Backbridge Farm x1, Burton Hill and Cowbridge x2, Common Rd x1, Malmesbury South x2, Malmesbury North x6, Malmesbury West x7, and Milbourne x1).

M2 – Proposed by St Paul Malmesbury Without

M2 (1) - To reduce the existing two wards in the parish down to one- incorporate the Westport Parish Ward into one integrated St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward & keep the present combined number of councillors at 12.

M2 (2) – To change the Parish boundary in line with the [LGBCE's] decision to alter the Malmesbury & Sherston electoral divisional boundary to incorporate Backbridge within the Sherston division. Therefore, we propose that the Backbridge development be incorporated into St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward.

4 **Amended Scheme Requests** *(Pages 69 - 82)*

Amendments to proposals received to date:

Malmesbury TC (MTC) & St Paul Malmesbury Without (SPMW)

1. Following meetings held between MTC & SPMW to discuss possible compromises, both MTC and SPMW submitted details of their views and response to proposed alternative suggestions. The information was accompanied by several maps. These are attached and include reference to withdrawal of some earlier proposals, and possible solutions, including involvement of other parishes.

Calne TC proposal

2. Calne Town Council, asked to provide clearer maps of their proposal, suggested an amended version. A version of this showing the originally requested areas is shown in the attached map also included in the info sheets – the online survey was updated to include this.

5 **New Post Survey Proposals** *(Pages 83 - 104)*

Additional proposals received from parish councils during or after the online survey was launched:

Calne Without

- Bremhill PC – original 31/12/21, updated 20/1/22
- Compton Bassett PC - map
- Hillmarton PC – emails and maps

6 **Parish Council, Unitary and Public Sessions** *(Pages 105 - 158)*

In October 2021 the Committee invited all of the Town and Parish Councils listed in the terms of reference, which may be affected by the submissions if taken forward, to meet online with the Chairman and available Members to ascertain local views and invite alternative submissions.

A series of online sessions were set up and held between October to December 2021. These included 3 public open sessions aimed at Local Residents. The Chairman also met with Wiltshire Council Local Members during this pre-consultation stage.

Notes from these meetings are attached.

If a parish not specifically listed within the terms of reference, but within the scope of the review, might be affected by a Committee recommendation, sessions would be arranged to discuss the matter with them directly.

7 **Survey Responses** (*Pages 159 - 258*)

Online Surveys for each of the three areas were launched on 15 November 2021 to until at least 31 December 2021. The final data was collected on 7 January 2022.

A table of the responses for each survey is attached.

Malmesbury – 171 responses - Summary P 141-143, full table of responses 144-190

Beechingstoke – 43 responses - Summary P 191-196, full table of responses 197-202

**Calne Without and Calne – 122 responses total (respondents could respond to the Derry Hill, Compton Bassett and the Town council proposals, or choose to respond to only 1 or 2 of them)
Summary P203, Derry Hill and Studley P204-226, Compton Bassett p227-228, Calne Town p229-235, other comments p236-237**

Charlon and Wilsford – 8 responses –P239

8 **Other Responses** (*Pages 259 - 278*)

Responses received by email or another method.

9 **Presentation** (*Pages 279 - 298*)

Summary presentation to workshop

This page is intentionally left blank

Calne

Hilmarton CP

Cherhill CP

Legend


- NWLP - H2 - Housing Proposal
- NP_2021

Outline_2021_North

- Extant

Full_2021_North

- Complete
- Current
- Extant
- Parish Boundaries April 2021
- Polling Districts 2021
- Development Control



Calne Without CP

This page is intentionally left blank

Malmesbury

Brokenborough CP

Charlton CP

Malmesbury CP

St. Paul Malmesbury Without CP

Lea and Cleverton CP

Little Somerford CP

Page 25

Legend

- NP_2021
- Parish Boundaries April 2021
- Polling Districts 2021
- Outline 2021 North
 - Complete
 - Current
 - Extant
- Full 2021 North
 - Complete



This page is intentionally left blank

Information Sheet

Beechingstoke

[Community Governance Review Terms of Reference and LGBCE Guidance](#)

Background

The Parish of Beechingstoke is able to elect a parish council of up to five councillors, with a minimum quorum of three.

Since at least 2017, across two elections (2017 and 2021) no councillors have been elected in Beechingstoke, despite multiple reruns.

The Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council has initiated a review of the governance arrangements of Beechingstoke to determine if they could be more effective and convenient, and better reflect the interests and identity of local communities.

To enable to most options to be considered, all surrounding parishes of Beechingstoke are included for the review.

Proposals

Wiltshire Council is not, at this time, proposing any specific arrangements for Beechingstoke but invites comments. Options could include:

B1 – Change to Parish Meeting

This would mean the parish would no longer have elections to a parish council. Instead, any elector of the parish could call a meeting to consider proposals on limited matters. There are approximately 20+ parish meetings in Wiltshire out of over 250 parishes. An example would be the parish of East Kennett.

B2 – Grouping with another Parish

This would mean Beechingstoke would retain its status as a parish, but would be represented by a joint parish council which covered more than one parish. An example would be Kennet Valley Joint Parish Council, representing the parishes of Fyfield, and West Overton.

B3 – Merger with another Parish

This would mean Beechingstoke would no longer be a parish in its own right, but would form a single parish of multiple communities and a single parish council. An example would be Wilcot, Huish and Oare, which was formerly the separate parishes of Wilcot, and Huish.

Transfers

Regardless of whether any of the options above are approved, the boundaries of the parish are also able to be amended if appropriate. One proposal has been suggested at this stage.

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

B4 – Transfer of Land around Bottlesford to North Newnton

Representatives of North Newnton Parish Council have suggested that the community of Bottlesford is currently divided between Beechingstoke and North Newnton, and that unifying the community could be considered.

Parish Information

Electorates (August 2021)

Beechingstoke – 124
 Patney – 132
 Marden – 104
 Stanton St Bernard – 159
 Wilsford – 66
 Woodborough – 252
 North Newnton - 385

Projected Electorates (2026)

Beechingstoke – 127
 Patney – 135
 Marden – 106
 Stanton St Bernard – 162
 Wilsford – 67
 Woodborough – 259
 North Newnton – 393

Council Tax by Parish, including Police and Fire Precepts

This data is provided for information, however please note that Community Governance Reviews cannot use the level of precept in affected areas as justification to approve or disapprove of a scheme.


Council Tax Schedule 2021/22 (monthly)	Band A (£)	Band B (£)	Band C (£)	Band D (£)	Band E (£)	Band F (£)	Band G (£)	Band H (£)
Beechingstoke	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marden	22.78	26.58	30.37	34.17	41.76	49.36	56.95	68.34
North Newnton	50.1	58.45	66.8	75.15	91.85	108.55	125.25	150.3
Patney	9.74	11.36	12.99	14.61	17.86	21.1	24.35	29.22
Stanton St Bernard	29.93	34.92	39.91	44.9	54.88	64.86	74.83	89.8

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

Wilsford	11.31	13.2	15.08	16.97	20.74	24.51	28.28	33.94
Woodborough	35.37	41.26	47.16	53.05	64.84	76.63	88.42	106.1

Maps of Area


Map of Beechingstoke and surrounding parishes



Community Governance Review 2021-2022

Map of proposed transfer from Beechingstoke to North Newnton

Area bounded by red transfer to North Newnton



This page is intentionally left blank

Information Sheet

Calne Without 1

[Community Governance Review Terms of Reference and LGBCE Guidance](#)

Background

In September 2019 a petition with over 650 signatures was submitted to Wiltshire Council requesting that a new parish be established at Derry Hill and Studley, with no wards and nine councillors, on the boundaries of the then wards of Pewsham Ward and West Ward of Calne Without Parish Council.

The Electoral Review Committee considered the petition during 2019-20. As some of the options for the remainder of Calne Without parish, should it be felt appropriate to create a new parish at Derry Hill and Studley, might involve other parishes not included in the 2019-20 review, Full Council at its meeting on 9 September 2020 determined that a further review should be undertaken involving all potentially affected parishes to enable all options to be considered.

[Final Recommendations of the 2019-20 CGR](#) (includes links to previous consultation responses and information packs on the Calne Without proposals, including the petition for creation of a new parish)

Proposal Received

CW1 - New Parish Derry Hill and Studley - that a new parish be established at Derry Hill and Studley, with no wards and nine councillors, on the boundaries of the then wards of Pewsham Ward and West Ward of Calne Without Parish Council (See initial map below)

CW2 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, the remainder of Calne Without to continue to exist

CW3 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, to dissolve the remainder of Calne Without and transfer its area to other parishes as set out in the maps below

CW4 – To transfer the areas shown in the maps below from Cherhill and Calne Without the Compton Bassett

Parish Information

Electoralates (August 2021)

Bremhill – 801

Calne – 14175

Calne Without – 2674

Cherhill – 610

Compton Bassett – 199

Heddington – 351

Hilmarton – 586

Community Governance Review 2021-2022
cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk

Projected Electorates (2026)

Bremhill – 819
 Calne – 15147
 Calne Without – 2733
 Cherhill – 624
 Compton Bassett – 203
 Heddington – 359
 Hilmarton – 599

Wards of Calne Without

East – 640 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 3 Cllrs
 Middle – 526 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 6 Cllrs
 Pewsham – 159 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 1 Cllr
 Sandy Lane – 75 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 1 Cllr
 West – 1274 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 6 Cllr


Council Tax by Parish, including Police and Fire Precepts

This data is provided for information, however please note that Community Governance Reviews cannot use the level of precept in affected areas as justification to approve or disapprove of a scheme.

Council Tax Schedule 2021/22 (monthly)	Band A (£)	Band B (£)	Band C (£)	Band D (£)	Band E (£)	Band F (£)	Band G (£)	Band H (£)
Bremhill	12.92	15.07	17.23	19.38	23.69	27.99	32.3	38.76
Calne	143.71	167.67	191.62	215.57	263.47	311.38	359.28	431.14
Calne Without	14.48	16.89	19.31	21.72	26.55	31.37	36.2	43.44
Cherhill	20.73	24.19	27.64	31.1	38.01	44.92	51.83	62.2
Compton Bassett	35.85	41.82	47.8	53.77	65.72	77.67	89.62	107.54
Heddington	20.71	24.16	27.61	31.06	37.96	44.86	51.77	62.12
Hilmarton	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52

Map of Area


Map of Calne Without Parish



Initial Map of proposed Parish of Derry Hill and Studley




Potential new parish proposal




Blue to Heddington, Red to Cherhill, Orange new parish of Derry Hill and Studley, Green to Bremhill or Derry Hill.

Current wards of Calne Without



Compton Bassett Proposal

Two areas to left of (black) parish line, to be transferred to Compton Bassett from Cherhill and Calne Without



This page is intentionally left blank

Information Sheet

Calne Without 2

[Community Governance Review Terms of Reference and LGBCE Guidance](#)

Background

Calne Town Council submitted a number of requests for transfers of land from surrounding parishes to their own.

Parish Information

Electorates (August 2021)

Bremhill – 801
Calne – 14175
Calne Without – 2674
Cherhill – 610
Compton Bassett – 199
Heddington – 351
Hilmarton – 586

Projected Electorates (2026)

Bremhill – 819
Calne – 15147
Calne Without – 2733
Cherhill – 624
Compton Bassett – 203
Heddington – 359
Hilmarton – 599

Wards of Calne Without

East – 640 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 3 Cllrs
Middle – 526 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 6 Cllrs
Pewsham – 159 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 1 Cllr
Sandy Lane – 75 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 1 Cllr
West – 1274 Electorate (Aug 2021) – 6 Cllr

Council Tax by Parish, including Police and Fire Precepts

This data is provided for information, however please note that Community Governance Reviews cannot use the level of precept in affected areas as justification to approve or disapprove of a scheme.


Council Tax Schedule 2021/22 (monthly)	Band A (£)	Band B (£)	Band C (£)	Band D (£)	Band E (£)	Band F (£)	Band G (£)	Band H (£)
Bremhill	12.92	15.07	17.23	19.38	23.69	27.99	32.3	38.76

Calne	143.71	167.67	191.62	215.57	263.47	311.38	359.28	431.14
Calne Without	14.48	16.89	19.31	21.72	26.55	31.37	36.2	43.44
Cherhill	20.73	24.19	27.64	31.1	38.01	44.92	51.83	62.2
Compton Bassett	35.85	41.82	47.8	53.77	65.72	77.67	89.62	107.54
Heddington	20.71	24.16	27.61	31.06	37.96	44.86	51.77	62.12
Hilmarton	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52	53.52


Proposal Received as detailed by Calne Town Council – see below parish maps

Map of Area

Map of Calne and Calne Without Parishes



Summary map (individual maps follow)



Community Governance Review Request Form

Name of Town/City/Parish: Calne Town Council

Governance change requested:

(Tick all that apply)

- Change name of parish/parish wards
- Change number of councillors for parish
- Change number/shape of wards for parish
- Change external boundaries of parish
- Creation/merger/abolition/grouping of parishes
- Change name of parish
- Other change

Details of requested change(s):

To extend the North Town Boundary to incorporate the Town Councils' Beversbrook Sport Facility and Allotments.

Reason for requested change(s):

Currently the land is on a 125 year lease from Wiltshire Council and sits outside of the Town Boundary

Date of council resolution(s): 23rd September 2019

Detail of council resolution(s):


It was proposed by Cllr Ansell, seconded by Cllr Fisher and

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED to request via the Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council to extend the North Town Boundary to incorporate Town Councils' Beversbrook Sports Facility and Allotments.

Proposer signature:

Proposer position: Town Councillor Glenis Ansell

Insert map of proposed change (if applicable):



Community Governance Review Request Form

Name of Town/City/Parish: Calne Town Council

Governance change requested:

(Tick all that apply)

- Change name of parish/parish wards
- Change number of councillors for parish
- Change number/shape of wards for parish
- Change external boundaries of parish
- Creation/merger/abolition/grouping of parishes
- Change name of parish
- Other change

Details of requested change(s):

To extend the Town Boundary to the east to include the new development off Low Lane

Reason for requested change(s):

To include the new development off Prince Charles Drive and Low Lane within the Town Boundary

Date of council resolution(s): 23rd September 2019

Detail of council resolution(s):


It was proposed by Cllr Rounds, seconded Cllr Hill and

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED to request via the Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council to extend the Town Boundary to the east to include the new developments off Low Lane.

Proposer signature:

Proposer position: Town and Unitary Councillor Tom Rounds

Insert map of proposed change (if applicable):



Community Governance Review Request Form

Name of Town/City/Parish: Calne Town Council

Governance change requested:

(Tick all that apply)

- Change name of parish/parish wards
- Change number of councillors for parish
- Change number/shape of wards for parish
- Change external boundaries of parish
- Creation/merger/abolition/grouping of parishes
- Change name of parish
- Other change

Details of requested change(s):

To extend the south west Town Boundary to incorporate

- 4.1 Cherhill View allotments
- 4.2 Cherhill View housing estate
- 4.3 Rookery Farm

Reason for requested change(s):

- 4.1 Cherhill View allotments, reason: - already owned by the Town Council,
- 4.2 Cherhill View housing estate, reason: - to correct the anomalous build, Calne is the closest Town for provision of amenities and facilities
- 4.3 Rookery Farm, reason: - the only access to this farm is via Calne and Calne is seen as providing the closest amenities and facilities

Date of council resolution(s): 23rd September 2019


Detail of council resolution(s):

It was proposed by Cllr Rounds, seconded by Cllr Pearce-Kearny and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED to request via the Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council to extend the south west Town Boundary to incorporate Cherhill View allotments, Cherhill View housing estate and Rookery Farm

Proposer signature:

Proposer position: Town and Unitary Councillor Tom Rounds

Insert map of proposed change (if applicable):



Community Governance Review Request Form

Name of Town/City/Parish: Calne Town Council

Governance change requested:

(Tick all that apply)

- Change name of parish/parish wards
- Change number of councillors for parish
- Change number/shape of wards for parish
- Change external boundaries of parish
- Creation/merger/abolition/grouping of parishes
- Change name of parish
- Other change

Details of requested change(s):

To extend the Town Boundary to the east to connect the A4 in the South to the A3102 and to the west by Kingsbury Green Academy

- 6.1 to incorporate Penhill Farm to Abberd Lane
- 6.2 to incorporate Land to the west of Kingsbury Green Academy
- 6.3 to incorporate land to the North of Quemerford

Reason for requested change(s):

- 6.1 Access to and from these properties and industrial units is only available through Calne and Calne provides the closest amenities and facilities.
- 6.2 To enable the development of an improved footpath/cycle path from Cherhill View to the school and leisure centre
- 6.3 This land is a buffer between Quemerford and the industrial uses at the Hills site. As the Local Plan is refreshed any future development may come in this area and therefore use the amenities and facilities that Calne provides.

Date of council resolution(s): 23rd September 2019

Detail of council resolution(s):

It was proposed Cllr MacNaughton, seconded by Cllr Rounds and


UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED to request via the Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council to extend the Town Boundary to the east to connect the A4 in the South to A3102 and to the west by Kingsbury Green Academy to incorporate Penhill Farm to Abberd Lane, to incorporate Land to the west of Kingsbury Green Academy and to incorporate land to the North of Quemerford.

Proposer signature:

Proposer position: Town Councillor Robert MacNaughton

Insert map of proposed change (if applicable):


6.1



6.2




6.3



Community Governance Review 2021-2022

Development Map



Information Sheet

Malmesbury and St Paul Malmesbury Without

Community Governance Review Terms of Reference and LGBCE Guidance

Proposed Schemes

M1 – Proposed by Malmesbury Town Council

M1 (1) - For an extension to the parish boundary to include Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Milbourne and Foxley/ Common Road, and the area north of Filands, Kings Heath and Cole Park.

M1 (2) - For the parish to be divided into seven wards being Backbridge Farm, Burton Hill and Cowbridge, Common Rd (Common Rd, Foxley Rd, and Kinds Heath), Malmesbury South, Malmesbury North, Malmesbury West, and Milbourne.

M1 (3) - Change the number of Councillors for the Parish from 16 to 20 as proposed, in support of the proposed wards (namely Backbridge Farm x1, Burton Hill and Cowbridge x2, Common Rd x1, Malmesbury South x2, Malmesbury North x6, Malmesbury West x7, and Milbourne x1).

Reason for Request

In summary our proposal, if adopted, would:

- 1. Achieve an improvement in community cohesion across the new parish area*
- 2. Increase the effectiveness of local government across the new parish area*
- 3. Increase the convenience of local government across the new parish area*
- 4. Increase the opportunity for the community living in the new parish area to be involved in future planning and the development of local resources that recognises needs and requirements across all the new parish area.*
- 5. Make sense in terms of developments and attributed CIL and s106 funds, and enable the parish to maximise the best use of these funds for the whole community area.*
- 6. Support the development of warding to improve representation arrangements across the new parish area.*
- 7. Support Parish capability to take in devolved services*
- 8. Recognise the natural historical boundaries and identity of the area*

M2 – Proposed by St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council

M2 (1) - To reduce the existing two wards in the parish down to one- incorporate the Westport Parish Ward into one integrated St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward & keep the present combined number of councillors at 12.

M2 (2) – To change the Parish boundary in line with the [LGBCE's] decision to alter the Malmesbury & Sherston electoral divisional boundary to incorporate Backbridge within the Sherston division. Therefore, we propose that the Backbridge development be incorporated into St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward.

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk

Reason for Request

1) *Given the geographical size of the Parish there is now no Historical or other reason now to have two wards.*

2) *The change proposed to the parish boundaries, to align with the [LGBCE] decision that the proposed Backbridge development be included in the Sherston Division of [Wiltshire Council], is made for the following reasons:*

a) There is a logic and consistency in having a common boundary for the county division and the parish.

b) It would be more understandable and efficient for residents of the Backbridge development to be in a parish which was also part of a larger county division with a county councillor who would speak for the parish at the county level, than for them to have a county councillor who did not represent their parish. i.e to have a different county councillor for parish (Malmesbury Town Council) matters than for county matters.

c) The county councillor for the Sherston Division would otherwise need to attend meetings of Malmesbury Town Council as well as those of this parish which would be an additional call on his/her valuable time.

Background Information

Warding

Malmesbury Ward (Malmesbury) – 15 Cllrs – 4455 Electorate (August 2021)

Backbridge Ward (Malmesbury) – 1 Cllr – 18 Electorate (August 2021)

St Paul (St Paul Malmesbury Without) – 10 Cllrs – 1596 Electorate (August 2021)

Westport (St Paul Malmesbury Without) – 2 Cllrs – 222 Electorate (August 2021)

Parish Electorates

Electorate of Malmesbury August 2021 - 4473

Electorate of St Paul Malmesbury Without August 2021 - 1818

Projected Electorate of Malmesbury 2026 – 4899

Projected Electorate of St Paul Malmesbury Without 2026 – 1904

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk


Council Tax by Parish, including Police and Fire Precepts

This data is provided for information, however please note that Community Governance Reviews cannot use the level of precept in affected areas as justification to approve or disapprove of a scheme.

Council Tax Schedule 2021/22 (monthly)	Band A (£)	Band B (£)	Band C (£)	Band D (£)	Band E (£)	Band F (£)	Band G (£)	Band H (£)
Malmesbury Town Council	143.23	167.1	190.97	214.84	262.58	310.32	358.07	429.68
St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council	11.65	13.59	15.53	17.47	21.35	25.23	29.12	34.94


Maps of Area

Map of Malmesbury Town




Shown – parish lines only

Map of St Paul Malmesbury Without



Shown – parish lines only

Map of Malmesbury and Sherston Divisions




Shown – unitary division lines only

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk


Map of Backbridge Ward (Malmesbury Town)



Community Governance Review 2021-2022

cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk

Map of Westport Ward (St Paul Malmesbury Without)




Map of St Paul Ward (St Paul Malmesbury Without)



Community Governance Review 2021-2022


cgr@wiltshire.gov.uk

Malmesbury Town council Proposal



1. Backbridge
2. Malmesbury North
3. Milbourne
4. Malmesbury South
5. Burton Hill and Cowbridge
6. Common Road, Foxley Road and Kings Heath
7. Malmesbury West

Development Map



This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

16/11/21

Dear Committee,

This email is to provide some additional information following the publication of the recent briefing note in respect of the inclusion of a proposal relating to the parishes of Charlton and Wilsford. I apologise as I had intended to send this email in advance of that briefing note.

Most simply, during discussions on the Beechingstoke matter I had been looking at the elections for the parishes of Charlton and Wilsford. From that it appeared that although they, and we, had thought them to be a joint parish council for the two parishes, the elections that have actually been held have treated them as if they were a single parish.

This does not have any negative effect, except for how the parishes are listed administratively, but if confirmed would be an anomaly in need of correction. A similar anomaly was identified and resolved for Wilcot and Huish in the last review. I have been in communication with Charlton and Wilsford Parish Council to obtain their understanding, and a meeting may be set up between yourselves and them.

As Wilsford was included in the terms of reference for the current review, following discussion with the Chair and Vice-Chair a short survey was included for the pre-consultation stage, so that you can make a recommendation within this present review.

From an initial look it would appear there may be at least one other governance anomaly within Wiltshire, where a parish(es) governance arrangements do not appear to match the latest confirmed legal position we can find. This will be confirmed, and Elections have been asked to cross check all parishes to identify any further anomalies, with a view to you correcting them all in one go in a 2022/23 review.

I hope this will clarify the inclusion of a survey relating to Charlton and Wilsford, which will not have been part of a briefing you received to date.

Yours

Kieran Elliott
Acting Democracy Manager (Democratic Services)
Legal and Governance

This page is intentionally left blank



MALMESBURY TOWN COUNCIL

Malmesbury Town Council's revised Community Governance Review submission to the Wiltshire Council Electoral Review Committee

In our Community Governance Review informal, virtual public meeting with your Committee on Tuesday 14th December 2021, it was suggested that the Town Council should meet with the Parish to see if we could come to a united view on our boundaries.

Consequently, I invited Cllr Roger Budgen, the Chair of St Pauls Without Parish to meet with me, Cllr Paul Smith, the Mayor of Malmesbury and Chair of our Town Council. We have met together several times and made some progress.

Sadly, we have been unable to reach a common view on all matters. But I would like to share with the Committee the progress that we have made, the areas of agreement and where we remain in disagreement.

Milbourne, Kings Heath/Cole Park Estate

First, we agreed in principle that the Parish should be responsible for distinct, rural areas and Malmesbury Town Council should be responsible for the built areas, especially those that identify as part of our town.

Consequently, although connected to our town, we felt the community of Milbourne and the areas of Kings Heath and Cole Park Estate are clearly rural in nature and should stay with the Parish.

Backbridge

Similarly, there can be no doubt that the Backbridge Farm development of 201 houses that sits within the current boundaries of Malmesbury Town Council is a town development and the claim on it made by the Parish has no merit and should be rejected.

Daniel's Well and Burton Hill/Swindon Road

We agreed partly about some other areas. The Parish proposed that the area and houses to the north of Arches Lane and the area known as Daniel's Well should be included in the boundary of Malmesbury Town Council. We agree.

Similarly, the Parish Chair also proposed that the area of Burton Hill on the other side of the A429 opposite Arches Lane that contains the Malmesbury Primary Care Centre and Townsend Court (older people's assisted living accommodation), as well as the majority of the properties on the south side of the Swindon Road, should also be included in the boundary of Malmesbury Town Council. We welcome and agree with this as there can be little doubt that residents in these areas associate directly with Malmesbury.

Unfortunately, the Parish think some areas such as Cowbridge Crescent should remain with them, similarly the houses on that side of the Swindon Road and another isolated group of houses at Storey Mews and to the south at Burton Hill.

We see no logic here in terms of community cohesion and identity, let alone good governance, in dividing Burton Hill/Swindon Road into three zones as suggested by the Parish. They are one community and part of Malmesbury.

Indeed, the Committee heard from one of them at its informal, virtual public meeting. Then, Mr John Fairhurst who lives on the Swindon Road. He was outspoken on this matter and his sense of being disenfranchised as he is currently unable to vote for a Malmesbury Town Councillor or have any say in the governance of our town.

A similar view is held and has been expressed to you by Cllr Erica Whatton. Erica lives at Cowbridge Crescent off the Swindon Road. In May, Erica was elected in our contested elections for the Town Council. However, she was unable to vote for herself as her home sits outside the current boundary of the Town Council.

Therefore, not including the remaining built residential areas still creates an unnecessary divide which ignores community cohesion and governance, and will do little to remove confusion over which parish a resident is in.

Areas of further contention are those of Cowbridge Mill, Foxley Road/ Common Road and the Land designated as Malmesbury Employment Park that houses the new Aldi supermarket, Nurden's Garden Centre and other businesses, and the houses on the north of Filands.

Let me outline the issues related to each one in turn and the considered view of Malmesbury Town Council after our discussions with the Parish.

Cowbridge Mill

While we firmly believe Cowbridge Mill is part of the continuous built area of our town, unfortunately the Eastern edge of Cowbridge Mill abuts the boundary with the Parish of Lea & Cleverton at the River Avon. That would cut off Milbourne from the remainder of the Parish. In recognising the rural nature and distinct identity of Milbourne, that would not be welcomed by them.

Consequently, we respectfully suggest that the Committee examines the options around Milbourne, while recognising the current Parish retain a keen interest in this area, as do the residents of Milbourne and the northerly rural area.

Three other Parishes border the area of Milbourne and the larger rural area to its north. These are Brokenborough, Charlton and Lea & Cleverton and the most obvious connections are with Charlton.

We have met with Charlton Parish Council and they have expressed to us their interest in being included in your boundary review process and consulted with, given the potential options to amend their parish boundary to include Milbourne in the interests of improved governance, identity and cohesion.

It is of course for the Committee to decide as to whether you would wish to speak to these other Parishes on this matter.

Should the Committee conclude and recommend that Milbourne should remain in its current Parish, then it would be necessary for Cowbridge Mill, which is a discreet area with its own Residents Association, to remain with the Parish to enable a physical connection to Milbourne. We believe, as we have shown in Appendix A, there is a line that can logically be drawn appropriately to allow this to happen.

Should the Committee come to a conclusion to recommend that Milbourne becomes a parish in its own right or forms a relationship with one of its neighbouring Parishes, then we would press the case that Cowbridge Mill should become part of Malmesbury.

Common Road/Foxley Road

This densely developed area is only separated from Malmesbury by the land occupied by a local Animal Sanctuary.

However, we note that the area and those further along both roads are a separate and distinct Ward within the Parish.

While we believe there is a strong case for this area to be included within the Malmesbury Town Council area, in the interests of a constructive approach, we will not press our case and withdraw our proposal in this area.

Similarly, despite the historic and strong links that the Kings Heath has with Malmesbury, we recognise that it is rural and in the spirit of my principle agreement with the Parish, we withdraw our proposal to place Kings Heath within the Malmesbury Town Council area.

The same applies to the Cole Park Estate to the north of Grange Lane. It is rural, and we agree with the Parish that it should not be included in the boundary of Malmesbury Town Council.

The Employment Land and houses north of Filands.

The location in the Parish of the only available land in Malmesbury designated for employment is a matter of very serious concern to Malmesbury Town Council.

The development of the ALDI supermarket in this location is recognised as posing a significant challenge to the retail businesses in Malmesbury Town centre.

The senior Wiltshire Council Planning Officer dealing with Aldi's application on this site assumed that the Town Council could use the CIL payment it would generate to support the High Street. Indeed, he cited this as a reason not to make a requested grant to the Malmesbury Town Team, who support local business within our town and the performance of our High Street.

When challenged that the land sat in the Parish, he reiterated that the CIL would still come to the Town Council. It did not. Nor has there been any support for the Town Team from any party outside the Town Council.

This land is designated for further development for light industrial use. Further CIL funding will attach itself. Once again, as with Aldi, the primary planning consultee will be the Parish and they will also be the beneficiary of further development. Given the importance of the future use of this land for the economic wellbeing of Malmesbury, this cannot be good governance.

The road named Filands has seen recent and substantial housing development applications granted on the area that sits inside Malmesbury Town Council. The opposite side of the road has numerous sites where developers and land owners are seeking housing development.

At present 15 houses are to the northern side of Filands. They are not a separate rural community as in Milbourne or Common Road/Foxley Road, and clearly link much more strongly with Malmesbury than any part of the parish. Their character was exactly the same as the original properties on the Malmesbury Town Council side. They should be in Malmesbury, as should the adjoining open land along that side of Filands, which is indicated for future development, just as the land is being developed on the southern side, on the grounds of identity, community cohesion, and good governance.


The area of open countryside beyond Filands should be in a rural Parish. That could be St Paul's Malmesbury Without or one of the neighbouring Parishes it borders.

Should the Committee believe this sparsely populated area and Milbourne should remain in their existing parish, then this can be achieved while still transferring the Employment Land and housing on the north side of Filands to Malmesbury Town Council.

To that end and in order to aid the Committee's deliberations, we enclose new and detailed maps covering the areas described above (Appendix B).

Conclusion


We have achieved some common ground with the Parish through the agreement of some helpful guidelines and compromise. The Parish has clearly agreed that in principle the built edges of Malmesbury, which are currently within their boundary, should be included within the boundary of Malmesbury Town Council. However, there are still important anomalies where this applies, but agreement on these specific points has not been reached. We propose strongly that, by the criteria of this review, those areas we have highlighted should become included within the boundary of Malmesbury Town Council and further consideration is given to the most satisfactory means to maintain Milbourne within a rural parish.



Councillor Paul Smith, Mayor of Malmesbury
Malmesbury Town Council

21/01/2022


Appendix A – Map of Burton Hill/Cowbridge



— Current Boundary — MSPW Parish Council position

— MTC position to allow MSPW to retain Milbourne — MTC position if Milbourne joins another Parish

Appendix B – Map of Filands/Emplment Area



— MTC position — MTC preference if MSPW retain Milbourne — MTC preference if Milbourne joins another Parish

This page is intentionally left blank

St Paul Malmesbury Without Boundary Submission

The Chair of the St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council [StPMWPC] and Mayor of Malmesbury Town Council [MTC] have met several times over the past two weeks to try to find a mutually acceptable position to the conflicting boundary proposals. The meetings have been amicable and held in a constructive atmosphere however whilst some progress has been made in meeting the MTC demands no agreed position has been reached.

StPMWPC believed that the position reached with the Mayor was - for MTC to recognise the rural character of the areas of Foxley & Common Roads, Milbourne and Cowbridge and to withdraw its request for their incorporation into the town boundary in exchange for StPMWPC withdrawing its request for the Backbridge Farm site, in addition to the revised boundary to the south and east of the town as depicted in the attached document to be accepted. Unfortunately this accord was not subsequently supported by the MTC Working Party [WP] tasked with representing MTC.

StPMWPC, at the request of MTC, was prepared to cede the area known locally as Daniel's Well in addition to the northern part of Burton Hill, but not further south than the Malmesbury & District Primary Care Centre [PCC]. South of the southern boundary of the PCC are numerous residences that have submitted opposition to the MTC proposal via the online survey and by personal contact. In any event this area to the south is clearly rural in character. StPMWPC is also prepared to cede the residential area west of the eastern boundary of the PCC up to a mid point on the B4042 where it turns west to link up with the existing boundary along the A429. It believes there is no justification for this ceded area to be any larger where it would impinge upon rural parts of the parish - please see attachment

The MTC WP mandated the Mayor to ask for further concessions, south of the PCC at Burton Hill, plus the Aldi/Garden Centre site and north of Filands. StPMWPC believe, as already explained that immediately south of the PCC are many residents that oppose incorporation into MTC, further there is no case for the area to the north of the B4014 Filands, which is overwhelmingly rural in character and has few properties, to be included into any incorporation. Nor does it believe the Aldi/Garden Centre site, designated for light industrial use in the WCS, should be incorporated. StPMWPC believe the 'hard' boundary of the B4014 and A429 should be maintained in any future boundary changes. It is inconceivable that the two Councils' aims and ambitions for this site will not be aligned to prevent any future development negatively impacting the commercial/retail viability of the town's much valued High Street.


It appears to this Council that the boundaries being proposed by the MTC WP at the final meeting with the Mayor are based solely upon the future development sites around the town contained within the latest WC SHELAA in order to maximise Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL] receipts. StPMWPC indicated during these informal discussions that it would be prepared to work with MTC in a cooperative manner to use any CIL forthcoming from this Council's boundary proposal for the benefit of all residents.

StPMWPC respectfully recommends that any boundary changes proposed by the Committee are based on the recognition of the rural and urban characters of the two parishes.


Roger Budgen

Chair

MALMESBURY



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Governance Review – Proposed Changes to BPC External Boundary

The Bremhill Parish Council Review Team have considered changes to the external boundary of Bremhill Parish to be considered in the ongoing Community Governance Review. Some of these arise from extending the community cohesion, heritage and historical cohesion of Stanley in the Tytherton Lucas Ward and increasing community cohesion in Avon, in the Foxham Ward. Others arise from the proposal to form a new parish council of Studley and Derry Hill.

Bremhill Parish is a rural parish consisting of three villages (Bremhill, East Tytherton and Foxham) with small hamlets (Stanley, Tytherton Lucas, Bremhill Wick, Charlcott, Spirthill and Avon). Community facilities are limited to a village hall and church in Bremhill and Foxham, a church in East Tytherton and Tytherton Lucas and two pubs. It has four wards – Bremhill, East Tytherton, Foxham and Tytherton Lucas and 13 councillors.

The issues faced by BPC are those faced by many rural parishes - supporting agricultural economy, protecting the open countryside from inappropriate development, working with Wiltshire Council to maintain rural lanes and protect them from being used as rat runs as well as making them safe for all roads users vehicles, horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians, maintaining access to open space for the peoples' health and wellbeing, preserving and enhancing the natural habitat and preventing flooding.

The proposed changes to the external boundary of Bremhill Parish detailed below would bring in areas to the parish that face the same problems as those in Bremhill Parish and would fit well with the community cohesion already existing in the parish as well as with the local governance issues faced by the parish.


There are currently about 390 properties in the parish. These proposals would mean an increase of around 28 properties. No new wards or councillors would be required.

	Proposed Change	Reasons
1	Include Rose Cottage, Stanley Abbey Farm and the historical remains of Stanley Abbey	Rose Cottage sits on a small part of Calne Without Parish which is isolated from the rest of the parish by land in Bremhill Parish. Its residents are part of the Bremhill Parish. The Bremhill Parish Calne Without Parish boundary runs between the Stanley Abbey Farm farmhouse and its barns. The Farmhouse is in Calne Without Parish and the barns are in Bremhill Parish. The other buildings in this location are in Bremhill Parish.


		<p>The site of Stanley Abbey is linked historically to Old Abbey Farm in Bremhill Parish and its history has been researched as part of the Bremhill History Project showing its links with the parish and particularly the hamlet of Stanley For community, heritage and historical cohesion the boundary of Bremhill Parish should be changed to include these sites. This proposal would increase the number of dwellings in Bremhill Parish by two which would not require a change in ward boundaries or an increase in Councillors. The proposed new boundary follows identifiable water courses from the junction of Pudding Brook to the bottom of Studley Hill and then hedge lines around the site of Stanley Abbey to the railway line on the west boundary of Great Bodnage Copse.</p>
2	<p>Change boundary to follow the disused railway line/ cycle route from the western end Great Bodnage Copse to Black Dog Bridge.</p>	<p>This provides an easily identifiable hard boundary to Bremhill Parish. It is a rural area compatible with the community interests of rest of Bremhill Parish. It does not include any extra dwellings falling into Bremhill Parish.</p>
3	<p>Extend boundary from Black Dog Bridge to the area of GR 988706 on the disused railway line/cycletrack and then north following field boundaries and A4 to A4/A3102 junction</p>	<p>This is a rural area with two farms (Berhills Farm and Studleybrook Farm). It is compatible with the community interests of Bremhill Parish. It includes two extra dwellings. It would not require additional wards in Bremhill Parish or additional councillors.</p>
4	<p>Extend boundary along A3102 beyond the junction with Oxford Road to boundary of first dwelling on left. Then follow Hilmarton Parish boundary NW to Fisher's Brook and continue NW along the hedge line to the hedge on the left. Follow the hedge SW and then SE to Fishers Brook. Follow the brook in a westerly direction until the hedge going NNW towards Whitley Farm. At the bridleway follow it towards Cowage Wood to join the current Hilmarton Parish boundary and follow this to the current Bremhill</p>	<p>This is a rural area with scattered dwellings similar to Bremhill Parish. The current boundary with Calne Without Parish runs through the small hamlet of Ratford. The properties are mainly located on the Ratford to A4 lane and Turf House Lane from Mead Cottage to A3102. The farms are Swerves Farm, Lower Whitley Farm, Whitley Farm and Lickhill Farm. It is compatible with the community interest of Bremhill Parish. It can be incorporated into the current Bremhill Ward. No additional councillors are required.</p>

	Parish boundary at the weir south of Bremhill House Cottages.	
5	In Foxham Ward include Brook Farm, Christian Farm and Foxham Farm in Bremhill Parish. To the west of Foxham Farm change the boundary to run to small pond on footpath 17 on the north side of the farm. At Brook Farm and Christian Farm extend the boundary north on the lane to Christian Malford and at the railway line follow it SW to connect with the existing Bremhill Parish boundary.	These farms are on the periphery of Christian Malford Parish, have strong economic and social ties with Bremhill Parish. Their residents are part of the Bremhill Parish community. These farms can be incorporated into Foxham Ward without the need for additional councillors.
6	Bremhill Parish boundary at Avon Lane. Currently the majority of the properties in the hamlet of Avon are in Bremhill Parish. Some fields to the west of the southern part of Avon Lane are also in Bremhill Parish. Change the boundary to follow the River Avon from the wood south of Carpenter's Farm to the sluice and then turn SE to follow the drain to the NE of Manor Farm to the current Bremhill Parish boundary. On reaching Avon Lane at Partridge View it would follow Avon Lane to Maud Heath's Causeway.	This would provide a more distinct Bremhill Parish boundary and add to the community cohesion of Avon and its links with Bremhill Parish. It would add three additional properties to Bremhill Parish and would not require additional wards or councillors.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Governance Review – Proposed Changes to BPC External Boundary

The Bremhill Parish Council Review Team have considered changes to the external boundary of Bremhill Parish to be considered in the ongoing Community Governance Review. Some of these arise from extending the community cohesion, heritage and historical cohesion of Stanley in the Tytherton Lucas Ward and increasing community cohesion in Avon, in the Foxham Ward. Others arise from the proposal to form a new parish council of Studley and Derry Hill.

Bremhill Parish is a rural parish consisting of three villages (Bremhill, East Tytherton and Foxham) with small hamlets (Stanley, Tytherton Lucas, Bremhill Wick, Charlcott, Spirthill and Avon). Community facilities are limited to a village hall and church in Bremhill and Foxham, a church in East Tytherton and Tytherton Lucas and two pubs. It has four wards – Bremhill, East Tytherton, Foxham and Tytherton Lucas and 13 councillors.

The issues faced by BPC are those faced by many rural parishes - supporting agricultural economy, protecting the open countryside from inappropriate development, working with Wiltshire Council to maintain rural lanes and protect them from being used as rat runs as well as making them safe for all roads users vehicles, horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians, maintaining access to open space for the peoples' health and wellbeing, preserving and enhancing the natural habitat and preventing flooding.

The proposed changes to the external boundary of BPC detailed below bring in areas to the parish that face the same problems as those in BPC and would fit well with the community cohesion already existing in BPC. Also some of the changes are tidying the parish boundary by using geographical feature such as brooks to create an identifiable boundary. All the proposed changes fit well with the local governance issues faced by BPC.


There are currently about 390 properties in the parish. These proposals would mean an increase of around 28 properties. No new wards or councillors would be required.

	Proposed Change	Reasons
1	Include Rose Cottage, Stanley Abbey Farm and the historical remains of Stanley Abbey	Rose Cottage sits on a small part of Calne Without Parish which is isolated from the rest of the parish by land in Bremhill Parish. Its residents are part of the Bremhill Parish. The Bremhill Parish Calne Without Parish boundary runs between the Stanley Abbey Farm farmhouse and its barns. The Farmhouse is in Calne Without Parish and the barns are in Bremhill Parish.

		<p>The other buildings in this location are in Bremhill Parish.</p> <p>The site of Stanley Abbey is linked historically to Old Abbey Farm in Bremhill Parish and its history has been researched as part of the Bremhill History Project showing its links with the parish and particularly the hamlet of Stanley For community, heritage and historical cohesion the boundary of Bremhill Parish should be changed to include these sites. This proposal would increase the number of dwellings in Bremhill Parish by two which would not require a change in ward boundaries or an increase in Councillors. The proposed new boundary follows identifiable water courses from the junction of Pudding Brook to the bottom of Studley Hill and then hedge lines around the site of Stanley Abbey to the railway line on the west boundary of Great Bodnage Copse.</p>
2	Change boundary to follow the disused railway line/ cycle route from the western end Great Bodnage Copse to Black Dog Bridge.	This provides an easily identifiable hard boundary to Bremhill Parish. It is a rural area compatible with the community interests of rest of Bremhill Parish. It does not include any extra dwellings falling into Bremhill Parish.
3	Extend boundary from Black Dog Bridge to the area of GR 993707 on the disused railway line/cycletrack and then north following field boundaries and A4 to A4/A3102 junction	This is a rural area with two farms (Berhills Farm and Studleybrook Farm). It is compatible with the community interests of Bremhill Parish. It includes two extra dwellings. It would not require additional wards in Bremhill Parish or additional councillors.
4	Extend boundary along A3102 beyond the junction with Oxford Road to boundary of first dwelling on left. Then follow Hilmarton Parish boundary NW to Fisher's Brook and continue NW along the hedge line to the hedge on the left. Follow the hedge SW and then SE to Fishers Brook. Follow the brook in a westerly direction until the hedge going NNW towards Whitley Farm. At the bridleway follow it towards Cowage Wood to join the current Hilmarton Parish boundary and	This is a rural area with scattered dwellings similar to Bremhill Parish. The current boundary with Calne Without Parish runs through the small hamlet of Ratford. The properties are mainly located on the Ratford to A4 lane and Turf House Lane from Mead Cottage to A3102. The farms are Swerves Farm, Lower Whitley Farm, Whitley Farm and Lickhill Farm. It is compatible with the community interest of Bremhill Parish. It can be incorporated into the current Bremhill Ward. No additional councillors are required.


	follow this to the current Bremhill Parish boundary at the weir south of Bremhill House Cottages.	
5	From GR 014760 change the boundary to follow Cowage Brook	
6	In Foxham Ward include Brook Farm, Christian Farm and Foxham Farm in Bremhill Parish. To the west of Foxham Farm change the boundary to run to small pond on footpath 17 on the north side of the farm. At Brook Farm and Christian Farm extend the boundary north on the lane to Christian Malford and at the railway line follow it SW to connect with the existing Bremhill Parish boundary.	These farms are on the periphery of Christian Malford Parish, have strong economic and social ties with Bremhill Parish. Their residents are part of the Bremhill Parish community. These farms can be incorporated into Foxham Ward without the need for additional councillors.
7	Bremhill Parish boundary at Avon Lane. Currently the majority of the properties in the hamlet of Avon are in Bremhill Parish. Some fields to the west of the southern part of Avon Lane are also in Bremhill Parish. Change the boundary to follow the River Avon from the wood south of Carpenter's Farm to the sluice and then turn SE to follow the drain to the NE of Manor Farm to meet the current BP boundary across the field to the south of Partridge Cottage and onto Avon Lane. On reaching Avon Lane it would follow Avon Lane to Maud Heath's Causeway.	This would provide a more distinct Bremhill Parish boundary and add to the community cohesion of Avon and its links with Bremhill Parish. It would add three additional properties to Bremhill Parish and would not require additional wards or councillors.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Proposal from Compton Bassett Parish Council – in purple



This page is intentionally left blank

From:	John Henly <>
Sent on:	Friday, December 10, 2021 4:47:39 PM
To:	CGR < CGR@wiltshire.gov.uk >
CC:	Email removed
Subject:	Re: CGR - Hilmarton proposal
Attachments:	Proposal for Hilmarton Parish.pdf (2.71 MB), Aerial view of proposed boundary change.pdf (2.89 MB)

Good afternoon Kieran and Lisa

Thank you for your patience to enable us to map our proposal.

In the end the only suitable map we could find to use was the Wiltshire Council Rights of Way Explorer Map as this enabled us to show the existing Parish Boundary alongside our proposal.

I've attached a pdf showing the area in question with a close-up more detailed map on the second page showing The Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve.

Also attached is an arial photograph that may help the committee identify specifically the High Penn farm buildings and cottages.

Please can you ask the committee to read these bullet points in conjunction with the attached - thank you.

- Existing Parish boundaries can be identified on the maps by the black dotted lines. These lines are already layered on the Wiltshire Council Rights of Way Explorer Map.
- The existing Hilmarton boundary comes almost down to the Tesco Roundabout.
- The green field adjacent to Tesco and the roundabout is where a new Lidl is going to be built so the shape of that part of the boundary is correct.
- On the close-up map you can clearly see the new housing estate on the edge of High Penn Road and the Calne Without boundary line crossing at this point.
- The proposed new Hilmarton Parish boundary largely follows part of the existing Calne Without boundary but creates a new boundary between New Cottages on High Penn Road and The Quag, which is on the edge of the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve.

I trust this will give the committee sufficient detail but should any additional information be needed please do come back to me.

With kind regards

John Henly

For and on behalf of Hilmarton Parish Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed Hilmarton Parish Boundary Change



The white line is the existing Hilmarton Parish boundary.


The blue line is the proposed new Hilmarton Parish boundary incorporating High Penn cottages, farm buildings and Penn Wood Nature Reserve.


Please note:


- This new area is currently part of Calne Without.
- Cherhill and Compton Bassett Parishes also meet this line but are not a part of the enclosed area.

The second smaller blue area has nothing to do with Calne without and is just a minor proposal to move the Hilmarton Parish boundary slightly into Bremhill Parish. The existing Hilmarton Parish boundary runs straight through the back of Beversbrook Farm House, which is now called Haines Construction. No other dwellings would be affected by this proposed change.


This page is intentionally left blank



Area highlighted yellow  is the existing southern part of Hilmarton Parish.

Area highlighted light green  is part of existing Calne without incorporating High Penn farm buildings, cottages and Wiltshire Wildlife Nature Reserve.





Page 102

Here is a close-up of the identified area



	Area: Beechingstoke & Surrounding Parishes
	<p>Notes;</p> <p>Information sheets were provided ahead of the online Town and Parish sessions.</p> <p>The Chairman explained the background at each sessions which explained the process and aim of the Community Governance Review (CGR).</p> <p>The Parish of Beechingstoke is able to elect a parish council of up to five councillors, with a minimum quorum of three.</p> <p>Since at least 2017, across two elections (2017 and 2021) no councillors have been elected in Beechingstoke, despite multiple reruns.</p> <p>The Electoral Review Committee of Wiltshire Council has initiated a review of the governance arrangements of Beechingstoke to determine if they could be more effective and convenient, and better reflect the interests and identity of local communities.</p> <p>To enable to most options to be considered, all surrounding parishes of Beechingstoke are included for the review.</p>
	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>Wiltshire Council is not, at this time, proposing any specific arrangements for Beechingstoke but invites comments. Options could include:</p> <p>B1 – Change to Parish Meeting This would mean the parish would no longer have elections to a parish council. Instead, any elector of the parish could call a meeting to consider proposals on limited matters. There are approximately 20+ parish meetings in Wiltshire out of over 250 parishes. An example would be the parish of East Kennett.</p> <p>B2 – Grouping with another Parish This would mean Beechingstoke would retain its status as a parish, but would be represented by a joint parish council which covered more than one parish. An example would be Kennet Valley Joint Parish Council, representing the parishes of Fyfield, and West Overton.</p> <p>B3 – Merger with another Parish This would mean Beechingstoke would no longer be a parish in its own right, but would form a single parish of multiple communities and a single parish council. An example would be Wilcot, Huish and Oare, which was formerly the separate parishes of Wilcot, and Huish.</p> <p><u>Transfers</u></p>

	<p>Regardless of whether any of the options above are approved, the boundaries of the parish are also able to be amended if appropriate. One proposal has been suggested at this stage.</p> <p>B4 – Transfer of Land around Bottlesford to North Newton Representatives of North Newton Parish Council have suggested that the community of Bottlesford is currently divided between Beechingstoke and North Newton, and that unifying the community could be considered.</p>
	<p>The following discussion questions were put to each of the sessions:</p> <p><i>Discussion Questions:</i></p> <p><i>Please set out your views on the suggested options keeping in mind the statutory criteria.</i></p>
<p>21 Oct</p>	<p>North Newton (NN) PC Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ian Thorn (IT), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC), Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Kieron Elliott - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Tom Ellen (TE) – Vice Chairman</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TE - NN is a rural Parish, a ribbon development of 3 small settlements. The Elector numbers are 3 times the size of Beechingstoke. • A short section of Bottlesford currently in Beechingstoke would sit more appropriately in our parish. • NN has no Village hall and is short of amenities, with 2 pubs and a church – but nothing else. • If Beechingstoke had any of the facilities we do not have, then that would work well and compliment ours. • We have 7 elected PC Cllrs (full) since May 2021. Majority have sat previously so quite experienced, we have the capacity, but Cllr numbers to be adjusted if Beechingstoke were included as a ward of NN. • Agnostic at this stage – in terms of the three options.

GG – In this case we are dealing with a non-existent PC. More speculative conversation. Is part of Bottlesford community in within your parish?

- TE - We have 3 settlements, North Newton (with the church), Hillcott & Bottlesford. Geographically, part of Bottlesford sits in Beechingstoke. There is no real network of streets in the parish, 10 or 12 houses, right up Broad Street. There is already quite a close relationship.

GG - Does that include Manor Farm?

- Probably, yes.

GG – Is there any representation within your PC from that community?

- No, but we had notification from 2 people within Bottlesford and the PC Clerk is from there.
- There are no facilities in Broad Street, so that community sit more comfortably in Bottlesford. Logically it would seem most appropriate to take that bit into NN.

GG – There is a strong argument for that particular parish inclusion. In terms of the other parts of Beechingstoke, do you see any connectivity with yourselves?

- Geographically, south of the railway line would fit with our parish – I think that is the parish boundary. Whilst no link we are all in Lowland PC vale. As good a fit as anybody.

EC – Your Parish currently has no school or shops. would you gain those if you merged?

- No idea

GG – With the railway line barrier, in terms of community cohesion – would it be fair to say, the line is a natural division in the community?

- It is artificial but it has been there before the parishes were given a role in governance. I assume that's why it was declared a parish boundary. Yes, it is a barrier as there are only 2 or 3 places you can cross, they tend to be main roads.

GG – in terms of Comm cohesion we are struggling to get governance in to Beechingstoke in a traditional way, people of Beechingstoke look more southerly than northerly.

IBP – There are 2 pubs but no other amenities. But in other areas there are shops, so if you asked those in Broad Street, they may say they connect their business in Woodborough.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, Woodborough has a good school and many people go there. <p>Q – We need to survey the people of Beechingstoke to ask them.</p> <p>KE – NN has 7 PC Cllrs at the moment, having been provoked into a review would you feel the need for more or less cllrs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not aware – we currently have a full set. Only addition would be that section of Broad Street. <p>GG – If the committee were minded to suggest a formal merger, then your view was that there would need to be some kind of change, possibly some kind of representation from Beechingstoke. Would there be a need for a greater number of PC cllrs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of governance & democracy – we would need to see an increase of at least 1 cllr and invite a member from Beechingstoke. Without losing one of our elected members. <p>IBP – But, if you only took on Bottlesford, that small change would not require a change to the PC numbers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No that would not alter the size or balance
<p>21 Oct</p>	<p>Stanton St Bernard (SSB) PC Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC), Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Bryan Read Chairman (BR)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a comfortable PC – all cllrs are actively involved. • We have a natural barrier between us and Beechingstoke due to the railway, although there is a footpath you have to cross the railway line. • Not a natural extension. To reach by road you have to go through 3 other parish areas. <p>IBP - Any views of Beechingstoke itself?</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not really – the other PC cllrs have no interest in amalgamating Beechingstoke with us due to the natural barrier. At this present time we don't see we have a lot to offer. <p>GG – if we were looking at the options of a merger or the partitioning up of Beechingstoke into other areas, given your knowledge, what would be your solution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To take Broad Street into Woodborough, the bit at bottom with Marden or one of others, If Beechingstoke had no interest in raising their own PC they probably wont mind if you split it up. • Woodborough has same boundary of railway line as we do. A willing partner would be better than a forced one
<p>22 Oct</p>	<p>Woodborough PC Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Chairman Steve Napier (SN) & Vice Chairman John Brewin (JB)</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SN - Woodborough is happy to stand alone as it has its own identity. The PC is just keeping its head above water, it struggles to retain Cllrs and volunteer commitment and would struggle to merge with Beechingstoke – we have limited interactions with them apart from their annual fete. • We would struggle to make a meaningful difference if merged with Beechingstoke. • JB – I support that. I have been on the PC for 25 years and I know Beechingstoke well. At a PC meeting last night this was discussed and felt that there was no obvious synergy between us and Beechingstoke. • If they have not managed to get the enthusiasm to get a PC together then they would be unlikely to get a Parish Meeting together – which seems the obvious choice out of your suggested outcomes. There is nothing obvious to promote a merger. <p>GG – Bottlesford is close to you, there could be a case where we look at other solutions. It has been suggested that Bottlesford might sit comfortably with you or North Newnton, what are your views on that? Or any view on any other neighbouring parishes whether part merge or whole?</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SN- If the amenity (Seven Stars pub) fell in then I would support it. With regards to changing boundaries, I am keen to entertain conversations about Bottlesford as the pub and the walking area around Mullings farm would tick the box of doing the right thing for society. • JB - Looking at the list of parishes, the only one obvious is Marden – Beechingstoke would have more in common with Marden. • As far as Bottlesford is concerned, I didn't realise it was up for grabs. North Newnton is an odd shaped parish as it is long and thin. Not sure they would support losing Bottlesford. • JB - I would be happy for Broad Street to come properly in to Woodborough as we treat it as it is in now. There is a synergy there I think. <p>IBP – Are we talking about Broad Street & Manor Farm?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SN – I would like to ask the cllrs on the PC before I say yes. I would be happy to take the suggested area if the other PC cllrs are, it would mean more work for the parish but would be a benefit to the community. • JB – We would need to clarify what was meant by Broad Street, as Woodborough village's understanding is it includes the school and a few houses, but it actually goes on to North Newnton. That should not stop any conversations though. <p>JL – If North Newnton did take on the area of Bottlesford, there would be a natural link as children go to school there.</p> <p>IBP - Would you entertain further discussions between Woodborough & North Newnton with regards to Bottlesford if the Cmmtt initiated them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes if you arranged this. • JB – My wife may be able to get a contact for the big house in Beechingstoke where they run the fete. Will pass to clerk.
<p>3 Nov</p>	<p>Session with WC Local Member Cllr Paul Oatway</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (Chairman) Cllr Gavin Grant</p> <p>Lisa Alexander, Kieran Elliott – Democratic Services</p> <p>Cllr Paul Oatway</p> <p>Discussion:</p>

- PO - They have been rudderless for the whole duration of my 2.5 terms. Previously led by Charles Lucas - he moved out a year or so ago, no one has taken on the role since.
- Not in favour of a parish meeting – This would not achieve anything as would remain in a rudderless position
- I would like to see them create a PC so they have some democracy. If that is not possible, the favourable PC would be Woodborough (managed and chaired very well) and secondly North Newton (but the latter already have 3 wards).
- Charlton St Peter and Wilsford are already 2 parishes. Don't want to create another mix.
- Patney have taken a step back already
- Stanton St Bernard – not in mix

IBP – when we spoke to Woodborough they would consider taking on houses just over railway – but not keen on taking on whole of Beechingstoke. All others are saying no.

- PO – I could talk with Woodborough to see if they may change their mind. I don't favour having a part of Beechingstoke go to one and a bit to another. It should all go together.
- Potchingdon house and dairy? what happens to them. If it moves it should go as a whole.

KE – the dwellings in Beechingstoke are to the west would it not sit better in terms of community cohesion with Patney?

- PO - It's the dynamics of the communities and the community leaders.

Merge – if with Woodborough – would be a single parish could be called a variation of names. No longer its own entity but part of a larger whole. It could be warded so still a potential for people in Beechingstoke standing for a seat on the PC

Grouping - would mean both parishes retain their own meetings. Governed by one council but still separate entities. Warded with 2 separate parishes. It could be that no one stands for Beechingstoke, but there would then be a PC that could oversee them. PC responsible for all financial matters. PC would be in charge of both parishes.

	<p>Open question – If Beechingstoke were to merge, the committee would need to clarify what would be the ideal position. (how many wards it would need etc) Number of councillors would be up to the committee.</p> <p>Legal minimum for a PC is 5 – could add to the 7 that Woodborough have at the moment or say that 7 is enough. Or even bump up to say 9.</p> <p>IBP – complicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PO – grouping seems complex. Merge is the most slick option. <p>GG – when we met with Woodborough they appeared not too keen of taking on Beechingstoke – they did say that they had a connection with Bottlesford. North Newton again were interested in the Bottlesford piece.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PO – uncomfortable in carving Beechingstoke up for other parishes own desires. <p>KE – we will be writing out to the people of Beechingstoke themselves.</p>
13 Dec	<p>Public Online Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL)</p> <p>Cllr Paul Oatway (PO) Local Member Lisa Alexander & Kieran Elliott (KE) - Democratic Services</p> <p>Attendees: Jonathan & Marilyn Fry Mark Banham (MB) – Broad Street Resident Chris – Beechingstoke resident David Pritchett – Beechingstoke Resident Ben Neale (BN)– Broad Street resident Tony & Elizabeth – Beechingstoke Resident</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Kneale – surprised when I got the letter to hear that there had been any parish elections – lived here 13 years and was unaware of the status and any previous parish election. <p>KE – It is quite likely that there was no election as such, in order to hold an election would need more than the minimum of 5 – so need at least 6 people to have put themselves forward. In 2017 & 2021 The Elections team would have written out. We can enquire about the process for Beechingstoke – no nominations.</p>

- Marilyn – agree have lived here 20 years – I know there was a PC when I first arrived, not aware of any notices coming out in years since 2017. Have an active PCC – There may be some people wishing to take role on if we knew what the role would entail.
- MB – lived here 20 years – were familiar with previous PC – have looked to see if there will be nominations but seen nothing. You perceive a lack of local governance – what are we lacking that we need to replace.
- We didn't know we had to put nominations forward – what is missing? What has initiated this review

GG – Explained the role of a Parish Cllr.

IBP – cannot consider precepts as a factor – but important to understand how it works. PCs decide the amount of money they need to raise – and WC provides them with a number of all equitable values – gives the Band for the area. WC collects the precept for you, banks that and hands it over to you.

- MB – With regards to planning consultation, what has happened in the past whilst we have had no PC?

IBP – any resident can comment on a planning app as they do. Notices go up. Your local WC cllr has the ability to call an app to committee. The PC is a statutory consultee in this process and the committee give weight to the PC view.

- MB – At the moment we don't pay a precept and not aware of one before when there was a PC. What is it spent on? Projects of their own device?

IBP – WC cannot tell you what to do with your money – if you have a PC and a clerk – generally they get paid an hourly wage – comes out of precept – in my own PC – we may need to contribute to things such as traffic projects.

GG – There are currently around 20 parishes which don't raise a precept – that is also an option.

- MB – what is legal liability of a PC Cllr?

GG – There is a Code of Conduct (CoC) – we all sign up to it as to how you would conduct yourself.

IBP – There is a national CoC and WC have one, parishes can choose to adopt one of those, or create its own.

Cllr Paul Oatway – apologised for joining late due to connection issues.

- Marilyn – if we are raising our own precept – the PC can spend the money in their own area – can it be spent on the parish church? Our church is the main asset of our community – so interested on that.

IBP - No but there are creative ways to spend the funds on projects which would benefit the wider community – could also apply for funding to the AB.

- Mrs Banham – thank you for re-arranging the meeting. We are a small but closely connected village, as a consequence of the original letter, we have had a conversation with neighbouring parishes. For me, I would say Woodborough – we are in the same cluster as them. We are under the impression, that they are not keen on taking us on if we don't come up with a plan. Is that a relevant factor when it comes to making decisions at the end of the day.

IBP – In respect of Woodborough and North Newnton there are possibilities, the others we spoke to did not see a direct linkage and highlighted geographical difficulties. The Woodborough attitude was that they were not interested in making a power grab nor would they shy away to take you on if they felt it would help. North Newnton were the same.

- Mrs Fry - I live on Broad Street – does it apply to Broad Street, as I don't want to be a part of North Newnton, I would rather it be with Woodborough.

IBP – If having your own PC isn't to be, where do you feel the natural fit is?

- Woodborough was supported by all 4 residents.

IBP – It could be possible, if there was a clear wish to form a PC, we could look at that option with Elections again and see if one could be set up within a set period of time.

KE – If you feel that a PC on the current boundaries is the preferred option – no need to go to FC. If there are people coming to us saying they are interested. We can ask Elections to put out some notices for an election in 2022. The Committee makes no recommendation at this stage, someone can request one within 2 years and the Committee can carry out a review at any stage.

GG – does anyone feel NN is the answer?

	<p>PO – Woodborough were happy to take part of Beechingstoke, however I felt it should remain in its entirety and not be broken up. North Newton were warmer. I am more than happy to go back to Woodborough and have discussions. If the outcome is to set up a PC, I would be with you side by side in the formation of it, you would not be alone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• David – I moved here 3 years ago. I suspect that over a longer time period governance was important – it may be that there was a gap for a period and changing individuals may now mean there is more of an appetite.• Marilyn – As a community in Beechingstoke we already have an effective governance – I would be happy to put myself up as a PC Cllr in order to keep the status quo as it is, we do have a strong community sense and we are cohesive.• Mark – we have agreed that breaking Beechingstoke up not the best approach whilst we have the Broad Street element separated – actually 2/3rds of the parish live in Broad Street but we all come together to make things work. In the interim – if we are not able to form one – the fall back should be the parish meeting . <p>KE – The online survey runs until 31 Dec – people can also write or email their views to us. If a lot of responses indicated that people are interested in putting themselves forward – we could speak to elections and establish timescales.</p> <p>GG – if not a PC – would you be in support of a Parish Meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All agreed.• Mrs Fry – spoke with 20-25 people in the village as to what do they want – all stated they don't want to be split up they want to be together.• Marilyn – this weekend we have the village carol party – we can speak to residents then. <p>IBP – An in-person meeting is not optional due to covid at present- if you wish to hold a local meeting then that is up to you.</p> <p>GG – please do get the word out</p> <p>KE – Anything that is submitted after the 31st – would still be logged and put before the cmmtt. If the cmmtt intends to propose a change – they would go out to consultation. Any changes would take effect in May 2025</p> <p>IBP – will check with elections on timeframe of an election for a PC.</p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mark – were we to adopt a parish meeting and there were no meetings held between the 2 years – would that indicate we had no problems or that there were governance issues? <p>KE – there are some areas where Parish meetings are not held and others where they don't know the processes, others meet as often as a PC. Some Parish meetings can request more powers. Supposed to hold a minimum of one meeting a year.</p>
--	---

	<p>Area: Malmesbury & St Paul Malmesbury Without</p>
	<p>Notes;</p> <p>Information sheets were provided ahead of the online Town and Parish sessions.</p> <p>The Chairman gave an introduction at each sessions which explained the process and aim of the Community Governance Review (CGR).</p> <p>The proposals for Malmesbury & St Paul Malmesbury Without were presented and those in attendance were asked for their views on each, and whether they had any additional changes or proposals for consideration by the Committee.</p>
	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>M1 – Proposed by Malmesbury Town Council</p> <p>M1 (1) - For an extension to the parish boundary to include Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Milbourne and Foxley/ Common Road, and the area north of Filands, Kings Heath and Cole Park.</p> <p>M1 (2) - For the parish to be divided into seven wards being Backbridge Farm, Burton Hill and Cowbridge, Common Rd (Common Rd, Foxley Rd, and Kings Heath), Malmesbury South, Malmesbury North, Malmesbury West, and Milbourne.</p> <p>M1 (3) - Change the number of Councillors for the Parish from 16 to 20 as proposed, in support of the proposed wards (namely Backbridge Farm x1, Burton Hill and Cowbridge x2, Common Rd x1, Malmesbury South x2, Malmesbury North x6, Malmesbury West x7, and Milbourne x1).</p> <p>M2 – Proposed by St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council</p> <p>M2 (1) - To reduce the existing two wards in the parish down to one- incorporate the Westport Parish Ward into one integrated St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward & keep the present combined number of councillors at 12.</p> <p>M2 (2) – To change the Parish boundary in line with the [LGBCE's] decision to alter the Malmesbury & Sherston electoral divisional boundary to incorporate Backbridge within the Sherston division. Therefore, we propose that the Backbridge development be incorporated into St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward.</p>
<p>22 Oct</p>	<p>Malmesbury Town Council session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman</p>

<p>Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL) & Cllr Ernie Clark(EC)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Town Council attendees: Cllr Wayne Jones Cllr Gavin Grant (GG - in role as Town Cllr) Claire Mann (clerk)</p> <p><i>Discussion Questions:</i></p> <p><i>Q For the proposed extension (MTC), are your reasons of community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance, to support a transfer of the area proposed? If not, please expand on the connection of those areas with the remainder of St Paul Malmesbury Without</i></p> <p><i>Q In respect of the Backbridge ward of the town council, within the Sherston division, what are the community connections with St Paul Malmesbury without, if any? Do you believe there are governance reasons that would support such a transfer?</i></p> <p><i>Q The area projected to receive significant development – would this affect the overall identity of the parish, and is the parish supportive of that?</i></p> <p><i>Q Why were the indicated areas included in the request but not others?</i></p> <p><i>Q Regarding the MTC proposal - for the proposed warding and cllr numbers, please indicate clearly the areas described – why such a range of ward sizes?</i></p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The TC proposals are based around the fact that the community of Malmesbury is wider than the current area. People are treated as a resident of Malmesbury if they live close to the town, but in surrounding parishes. Therefore, we propose to take on board some of the neighbouring parish to include those that feel part of Malmesbury town but aren't currently.• We would need more cllrs for the increased workload, as we would want to be resourced accordingly to deliver the community requirements. There is confusion within the community about where Malmesbury starts and finishes want to provide clarity on this for residents.• GG – Burton Hill, people think they live in Malmesbury but they don't they live in St Paul Malmesbury Without (SPMW) which is in Sherston division.

- There is continuous development across the main road between Burton Hill and Cowbridge. Cowbridge is in Sherston, people there also think they are in Malmesbury.
- Milbourne residents also think they live in Malmesbury but are in SPMW. People from these areas often go to vote in Malmesbury Town but are not eligible because that is not their division.
- There was a new Aldi built on the edge of Malmesbury, but over the division line so SPMW benefitted not Malmesbury although they suffer disruption from the building.
- Common road area out of Malmesbury over Truckle Bridge, including the area of allotments and densely built area, these people also think they live in Malmesbury.
- Kings Heath land was granted to the sons of Malmesbury, administered by Warden of Malmesbury.
- The continuous development in the immediate areas around the town, includes the Dyson Headquarters. All of the people in these surrounding areas use the town facilities and identify as part of Malmesbury.
- In Backbridge there are 1.81 voters per house, Malmesbury couldn't cope with the number of voters at the time of the lines being drawn. There is a large housing development there closer to the centre of Malmesbury than a lot of existing areas of Malmesbury.

IBP – What is the effect of the proposal on M SP without?

- GG – Suburbs of Malmesbury and then two discrete settlements, Corston and Rodbourne in Sherston, focal point of SPMW. There is a village hall for SPMW which is in Corston, far from urban edge of Malmesbury.
- Cowbridge gave S106 money to MTC to be spent in Malmesbury, should just be included in by Malmesbury.
- There would need to be internal warding to balance out cllrs and focus the parish to where it should be, Corston and Rodbourne.

IBP – What is proposed doesn't necessitate WC boundary changes?

- GG – no does not require that.
- The MSPW proposals seem counterproductive, SPMW detrimental to community cohesion, puts large divide in Malmesbury. Parish and town parted ways on a lot of things over past few years (previously had a joint cemetery).
- Do not think SPMW residents would support the view, they don't want to be divided from Malmesbury, not in best interests of residents.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern in terms of purpose of proposal, the Malmesbury proposal focused on bringing community together. • GG – Primary school right on edge of boundary with Backbridge Development in heart of Malmesbury – would take out that and the Dyson factory <p>IBP – Malmesbury in WC terms is a doughnut but couldn't remove Brokenborough because of Backbridge development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new lines push so far south due to the road infrastructure Brokenborough stays as separate Parish.
<p>29 Oct</p>	<p>St Paul Malmesbury Without session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (IBP) – ERC Chairman Cllr Ian Thorn (IT), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ashley O'Neil (AO), Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Kieran Elliott (KE) - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr Roger Budgen (RB) Chairman of PC Cllr Peter Hatherall (PH) Vice Chairman of PC Cllr Allan Hopkins (AH) Chair of Finance Committee</p> <p><i>Discussion Questions:</i></p> <p><i>Q For the proposed extension (MTC), what are your thoughts on community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance, in regards to a transfer of the area proposed and on the connection of those areas with the remainder of St Paul Malmesbury Without?</i></p> <p><i>Q In respect of the Backbridge ward of the town council, within the Sherston division, what are the community connections with St Paul Malmesbury without, if any? Do you believe there are governance reasons that would support such a transfer?</i></p> <p><i>Q The area projected to receive significant development – would this affect the overall identity of the parish, and is the parish supportive of that?</i></p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPMW proposal was put forward in response to the proposal by MTC. There was no fractious behaviour at SPMW PC, it is a

well-run council, in 2021 audit report was clean. Cllrs have a varying and vast scope of experience. The PC provides a wide range of facilities and has attended numerous NAPC meetings, with positive and effective engagements. The PC is one of three constituent councils to provide a neighbourhood plan. There are natural historic boundaries, easily understood boundaries, and understands the urban and rural needs of the parish.

IBP- The map indicates what SPMW would be left with if MTC plans went through. SPMW would basically be left with just Corsten.

- Corsten is a small hamlet nearby, very rural area

IM – if you were to be in Malmesbury but identify with SPMW, which area would you be in?

- The natural boundaries at the moment provide assurance and confidence on what is the town and urban areas. Parklands and white line park areas, even Calnbridge area has its urban areas. Shouldn't dismiss that we have worked closely with MTC, RB was a member of MTC for many years. Very difficult to identify an area that should be hived off. A429 very sound boundary, village of Milbourne very rural little in common with Malmesbury.
- To the south its mainly fields, very rural, I don't believe there is a direct connection to the town.
- Milbourne is a mixture of rural and urban, Cllrs from different parts of the parish which is geographically large, parish cllrs very cohesive. In practice the PC is a cohesive operation.
- We have worked very strongly in past 10 years on cohesion, our council reflects that, each area has own issues but we prioritise them. We feed back to residents and they understand.

IBP – could you clarify the warding in SPMW? Match number in TC proposal?

- There are 2 wards, which go back historically, if no changes are to take place then it would be more efficient to just have one ward for SPMW.
- There is concern about proposed warding, in that it would leave people of SPMW underrepresented. They wouldn't have as much influence as they do under the current arrangements.

JL – Huge parish in comparison with other parishes, just need to listen to what people have to say.

KE – In response to the Malmesbury proposal do you feel that Backbridge fits in SPMW?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe there is more to it than just a negative reason for putting forward proposal. It relates to the fact that it would match the boundaries of the county's divisions. Without it residents of Backbridge would be in the divisional area of Sherston. but would be in MTC and the cllr would be Malmesbury division, which would be confusing for residents, who won't know who they should be going to. • I have been on PC a long time, it is a very effective and slick PC, and represents the community well, we would hate to lose that.
<p>2 Nov</p>	<p>WC – Local Member session</p> <p>In attendance:</p> <p>Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (IBP) Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM),</p> <p>Cllr Gavin Grant - as Malmesbury Division Member Cllr Martin Smith – Sherston Division Member</p> <p>The Chairman gave an overview of the proposals and invited comments from the two Division Members.</p> <p>Cllr Gavin Grant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The map which shows warding proposals, indicates a straight blue line running up to the top left diagonal corner, to Brokenborough PC. There are three PCs that form the Malmesbury Area Board, and there is strong collaboration. • Areas 1,2, 4, 7 on the map constitute parish boundary and urban boundary of Malmsebury. • The area SPMW are interested in is area 6 (Common Rd, Foxley Rd, Kings Heath). SPMW is just under half of Martins division. • Where does Area 1 – Backbridge belong? It is currently in Martins division and is there by necessity due to the numbers of voters taken and divided by 98 wards. It was pushed into Martins division due to the numbers being too large, that was the only reason it wasn't included in Malmesbury. • There are 201 houses being built there, which pushed it over the limit for WC purposes and pushed it into Sherston division. • How SPMW made argument that it should be part of SPMW, because they are also in Sherston. • Also located in Area 1 is Dyson, a major employer in Malmesbury town. There is no case for it to be moved out of TC of Malmesbury. • The Local Boundary Commission don't like a donut shaped area, but made an exception here, Sherston goes round Malmesbury. This exception was made because no other solution was available.

- Area 5 – Burton Hill, Cowbridge, runs up to edge of the roundabout, that is the border of Malmesbury. Going into Milbourne. There is a large rural dog-leg. That area identify with Malmesbury.
- Area 4 - Closest to Common Road, Foxley Road out of Malmesbury, which then forks. The houses are an extension of Malmesbury, people past division boundary perceive themselves as being in Malmesbury.
- The area of Kings Heath was granted to the warden and free masons by King Athelstan. There is a strong case that the area is attached to Malmesbury.
- The village of Corston has a distinct rural community, in keeping with rural parishes around the outside of Malmesbury.
- Area 5 – Burton Hill & Cowbridge, MTC making a bit of a reach for Cole Park Estate. Long historic relationship with Malmesbury, there is a case for saying Area 5 should be drawn a lot closer to Malmesbury itself. Burton Hill is part and parcel of Malmesbury. Parliament Row over the road from the Silk Mills think they are in Malmesbury but they are not currently, however the Silk Mills are.
- People use town facilities, clubs and societies meet there, they believe that they live in Malmesbury, not SPMW. There is frustration, people feel they have no say in the town where they live.
- Area 3 – A new Aldi store was built here, MTC application for S106 support. There was confusion by the Planning Officers who originally advised that MTC would get the S106 as the site was in Malmesbury, only later to advise that the site was actually across the boundary in SPMW so the S106 went to them.
- The Village Hall in Corsten is a community asset along with the playground. There are no other real community facilities, the facilities for this whole area are in Malmesbury.

Cllr Martin Smith:

- I am not disagreeing with some of the things mentioned, splitting area two to give some parts to Backbridge. I do have issues with some other aspects mentioned.
- Milbourne village has a real rural feel about it, the same with Common Road, Foxley Road and Kings Heath, they are all open countryside miles from anywhere.
- There are issues with Area 3 - Milbourne becoming part of the town and Area 6 - Common Road, Foxley Road and Kings Heath areas, as they have more rural communities.
- My other thoughts currently are that SPMW have a well-run PC, I regularly attend 4 different PCs across my patch, one of the better run ones is SPMW, it has good representation and works closely with WC, especially on Highways matters. It has a list of community projects and had worked with MTC and Backbridge

	<p>on neighbourhood plan. The proposed changes could jeopardise a well-run council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• At the moment most residents in SPMW are in Sherston, all in Malmesbury are in the Malmesbury division, the changes would change the Parish but not Wiltshire councillor, this could cause more confusion.• I would also need to attend MTC meetings if areas in my division came under the Town Council with the changes. <p>IBP – Regarding mentions of development, we can only take into consideration that which we know is definitely going to be developed in the next 5 years. There are some fundamental disagreements around the substantial breaking up of SPMW, consideration could also be given to alternative smaller adjustments that could be made.</p> <p>JL – It would be quite useful to see points raised by the PC and TC members. The S106 money from the Aldi development is one of the benefits of an unwelcome development in a rural location. They could also have elections locally instead of at Malmesbury with the funding.</p> <p>IM – Area 1 Backbridge is wholly in Malmesbury, current boundary, development you mentioned will be going into Malmesbury, don't see any issue there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GG – Clarified that SPMW was trying to take that section. Martin has a point about community of Milbourne, but Foxley and Common Road residents believe they live in Malmesbury. Milbourne is a wider debate, as is more distinct, could form parish with Brinkworth. There is the assertion that Cowbridge, Burton hill, Foxley and Common Roads are urban parts and identify with Malmesbury. <p>IM – The areas you mentioned are part of SPMW which has a viable parish council elected every four years, so if you were to move those large chunks of houses that would adversely affect SPMW. Have there been discussion between MTC and SPMW PC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GG – A TC Cllr lives in SPMW, the head of the SPMW PC lives in the town. <p>IM – I accept that a town or parish cllr can stand in adjacent areas, but my question regarded whether a conversation has taken place to reach an amicable agreement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GG – No. <p>IBP – We are anxious to ask questions and get answers, however this stage is not aimed at forming a solution, but to elicit views.</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS – I am aware that SPMW PC see the proposal from MTC as a ‘land grab’ so no collaboration of that. The Chair of SPMW tried to reach out to Chair of MTC. I note that we need to be a little bit careful of assuming that those who use the facilities of the market town are therefore part of that community, people from Sherston often go to their nearest town for facilities but identify and are part of Sherston not Malmesbury Town. Need to look at identity not just facilities, urban/rural. etc. Burton Hill could be agreed as more urban. I am also concerned about what is left behind if these areas are added to Malmesbury town and removed from SPMW, would what’s left be able to serve the community? <p>AO – I see the logic to the Common Road and Foxhill Road areas, but Milbourne is less in that boat. What was the thought process from MTC on why they didn’t propose a line that skirted directly around settlements? As the proposed line takes over a significant extent of land, why not something smaller?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GG – You would need to ask MTC, it is a valid question. Martins point about as you move south and north, the nature of the area becomes very distinct and different. <p>AO – Would you be supportive of a more modest scheme of extension of the Malmesbury boundary to include those who identify with Malmesbury?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GG- The more immediate area has a corridor that cuts the area in half. <p>IBP – That is an interesting and challenging issue. Burton Hill is pivotal, when we start taking that away, it removes huge chunk from SPMW, we need to ask, does it leave it viable? There are questions that needs to be tackled with the Committee. The MTC will make its argument, the Committee would need to get down into what the people who live in this area really feel. What does someone in Burton Hill think about this. We have heard from cllrs, we also need to hear from parishioners. We will also need to consult with Brokenborough.</p> <p>IM – how old are the developments being spoken of?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GG – Next major development in Burton Hill has planning permission, rest of that surrounding area is new, developed over the last 4 years. Burton Hill varies in age, most built in last 40 years. Cowbridge Crescent last 10-15 years. Common Road and Foxely Road are nearly all new development one side of road, other side a bit older. Similar to Burton Hill. Millbourne is much more established.
14 Dec	Public Session (18:00 – 19:20)

In attendance:

Cllr Ian Blair Pilling (Chairman)
Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Allison Bucknell, Cllr Ashley O’Neil

Lisa Alexander, Leo Penry & Kieran Elliott – Democratic Services

Alan Hopkins – SPMW PC
Campbell Richie – MTC & Chair Malmesbury Town Team
Katherine Dooley – MTC
David Briggs – SPMW PC
Deborah Clogg – SPMW PC
Graham Cook – Resident Burton Hill
Gavin Grant – MTC/WC
John Fairhurst – Resident SPMW
Jonny Hobson – Resident SPMW
Kim Power – MTC Deputy Mayor
Maureen Inwards – Corston Resident
Paul Smith – MTC
Francis Smith – MTC Deputy Mayoress
Pete Sladden – Resident SPMW
Wayne Jones – MTC
Roger Budgen – SPMW PC
Peter Hatherall – SPMW Vice Chair
Steve Darcy – MTC
Erika Watton – MTC

The Chairman noted that Committee Member Cllr Gavin Grant was in attendance in his role as Malmesbury Town Council role and as Divisional Member.

An overview of the aim and format of the CGR was provided along with a presentation by the Acting Democracy Manager on the proposals submitted by Malmesbury Town Council and St Paul Malmesbury Without, noting that in addition to the proposals currently submitted the Committee has the scope to produce a new proposal.

This session formed part of the pre-consultation information gathering stage.

- John Fairhurst – Lives in the outskirts of the town. As a resident he would prefer any re-arrangement that would link Burton Hill area with the town.
- Kim Power – Deputy Mayor of Malmesbury and MTC Cllr. Part of NHP team. Seems strange that the settlement boundary is not same as the Parish boundary. As the town has developed and moved out, the parish boundary hasn’t moved with it. There is an issue at the bottom of the town, where on one side of road it is

	<p>MTC and on the other it is SPMW. Geographically the boundary is unnatural we are a service centre to many locals around the town already view themselves as in Malmesbury town. This can cause confusion when people want to report issues and they are not in the town. People around the town do identify with Malmesbury town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pete Sladden – Resident in Common Road on the edge of Malmesbury. I know to go to SPMW PC with any concerns, they have successfully managed any issues for me over the years. The advantage of SPMW is they look after the surrounding areas of the town and the requirements are not all mixed in with those living in the centre. What happens to SPMW if the parts requested by MTC have been removed? <p>IBP – The Committee is able to accept all of the proposals from MTC as a whole or alternatively, it could take parts of it forward. It could be a proposal that a line is drawn with a tighter boundary. Whilst looking at all of the options we look at the impact for the community and the governance for the rest of SPMW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pete Sladden – Some areas requested are a long way from the town whilst others are nearer and feel part of the town. The Backbridge area is due to be developed. I consider that to be close to the town and would introduce a lot more residents and properties. SPMW currently looks after the periphery• Steve Darcey – I am a resident in the town and own a property near Burton Hill outside of the town. The tenants there use the facilities and walk into town and are very much part of the town. They don't have any say over the Cllrs that are going to represent them and the facilities they use in the town. They should be part of Malmesbury town.• Paul Smith – I am a MTC Cllr and the Mayor of Malmesbury - 12 years ago we moved to Cowbridge and believed that to be in Malmesbury Town until we went to vote and discovered we were part of SPMW. Later we moved to the town and see a split community and would like to see Malmesbury being the whole of Malmesbury. The Malmesbury Primary care centre is at Burton Hill. People living there do not realise. Would like to see as a unified town.• David Briggs – SPMW PC Cllr – I am against the MTC proposals, there are no practical details on how the proposed benefits would be achieved and no evidence the changes are required. There has been no communication with SPMW prior to them submitting the
--	---

	<p>proposals we look for mutually beneficial relationship. If the MTC proposals are agreed, residents in SPMW could see planning developments agreed against the wishes of those currently representing the parish and against the wishes of residents.</p> <p>AB - If there were a discussion between SPMW & MTC – was it likely that a proposal may come through that would be better than what is proposed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• David Briggs – I would have liked them to come to us out of courtesy. <p>IM – I would support that argument, there are areas around Malmesbury where development has or is due to take place – a discussion between the 2 councils could produce some good outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kim Power – MTC has a joint NHP with SPMW & Brokenborough <p>IBP – A discussion of that nature between the two councils would be helpful, the timeline will explain how such a discussion could fit in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Philippa Jones – Resident of MSPW for last 20 years – never felt part of Malmesbury Town and feel that SPMW has always represented my interests. The MSPW PC represents all of the parish areas equally and my neighbours feel the same.• John Fairhurst – As a newcomer to Malmesbury, the identity issue does matter to me. I am not on the PC, I chair a Youth Group, I was surprised to find that I am not in Malmesbury.• Campbell Richie – MTC - & Chair of Malmesbury Town Team – I see the effects of recent development and historical content. Malmesbury has grown significantly, and we now see a change in the shape and the unit of the town. SPMW is a huge parish one of largest of its type in Wiltshire.• Wayne Jones – MTC and resident in Garston. Backbridge has changed diversly. That area is directly connected to our town and would be completely inappropriate to move it anywhere else. We have always been happy to work with the parish and have a NHP together. It isnt always beneficial to work together for everyone. SPMW backed out of a 140 year old joint Burial cmmtt with MTC. All of the S106 moneys went to the parish, there were direct impacts on those in the town but the parish decided that they did not want to have any discussions with us in regard to that development Taking place.
--	---

IM – There is an argument for the 2 sides to get together, the committee will end up making decisions which may or may not be the right ones for those involved. That is why it is always useful for those involved to enter into discussion together.

- Deborah Clogg – SPMW - There are always two sides to every story and the reason the parish did not continue with the Joint Burial committee was for the benefits to wider parish. As a councillor I can say that we would be happy to sit and talk with MTC. The area they are proposing is very large and some level of compromise would be better for us. As a resident I spend a lot of time and work in Malmesbury, I am not sure of the need of the more distant parts of the parish to be included as possibly their needs may not be best met by MTC.
- Maureen Inwards – Resident Corston - seems we are doing things upside down – why doesn't Malmesbury look at where the town has expanded to? Feel that the rural residents won't get the support they currently do if part of the town, they currently are well supported by the SPMW.
- Jonny Hobson – As a resident of Milbourne for 40 years I can confirm the efficient and effective government of the PC and sing the praises of SPMW. Milbourne is a series of close-knit communities – the support of the PC has done us a lot of good. The current councillor to resident ratio is 1/160 however under the MTC proposal it would increase to 1/320. I feel that would result in it being difficult to have our voices heard. Milbourne does not feel a part of Malmesbury, it is over fields and quite far away. The rest of the residents in SPMW feel the same. The MTC proposals are bland and generalised thinking.
- John Fairhurst – I am aware I am in a string ribbon development, but I don't relate to Milbourne, once beyond cowbridge there is a rural area before you get to the Summerfords. I want to be a part of the town as that's the way I look.
- Kim Power – It's not about personality or performance, we all perform well in our own areas. I feel it is more about the governance issue. MTC has committees that deal with pavements and we look after a lot of parks and bins and we have a huge problem with SPMW due to a bin that isn't emptied enough. We have a lot of experience in dealing with this. We have the infrastructure within our council set up to deal with more than a PC can.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roger Bugden – Agree with Deborah Clogg. <p>The Chairman highlighted the next steps and closed the session.</p>
--	---

	<p>Area: Calne Without</p>
	<p>Notes;</p> <p>Information sheets were provided ahead of the online Town and Parish sessions.</p> <p>The Chairman gave an introduction at each sessions which explained the process and aim of the Community Governance Review (CGR).</p> <p>The proposals as submitted through a Petition (Calne Without 1) and the proposals of Calne Town Council (Calne Without 2) were presented. Those in attendance were asked for their views on each, and whether they had any additional changes or proposals for consideration by the Committee.</p>
	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>Calne Without 1 (CW) - Petition</p> <p>A petition with over 650 signatures was submitted to Wiltshire Council requesting the following:</p> <p>CW1 – A new Parish of Derry Hill and Studley - that a new parish be established, with no wards and nine councillors, on the boundaries of the then wards of Pewsham Ward and West Ward of Calne Without Parish Council</p> <p>CW2 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, the remainder of Calne Without to continue to exist</p> <p>CW3 – If a new parish is created at Derry Hill, to dissolve the remainder of Calne Without and transfer its area to other parishes as set out in the maps</p> <p>CW4 – To transfer the areas shown in the maps from Cherhill and Calne Without to Compton Bassett</p> <p>Calne Without 2 (CWTC) – Calne Town Council</p> <p>Calne Town Council submitted a number of requests for transfers of land from surrounding parishes to their own.</p> <p>CWTC1 – To extend the North Town boundary to incorporate Beaversbrook Sports Facility and Allotments.</p> <p>CWTC2 – To extend the Town boundary to the East to include the new development off Low Lane.</p> <p>CWTC3 – To extend the South West Town boundary to incorporate Cherhill View Allotments, Cherhill View Housing Estate & Rookery Farm.</p> <p>CWTC4 – To extend the Town boundary to the East to connect the A4 in the South to the A3102 and to the West by Kingsbury Green Academy, to</p>

	<p>incorporate Penhill Farm to Abberd Lane, Land to the West of Kingsbury Green Academy and land to the North of Quemerford.</p>
	<p>The following discussion questions were put to each of the sessions:</p> <p><i>Discussion Questions:</i></p> <p><i>Q What are your views, if any, on the proposal (CW1) for Derry Hill in community identity or governance terms?</i></p> <p><i>Q Regardless of your views on the creation of a new parish at Derry Hill, if a new parish was recommended do you have any views about what, in accordance with the criteria, would be appropriate for the remainder of what is now Calne Without? Could/Should it remain as a parish covering the remaining area? Would it make sense under the criteria to transfer the remaining parts of Calne Without to other parishes, as detailed in the proposal?</i></p> <p><i>Q Do you have any views on the various proposals from the town council (CWTC1 to CWTC4)? Is there a community identity or effective governance argument to support them?</i></p> <p><i>Q Are any of the areas of the CWTC proposals which are covered by an allocated housing site or existing application/development, and if so are you aware of if the area is likely to be developed for the period considered by the review (5 years).</i></p> <p><i>Q If there is to be development, would it relate in community terms to the existing parishes, or to the town, and why?</i></p>
<p>21 Oct</p>	<p>Compton Bassett Parish Council session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO)</p> <p>Kieran Elliott, Lisa Alexander and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr – Peter Szczesiak - Chair Cllr Julian Barlow Cllr Laurie Waite Diane Zeitzen – Clerk</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not directly concerned with the area far to the west of Calne. But Calne without parish – borders an area to the west of us – if its

carved up we have views. No answer to whether it should or should not be carved up. It's a matter of process if people want it, then it will happen.

GG – If the petition proposals were approved, what would the implications for the Calne Without parish. The residual parish would have no community facilities and be a bizarre shape, running round the balance of Calne itself. Need to consider if Calne Without remained a single parish or whether it should join with other parishes.

- Have assumed that Calne without would be carved up, if so we have provided a map detailing a section in purple. This is a logical extension of our own parish to take out some of the land in question. Some of the land is already farmed by CB farmers. Some land in High Penn and Lower Penn.

Q – what is the community impact on those 2 areas and are you aware of any proposed development in those areas?

- High Penn consists of a small community on a hill with farmland, landfill and the recycling centre, some of that in our parish at the moment – it is very rural a few houses involved. There is a suggestion of some development – not sure of numbers.
- CB would welcome the inclusion of the extra areas within the purple line.

GG – familiar with High Penn, could you explain the logic of the purple extension?

- The Bridleway parallel to the existing boundary diverts across fields at present then continues down south, the Tudor lodge was part of the boundary line at some point.
- There wouldn't be a dramatic impact as only 10/12 houses in High Penn. I would be surprised if there would need to be a change in governance.
- No I don't think there would be a need for any change to the number of cllrs, it's a small parish.

What is the connectivity between High Penn and CB ?

- The village road is partially within our boundary and we would have a bit more of it. High Penn road goes down (A3102). No direct road to them. It is a community at the end of a road.
- Currently an odd situation where they are almost divorced from all sites – there are good RoW links

AO – I know the area very well. There is a significant collection of houses at Lower Compton

If a new parish was created – there's a question about what happens to Lower Compton – does it sit better with Cherhill or CB?

- We took the decision that it was not a great fit for us – mainly farmland – rural and sparsely populated – the village road is 2.5 miles long which would present another 1.5m extension – this would not sit well with us. Chalk and cheese with our parish concerns at the present time.

Would it sit better with Cherhill?

- They are joined together already for the community magazine – LC & Cherhill. There is only half a mile between lower Compton and Cherhill

Q – Quemeford farm – is that within the area that you suggested could come to you?

- No that is further south
- We understand the need for housing – but we are concerned on what happens to the increase in traffic as it moves through Calne. There is a negative impact, a knock on effect to villages like ours.
- We have surveyed our residents and traffic management is their biggest concern – not just intrusive but dangerous.
- Calne does not look at impact to surrounding communities – with the development impacts. Concern on the expansion of Calne

IBP – not part of our remit and need to be careful when considering development – cannot take into account the speculative of this.

Do the new or planned development sit better with a PC or better with the urban entity of Calne?

- The Calne proposal does not really affect CB – the reason we put proposals through was to register our preference should the proposals go through.
- They clearly want to expand – and want more residential housing in their remit. There are current plans for new building in next 5 years. It doesn't happen in isolation to Calne – people go through our village. We need a wider picture to look at it, not in isolation.

JL – have every sympathy regarding the traffic issues – as Calne expands out more pressure will be put on to the rural community. Would be useful if we could have clearer maps of what was proposed.

KE – At this stage we are reliant on the maps provided by those making proposals.

22 Oct	<p>Calne Without Parish Council Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO) Cllr Ernie Clark (EC)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr Ioan Rees (west ward) Cllr Sue Deedigan (Sandy Lane) Cllr John Barnes (Pewsham) Cllr Rob Hislop (East) Cllr David Songhurst (Middle) Clerk – Katherine Checcia</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Middle Ward is a large area, but it doesn’t have a large population. I spoke to a lot of people in the ward and asked them where they identify with. They identify with Calne Without, they had chosen to live in small rural hamlets. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty where they live and happy with how the parish has been governed. Being part of a large parish gives more resources, better to protect beautiful rural areas. Consultant for transport and speeding for the whole parish, example of resources. Group looking at climate change, to support WC. We can only do these as a larger parish, not if broken up. <p>IBP – Formation of Derry Hill parish opinion separate from breakup?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Want to keep Calne without as a separate identifiable parish.• More complicated than that – separate parish removes resources from Calne Without if Derry Hill removed• We need to protect the areas, larger parish gives best chance of that. Would put beautiful areas at risk if split off.• One of the organisers of the petition - hugely complicated. Non-party political. The case for Derry Hill and Pewsham is very strong, the issue is, what happens to remainder of Calne Without. Assume remainder would stay as a parish council, large area. Remained would be 1200 voters, split off 1400 voters in new parish. Smaller parishes so criticism saying remainder of Calne without being too small not accurate. Few services provided by CW, dog waste and notice boards etc. New council has more ambitions but new parish creation shouldn’t stop this. Disagree that remainder of Calne without wouldn’t be a viable council. Could be broken up and added to surrounding parishes, doesn’t identify clear difference between CW and surrounding parishes a lot of facilities in
--------	--

	<p>neighbouring parishes used by CW. Can keep it as a parish CW, then could move to being part of neighbouring parishes. Think this is viable. Doesn't understand argument of strong identification with CW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Never seen urban expansion from town retained by rural parish. Think Stockley and Headington would join together. Stockley keen, but Headington might be put off by addition of voters impact Parish council there. Sandy Lane 75 voters, very small parish, distort representation. If West ward had same representation would have 17 councillors. Sandy Lane combined with Middle Ward and Middle Ward has 4 cllrs, for less than 500 voters. Committee should look at changes that should be made regardless of new parish council.• Children from Stockley go to school in Derry Hill not Headington. Nothing from Derry Hill if Studley was rejected by Calne Without, can get everything they need from CW they don't need new PC. <p>IBP – laying ground for other options is the process occurring now.</p> <p>IM – The rebalancing of wards could be considered, suggested to parish council, how would this be perceived?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Raised twice with Calne Without, resisted by the PC. <p>IBP – Point taken on board, would this work for people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don't think equalising and rebalancing would please people completely. Would probably give these areas a majority on the PC that they don't currently have. Members only want to represent their community, no connection between east and west. <p>Q Regardless of your views on the creation of a new parish at Derry Hill, if a new parish was recommended do you have any views about what, in accordance with the criteria, would be appropriate for the remainder of what is now Calne Without? Could/Should it remain as a parish covering the remaining area? Would it make sense under the criteria to transfer the remaining parts of Calne Without to other parishes, as detailed in the proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I want to keep the current parish together. It works effectively no need to change it. Size gives economy of scale. Core of Derry Hill, Pewsham ward would want to stay with Derry Hill regardless. Don't want to be a non-warded parish. Core of parish Derry Hill and Studley, facilities, village hall, shop, school, pub are the heart of parish. Would understand if East and Middle Ward felt dominated by West Ward. Not in favour of West Ward devolving BC it would cut off more rural areas from the parish. Key thing, proper consultation in East Ward and Middle Ward where they feel their interests are best served. Also consider economy of scale, CW PC have a large tax base allowing effective operation, with the
--	---

	<p>lowest precepts in area. Not just looking to split up parishes but maybe bring in communities to larger parish. Balanced consultation, no loaded questions.</p> <p>GG – Creating larger communities, one direction yes putting parts of CW into other parishes, also the other way around, could you explain if you think tis and which ones you think should join CW?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bremhill, Headington, Compton Basset, Cherhill – self determination at local level, should be an option. <p>IM – Independence of Derry Hill and Studley, is there rebalancing to be done and ways of creating more autonomy within the wards? Eg. Committee for specific wards to report back to PC but retain economic advantages of CW. All different areas across parish, more economic base than pure identity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agrees. Good argument for economy of scale from current size. Traffic consultants. Efficient operation, more services. Flipside to maintain internal community cohesion, can use local committee for this. <p>JL – Listening to all points. Wondering what the relationship is within communities, some rural parishes have relationships with neighbouring divisions? It will be useful to hear from all people in Calne. Surprised by size of some of these wards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Against breakup of CW. History, there was a time when there was a significant high status individual on the PC, lots of cllrs were renting land from him he swayed a lot of decisions. Wonders if this would still be backed by the same numbers. No shortage of cllrs applying for West Ward.• Economy of scale – potential for achievement. PC about actions. Work with other parishes, blue corridor River Marden project risk to this is break up of parish. Do see themselves as part of Calne from her perspective.• Villages having own identity, Bremhill Parish also has two other villages as well as Bremhill, both have own identity but are part of Bremhill. Don't think identity argument strong enough on its own. Don't fix what isn't broken.• East Ward, is in the middle, with a school and village hall in Cherhill. Rural area, lots of people like to use. Middle of the road on this as there are advantages and disadvantages to both options.• Against combination of parish councils, needs to be local. Don't need to become district councils. Parish forum good idea, better than building bigger councils. Economy of scale, don't need one not dealing with big enough funds. Low spending parishes, most on hall hire and clerks.
--	---

	<p>Now we will move on to your views on proposal 2 – Town Council Proposals.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a development has taken place and has spilled over boundary it should be taken into the town. Natural, happens a lot around the country every year. The other proposals are speculative boundary grabs, unaware of any plans. Would say no to 4,5 and 6. Sports centre, can stay as it is. • Definitely against 4, 5 and 6. Beaversbrook, at the time PC voted for, 2 and 3 supported extension of Calne to include Low Lane, opposed incorporation of Cherill View, extensions of Calne Town would make sense. • In agreement with last speaker. <p>GG – question about process of consultation.</p> <p>KE – pre-consultation providing options, open to suggestions. Could produce other options based on evidence. Purely information gathering at this stage, though no obligation to do this. Committee not leading towards a certain option. Encourage people to respond to pre-consultation survey.</p>
<p>29 Oct</p>	<p>Calne Town Council Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ian McLennan (IM) and Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Town Council attendees: Cllr Robert MacNaughton Cllr Ian Thorne (as member of Calne TC)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against the proposals to form a new parish, I think CW should stay together, community works better together. Community plan works together with CW. Don’t see value in splitting things up. • Agree that it is a matter for residents in Derry Hill and Calne rural. I don’t think it’s for the TC to have a view on the governance of CW. <p>If a new parish was created – there’s a question about what happens to Lower Compton – does it sit better with Cherhill or CB?</p>

<p>TC Proposals</p> <p>Q Do you have any views on the various proposals from the town council? Is there a community identity or effective governance argument to support them?</p> <p>Q Are any of the areas covered by an allocated housing site or existing application/development, and if so are you aware of if the area is likely to be developed for the period considered by the review (5 years).</p> <p>Q If there is to be development, would it relate in community terms to the existing parishes, or to the town, and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In terms of planning allocation from WC 1600 houses in next few years so no large scale planning here. Tidying up existing developments. Calne town has a strong identity and community spirit, there are lots of people involved in the outer edges of town.• Beaversbrook – recreation area – we have bonfire celebrations there, the allotments well used, just off ring road, used by the town. We look after allotments. Low Lane – tidying up. <p>IBP – two rectangular areas, northern and southern what is in there now?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The bottom rectangle is the persimmon homes site, nearing completion, top right is backhouse with some built and homes being built, already happening.• Cherhill view allotments, the housing estate and Rockery farm – Rockery farm has been accessed through Calne, everyone there uses Calne as centre of their activities.• Kingsbury green academy – This fills in space between this and stokes meadow <p>IBP – good to see on a map what is actually there in development</p> <p>LA – Spatial Planning Maps have been requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quemerford and Low Lane, not yet been built on• There is debate in town about how many more houses the town needs.• It would be helpful and instructive, to provide empirical evidence except all but one of the proposed extensions. Low lane, part in two different wards, bemused about who is your representative there. <p>IM – Luck Hill farm and Lytchett house, Calne view on losing that to the rural area?</p> <p>IBP- or pushing further out?</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Northern bypass road is there, <p>IBP – thin strip of land above bypass, seems to have nothing in it, any reason either way why that should be a part of Calne or Calne Without?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It doesn't add to community cohesions, tree nursery there, nothing much else. <p>IBP – nothing residential?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
29 Oct	<p>Bremhill Parish Council Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling (IBP) – ERC Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ashley O'Neil (AO).</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Kieran Elliott (KE) - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr. Richard Tucker (Chairman, Bremhill Parish Council) Cllr. Isabel McCord (Vice Chairman, Bremhill Parish Council)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>IBP- key things being looked at community cohesion and effectiveness of local govt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has prompted desire to create a new parish? <p>IBP – understanding is a group of people, petition associated with, decided that they would rather form their own parish. This causes spill over, previous consultation did not include these, so this new consultation aims to include all areas that might be affected.</p> <p>AO – We are legally required to consider a petition put forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would give a better understanding to understand what the residents of CW feel about proposition. <p>IBP – we are meeting with them. Similar meeting to talk to them. All of the communities in this area of consultation are being consulted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we were to focus on what would fit with Bremhill, it would seem sensible for us to assume the green area (indicated on the map) from a number of vantage points – 4700 acres of land across parish, 4 wards, geographically works, sufficient capacity to take that area within the bounds of our parish.

- Going back a step to look at CW breakup, disparate parish, wonder about community cohesion. The remaining parts of CW would hardly be viable as individual parishes on their own, seems to make sense to attach them to existing parishes. Sandy lane poses an issue.

IM – The green area on the map, Fishers brook down to boundary of Calne Town. Covers Calne end of road up to Ratford. Currently stops at tributary to the Marden, proposes that it runs nearly down to A4. How many more residents would that put into B Parish?

AO – approx 75-100 mark.

- If that's what their residents want this should be taken into account, I don't see how it really affects us. Up to CW. Disparate parish at the moment, community cohesion - wonder how they manage to achieve that currently. It can be hard work for us with 4 villages, so imagine it is very difficult for CW.
- We would need to consider the views of our residents. From a physical point of view and from the resources they have, capable of taking green area. Could be some benefits to that.

IBP – Does the green area on the map have community affinity with Bremhill?

- I think more affinity to B than Calne, closer and quite agricultural, culturally more akin to us. Relationships to people within the green area, culturally more aligned with Bremhill than Calne North.
- Makes sense to focus on green area, breaking off bits of it doesn't make a contiguous boundary that would be efficient for either area. Thinks where the line is drawn makes sense if that's the way they choose to go.

JL – Just thinking about future in case later Calne decides they want more. Boundary along edge of built up area to stop it extending any further. Bremhill PC could look to see where a line could work for them.

IBP – for purposes of this can't look too far forward.

AO – would echo chair, unwise to make assumptions about where development will occur unless it is allocated by a plan. Draw attention to an anomaly and ask for thoughts on Rose cottage.

- We would like to have that back, one change they would ask to make, totally incongruous, please could you make that change. Part of Bremhill. 1 house Rose Cottage.

AO – The boundary should also be straight lined where Studley bridge is

IM – Yes, at least bring back to bridge over the canal

IM – if you were to consider Derry Hill and Studely where would you draw the lines of the new parish?

- We would appreciate the views of the rest of the PC. That may bring other comments.

AO – Any particular views on the boundary by sandy lane?

- It is sufficiently south for us to not be affected by/interested in that part of the proposal.
- If it was agreed that we put the line at bottom of Studley Hill, the boundary could run along wooded path and come out onto A4. Would take into Forest Gate Farm as well. Would make a much tidier boundary.

JL – Logical for boundary to follow footpath, boundary follow landmarks.

If a new parish was created – theres a question about what happens to Lower Compton – does it sit better with cherhill or CB?

Q Do you have any views on the various proposals from the town council? Is there a community identity or effective governance argument to support them?

Q Are any of the areas covered by an allocated housing site or existing application/development, and if so are you aware of if the area is likely to be developed for the period considered by the review (5 years).

Q If there is to be development, would it relate in community terms to the exiting parishes, or to the town, and why?

IBP -The recreation area and the allotments are near to Bremhill.

- The ring road area could make natural boundary to incorporate that.

IBP – community cohesion, where is it's affinity? Bremhill or Calne Without?

IM – Part of Calne, especially Beaversbrook, part of community offering of Calne Town. Makes sense to incorporate in Calne.

JL – seems to be logical sense to bring into Calne, entrance by Calne bypass road.

EC – Striking that as you go along Calne Bypass why the boundary doesn't just run along the road?

JL – probably following field boundaries prior to road.

AO – A lot of that area was county farms, probably related to that. Which farm was in which parish. Looks odd now though.

IBP – could look to bring boundary back in line with road, the further down push it out to encompass recreation area.

IM – Is there a facility to hold meetings at the recreation area?

AO – I don't believe it is used for that purpose

- You used to hold Calne Area board in Beaversbrook.

AO – Facility owned by Calne TC, potentially relevant.

- The boundary appears to go through a property at Beaversbrook farm. Beaversbrook farm in Hillmartin parish is part of Calne Rural. It makes sense to straighten off to keep Beaversbrook farm in one parish.

JL – another farm that the boundary goes through as well, need to look at these.

- Studley would lose all of rural parts, green area is a rural area and faces same issues as Bremhill. Can't see synergy with Calne, how can it meet community cohesion in Calne. But with Studley less so, currently CW has lot of rural areas but if Studley goes off on its own it will lose most rural areas, much more town outlook.

LA – If you are able to discuss the proposals at your parish meeting in next two weeks, potential to submit form with your proposals.

IM – Meeting on Monday night so quite last minute then next meeting December, could have an extra one but tricky with covid. Timelines tight.

IBP – I ask that you press on and do your best with it. Flexible with timeline but don't want it to drag on. Doesn't need to be absolute voted on decision just opinion will do.

IM – would be good to get a vote from parish councils on proposals.

IBP – The committee would be formulating a view and coming out with proposals to consult on.

LA – Maps have been requested to show development, and the planned proposal from Calne TC as a whole.

22 Nov	<p>Hilmarton Parish Council Session</p> <p>In attendance:</p> <p>Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Mel Wilkins, John Henly</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">I can understand the Derry Hill & Studley reasoning, as whichever way you look at it Calne Without parish is very disjointed, all round the town. By joining up our boundary with Cherhill and existing boundary on A3102, the area would incorporate the wildlife reserve, which would greatly enhance our parish and could encourage the schools to visit. <p>IBP – Are there any buildings in that area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Yes, High Penn Farm, and 2 or 3 dwellings, plus the wildlife reserve to north west of those dwellings.The original Derry Hill proposal is probably the right thing to do. However, I didn't realise other consequences of that happening. But does make total sense. People in Hilmarton collect survey notes for wildlife area and walk that area. Lot of people would support this. Makes sense geographically. <p>IBP – Would you include further south, Penn Hill Farm?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">We haven't considered that. Up against proposed boundary is near Lidl supermarket. If we extend our boundary to meet the Cherill one that could deter development.The southern areas would not fit well no.Work closely with Calne Town Council, does make sense. Fears of development encroaching towards our parish are less so now. Seems to fit expanding town boundary. <p>IBP- We can only consider known development that will be development within the next 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">I don't see any issue with it. Definitely Beaversbrook sports facility should fit with the Town. No objection with the other changes proposals. Think it's a natural progression of the town getting bigger. Don't see issue with the changes.
--------	---

	<p>LA – What are your views on the overlap of the area requested by Calne TC and H?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to know reason not necessarily opposed. <p>IBP – Penn Hill Farm, local knowledge, not due for development in next 5 years, who is it occupied by? Farmer? Is it rural?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Penn Farm originally one decent sized farm house with farm buildings, but now the buildings have been converted to dwellings, approx 4. Access is via a private track, line may incorporate one other house as well, definitely not more than six dwellings. • Residents don't need to go into Calne Town to leave Penn Hill farm. Penn Hill now business units.
<p>22 Nov</p>	<p>Cherhill Parish Council Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Ernie Clark (EC), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander, Kieran Elliott & Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr Nick White</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think the proposal of Derry Hill as a new parish impacts on Cherhill, no comment on that. • In terms of rest of proposals about rest of Calne Without, looked at proposals, seems sensible to split with neighbouring parishes, few questions on sectioning bordering Cherhill but happy with the suggestions and want to take that further. • The top part of Cherhill parish between Compton Bassett and Calne Without, whether it should be in Compton Bassett or Cherhill, it is closer to Compton Bassett • Unsure what is in that area in terms of residential. Unsure why that section is part of Cherhill, I wouldn't object to boundary cutting off that section and moving it to Compton Bassett. <p>IBP – Sands Farm where would that lie?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is sand and gravel extraction there on a Civil amenity site, it would be best suited in Lower Compton whichever parish that is in because that's where the access is. But Abberds farm and

<p>Sands farm probably impact the town more, borderline just below Sands Farm maybe?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lower Compton is linked with Cherhill, people use their pubs, go to school there, walk dogs there. <p>IBP – potential new boundary between Headington and Cherhill, lower half of proposed area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It isn't walkable, nothing that people there would walk to Cherhill for. Probably closer to Headington and Stockley, would have no issues with it being in Cherhill but 50/50 who it would suit better. <p>IM – Could Calne Without carry on without Derry Hill?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I don't know, seems to me most of facilities are located in Derry Hill and Studley areas. Would leave unusual shaped disjointed parish without single point of focus or community. Wouldn't encompass one community. Might be able to operate on its own but questionable whether this would be effective, small parts of lots of different communities. Best thing to carve it up and allocate to existing related communities. <p>IM – is that where you would draw new boundary lines? (shown on proposed coloured map)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NW – looks like a good suggestion, based on existing wards of Calne Without, finger up between Calne Town and Compton Bassett (new proposed section and existing one) may be better suited with one of those. But rest seems to make sense, connects communities with common feature. Potentially cut top of those fingers off at road or stream on thin part at start of finger. <p>KE – There could be a change of the Parish name to Cherhill & Yatesbury. Could you provide suggestion with explanation, as part of the survey by the council? The Committee would look and if OK it would then go to full council.</p> <p>Now we will move on to your views on proposal 2 (the land transfers to the TC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I have no strong views either way, if areas are to be built up makes sense to include in the town, no impacts on Cherhill. <p>Do you have any additional options you wish to present? (eg to your own arrangements or boundaries, irrespective of the new parish or town council proposals?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only question about areas coming into the parish, how are we made aware of any financial liability we are taking on? Local works that need to be done etc. How would we know if there was a list of
--

	<p>work and what sort of monies local communities are used to having spent on them?</p> <p>KE – Simple transfer of properties not normally an issue, two parish councils would need to discuss. Dissolved PC would present more issues and would involve Wiltshire Council’s legal teams. Legal services will be involved once any decisions are made to support PCs.</p> <p>IBP – If a parish had built a new parish hall, taken out a mortgage, found itself dissolved, what would happen?</p> <p>KE – This has happened before, a hall went to one parish but was owned by the other. Complex issue.</p> <p>LA – If you took on extra areas, would you see the need to increase number of parish cllrs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - would certainly think they would need to increase number of Parish Cllrs? <p>IBP – would they need to ward, cross Wiltshire Council boundaries? KE – no, would not need to ward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were currently one for Cherhill and one for Yatesbury.
<p>29 Nov</p>	<p>Heddington Parish Council Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ashley O’Neil (AO)</p> <p>Lisa Alexander, Kieran Elliott and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Parish Council attendees: Cllr Geoff Dickerson</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our principal interest is the Derry Hill and Studley proposal and the knock-on effects and curious on how it effects Heddington. Want to find out if we still stand on our own and will do in future? <p>IBP – No one has made any suggestion that Heddington be subsumed or changed, we are looking at the proposals and seeing if it is sensible for all of the surrounding parishes to take on a part of Calne Without if it is broken up. More ideas could yet be put forward.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nothing more to say at this stage. Heddington has been on its own for years, out by itself in maps. The talks about some of CW linking on to Heddington, but when PC first made aware of review, weren't looking towards amalgamating, looked to retain integrity of Heddington as it stands. Will look at future proposals with a fair mind. <p>IBP -Opened to committee.</p> <p>JL – The main job for the Cmmtt is to listen to the views of those we have met, maybe other ideas will come forward. Might need to hear from PCs again. Question about capacity to attract parish cllrs, governance clerking how they deal with that?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We had a vacancy quite recently and had 3 applicants, there is a will within the community to support Heddington PC. Clerk has been with us 5-6 years, doing first class job with no issues. <p>AO – There have been some discussion about some areas sitting within CW that could be a better fit for Heddington, could you identify with those areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The adjacent areas, Stockely, Broads Green, Mile helm. If a parish council changes name and status how is completed bureaucratically? <p>IBP – It is not impossible that Heddington get sucked in, not on my radar at present. Proper legal procedure to follow for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Satisfied at this stage. Those areas discussed because they were on the border, Stockley been given choice to join with Heddington and chose not to. Currently Heddington has no mind to expand. <p>AO – What about Sandy Lane? Where does it best fit?</p> <p>IM –Sandy lane, very rural area. Would no more fit with Studly and Derry Hill than they fit with CW.</p> <p>LA – clarification on timeline, bit more flexibility, more schemes for survey needed soon, after this deadline committee can still take suggestions to consult on next year. If committee felt it was important to consider new schemes that came in at a later date.</p> <p>IBP – want to find solutions that suit people in the areas effected, more important than timetable. Important to get it right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We are a viable thriving council as it is, with no aims to expand, but have identified areas that would not be a bad fit. Haven't discussed Calne Town expansion as doesn't directly affect yet.

	<p>Q - If a new parish was created – there's a question about what happens to Lower Compton – does it sit better with Cherhill or CB?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heddington has a meeting in two weeks, this will be an item on the agenda. We don't want to end up with bits and pieces no one else wants. Pace set by Derry Hill and Studley. Sets ball rolling, CW will then be looked at.
<p>22 Oct & 12 Nov</p>	<p>WC – Local Member session</p> <p>Note: 2 sessions were held to accommodate the availability of Members.</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL) Cllr Gavin Grant (GG), Cllr Ashley O'Neil (AO), Cllr Ian McLennan (IM), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC).</p> <p>Lisa Alexander, Kieran Elliott and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>WC Local Members:</p> <p>Cllr Tony Trotman (TT)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The Chairman gave an overview of the proposals and invited comments from the Division Members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TT – Studley has more development and increase in population. Concerned about segregation away of other parishes and about South East parishes, Calston Blackland's, Cherhill getting cut off. Previously very concerned about that, but with increased support of Studley with population growth could work. Will take lead from AO. • AO – Speaking as the Local Division Member, wearing that hat during this session. I am open minded about this discussion. Addressing the request for a new parish for Derry Hill and Studley, I was one of those who previously felt that there was a good case for this. Reasons for this included the petition put forward had a significant number of signatures. The settlement in itself was distinct. Areas around feel very different, more rural than Derry Hill and Studley, case well made. Respect the petition that was signed and right for self-determination. <p>Calne Without as a parish council, very different issues discussed for the different areas – potential for those in other areas able to</p>

<p>vote on issues just affecting Derry Hill and Studley, not always fair representation of views. Would support the new parish.</p> <p>JL – Relationship with Calne Rural and the parochial church boundaries, identify with them but not parish boundaries.</p> <p>GG – For clarity, Derry Hill and Studley, does this include Pewsham?</p> <p>AO – Follow existing line of parish. Sandy Lane its own entity, in new parish but would be better in Stockley and Headington.</p> <p>GG – Reflections on Bremhill? Does it work as a parish in its own right?</p> <p>AO – Bremhill is a well governed parish, works well. Ratford (split by a parish boundary at present) and Fishersbrook would fit well there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TT – Bremhill goes right down to abbey field school, agricultural sparsely populated. Works well covering huge rural area, Ratford could be contained within one part of it. <p>AO – Ratford split by a parish boundary currently, CW and Bremhill. Would make sense to go into Bremhill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TT – Canal natural boundary, need a boundary between rural areas and Chippenham. <p>JL – I do feel we need to know more about what the people think and who they see they relate to. It could well be that what might work is a complete redrawing of the map and splitting Calne into three parts. The town, the Western parishes and the eastern parishes. but it would all hinge on who the people relate to as to which part they are included into.</p> <p>IM – Case for Derry Hill and Studley, was an urban area now from density of housing. Don't share rural view anymore but new lines include large rural area. What is real boundary of difference?</p> <p>AO – Semi urban, not so urban that you couldn't include any rural. Mostly farmland. Not sure what you would do with those areas if they weren't included in the new parish. Area near boundary would look towards Chippenham.</p> <p>IM – If there would be a mix of rural/urban in that area what is the purpose of the new parish?</p> <p>AO – The question is, what is done with the remaining sections if a new parish is formed. Could sections of CW go into surrounding parishes. Don't think it is wise to retain CW without Derry Hill & Studley, the remainder would be an odd shape and contain very different communities that surround different centres, clumsy thing to do.</p>

IM – We can't just dissolve a parish council if it effective, well run and meets the needs of the people. Agree with where sections could go but needs to be supported by the people as part of the consultation. Why create a new parish to destroy an old one.

Cllrs JL & GG had left the session due to other meetings.

A second session was requested and set up.

Session 2

In attendance:

Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman

Cllr Jacqui Lay (JL), Cllr Ashley O'Neil (AO), Cllr Ernie Clark (EC).

Kieran Elliott and Leo Penry - Democratic Services

Local Members:

Cllr Sam Pearce-Kearney (SPK), Cllr Tom Rounds (TR),

Cllr Tony Trotman (TT) joined later

- TR- The catchment area would make sense for Derry Hill and Studely, provided leadership in CW. Big worry what happens to rest of the body once you remove them. Not familiar with where leadership would come from or where they have their meetings.

IBP – there is the potential for tinkering with boundaries that we are talking about

- SPK – Agree with TR, CW and DH & Studley should probably split, own sense of identity has grown exponentially, worry for rest of CW, I serve Sandy Lane area, would be very much on own because so close to DH and Studley, putting everyone with everyone else would remove sense of identity, people in CW identify as part of CW.

JL – important to hear back from communities, if they are unhappy can't make decision until we hear this.

KE – The options available to the Committee - everything on table, not restricted to what has been requested. Could agree a new parish but change the shape of it. Key question is whether a new parish is justified and then what will you do? The remainder of CW population if a new parish was created is still large and could remain a parish by itself.

IBP – Regarding the map put forward with the proposals – If DH and S take the orange area, what would the people in green, blue, brown areas

<p>do, do you think they will stay as a PC or want to go and be part of surrounding parishes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR- You are comparing apples and pears, the areas pointed at are very rural, no identifiable populations could take on the leadership role of governance if DH splits away, DH will be quite happy, what do we do with the rest of CW? Know for a fact that Calne, re neighbourhood plan can only expand to east, pressure to expand with housing, expand towards Cherhill, no reason for Cherhill to expand west nothing for them there, but Calne does have something to gain. <p>IBP – We can only consider what will be built in next five years, not what might in the future, will these be built in next five years?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – I don't know detail of NP developed at present. Currently expanding to east towards Cherhill, only place it can expand. 5 years or ten years, only way it can expand. Should ask people what they want. <p>IBP – Today's session is about what you, the Local Members think. We will have public consultations, more than one option could be included in consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – With the brown section, Calne will have it's eye on that. Will not care about southern portion of that area. Blue already part of Calne South, SPK's patch. <p>KE- Part of Calne South division, CW parish.</p> <p>AO – asked a specific question to SPK – not met with Cherhill yet, more talking to do, interested in understanding, if CW were to be dissolved would Sandy Lane go with, the new parish of DH & S or would it be best with Heddington?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SPK- Sandy Lane is a better fit with DH & S• TR – no idea why small finger into Bremhill from CW. My view is that Sandy Lane would be a better fit for the breakaway new Parish of DH & S. I would prefer to see northern bit of brown sector (on east) allocated to Calne. <p>JL – We also need to be aware of the spatial planning information detailing known planning sites.</p> <p>IBP – Spatial planning will be briefing the Cmmtt on this in a separate session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – Persimmon bought land in the area to south east of Calne, waiting for where the TC see expansion going.
--

AO – distinction between NP and local plan review from WC to allocate land for development, just because CTC wants to allocate land doesn't mean that it will be.

KE – As mentioned – only the next 5 years development can be taken into account. Also note that just because building will be built on edge of the town, that does not automatically mean that they should definitely become part of the town.

The NP is distinct from LP, would say that even if a plan exists, the boundary of the plan doesn't mean that you can't make changes. More details can be provided on this depending on what the Committee proposes.

Town Council Proposals

- TR – The TC is trying to regularise ownership of that land, belongs to WC, CTC wants to take ownership of it.

IBP – It wouldn't change ownership, only changes which council the people who live there look to from CW to CTC.

- SPK – My take on this, is that even though there is no one living there, all the people that go there look to the town. Don't know if that is a factor.
- TR – preparation for future development, much of land north of Lowe Lane built on already, clutch of houses to the north what looks empty there is built on, further development going on south of there again.

IBP – If we assume that those two rectangles are built on, do those people think of themselves as part of Calne Town of CW, rural or urban?

- TR – That is a pertinent question, where these people use services. People in these homes will gravitate towards Calne, schools, doctors, dentists, shops. Will be subsumed by Calne. Has happened before, natural.

IBP – There is no rural community within reasonable distance?

- TR – no, as there are no services.

IBP- do people in the houses in section 3 identify as part of CTC or CW?

- SPK – Split, people see themselves as living in CT and use services there, sometimes use services in Devizes, but definitely don't think of themselves as rural

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – people send their children to school in the town, services in the town. Example – plot of land six homes clustered together, been there some years, when development north of there started up they were incorporated into the town, fought tooth and nail to stop this not be part of Calne, only about precept. <p>Q – What about Penhill Farm to Abberd Lane?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR - Area to south of Penhill farm is being built on, NP states that that's where the community want building on and nowhere else to expand to but east. Aside from landfill area. <p>Q – What about Kingsbury Green Academy & Stone Meadow housing development to north and west of there?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – not expected to be purely housing, part of the request is for housing and part for light industrial. <p>IBP – slight weighting difference take point, need to be guided by spatial planning. What we've seen going round Calne, reason why they are saying people in those areas look to the town. Going back to initial DH and Studley: any tweaking of boundaries that strikes you? Anything we haven't spoken about?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – Yes, incorporate Sandy Lane in DH&S parish <p>KE – all parishes in CGR can make proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TR – The parts of CW to the north, would not want to be part of Calne Town. Won't want to pay precept.• TT – I was against new parish, to separate some smaller parishes from larger area. But given discussion would now accept that DH and S parish would preferably be away from CW as such. <p>IBP – The view on Sandy Lane, so far that it should sit with DH and S?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TT – agree <p>IBP – The slice of land (finger) off from DH and S, should it be removed and joined elsewhere?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TT – It is part of Studley because there are only 4 properties with small, populated area better suited to Studley than CW. There are not a lot of populated areas in CW, can't see them working on their own, would not have enough governance or funding. <p>CTC proposals:</p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TT – Calne Town needs to increase in North, Beaversbrook and further expansion one day in east. I would accept all proposals; town has expanded a lot. <p>KE - Some options would require a change in divisions as well and need to be approved by the LGBC.</p>
<p>2 Dec</p>	<p>Public Session</p> <p>In attendance: Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling – (IBP) ERC Chairman Cllr Allison Bucknell (AB), Cllr Gavin Grant (GG).</p> <p>Lisa Alexander, Kieran Elliott and Leo Penry - Democratic Services</p> <p>Public attendees:</p> <p>Peter Szczesiak Martin Purslow Nick White Keith Robbins John Henly Laurie Waite Sophy Ioan Rees Julian Barlow David Songhurst</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Songhurst (Cllr Calne without PC, represent middle ward) There is no evidence that DH & S have not been governed adequately by CW. If CW was broken up, Heddington PC do not want middle ward in with them. This leaves us with one alternative, that CW carries on with the inclusion of DH&S. Most people I have spoken to are happy with how things are run – since 1890. • John Barnes (Cllr Calne Without PC - Western part – Persham) DH&S is the core/heart of the existing parish. The hall and shop are both there. The other parts are the lesser areas. It's a case of the main part saying the little parts have to break away and look after themselves. We have more affinity to Cherill. If Stockley wanted to go to Heddington fair enough. We would be left in limbo as the surrounding parishes don't want parts of CW. If this review does decide a breakup – should consider Sandy land in Studley

- Ioan Rees (Chairman of Calne Without PC – Main petitioner)
We had a massive petition showing overwhelming support, with 763 signatures. CW is a strange invention put together in 1890s. The world has changed dramatically since then. It's too big, stretching from Chippenham to Avebury. Calne town cuts off half of the parish – huge barrier down the middle. No surprise there is little connection between some of the parishes.
Decisions are made by people that live 5 miles away that have nothing to do with the area. Regarding Sandy Lane, if people there said they have more affinity with Studley, the Boundary Commission would have to give permission. The A4 links houses close to Derry Hill & Studley (bottom end of green section).
- Keith Robins (Cllr of Calne Without PC - West Ward)
In favour of DH&S becoming its own parish. Took out survey 2017 – West Ward wanted to become a separate parish on own. It had only 6 Cllrs covering the area and had the largest amount of voters in the area, including the Village Hall, post office and school, which are the vast majority of the facilities and rarely used by those in other wards
95% of those canvassed wanted to have their own PC.
- Pete Szczesiak (Cllr - Compton Bassett PC)
We did not support taking on the whole area suggested, should the new parish be approved. Lower Compton seemed a better fit with Cherhill.
We proposed the purple area CW4 as there are not too many residents and includes the gravel pits. We put this forward so not left with taking on an area we didn't want.
- Nick White (Cllr Cherhill PC)
No objection to the Compton Bassett proposal, it makes sense. There is a discussion to be had around Lower Compton, it would be a good fit with Cherhill. No real objections to CW4
- Ioan Rees – CW no official view, can't see a problem with Compton Bassett taking this small part, there is a good link with quarrying there.
- John Henley (Cllr Hillmarton PC)
We weren't initially looking at adding any parts on to our parish, but then did discuss the small triangle becoming part of Hillmarton, where the Wildlife area is.

Calne TC proposals

Note: A key criteria we look at when considering an area is the expected and known development for the next 5 years. There are only 2 areas, these were indicated.

- Ioan Rees - Area 3 is developed with access only through Calne town. The Knowle at Cherhill View is urban, it should be in the town. Two thirds of the electorate are in middle ward, if it goes into Calne, selective choices would be more logical.
Area 2 – well built on and on its way to being urban – no links to Calne without.
Area 1 – Partly sports ground and other half is open countryside. I think rural parishes should keep the rural countryside.

GG – you are saying only the sports centre and the allotments but not the other sections of Area 1 should be in the Town?

- Ioan - Yes outside development boundary
- Nick White – if CW is broken up then it will no longer exist, area 4 (lower) is in CW so that would either go in to Cherhill or CTC. My personal view it is more akin to town than Cherhill, it borders the town. This proposal from TC will be impacted by what happens with other proposals.
- John Barnes – Supports Ioan. Areas 2 & 3 built on and part of urban Calne, so transferring those is fair enough.
Areas 4 still open countryside and should stay rural
Area 1 – undecided.

Q - If DH&S is created – should the remainder stay as a parish in a reduced state or be broken up.

- Ioan Rees – It would be viable as a PC and would still be one of the larger PC in the area. Few services are provided in those areas so yes, they would be able to continue. But feel the better option is for them to join with the true centres of their community.

GG – Is there an opinion where some areas should join and others not?

- John Barnes – Regarding the viability of coloured areas staying as a parish, there are no shops, pubs or Village Halls. No real focus or core.
- Keith Robbins – With the Red, Green, and Blue sections, there is no coherent feel about them. Blue with Heddington, Red with Cherhill as each has a VH etc. on their own they don't have those sorts of facilities.

IBP – if we assume that some areas of red go off to north & south. What is your view of whether some of blue comes in to DH & S?

- Ioan – There are approx. 150-175 voters in that area, it is so divided from DH & S, where is their focus as it is not DH&S? I did live in Heddington. I think their focus would be Heddington. There

	are probably 800 voters in the Red & Blue areas together, that is a viable PC area.
--	---

Malmesbury Suvey Summary Page 1

Comment	Malmesbury TC Proposal Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	St Paul Malmesbury Without PC Proposal Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/ Amend
Agree	44	72
Disagree	124	60
No Opinion	2	34
Supports an amended proposal	1	0
Blanks	0	5
Total	171	171

Amended proposal suggested	To include the contiguous built area and built areas where residents see themselves as belonging to the town - Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Milbourne, foxley and Common Roads. Historically important areas like Daniel's Well, the western river valley and Arches Farm and the routes to and from the lands owned by the Warden and Freeman (to the west of the town).
----------------------------------	--

Malmesbury Suvey Summary Page 2 - postcodes within St Paul Malmesbury Without
Malmesbury TC Proposal

	Arches Lane	Burton Hill	Burton Hill Manor	Corston	Foxley Road	King's Wall	Milbourne	Tetbury Hill	Post Code not clear	Total
Agree	3	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	9
Disagree	8	18	4	6	19	1	58	1	2	117
No Opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blanks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
									Total	126

Rough estimates of location based on postcode - Arches Lanes indicates the area between Arches Lane and Burton Hill across the A429

Malmesbury Suvey Summary 3 - postcodes within St Paul Malmesbury Without
 St Paul Malmesbury Without PC Proposal

	Arches Lane	Burton Hill	Burton Hill Manor	Corston	Foxley Road	King's Wall	Milbourne	Tetbury Hill	Post Code not clear	Total
Agree	9	9	3	4	8	1	22	1	0	57
Disagree	0	6	1	2	6	0	19	0	1	35
No Opinion	0	5	0	1	5	0	17	0	1	29
Blanks	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	5
									Total	126

Rough estimates of location based on postcode - Arches Lanes indicates the area between Arches Lane and Burton Hill across the A429

Comment	Status	Area Of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Malmesbury TC Proposal Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Details of amended proposal	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Any other comments or alternative suggestions
1	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Current St. Paul without council is better suited to our needs than the proposed combined areas	
2	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Agree		Milbourne, Foxley Road and Bourton Hill residents are closely related to Malmesbury and are not clearly distinctive from the town but are clearly distinct from other parts of the current Without Parish. The remaining parish may be better named Corston and Rodbourne.	
3	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		This is a more cohesive arrangement. It makes sense for all Malmesbury residents to be represented on the Town Council.	None
4	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Will give no extra benefit as SPMW parish looks after all the parishes interests at all levels	I would like to point out that the increase in council tax will be a big burden on the pensioners in this area. Some being on a fixed pension and will have to adjust there budget and may have to cut down on essentials to cover this extra cost.
5	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Disagree		I think SPMWPC represent us very well	
6	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		Proposed wards are geographically more specific than at present	
7	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		The interests of the residents of the more rural areas currently within St Paul Malmesbury Without would not receive the same level of priority if absorbed within a town council with so many responsibilities within the town itself.	
8	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		With the current arrangements, councillors are living within the communities that they represent, and have a vested interest in local matters such as planning, road safety and local amenities. It has been shown by boundary change reversals in recent years, that larger councils are less efficient, more expensive and more beauracatic than smaller ones. Also, i do not wish my council tax burden to increase, which it would under these proposals.	I do not trust any decisions made by Wiltshire Council, as they are led by self-interest on the part of departments and councillors, and generally prove to be incompetent at best, and legally questionable at worst. The council has a record of lies and deceit to achieve their own ends at the expense of the ordinary, law-abiding rate-payer.

9	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		These proposals will put my council tax up, which I think is large enough already. The councillors are living in their local communities. They want to improve their local areas, with road safety measures and local amenities. They are more sympathetic to local planning issues. Larger councils cost more money and are more beauracritic than smaller ones.	Leave things as they are. I live outside the town for a reason.
10	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree		I just cannot understand why MTC are able to launch a land grab for parts of St Paul's Without. I can see no reason why this should be allowed. MTC's reputation in trashing the town and failing to listen to shoppers and traders in respect of the pandemic was disgraceful. I want nothing to do with them. St Paul's without function in an efficient and competent manner and under no circumstances should MTC be allowed to get their hands on parts of this parish.	Thank you for letting us know and the opportunity to comment
11	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Having lived in this parish council for almost 10 years, in various villages, I have found the local parish council works well in dealing with the various village issues that have arisen, they communicate with the residents and are approachable. Having always worked well, for the best interests of the parish I am amazed that Malmesbury TOWN council are suddenly wanting to take over control of what happens in the rural villages. There is no reason to correct something that isn't broken and has historically worked well for so long.	
12	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree			Member of St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council
13	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Disagree		Insufficient details about the benefits to the residents of the areas proposed to be absorbed.	
14	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		The outlying areas of Malmesbury are well represented by the current arrangements and I see no reason to change them.	

15	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Disagree		I object on two main grounds: 1) The existing parish of St Paul without would effectively be reduced to the village of Corston, which would hardly seem viable as a parish. 2) Malmesbury Town Council Claims that this will improve governance in the area. They have failed to provide any reasons why this change is actually required. The benefits it claims are lacking in any real detail of how this will be achieved. I believe that the proposals will actually lead to confusion, particularly over representation on Wiltshire Council - St Paul's representation will be diluted. Malmesbury Town Council should be forced to explain why this proposal is necessary and describe, in detail, how it will benefit the residents of St Paul's	
16	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		We have excellent Councillors, all well based in these areas, and it should stay the same. Money is needed in these outlying areas to provide localised needs.	All this means more paperwork as usual. Definitely not needed. The money should go on projects not pushing paper.
17	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		I disagree with this proposal because I support StPWPC proposal and it makes more sense to have rural parts of Malmesbury represented by those in those Parishes on a separate council to MTC [centre of town and an already significantly large electorate. .	
18	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		Loss of local control, CIL payments attributed to developments in the Parish would be likely incorporated in the wider MTC plans and funds whilst earned on a local Parish asset being developed, ie land, would and are at risk of now being spent outside the Parish.	Why change a system that is working perfectly well, and how can the larger MTC propose/impose such a change on a smaller without their wider consent, seems like a land and funds grab for no actual benefit to the Parish that would cease to exist.
19	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Malmesbury town council is only interested in investing in the town hall. St Paul without have always taken the wider community into account when spending its money. The rural area left after this proposal would suffer for lack of investment i.e. be cut off.. and the villages brought into Malmesbury would be squeezed and not invested in. It's a terrible idea which will ruin the careful stewardship of the st Paul without council.	
20	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Agree		Inefficiency in funding to support an artificial slicing of Malmesbury - see no benefit in current set up. Parish council have provided very little overall benefit.	
21	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		I want to retain local councillors for the area and not be part of the Malmesbury set up. The issues facing this rural community are not the same as the town and we need a distinct voice and to be able to manage our own issues.	There are no reasons for this change and the principals of local governance established long ago should be maintained.

22	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		St Pauls Without has a separate identity from Malmesbury, being mainly rural. Absorption into Malmesbury Council will destroy that identity, reduce representation and therefore effectiveness of it's Representatives thus working against the interests of the largely rural and semi-rural population of St Pauls Without.	
23	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Perfectly content with the current arrangements	No leave well alone
24	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		We are perfectly represented by the STPWPC councillors at present and see no reason to alter things especially as the council tax for Malmesbury Town is much higher than St. Pauls Without.	
25	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		St Paul's Without Parish Council as it stands offers residents far more direct representation over key local issues (planning, roads, development etc) that affect them (and has a very good track record of doing so) than membership of the much larger proposed Malmesbury Town Council, where our interests would be firmly in the minority. I do not believe Milbourne identifies with Malmesbury; we are geographically separated by a major road, river and hundreds of yards of farmland, but our interests are more akin to those of the other outlying St Paul's Without communities. Communications with our Parish Council are good, councillors are known local individuals with whom we can speak easily, and whose website is helpful and informative. They are good at maintaining contacts and influence with County and outside resources. They look after our interest in a way I cannot imagine the larger, town centred Town Council can (where they would carry a huge 75% majority of the councillors.)	The proposed benefits of Malmesbury Town Council's proposals seem bland and vague, more wishful thinking than reality. A larger, more clumsy council will not offer community cohesion, effectiveness, or increase in involvement in planning, It would increase Town control over currently more independent local communities to the town's advantage, especially in access to CIL funds attached to potential future developments and force the Parish residents to financially support Town costs for no benefit
26	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		Despite the claims made within "Reason for Request" I see no clear, compelling evidence or justification to warrant changing the existing provision for St Pauls Malmesbury without Parish Council.	Frankly what is in place today seems to work very well, my additional comment would therefore be "why disrupt or change what seems to be working well ?"
27	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		There is nothing to be gained and a lot of local knowledge and help to loose. A Parish Councillor is someone who understands the local people and their problems and needs. Why change things that are working perfectly well.	A local Parish Councillor is a great asset to the community for their local knowledge and understanding of local needs. I do not see the need for change and any benefit to be made by Malmesbury Town Council's proposal. Therefore I object.

28	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree		As resident of Malm St Pauls without I value the support and provision of amenities specifically designed for the needs of people who live outside the town centre. I would feel this would not happen if we were to be amalgamated.	
29	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		The needs of malmesbury without differ from the town and the council would allocate most of its resources to the town leaving malmesbury without disadvantaged	No
30	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		Local councillors who live in the parish, should make decisions not town council members. This looks like a land grab to me!	
31	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		The distribution of councillors makes no sense; the smallest area gets the most councillors?!	
32	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree			
33	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree			
34	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			Those that live in Malmesbury and use the services of the town should be served by Malmesbury Town Council and be part of decision making about Malmesbury. Splitting the town in two was not a good decision.
35	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			Most residents of St Paul's Without benefit from using all the facilities within the Parish of Malmesbury and the local events organised by the Town Council. I have no idea what the Parish of St Paul's contributes - it even pulled out of the local cemetery and their residents now complain about the costs to be interred there!

36	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		I am seriously concerned that the proposal is for Milbourne where I live and other rural communities to be subsumed into the urban area of Malmesbury. The needs of the communities are different. As independent areas, the voice of the rural communities can be heard and their needs addressed. If subsumed into a greater Malmesbury, the risk is that the whole area will be urbanised. Additionally monies raised in a greater area will be targeted on central Malmesbury and its sprawling new estates with no money being allocated to the rural communities. It is crucial that the areas remain distinct	I am concerned as a resident of St Pauls Without that there has been no prior consultation with SPW residents before a proposal was laid on the table by, seemingly when reading this survey, SPW. This is not an appropriate way to put forward proposals.
37	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Tetbury Hill	Disagree			
38	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		Leave as it is	
39	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		Much of the area proposed includes where the physical town of Malmesbury has expanded. Seems logical that it should all be under one council	
40	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		United planning for children, teens and adults in the Malmesbury area	
41	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No Opinion			
42	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		The proposals put forward by MTC are not acceptable in any way. The residents of the Parish Council will gain no benefit whatsoever from these proposals. Councillors representing them on any new council will be in a substantial minority. The existing Parish Council covers an area which is predominantly rural and is well served by its own councillors. The boundaries which separate the Parish Council from MTC are already well defined and do not require amendment.	
43	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		Malmesbury is a town, St Paul's Without is the rural aspect of coverage with different needs from that of the town.	St Paul's Without should be a stand alone from Malmesbury Town Council. The town has different needs from the rural areas surrounding malmesbury. Malmesbury town council will not act in our best interest.
44	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		I believe all Malmesbury residents should be under one organisation; we all benefit from Malmesbury Town Council's work, on behalf of all residents.	

45	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree			No
46	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Agree		These urban areas are part of Malmesbury. They form the continuous built area of the Malmesbury settlement	The boundaries of the Malmesbury Town Council proposal should be drawn tighter to the Town, so excluding essentially rural areas such as King's Heath. The area to the north of Milbourne has much in common with the more rural areas of Brokenborough Parish which it borders.
47	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			Leave to local people who live in the villages
48	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			Yes. As a former Malmesbury Town Councillor who was objected to sitting on the Council on the basis that I did not live in Malmesbury I find it somewhat ironic that now we want to be included in the Town. There is only one reason why this has been brought forward to gain for more land for the Town. To generate some much need income . We will lose the hard work that the Parish Council has carried out for many years. I know, from personal experience that we will have no active day in any Council.
49	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree			Milbourne is effectively part of Malmesbury, upon which it is reliant for shops, services, and social contacts
50	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			With only one councillor for Milbourne, would we be properly represented?
51	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			Better representation for Milbourne to stay as it is with more local councillors, the reduction to one is ridiculous, local action on local issues is very important and also with support for and against planning applications.

52	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		For all intents and purposes, the residents of the affected areas are already part of the community of Malmesbury and as such they use the existing town facilities and contribute to, as well as benefit from, its community activities. For this reason it is only right that they get an opportunity to have a say as to is representing them within their larger town and directly contribute towards its keeping.	
53	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree			
54	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		Logical to include these areas in the town	Make this type of information better available to residents. This only popped up on Facebook
55	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			
56	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		I don't believe the residents of ST Paul Malmesbury Without would be well served	
57	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Agree		There are significant parts of the Malmesbury community who wrongly believe they are in Malmesbury and are surprised to find out they are not. This proposal supports community cohesion, allowing the residents to feel part of the Malmesbury community supported by the benefits of being in the MTC parish, yet retaining local accountability through warding.	I believe the MTC proposal to be the best option for the wider community ensuring continued support to the residents and providing a feeling of being part of an excellent community.
58	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without		Disagree			
59	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without		Disagree			
60	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Why the need to change when things are fine as they are. The rates are expensive already we don't need another increase should we join Malmesbury	Leave as is, Cowbridge has many residents who are families, retirees, singletons who are all on tight budgets and cannot afford extra increases on our council tax bills
61	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		So close to town, I don't identify with the other outlying areas	No

62	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree		I want a representative from my area guaranteed a place on the parish Council to represent my best interests. I have no faith or trust in St Pauls within to care for my area.	
63	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree			
64	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree			
65	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		I would like to continue with our own autonomy including with regards planning controls. If there was a traffic light on the bypass I would agree that we could be the same parish- but as we are...access to Malmesbury from Milbourne is difficult.	This should be made more public, thank you
66	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No Opinion			
67	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		From information I have read, it appears that our council tax will rise considerably. I can't see what will get for our money????	
68	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		So MTC can have more power, no thanks	
69	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		This represents the natural boundary of shared community interest for the Town of Malmesbury.	This realignment is long overdue and will be of benefit to all the communities in the review area.
70	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Disagree		These areas need to maintain their independence and ability to self-govern.	I am appalled that the council are proposing this.
71	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Malmesbury town council is a shambles and will destroy the local community. This is purely a land grab by a greedy council and has no benefit to the residents in St Paul Malmesbury without.	
72	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree		Existing arrangement works well and the proposals will add nothing of community benefit or make for more effective governance.	

73	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		We fully appreciate the way that the parish council deals with parish issues through effective and efficient management of the more rural type issues, which are not the domain of MTC. The parish council has the time and inclination to work for the community and our fear is that change would marginalise the rural areas so we are more happy with the status quo because "if it ain't broke don't fix it".	Nil
74	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			
75	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		I don't see the benefit, I don't understand why there even is this proposal, it works fine as it is	
76	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		The community of Milbourne is a distinct rural one. There is a natural boundary from Malmesbury Town via the A429 main road. The two communities are totally different in character and need to continue to be represented as such.	
77	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		They should stay as they are. 14 town councillors will not cope with the extra work and planning will slip through the net.	I would guess the only reason for change is to save money. Keep it as it was been like it for years.
78	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	King's Wall	Disagree			
79	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Milbourne is a rural community and has not the facilities in Malmesbury town. We want to keep it like that.	
80	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree			
81	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		The Parish Council should retain control over issues such as planning	
82	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		Much more within the residents favour to have a parish councillor living in the area and reachable for face to face communication at any time. Local representatives who are very local understand the problems and opinions of their near neighbours. If a system works and the People concerned are happy with it, why change it.	

83	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree		400 yards from Malmesbury Town Council parish. Seems silly not to be part of Malmesbury	No
84	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		We know our parish councillors and they are very approachable. With the shortage of facilities in the town, empty shops, no banks, a very small chemist and charity shops, There is little incentive to use the town. The two biggest super markets available are in the rural areas. as. there is very little reason to use the town especially as rural areas.	
85	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree		its going to be too big for malmesbury area to look after	
86	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		community identity is essential and must be preserved	
87	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Better use if public money; fairer for all residents.	
88	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal			
89	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		Local devolved governance is the certainly the preferable option for residents living in St Paul without, we have good service, our councillors are very attentive and great and listening and representing our issues. We have no reason to need to join together with Malmesbury Town council. The costs to council tax payers of to run Malmesbury St. Paul without is far less than that paid by residents of the Malmesbury town for their local council. Further developments and planning applications can be better managed by local and resident St Malmesbury without councillors	I think the councils should show they are capable of working together, negotiating and supporting each other, with the current governance, rather than joining and making an large faceless and less flexible structure.

90	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I am quite happy with the current situation, I do not see the need to merge rural communities with their neighbouring urban community. The proposal would disproportionately benefit the urbanites to the disadvantage of the rural residents (the urbanites would control the council, most of it's spending would be within the town, they seem to want to have more development). I have never identified myself as being part of Malmesbury. I cannot see how any of the reasons supporting this request can be justified or realised for a St Paul Malmesbury Without resident. If we have to have a Parish council then St Paul Malmesbury Without will serve our needs as it does at present - we don't need the greater burden of Malmesbury Town Council.	
91	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		It's effective council has managed to keep household council tax lower than the Town Council	For the last 20 years at Paul's without council have managed to keep at least one, but the most costly household bill lower than anything the town council have managed.
92	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal			No
93	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal		Could result in less focus on the St Paul Parish area as less representation in proposed enlarged Town Council	The villages surrounding the town need proper representation in the future and the present number should not be reduced. There is a argument for one additional member for Backbridge with the new development.
94	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I live in the rural of St Paul Malmesbury Without, and believe that our Parish interests are best served by local rural based councillors, I'm really struggling to see what benefit Malmesbury's proposals will gain. Also I am shortly to join the retired community, and am very concerned with the proposed level of council tax increases being suggested, which as a pensioner this will certainly impact my wife and I.	

95	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		We are unable to see the benefit for the Parish of St Pauls Without to be added to a town base council (MTC). It seems underhand as to why this change has been suggested during the height of a pandemic and the Christmas period allowing limited discussion before the New Year deadline. Local residents /councillors need to make decisions based on their individual geographic areas. New developments within a Parish should benefit the local parish itself and not be added into effectively an "MTC" pot where the residents of boundary parishioners may not benefit from these additional funds within their locality. Changing boundary areas will involve additional costs which we can only assume would be passed onto the local residents with no perceived control / benefit. This appears to be an agenda by MTC to push the building line for new developments without increasing infrastructure e.g., schools, GP surgery (already at capacity), parking... As a resident in Milbourne, we have already noticed an	
96	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		Malmesbury Town Council have put forward no reasons why their proposals will improve the effectiveness or convenience of governance. Under their proposals the parishioners of St Paul Malmesbury Without (SPMW) would have their interests swamped by those of Malmesbury. This would be felt particularly in relation to planning applications which are made in respect of sites which are within the current area of SPMW. The Town Council have shown that they will grasp at the opportunity of receiving CIL income which may be to the detriment of people in SPMW. Evidence for this statement can be seen in the attempt to persuade Wiltshire Council to pay CIL payable by Aldi on their recent store located in SPMW to Malmesbury. In other words attempting to get Wiltshire to break the rule which they use for all CIL payments that it is payable to the parish in which the development takes place. Malmesbury Town Council make much of the fact that some people in SPMW shop in Malmesbury and are members of so	I had insufficient space to explain the reasons why the Malmesbury Town Council proposals are completely unacceptable.
97	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		You have not adequately defined the proposal nor how it differs from the current status. Therefore I am unable to offer a valid opinion.	
98	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The natural boundaries are easy to understand. Local councillors live in the area and have a sympathetic understanding to planning and area needs.	The MTC planned changes will be of no benefit to residents outside Malmesbury.
99	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Will not have any advantage to SPMW area and any gains will be diverted to Malmesbury Town	I think that the proposal of Malmesbury Town Council is for monetary gain

100	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		Will put council tax prices up without any benefits	
101	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Agree with the proposal		Sensible and logical idea	No
102	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		It makes absolute sense and will create efficiencies	
103	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		The Town should remain as the Town and the surrounding rural areas should remain as is. Don't fix what ain't broke.	
104	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Support an amended proposal	contiguous built area and built areas where residents see themselves as belonging to the town - Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Milbourne, foxley and Common Roads. Historically important areas like Daniel's Well, the western river valley and Arches Farm and the routes to and from the lands owned by the Warden and Freeman (to	I agree with MTC's request to redefine the parish boundary. At the moment MTC residents like me pay for services that benefit the whole community area, which is wider than the MTC area. The services in the town benefit the many residents who live immediately around the town, but who contribute nothing towards them. Many of them don't realise that they're not part of the MTC area, and would like to be. This wouldn't be such an issue but for the fact that St Paul's Without parish doesn't provide any services, which is why they can have such a small precept charge. The people from the outlying areas who use the town and feel like they're part of the town have no voice in how services are run and developed because they're represented elsewhere. It doesn't make sense now, but it makes even less sense when we know that more services are likely to be devolved and we know who will pay and who will benefit. Community cohesion will be compromised.	
105	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Agree with the proposal		To correct the anomaly of residents whose behaviour is part of Malmesbury Town not being part of, or contributing to, Malmesbury Town. To allow Malmesbury Town to govern such residencies.	
106	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	SN16 0DH - Malmesbury Town Postcode	Agree with the proposal		One town, one council	
107	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal			

108	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		People who live outside the current boundary definitely regard Malmesbury as their hub and benefit from Malmesbury's facilities. They should be united as one parish	Increasing the size of Malmesbury Town makes sense and will provide the town with extra much needed monetary resources from an increased number of community charges.
109	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Makes clear sense	
110	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Malmesbury continues to grow; the urban area increases. It is sensible to have one council for this and for it to include more urban activities rather than just rural ones.	Malmesbury is an old, historic and rural town. I recognise that some growth must occur it is important that this is so managed to retain the character of the town. I think the new proposals will help to ensure this does happen.
111	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		To include all current residents of Malmesbury and to introduce economies of scale and governance	
112	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		This rectifies a long standing anomaly and is totally logical for increased community cohesion and involvement.	
113	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		This correction is well over due and logical.	Back bridge development has always been seen to provide housing for Malmesbury to which it is linked . It is part of the Malmesbury Neighborhood Plan.
114	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal			

115	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		The current Malmesbury Town Boundary does not reflect the natural settlement of Malmesbury, nor the contiguous urban development. The proposal would bring these into a natural relationship. The areas of Foxley / Common Road, Burton Hill/Cowbridge, and Filands/Milbourn have no civic or social facilities of their own, but wholly on the Town. And most residents think of themselves as simply resident in Malmesbury (Town). Back as far as 1997 there was a kerfuffle when there was an election for Malmesbury Town Council and residents from Common Road were angry because they could not vote in the election. They assumed they were part of Malmesbury. Similarly, many of those living in these areas naturally think of Malmesbury Town Council as their local parish. Many Town Councillors, and several Mayors, have come from these areas, including mayors Peggy Hickson (Burton Hill), Bob Roberts-Phare (Common Road), Jacqui Martin (Burton Hill), plus other councillors past and present.	
116	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		The division between Malmesbury Town & St Paul's Without is something of an anomaly. The new arrangement covers all areas identifying with Malmesbury, while the ward system recognises the different characters of the zones.	No further comment
117	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		(i) fragmented local govt increases costs and conflicts (ii) need to speak with one voice when dealing with WCC	
118	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		People who live in Common Road/Foxley Road/Milbourne etc all look to Malmesbury for their basic services. It therefore makes sense for them to be able to elect representatives to Malmesbury Town Council. Of course, this proposal puts at risk the very existence of the St Paul's Without Parish Council, so perhaps Corston and Rodbourne should be included.	
119	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal			
120	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal			
121	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal		I like the fact that I often see our Councillor when walking locally and can discuss issues with him.	

122	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		O disagree with the proposal because Malmesbury Town Council have not given any notice of their intentions to the residents of Milbourne. This seems as though they are trying to push this through without us knowing. Luckily St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council have notified us of the plan and from their information I feel that the Parish Council has demonstrated our commitment to you over many, many years by: 1. Ensuring councillors live in all settlement areas of the parish, thereby being locally available to listen and respond to residents' questions and concerns.	My main concerns about the MTC proposals can best be expressed as follows: 1. The MTC proposals present broad statements of predicted benefits without any practical detail about how these benefits would be achieved or indeed any evidence that any change is actually required. 2. It is not uncommon for local settlements in and around market towns to use the facilities of the town. This is widely the case in many other parts of Wiltshire.
123	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal			People should have the right to vote for those whose decisions most affect their local environment
124	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		I firmly disagree with the proposal presented by Malmesbury Town Council (ref. M1). The two councils represent areas with significantly different needs and requirements. The Town Council adequately represents those living within the town of Malmesbury while the Parish Council represents those who live beyond the limits of the town, over a significant area, one with significantly different needs and requirements to those in the town itself. Under proposal M1, the people living in the area currently presided over by St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council would lose their voice since there would always be a majority of councillors representing the town on any newly constituted body. People, like me, living in St Paul's Without would experience a significant increase in the councillor to resident ratio if the new proposal was to be accepted. Would these new councillors understand and promote the needs of those in the outlying area when set against the needs of those dwelling within t	Might have helped to have given a Word limit for each box. Having prepared all of my arguments I found out, too late, that only half appeared when copied into the relevant box.
125	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree with the proposal		I object on the grounds that the Parish of St Paul's without will be subsumed into the Malmesbury parish leaving Corston and Rodbourne very much in the minority with little say in anything to do with the surrounding areas and the present parts of St Paul's without will be completely controlled by the urban part of any new Parish .	This is an urban sprawl by the Town Council of Malmesbury to take over the surrounding area. The people living in St Paul's without are largely country dwellers and they have built up a very successful and diverse spirit outside the town of Malmesbury. If the Town Council get their way it will mean that the residents of St Paul's without will have little say in the local governance of their area and will be completely dominated by the urban town of Malmesbury.

126	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal		Within an enlarged Malmesbury Parish any benefit from s106 funding that would otherwise accrue to the existing parish residents would now have to compete in the enlarged area. Second, there is no improved community interest or identity to be gained from this proposal.	Not at this time.
127	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		This is a hostile takeover bid for the territory currently looked after by SPMWPC which is already an effectively-run parish council. The debacle over Wiltshire Council being unclear about CIL funding for the Aldi on the A429 (which might have been diverted to MTC without the consent or even consultation with SPMWPC) shows that collaborative effective local governance has not been a behaviour espoused by MTC. I fail to see how community interest can be served if the area currently with the SPMWPC boundary no longer enjoys self-determining local representation on infrastructure projects. Council tax is likely to rise. Local planning decisions won't have the same level of local representation. I can see no benefit to these proposals - but I can see the disadvantage of giving more power to MTC. There's lots of evidence that SPMWPC is a well-run parish which contributes well to the local county. Let's keep it that way.	
128	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Loss of truly local input and support. Would not benefit from being absorbed into a larger area. We have experience from having lived somewhere in what was originally a small ward with its own identity which was lost when it was absorbed by a larger one with change of boundaries	
129	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		This proposal seems to me to be for the advantage of Malmesbury town, with no advantages for the out lying areas which constitute St Paul Without. The interests of the larger population numbers in the town would always be seen as needing attention before the needs of the smaller and more widely spread population of St Pauls	
130	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal		MSPW is an overwhelmingly rural parish. We believe it will be best served by a parish council membership with a predominantly rural focus.	
131	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I feel that being absorbed by MTC will provide no significant benefits for the residents of Milbourne. The current Parish Council have the interests of the community at heart. I see nothing that the MTC are saying which will match that. Communities thrive on local governance by people who live within that community - they know the area, they know the people who live there and they work hard to ensure those people have a voice.	

132	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		The existing arrangements work well, providing a focused and efficient service to the local community. The stated benefits for the proposal are not entirely clear and certainly do not provide a strong enough case to disrupt the current arrangements which have served us well over a number of years.	The proposal does not justify the upheaval and proposed changes, unless there are ulterior motives which at this stage have not been made clear.
133	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		The current Parish Council structure works well and there are no obvious problems with it. The proposed changes do not offer any tangible benefits while incurring the disruption of reorganisation. Under the current structure accountability is clear and works well. The identity of the Parish is well-established and recognised	
134	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		We would lose effective parish councillors who are local and understand our needs	No
135	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The proposed changes indicate fewer councillors will be focussing their attention on the interests of the residents of SPMW, with reduced identity and less-effective governance.	
136	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		There is no clear advantageous reason given for the change	
137	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Malmesbury St Pauls Without is very much a rural community having the needs and aspirations of such a community. Although physically so close the residents of Malmesbury St Pauls make little use of Malmesbury Town facilities other than for some shopping and even that is a reducing commitment with the steady reduction of active shopping outlets in the Town and the complete cessation of banking facilities. The bus services and library are services provided by Wiltshire County and thus play no part that could be described as a benefit from the Town Council. The residents of St Pauls Without would be poorly represented by the town councilors who would make up the considerable majority of the proposed council. Generally services are more satisfactorily provided when they come from a body that is close to the user.	There might be some merit in creating some overarching body, composed of representatives of other parish councils, which met occasionally to consider how best activities may be co-ordinated to the benefit of all. I have in mind parishes of like communities such as St Pauls Without, Charlton, Lea and Corston.

138	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		We have lived in Milbourne for nearly 40 years. The current set up works for myself and other residents I have spoken to. We chose to live in Milbourne as we didn't want to live within a town environment or subject to town issues. We do not make use of the town facilities other than on a commercial basis. The current arrangement has worked well for as long as I can remember. The few requirements that Milbourne require have been adequately addressed within the current set up. I would not want to see change for the sake of change. The reasons given by Malmesbury council for wanting to adopt M1 are non specific and very woolly at best. How are we sure that the changes will prove more cohesive, more effective, more convenient and will increase opportunity for residents of Milbourne (points 1-4)? Bigger is often not best, other than to increase bureaucracy and waste money. There is no explanation for 'CIL' and 's106' (point 5) so the reason is not understood. NO MORE ROOM!	Yes, require more space for comments.
139	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The needs of a town are vastly different from rural areas. At present there is a town council to manage the town and a parish council to manage the more rural outlying areas, which makes sense. I do not feel the needs of the outlying areas/hamlets would be met with the changes as the top priority would always be the town and the level of service offered would diminish. Malmesbury Without is best served by those who live in it and understand its needs.	I support SPMW Parish Council's belief that a cooperative, inter-council approach would achieve more benefits for the residents of both parishes than incorporation.
140	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Milbourne has an effective Parish Council run by Councillors local to us who are aware of the Parishes' needs! This does not need changing! I don't see any benefits to Milbourne residents, eg currently the Primary Sch in Malmesbury is not big enough to accommodate children in SPMWPC, how is that going to change with the Parish boundary change? Lea & Garsdon Sch are having to accommodate SPMWP children! I feel like this proposal is a total waste of time and money, why try to fix something that isn't broken?!	
141	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The Malmesbury Without Parish Council is entirely efficient, quietly getting on with all matters relevant to us residents, who cherish the different feel of NOT being Town folk of Malmesbury Within. We would risk being outvoted on all matters; like the Neighbourhood Plans where our submissions were ignored.	
142	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		I do not see any clear benefit to be derived from the proposed changes. The interests of the parish are distinct from those of Malmesbury town and I feel that they would be subsumed into issues relating to the town itself not those of residents of the existing parish area.	

143	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		This proposal would remove the ability for local people managing local issues and would put all the voting power in the hands of the town councillors. As another option how about increasing the number of councillors to 21 and every ward has 3 representative meaning a more balanced voting base.	This would seem to be a land/money grab by the town council as there seems to be little opportunity for Malmesbury council to gain extra funding and to avoid higher council tax fees for town residents.
144	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The plan most likely will increase Council Tax for SPMWPC parishioners, reduce our control over development within the parish, and hand over to the MTC the funding that future development in our parish might bring. What we would lose is an effective parish council run by councillors local to us and responsive to our needs.	
145	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		There is no evidence that this set up would lead to more effective governance. The current set up of SPMWPC is efficient and effective, with the benefit of excellent, local, contactable and responsive councillors. Milbourne is not part of Malmesbury, it has a separate identity. It would not benefit in any new way from being included within the proposed new council, but would be expected to contribute more, whereas at present it is economically run. Minimising the number of councillors down to an allocation of one for Milbourne would mean far less control in any local issue, eg planning, so for us governance would be much worse. No notification received as a resident about this proposal	As a resident I did not receive any warning of this proposal, surely the Council should make contact with all residents likely to be affected by such a change.
146	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		St Paul Malmesbury Without is a unique and essentially rural parish, significantly different in atmosphere, population density and challenges to Malmesbury Town. Assimilation of this parish into Malmesbury Town is neither logical nor justified. The speed and extent of development within Malmesbury Town boundaries has been out of proportion to the town infrastructure, and no doubt within a short period of time similar developments would be permitted in St Paul Malmesbury Without if this proposal were to go ahead. This not desired by many residents, nor is it part of the local plan. Most of the electorate is unaware of the proposed boundary change. There would be a significant reduction in the diversity of representation for the electorate making it much more difficult for rural voices to be heard. Councillors from Town could easily outvote the rural community.	
147	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		The proposed ward will be too large. There will be less representation for St Pauls Without residents. There will likely be a large increase in the parish precept.	The St Pauls Without parish council have always done a very good job and it would be a great loss to the community to lose them.

148	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		It seems eminently sensible and a more streamlined approach at every level	
149	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The proposal would massively dilute the impact of Milbourne interests on all governance issues which would be dominated by the interests of the Malmesbury Town Council wards and councillors. The rural character and interests of Milbourne would always come second to the urban interests of Malmesbury North, South and West who would have an effective veto on all issues.	
150	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		This proposal accurately reflects the focus and connections of the community that recognises itself as Malmesbury. It makes sense for it to work as a cohesive combined unit of local government. This includes the areas of Daniels Well and Kings Heath which are part of Malmesbury's story and its appeal to visitors and tourists and a vital element in promoting the local economy, but not at all on the agenda of the Parish.conomy but	The Malmesbury Town Council proposal also benefits the residents in the parts of SPMW who would not become part of the Malmesbury Parish. The parish that would be formed based on Corston and Rodbourne would be viable and focused on behalf of these residents and an improvement in relevance and cohesiveness. It is unlikely the survey as currently structured will fully capture this additional benefit.
151	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		Community interest	No
152	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Milbourne is a Hamlet and should stay that way with the Parish Councillors looking after it as well as they have done. Many people have moved to Milbourne because it is a Hamlet and enjoy the life here.	
153	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I support the SPWMPC in their opposition to the Malmesbury Town Council plan. I am wary that Council Tax may rise for SPMWPC parishioners as a result of the proposed changes, and I do not want to see a loss in our control over development within the parish. I do not want to hand over the funding, that future development in our parish might bring, to Malmesbury Town Council. I want to retain an effective parish council run by councillors local to me and responsive to my and my family's needs.	
154	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Disagree with the proposal		Content with the way things are now.	

155	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Primarily I want to ensure we retain an effective parish council run by councillors local to me and fellow residents of Milbourne. Thus I support the St Paul Without Malmesbury Parish Council (SPMWPC) in their opposition to the Malmesbury Town Council plan. This should not be about funding but I am concerned that by agreeing to these changes we inadvertently hand over the funding to Malmesbury Town, funding that future development in our parish might bring to our parish. What my family will not want to see is these proposed changes acting as a back door to a rise in Council Tax for SPMWPC parishioners. None of the residents I have spoken to want to see a reduction in control or say over future proposed developments within the parish.	Please do not let Malmesbury TC take over our parish. Thank you
156	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I do not want Malmesbury Town Council to take over the St Paul Without Malmesbury Parish Council land and run it from Malmesbury. Definitely not. This would inevitably reduce our control over development within the parish, and hand over to Malmesbury Town Council the funding that future development in our parish might bring. The residents of Milbourne do not want to lose what we have, ie an effective parish council run by councillors local to us and responsive to our needs.	Just to emphasise that I support The St Paul Without Malmesbury Parish Council in their opposition to the Malmesbury Town Council proposals. Please leave our parish alone.
157	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		As a resident of Milbourne I neither feel excluded from the community of Malmesbury nor do I feel that being part of MPC would add any value to community cohesion. MPC serves the needs of a small market town, whereas we currently have excellent representation for our more rural needs. In terms of the practical considerations of more effective and convenient governance I can see the benefits to the MPC but not to us. I cite the example of Malmesbury primary school, rebuilt just to the existing capacity. Some of the land was sold for housing, so that the extra school places will now be provided in the extension in Lea, which will mean more cars on our roads, thus more harm to the environment and more dangerous country lanes. I fear that the current proposal to extend the boundaries will result in many similar developments to the detriment of rural communities, as the town needs are bound to dominate governance.	
158	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I am a householder and see no discernible present or future benefit to the residents of St. Paul Malmesbury Without with regard to community interest, historic identity or effective governance.	

159	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree with the proposal		Expanding the town boundaries to include swathes of countryside seems a contradiction of what a "town" is i.e. urban. The villages around Malmesbury are not urban they are rural and well served by the Parish Council. The residents have access to proactive councillors who live in their villages and understand the needs of the community.	Malmesbury Town Council could consider looking at a fresh boundary for the town that make sense to the size of the town not just lump in surrounding Parishes.
160	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Our local Planning will be risky with less local councils interaction. Our CIL money needs to be directed towards local requirements and invested into the local area.	Please continue to keep all rate personal in the loop. We need to know of plans and possible changes.
161	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree with the proposal		St Paul Malmesbury Without PC predominately covers the rural areas around Malmesbury - so areas 2,3,5 & 6 have no direct connection to MTC. The present governance of ST P works well with one or two local Parish councillors in each area. MTC will not improve the governance in these additional areas. Also residents in Burton Hill, Lucent & Milbourne have said they will lose their identity. .	If the MTC proposal goes ahead then St Paul Without Malmesbury PC will be so reduced to become ineffective currently we are very effective in governance - representation on WC boards & projects. The recent development of the Aldi Supermarket in St Paul M W PC was not well received by MTC who questioned that the S106 monies should go to MTC & not St Paul M W PC. The existing boundaries of the A429 & the river Avon give a good separation between the two councils.
162	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burtin Hill Manor	Disagree with the proposal		As a resident of St Pauls without, I have no real connection to Malmesbury and very little reason to visit it. Malmesbury Town Council has no understanding of the concerns of us more rural residents. Their reasons given in support of the proposal are vague and do not show how they can be achieved. To date, I consider that I have been adequately and well represented by my Parish Councillors, who seem to understand the needs of our local community. I also have a strong suspicion that this is just a money grabbing exercise by Malmesbury Town Council. I suspect I would see absolutely nothing for my greatly increased MTC precept.	Parish Councillors for St Pauls Without have done an excellent job in resisting developments which would alter the rural nature of our parish. I fear that would not be the case if my part of St Pauls were absorbed into Malmesbury Town. The MTC proposal also causes confusion over address. Although my postal address includes "Burton Hill", I wouldn't be in the Ward of "Burton Hill & Cowbridge"
163	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		As already stated, Malmesbury has grown significantly and this seems as good a time as any to review	
164	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree with the proposal		I consider that I live in Malmesbury, i shop, socialise and use their facilities. if i have a problem i wd go to the council, it wouldnt occur to me to ask St Paul without	

165	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Smaller areas are more likely to be able to represent and reflect the interests of their community better.	
166	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I've been a Milbourne resident for 22 years. Our parish council has always served us effectively, composed of residents of our parish who've good knowledge of, and care about, the areas which they represent, making the best possible decisions for the area. An example in Milbourne is the new pavement by the dangerous phone box corner, ensuring pedestrian safety. Also unsuitable planning applications not in keeping with the area have been rejected. Milbourne (and most probably other areas affected by the proposal) considers itself a separate community with its own identity not part of Malmesbury, with the bypass and B4040 acting as distinct boundaries. Milbourne would risk being 'swallowed up' into Malmesbury and would lose its separateness and identity. I see no benefit to Milbourne in the proposal, only to Malmesbury, in providing extra development opportunities without proper representation on the council (only 1 rep, not necessarily a Milbourne resident) to voice objections.	
167	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Loss of representation for outlying areas, with no obvious benefit over current arrangements.	
168	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		The existing parish councils are better able to consider and address their occupants' needs than would a single representative for each, appended to the town council. The new boundaries aren't at all clear from the town council's map. This will cause arguments over authority. The council's scheme will reduce the focus on the communities, both for the town and for the surrounding parishes. This would inevitably reduce the town council's effectiveness and governance. What will be left of St Paul Without does not make sense. The benefits of the Town Council's proposed scheme are too vague to allow consideration.	
169	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		There will probably be a huge rise in council tax for which we will get little return. There will be a diversion of CIL money and Section 106 money away from Milbourne to Malmesbury TC for which we will get little benefit.	
170	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		St Paul Without is left decimated with just Rodbourne and Corston.	St Paul Malmesbury Without is a rural area that has been represented very well by the Parish Council who have looked after their interests

171	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Agree with the proposal	<p>These areas clearly identify as Malmesbury. They have no amenities of their own, for example Milbourne and Cowbridge have no play parks they use Malmesbury, unlike other villages close by such as Lea, which even though small has it's own. These areas on the outskirts identify with and use Malmesbury's amenities as a matter of course. Many also turn to Malmesbury Council with queries, not even realising that they aren't in the parish. Also supporting this is the anomaly that the contiguous built area of Malmesbury has expanded over the years, but the boundary hasn't, so we are now in the position of people once side of an residential road being in Malmesbury and the others in the neighbouring parish. Planning permission has also been given or is in the process for expansion such as on Filands, linking the residential area of Malmesbury with Milbourne, with the Aldi and Garden Centre being a centre focus on this edge of the town. Malmesbury has grown, but the boundary has not.</p>	<p>The boundary for Malmesbury should change to reflect its growth, both residential and the expansion of the employment land. Milbourne, Cowbridge and Foxley Rd were at one time separate small hamlets or village, but are now viewed as 'greater' Malmesbury. St. Pauls Without PC covers mainly rural areas, inc. Corston and Rodbourne, and these areas no longer fit in with this rural profile. I will send a separate email with map to show this and would encourage the PC to discuss this.</p>
-----	---	--	-------------------------	--	--

Comment	Status	Area Of St Paul Malmesbury Without	St Paul Malmesbury Without PC Proposal Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/ Amend	Details of amended proposal	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Any other comments or alternative suggestions
1	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		See earlier reasons given	
2	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Agree			
3	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		This would conflict with Q5, which is a more sensible arrangement.	None
4	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		Makes more sense and incorporates a more managed area within SPMWs community	I would like to point out that the increase in council tax will be a big burden on the pensioners in this area. Some being on a fixed pension and will have to adjust there budget and may have to cut down on essentials to cover this extra cost.
5	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Agree		It fits well within this parish	
6	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			
7	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		This makes sense to align with the changed boundary of the Sherston division	

8	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		I do not know what effect this would have on myself or anyone else, but I would guess it has something to do with building land.	I do not trust any decisions made by Wiltshire Council, as they are led by self-interest on the part of departments and councillors, and generally prove to be incompetent at best, and legally questionable at worst. The council has a record of lies and deceit to achieve their own ends at the expense of the ordinary, law-abiding rate-payer.
9	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		This is just to give malmesbury council more power over the building land.	Leave things as they are. I live outside the town for a reason.
10	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree		As above	Thank you for letting us know and the opportunity to comment
11	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Increasing the size of the ward by incorporating one ward and reducing the number of representatives is counter productive for ensuring inclusion and good representation across the wards' population.	
12	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Agree		Member of St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council	
13	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Disagree			
14	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree		Seems very sensible	
15	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill Manor	Agree		It would seem logical to align the parish and electoral boundaries.	

16	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Backbridge is part of Malmesbury, not Sherston as the map clearly shows. A very bad idea.	All this means more paperwork as usual. Definitely not needed. The money should go on projects not pushing paper.
17	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree		I agree with this proposal as it unifies the surrounding parishes whilst still retaining representation from those parishes separate from MTC and hence, crucially, having the outlying [often more rural] parishes interset more central to decisions and expenditure.	
18	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	No opinion			Why change a system that is working perfectly well, and how can the larger MTC propose/impose such a change on a smaller without their wider consent, seems like a land and funds grab for no actual benefit to the Parish that would cease to exist.
19	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		Parish lines should align with the wider electoral boundaries.	
20	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Disagree			
21	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree		The St. Paul's without area should remain distinct.	There are no reasons for this change and the principals of local governance established long ago should be maintained.
22	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		The Ward is now an integral part of Malmesbury after recent developments by Dysons. Few residents are impacted.	
23	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		The parish council provide an excellent service	No leave well alone
24	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		Bring Backbridge into Malmesbury Town but not into St. Pauls Without.	

25	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		To align Council and electoral boundaries seems to make administrative sense, and to simplify the arrangements for the County councillor for the Sherston division would surely make administration and representation more effective.	The proposed benefits of Malmesbury Town Council's proposals seem bland and vague, more wishful thinking than reality. A larger, more clumsy council will not offer community cohesion, effectiveness, or increase in involvement in planning, It would increase Town control over currently more independent local communities to the town's advantage, especially in access to CIL funds attached to potential future developments and force the Parish residents to financially support Town costs for no benefit
26	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree		St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council have been responsible for the more outlying areas of both Malmesbury and smaller communities for many years, this makes them entirely suitable to be responsible for the new Backridge development	Frankly what is in place today seems to work very well, my additional comment would therefore be "why disrupt or change what seems to be working well ?"
27	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		As set out in M2(1) and M2()	A local Parish Councillor is a great asset to the community for their local knowledge and understanding of local needs. I do not see the need for change and any benefit to be made by Malmesbury Town Council's proposal. Therefore I object.
28	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Agree		See my comments above	
29	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree			No
30	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree			

31	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	No opinion			
32	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	No opinion			
33	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree			
34	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree			Those that live in Malmesbury and use the services of the town should be served by Malmesbury Town Council and be part of decision making about Malmesbury. Splitting the town in two was not a good decision.
35	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree			Most residents of St Paul's Without benefit from using all the facilities within the Parish of Malmesbury and the local events organised by the Town Council. I have no idea what the Parish of St Paul's contributes - it even pulled out of the local cemetery and their residents now complain about the costs to be interred there!
36	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		Back ridge sits with Malmesbury and should not be added to St Pauls Without. Westport sits within Malmesbury and should remain with Malmesbury. The boundary line should be the bypass	I am concerned as a resident of St Pauls Without that there has been no prior consultation with SPW residents before a proposal was laid on the table by, seemingly when reading this survey, SPW. This is not an appropriate way to put forward proposals.
37	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Tetbury Hill	Agree			

38	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			
39	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		Makes no sense. By any standard this area is part of the urban area of Malmesbury town. Why would you have a part of it managed by a separate council?	
40	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		Cohesive planning and finance for the town	
41	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No opinion			
42	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne				
43	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	No opinion			St Paul's Without should be a stand alone from Malmesbury Town Council. The town has different needs from the rural areas surrounding malmesbury. Malmesbury town council will not act in our best interest.
44	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			
45	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree		The Malmesbury parish without parish ward are a waste of time and get involved in things outside of their legal rights and members of the said parish council are not required	No
46	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree		The Vackbridge Farm development will form an integral part of the urban development of Malmesbury	The boundaries of the Malmesbury Town Council proposal should be drawn tighter to the Town, so excluding essentially rural areas such as King's Heath. The area to the north of Milbourne has much in common with the more rural areas of Brokenborough Parish which it borders.
47	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			

48	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			Yes. As a former Malmesbury Town Councillor who was objected to sitting on the Council on the basis that I did not live in Malmesbury I find it somewhat ironic that now we want to be included in the Town. There is only one reason why this has been brought forward to gain for more land for the Town. To generate some much need income . We will lose the hard work that the Parish Council has carried out for many years. I know, from personal experience that we will have no active day in any Council.
49	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		Governance would be more uniform and cohesive for the included population	
50	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			
51	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			
52	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		I believe the proposal by Malmesbury Town Council best serves the interests of the residents of the affected residents.	
53	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree			
54	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree		If Backbridge development goes ahead this makes sense to include it in the town	Make this type of information better available to residents. This only popped up on Facebook
55	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree			
56	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			

57	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree		The proposal seeks to divide the community and relinquish the local accountability of warding. This is anything but community cohesion.	I believe the MTC proposal to be the best option for the wider community ensuring continued support to the residents and providing a feeling of being part of an excellent community.
58	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without		No opinion			
59	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without		Disagree			
60	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree		As stated above	Leave as is, Cowbridge has many residents who are families, retirees, singletons who are all on tight budgets and cannot afford extra increases on our council tax bills
61	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree			No
62	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree		I prefer to have a representative from where I live on the parish Council. After all, they have my areas best interests at heart!	
63	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree			
64	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	No opinion			
65	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			This should be made more public, thank you

66	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No opinion			
67	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne				
68	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			
69	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		Backbridge is clearly part of the town of Malmesbury. It would be dysfunctional for local government to be separated in this way.	This realignment is long overdue and will be of benefit to all the communities in the review area.
70	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Disagree		Why? Cannot be justified.	I am appalled that the council are proposing this.
71	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			
72	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree		Entirely logical proposal.	
73	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree		This is a logical proposal to maintain a parish council managing local rural issues.	Nil
74	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree			
75	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree			
76	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree		In Milbourne we have always been well served by the existing Parish Council who ensure their councillors live across our parish and understand rural living. It would be very unfair for us to have just one councillor represent Milbourne going forward as the character of town and rural living is different and should be preserved as such. Certainly feels like there is a 'hidden' agenda here...	

77	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree		Having it St. Paul without will be better. Hopefully they can stop more development and have more councillors to keep up to date on developments.	I would guess the only reason for change is to save money. Keep it as it was been like it for years.
78	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	King's Wall	Agree			
79	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion			
80	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree			
81	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree		No apparent benfit to residents	
82	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree			
83	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree		As above	No
84	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	No Opinion			
85	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Agree		it will be beter for the community	
86	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	No Opinion			
87	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Better use of public finances; fairer for all residents.	
88	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal			

89	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal			I think the councils should show they are capable of working together, negotiating and supporting each other, with the current governance, rather than joining and making an large faceless and less flexible structure.
90	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			I am not concerned either way - if the 18 electors of Backbridge want to escape from Malmesbury Town Council then I'm sure that they will be welcomed
91	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal		Again effective council	For the last 20 years at Paul's without council have managed to keep at least one, but the most costly household bill lower than anything the town council have managed.
92	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree with the proposal			No
93	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Agree with the proposal		Largely retains focus on the villages with adequate council representation.	The villages surrounding the town need proper representation in the future and the present number should not be reduced. There is a argument for one additional member for Backbridge with the new development.
94	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			It makes the ward a central urbanisation, and the recommendation is that suggested by the local government boundary commission

95	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		We are unable to see the benefit for the Parish of St Pauls Without to be added to a town base council (MTC). It seems underhand as to why this change has been suggested during the height of a pandemic and the Christmas period allowing limited discussion before the New Year deadline. Local residents /councillors need to make decisions based on their individual geographic areas. New developments within a Parish should benefit the local parish itself and not be added into effectively an "MTC" pot where the residents of boundary parishioners may not benefit from these additional funds within their locality. Changing boundary areas will involve additional costs which we can only assume would be passed onto the local residents with no perceived control / benefit. This appears to be an agenda by MTC to push the building line for new developments without increasing infrastructure e.g., schools, GP surgery (already at capacity), parking... As a resident in Milbourne, we have already noticed an	
96	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree with the proposal		It follows the boundaries used in Wiltshire Council divisions and therefore reduces confusion in the minds of SPMW parishioners as to who represents them at County level	I had insufficient space to explain the reasons why the Malmesbury Town Council proposals are completely unacceptable.
97	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Disagree with the proposal		Again you have failed to adequately explain the difference between now and your proposed change.	
98	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		Manageable and sensible boundaries.	The MTC planned changes will be of no benefit to residents outside Malmesbury.
99	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		To make it easier for ward councillor to manage	I think that the proposal of Malmesbury Town Council is for monetary gain
100	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane				
101	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		Agree with the proposal		Logical solution	No
102	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal			

103	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal		This keeps the business within the town and the residential on the outskirts.	
104	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		All of the resources and services available to the people of Backbridge, all of the social glue and community activities and amenities fall within the boundaries of the MTC area, yet they would contribute nothing and have no voice. Just like the edges of the town where residents believe themselves to be in the MTC area, the residents who move there will expect to be represented in the same way as the rest of the residents of the town. Future devolution will increase the need for community cohesion and exacerbate the frustration of the residents of this whole community.	
105	An interested party not necessarily from the parishes affected		No opinion on the proposal			
106	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	SN16 0DH - Malmesbury Town Postcode			One town, one council	
107	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal			
108	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		The area of Backbridge should be part of Malmesbury Town council	Increasing the size of Malmesbury Town makes sense and will provide the town with extra much needed monetary resources from an increased number of community charges.
109	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Makes sense	
110	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		It fails to recognise the urban development of Malmesbury and basically wishes to continue the status quo.	Malmesbury is an old, historic and rural town. I recognise that some growth must occur it is important that this is so managed to retain the character of the town. I think the new proposals will help to ensure this does happen.

111	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		It makes more sense for St Paul Malmesbury Without, along with Backbridge, to be governed by Malmesbury Town Council	
112	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		From the time of the Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment to the eventual Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan (approved by referendum) this area has been seen as an extension to the town of Malmesbury.	
113	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal			Back bridge development has always been seen to provide housing for Malmesbury to which it is linked . It is part of the Malmesbury Neighborhood Plan.
114	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No opinion on the proposal			
115	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		The Westport and other areas are naturally part of the town Malmesbury. The issue of Wiltshire electoral divisions and parish boundaries are quite separate issues.	
116	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		Previous proposal is better	No further comment
117	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		No opinion on the proposal			
118	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		With proposed housing development in the Backbridge Ward, the new residents would naturally look to Malmesbury and so they should be included within the Malmesbury Town Council.	
119	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal			
120	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal			
121	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	No opinion on the proposal			

122	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			My main concerns about the MTC proposals can best be expressed as follows: 1. The MTC proposals present broad statements of predicted benefits without any practical detail about how these benefits would be achieved or indeed any evidence that any change is actually required. 2. It is not uncommon for local settlements in and around market towns to use the facilities of the town. This is widely the case in many other parts of Wiltshire.
123	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		This is contiguous with Malmesbury and should be treated as such	People should have the right to vote for those whose decisions most affect their local environment
124	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal		This appears to make complete sense in terms of community interest and identity and effectiveness of governance.	Might have helped to have given a Word limit for each box. Having prepared all of my arguments I found out, too late, that only half appeared when copied into the relevant box.
125	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Agree with the proposal		M2 (1)This leaves this area of the Saint Paul's without parish, that is being carefully developed, an integral part of the parish and will leave the local area around the town some control of any future development.	This is an urban sprawl by the Town Council of Malmesbury to take over the surrounding area. The people living in St Paul's without are largely country dwellers and they have built up a very successful and diverse spirit outside the town of Malmesbury. If the Town Council get their way it will mean that the residents of St Paul's without will have little say in the local governance of their area and will be completely dominated by the urban town of Malmesbury.

126	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	No opinion on the proposal			Not at this time.
127	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			This makes sense for boundary reasons.
128	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal			same reasons as previous
129	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			
130	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal			SPWPC's proposal M2(2) is logical in providing all of the parish's electors with the same WC representative. Nevertheless, in light of probable future development, the Backbridge area can perhaps be seen as enjoying more community of interest with Malmesbury town
131	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			It makes sense.
132	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	No opinion on the proposal			The proposal does not justify the upheaval and proposed changes, unless there are ulterior motives which at this stage have not been made clear.
133	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree with the proposal			
134	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			We would have more control of our area and any funding - the councillors would be kept at 12 people No
135	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			SPMW Parish Council have demonstrated effective governance in the interests of their community and their proposals based on their experience appear to be sound.
136	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			

137	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I have expressed my views in my response to Q7	There might be some merit in creating some overarching body, composed of representatives of other parish councils, which met occasionally to consider how best activities may be co-ordinated to the benefit of all. I have in mind parishes of like communities such as St Pauls Without, Charlton, Lea and Corston.
138	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			Yes, require more space for comments.
139	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		It makes sense to incorporate the Westport Parish Ward into one integrated St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Ward. There are councillors living in and representing each area of the parish, which works well. It makes sense to keep to the existing boundaries and for the whole of SPMW Parish to be represented by one Wiltshire Councillor.	I support SPMW Parish Council's belief that a cooperative, inter-council approach would achieve more benefits for the residents of both parishes than incorporation.
140	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			
141	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		The logic of following the Boundary Commission's submission will save voter confusion at election times.	
142	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane				
143	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal			This would seem to be a land/money grab by the town council as there seems to be little opportunity for Malmesbury council to gain extra funding and to avoid higher council tax fees for town residents.
144	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			

145	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal		It would make some sense to reduce the two wards to one parish and retain councillors. Not sure what effect the change in the electoral boundary might have.	As a resident I did not receive any warning of this proposal, surely the Council should make contact with all residents likely to be affected by such a change.
146	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal		With an electorate of just 18, Backbridge should be able to decide its own fate.	
147	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	Agree with the proposal		The parish will remain largely rural following the proposed change and the issues affecting residents of rural areas are very different to those affecting towns.	The St Pauls Without parish council have always done a very good job and it would be a great loss to the community to lose them.
148	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		Absolutely agree. Ridiculous for Backbridge to be administrated in the Sherston Parish.	
149	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		The addition of the Backbridge Ward would add to the rural nature of the SPWMPC without dilution of governance or creation of a block veto by other wards with distinctly urban interests and needs.	
150	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		There is no community interest, increase in identity or development of effective and convenient governance in this proposal. Indeed, its effect would be the opposite. The local community would be artifically and damagingly divided and the benefits of Malmesbury Town Council's proposals would be lost for another generation.	The Malmesbury Town Council proposal also benefits the residents in the parts of SPMW who would not become part of the Malmesbury Parish. The parish that would be formed based on Corston and Rodbourne would be viable and focused on behalf of these residents and an improvement in relevance and cohesiveness. It is unlikely the survey as currently structured will fully capture this additional benefit.
151	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Disagree with the proposal		Community reasons	No
152	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		Milbourne is a Hamlet and should stay that way with the Parish Councillors looking after it as well as they have done. Many people have moved to Milbourne because it is a Hamlet and should stay that way.	

153	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			
154	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Arches Lane	Agree with the proposal			
155	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal		This change would not affect me	Please do not let Malmesbury TC take over our parish. Thank you
156	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		But I should say that I am not a resident of the Backbridge Ward.	Just to emphasise that I support The St Paul Without Malmesbury Parish Council in their opposition to the Malmesbury Town Council proposals. Please leave our parish alone.
157	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		The addition of the Backbridge Ward would add to the rural nature of the SPWMPC without dilution of governance or creation of a block veto by other wards with distinctly urban interests and needs.	
158	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		The proposal would benefit effective governance	
159	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Corston	Agree with the proposal		As Backbridge Ward, following the LGBCE decision, is within the boundary of the Sherston Division it makes sense to bring this into the Parish Council and certainly makes it easier for the County Councillor to represent them.	Malmesbury Town Council could consider looking at a fresh boundary for the town that make sense to the size of the town not just lump in surrounding Parishes.
160	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		I feel that the local parish Council are much more aware and listen to the needs of the residents. In the last three years at Milbourne we had a short length of footpath laid on the side of a very tricky and possibly dangerous bending road. Previous was particularly dangerous for those with young children. Now it's safe thanks to the parish council putting forward the needs of the residents of Milbourne.	Please continue to keep all rate personal in the loop. We need to know of plans and possible changes.

161	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Agree with the proposal		There is now no reason to keep Westport ward - but still keep the total number of councillors to 12. I agree with the change of Parish boundary as residents in Malmesbury will have 2 Electoral divisional boundaries - this will cause confusion & cannot see how this would work for the residents or the elected councillors.	If the MTC proposal goes ahead then St Paul Without Malmesbury PC will be so reduced to become ineffective currently we are very effective in governance representation on WC boards & projects. The recent development of the Aldi Supermarket in St Paul M W PC was not well received by MTC who questioned that the S106 monies should go to MTC & not St Paul M W PC. The existing boundaries of the A429 & the river Avon give a good separation between the two councils.
162	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burtin Hill Manor	Agree with the proposal		It seems logical to keep the boundaries in line with those of the Local Government Boundary Commission proposals.	Parish Councillors for St Pauls Without have done an excellent job in resisting developments which would alter the rural nature of our parish. I fear that would not be the case if my part of St Pauls were absorbed into Malmesbury Town. The MTC proposal also causes confusion over address. Although my postal address includes "Burton Hill", I wouldn't be in the Ward of "Burton Hill & Cowbridge"
163	A resident of the parish of Malmesbury Town		Agree with the proposal		As already stated, Malmesbury has grown significantly and now seems as good a time to review the administration of the town and impact on community. I live in the centre of the town and value greatly the amenities but also the feeling of community and physical places to meet. Those people living close by should have some say in the provision. It does seem that there will also be an administrative advantage to the proposal.	
164	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Burton Hill	Disagree with the proposal		St Paul without is an irrelevance to me	

165	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		The proposal would result in fewer representatives for local issues .	
166	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	No opinion on the proposal			
167	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		Provides a cohesive community of outlying areas with shared interests.	
168	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Foxley Road	No opinion on the proposal			
169	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Disagree with the proposal		We will get no benefit from these changes but will be paying a lot more council tax.	
170	A resident of the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without	Milbourne	Agree with the proposal		The proposal to have one integrated ward seems sensible. Backbridge should be incorporated into St Paul Without in line with the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposals.	St Paul Malmesbury Without is a rural area that has been represented very well by the Parish Council who have looked after their interests
171	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected		Disagree with the proposal		This area is considered a part of Malmesbury, geographically, governance-wise and also by residents. The contiguous built area of Malmesbury has and is expanding with hundreds of new housing in the pipeline and the boundaries should be increasing to support this, inc Milbourne, Foxley Rd, Cowbridge and other areas. Taking this chunk off the top corner is not sensible. The fact that the area is in the Wiltshire Council ward for Sherston and not Malmesbury, does not detract from this. This set up happens elsewhere. First and foremost residents identify with the place where they live and their local Town Council being Malmesbury. In my view the main area supported by St Paul Without Parish Council is Corston and Rodbourne and quite a large swathe of country area. It does not fit the profile of what they do to add in hundreds of dwellings which are already in Malmesbury. They currently provide very very few residential amenities, even withdrawing from cemetery arrangements in Malmesbury.	The boundary for Malmesbury should change to reflect its growth, both residential and the expansion of the employment land. Milbourne, Cowbridge and Foxley Rd were at one time separate small hamlets or village, but are now viewed as 'greater' Malmesbury. St. Pauls Without PC covers mainly rural areas, inc. Corston and Rodbourne, and these areas no longer fit in with this rural profile. I will send a separate email with map to show this and would encourage the PC to discuss this.

Beechingstoke and Surrounding Area Community Governance Review Survey

Responses	Supports changing the status of Beechingstoke to a Parish Meeting	Supports grouping Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish	Supports merging Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish	Supports retaining the current arrangements
43	11	7	6	28

If grouping Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to group with?	Marden	North Newton	Woodborough	Patney
	2	2	2	1

If merging Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to merge with?	Marden	North Newton	Woodborough
	2	2	2

View on the suggestion to transfer the area below around Bottlesford from Beechingstoke to North Newton	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Support Amended Proposal	Amended Proposal
	10 (6 of these respondents were from a neighbouring parish)	29	3	1	Manor Farm is very much a part of Beechingstoke, physically and its residents. I do not see the logic in any of the proposed properties becoming part of North Newton PC and would need guidance as to why this would be a good choice. The residents themselves will have their own views.

Summary of reasons 1
Responses from neighbouring parishes shown in blue

Reasons for supporting Parish Meeting (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)
This option seems to be the least change, given that the option to do nothing is not feasible.
This would allow people to decide on matters on an ad-hoc basis
To keep the parish boundaries intact. To maintain the autonomy of the village and for it to make its own decisions without possible conflict of interests.
Minimal bureaucracy, meeting called only when necessary - good community spirit in Beechingstoke
To recognise Beechingstoke as a separate entity and to avoid overloading an already busy neighbouring Parish Council.
I feel it is important to retain the ability for the parish to be able to discuss any arising matters relating to the parish at a local level but at the same time there is currently no need to have the structure of a parish council.
Residents tend to have more interest in matters which affect the parish in which they live, because they know the parish and the people who live there.
I do not believe that there is sufficient business to justify a complete new structure. There may be sufficient support for a Beechingstoke Parish Council which would probably be optimal but that would probably meet annually anyway. A straw poll of those who might be inclined to volunteer indicates that none has had any visibility of any proposed elections for this purpose over the last 5 or more years.
I believe this is in the best interests of this ancient ,close knit and friendly parish and it would lose its unique identity by joining another local parish.
Historic reasons and keeping Beechingstoke's identity.

If grouping Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to group with?	Reasons for supporting grouping (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)
Marden	Both Marden and B'stoke are very small communities, and could both benefit financially from a combinrd effort
North Newton	Only the part of Beechingstoke community who live on Broad Street - these houses form a much better community relationship with North Newton Parish, the remainder of the parish community of Beechingstoke to be asked if they want to stay as Beechingstoke or join with another closer parish council
Patney	Patney is a similar village with similar facilities and issues. I believe it would be an equal partnership
Woodborough	The village is closely connected with Woodborough and if could not retain its own status this would be the village most appropriate to join with. The Churches are part of the same Cluster and share a Vicar. The village has regularly provided Governors for Woodborough Primary School and I am currently a Governor there. The Churhc in Beechingstoke is very small so if weddings need more space they are usually held at Woodborough Church..
North Newton	Beechingstoke is sparsely populated . Concerns of Woodborough/Beechingstoke and North Newnton are common.
Woodborough	Woodborough School, Social club and Reading rooms where we vote. We have attended Woodborough planning meetings that would have effected us.

Summary of reasons 2
Responses from neighbouring parishes shown in blue

If merging Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to merge with?	What name would you suggest for the combined parish?	Do you think there should be separate wards to elect councillors to the different elements of the parish?	Reasons for supporting merging (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)
Woodborough	Beechingstoke and Woodborough	No	Combined parish would benefit from greater resources (including people)
Woodborough	Woodborough & Beechingstoke	Yes	Larger parishes provide a better basis for providing the voice and services needed by the community and with wards would retain the separate identity of each village.
Marden	Marden	Yes	Convenient governance
North Newton	north newnton	No	broad street could be considered an extension of hilcott so it is sensible for reasons of community identity, effective and convenient governance to merge.
North Newton		No	I live just inside the North Newton side of Beechingstoke/North Newton boundary. Planning matters, road safety, etc just in Beechingstoke affect me yet there is no parish council to make representations. Adjoining parishes have this representation.
Marden	Marden with Beechingstoke PC	Yes	They are already 'neighbours' and have a potential synergy that could be developed to their mutual benefit

Reasons for supporting current arrangements (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)
It's up to Beechingstoke parishioners to decide what they want, not other folk from outside
I am a new resident to Beechingstoke, so have been talking to my neighbours who have advised me to vote this way. I like it being a small friendly village.
PCC is effective for church and the wider community, very close knit community - supporting any events arranged to support church or village needs.
It will be better for Beechingstoken to govern themselves as they will be able to ensure that their interest are addressed and it doesn't impose on other parish councils who have elected officials to look after their village.
As above. [To recognise Beechingstoke as a separate entity and to avoid overloading an already busy neighbouring Parish Council.]
Beechingstoke needs its own council
Residents tend to have more interest in matters which affect the parish in which they live, because they know the parish and the people who live there. It is difficult for members of one parish to determine arrangements for another parish where they have no direct interest.

I believe that it is important for Beechingstoke to retain its independence and community identity. The previous chair of the Parish Council moved out of the village (although still listed on the Wiltshire Gov website) and this is probably the reason why things have gone into a void. There is a strong community feeling in the village and many people are very keen to get involved in a Parish Council, in all its forms. Previously there was a reluctance to fully embrace the process but this is now not the case. I believe that we would be able to easily find willing, effective and community minded people to run an effective Parish Council. The introduction of a Parish Council would also allow us to incorporate a village website, and other community based initiatives.

The Village identity in Beechingstoke is very strong and, if it is possible, the existing arrangements should remain in place. For example, we have a very successful Village Fete every year that involves at 40-50% of the village running stalls, providing donations

Beechingstoke is an active community that merits having its own democratic parish council.

I believe that Beechingstoke should have the opportunity to self governance . I moved into the village some three years ago and I have been impressed with the enthusiasm and commitment of people in the village. I would be prepared to put myself forward to stand for election to the parish council.

We are a group of a number small hamlets, that although seperate, come together several times in a year in order to raise funds for Beechingstoke Church, St Stephens. Other than the church we have no other community amenities. There are no projects in mind, other than some years we requested a 30mph speed limit, which was declined. At the online meeting the only example given was that if we had a PC, that body could object to a planning permission not favourable to village/hamlet. Does this mean that an individual's view does not carry as much weight as a PC? We have survived for years without a PC, and when we had one, no decisions were made by it in the last 17 or more years. I see no need for employing a clerk as our needs are negiable, we might be able change to a Parish Meeting, but keeping to our current arrangement would seem to be the best choice. I thought we already pay council tax, for Police and Fire Precepts.

We are a small community and any issue that may arise we seem to come to an acceptable outcome without to much problem

See no need to change the current status as all local village matters as being adequately managed as things stand

After a period of inertia it is time for local residents to become more involved, rather than change existing procedures. The current arrangements can and should be made to work

Beechingstoke is a thriving community of people who support the Parish very well indeed by organising village events throughout the year. The identity of Beechingstoke is well worth preserving because other local parishes actually support the events which are put on here in Beechingstoke such as Christmas carols & Party; Summer Fete; Harvest Festival and Party and many other smaller events throughout the year. Without such an identity, the village would be mere houses which would be tragic, and would remove the reason that my husband and I decided to retire here having had a home in the parish of Beechingstoke since 2007. We retired here permanently in 2017, and regard it as home.

It is essential to maintaining the community spirit which exists in the parish that our identity as a separate parish is maintained. Many local get-togethers derive from being part of Beechingstoke. If the identity disappears, the local community spirit will soon die

Beechingstoke is an active community and I believe that if it there was proper publicity there would be sufficient interested residents to form a parish council.

Beechingstoke has a wonderful community identity

My reasoning for retaining our current status is because we have been trying to establish a parish council for some time however our previous councillors did not transfer it to people who live in the village and also we as residents were not notified of when the Beechingstoke Parish Council elections would have been due. We, as a small village, have the right to retain our identity without being absorbed into a larger village. There are now a number of people who actively want to be a part of the council, so a full cohort of councillors and whole village support is assured.

If we can elect enough parish councillors we'd prefer to maintain our Beechingstoke parish as it is. We feel we have a good village community.

The demographics and population of Beechingstoke have changed in recent years with new and existing members of the village who now have a desire to take the opportunity to be part of developing the village's unique identity and seeing their ideas of community in the village developed and extended.

Those residing in Beechingstoke are more likely to be able to give sound input on the unique needs of the village. The covid pandemic has highlighted the importance of local knowledge and the importance of local community and discreet regional areas in identifying what is best for that area.

To retain the community

Summary of 'other comments'

Any other comments or alternative suggestions
Merger of all three Parishes into a single warded parish of North Newnton with Woodborough & Beechingstoke.
Please leave well enough alone. Beechingstoke is a thriving active community. No need to change status quo.
Now all Beechingstoke residents have been officially advised there is no current Parish Council. I suggest Beechingstoke residents re-instate a Parish Council.
Rally the Beechingstoke residents to govern themselves. They will lose out in the long run if they do not.
It is not clear what the benefit of transferring a small part of Beechingstoke parish into North Newnton would achieve. It would have been helpful if this had been explained in the proposal, given only a small area is suggested. Why is it just this small area and not the entire parish? This does not make sense.
Following discussions with other village residents I believe there are sufficient people who would be prepared to stand as Parish Councillors to ensure that the village can have the representation required.
Nor do I wish to join Woodborough
As a resident of Broad Street I would resist any suggestion that it be incorporated into North Newnton. Furthermore I find the presentation of this as an option prior to any consultation with residents to be extraordinary.
I would suggest you leave us as we are and spend the money in a way to support people with urgent needs
See no need to change the parish boundaries. Unessascary costs involved in making changes
The identity of our community will not be protected or best served by a change to arrangements; rather the community needs to step up and take responsibility !
I hope that the Council will work with the residents of Beechingstoke to create a Parish Council for the good of the Community
I have not received any communication in the 15 years I have lived here that we were without a parish council or that we could form one!
We have lived here for 20 years and feel part of the Beechingstoke community - church, fete etc.
The parishioners of Beechingstoke need the opportunity to develop their parish with new input.

Comment	Status	Supports changing the status of Beechingstoke to a Parish Meeting	Reasons for supporting Parish Meeting (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)	Supports grouping Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish	If grouping Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to group with?	Reasons for supporting grouping (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)	Supports merging Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish	If merging Beechingstoke with a neighbouring parish, which parish do you think would be most appropriate to merge with?	What name would you suggest for the combined parish?	Do you think there should be separate wards to elect councillors to the different elements of the parish?	Reasons for supporting merging (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)	Supports retaining the current arrangements	Reasons for supporting current arrangements (community identity and interests, or effective and convenient governance)	View on the suggestion to transfer the area below around Bottlesford from Beechingstoke to North Newton	Suggestion of ammended proposal	Any other comments or alternative suggestions
1	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke						Yes	Woodborough	Beechingstoke and Woodborough	No	Combined parish would benefit from greater resources (including people)			Agree with the proposal		
2	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke											Yes	It's up to Beechingstoke parishioners to decide what they want, not other folk from outside	Agree with the proposal		
3							Yes	Woodborough	Woodborough & Beechingstoke	Yes	Larger parishes provide a better basis for providing the voice and services needed by the community and with wards would retain the separate identity of each village.			Agree with the proposal		Merger of all three Parishes into a single warded parish of North Newton with Woodborough & Beechingstoke.
4	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke	Yes	This option seems to be the least change, given that the option to do nothing is not feasible.											No opinion on the proposal		
5	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke	Yes	This would allow people to decide on matters on an ad-hoc basis				Yes	Marden	Marden	Yes	Convenient governance			Agree with the proposal		
6	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes	To keep the parish boundaries intact. To maintain the autonomy of the village and for it to make its own decisions without possible conflict of interests.											Disagree with the proposal		no
7	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke						Yes	North Newton	north newnton	No	broad street could be considered an extension of hilcott so it is sensible for reasons of community identity, effective and convenient governance to merge.			Agree with the proposal		no
8	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	I am a new resident to Beechingstoke, so have been talking to my neighbours who have advised me to vote this way. I like it being a small friendly village.	Disagree with the proposal		
9	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke						Yes	North Newton		No	I live just inside the North Newton side of Beechingstoke/North Newton boundary. Planing matters, road safety, etc just in Beechingstoke affect me yet there is no parish council to make representations. Adjoining parishes have this representation.			Agree with the proposal		
10	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke			Yes	Marden	Both Marden and B'stoke are very small communities, and could both benefit financially from a combinrd effort	Yes	Marden	Marden with Beechingstoke PC	Yes	They are already 'neighbours' and have a potential synergy that could be developed to their mutual benefit			Agree with the proposal		
11	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes	Minimal bureaucracy, meeting called only when necessary - good community spirit in Beechingstoke									Yes	PCC is effective for church and the wider community, very close knit community - supporting any events arranged to support church or village needs.	Disagree with the proposal		Please leave well enough alone. Beechingstoke is a thriving active community. No need to change status quo.

12	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke			Yes	North Newton	Only the part of Beechingstoke community who live on Broad Street - these houses form a much better community relationship with North Newton Parish, the remainder of the parish community of Beechingstoke to be asked if they want to stay as Beechingstoke or join with another closer parish council							Agree with the proposal			
13	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke										Yes		I choose not to support any of the options as I propose reforming Beechingstoke Parish Council.	Suggest amended proposal	Manor Farm is very much a part of Beechingstoke, physically and its residents. I do not see the logic in any of the proposed properties becoming part of North Newton PC and would need guidance as to why this would be a good choice. The residents themselves will have their own views.	Now all Beechingstoke residents have been officially advised there is no current Parish Council. I suggest Beechingstoke residents re-instate a Parish Council.
14	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke										Yes		It will be better for Beechingstoken to govern themselves as they will be able to ensure that their interest are addressed and it doesn't impose on other parish councils who have elected officials to look after their village.	Disagree with the proposal		Rally the Beechingstoke residents to govern themselves. They will lose out in the long run if they do not.
15	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke	Yes	To recognise Beechingstoke as a separate entity and to avoid overloading an already busy neighbouring Parish Council.								Yes		As above.	No opinion on the proposal		
16	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke										Yes		Beechingstoke needs its own council	Disagree with the proposal		
17	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke			Yes	Patney	Patney is a similar village with similar facilities and issues. I believe it would be an equal partnership								Agree with the proposal		
18	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes	I feel it is important to retain the ability for the parish to be able to discuss any arising matters relating to the parish at a local level but at the same time there is currently no need to have the structure of a parish council.											Disagree with the proposal		None.

19	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke	Yes	Residents tend to have more interest in matters which affect the parish in which they live, because they know the parish and the people who live there.										Yes	Residents tend to have more interest in matters which affect the parish in which they live, because they know the parish and the people who live there. It is difficult for members of one parish to determine arrangements for another parish where they have no direct interest.	Disagree with the proposal		It is not clear what the benefit of transferring a small part of Beechingstoke parish into North Newton would achieve. It would have been helpful if this had been explained in the proposal, given only a small area is suggested. Why is it just this small area and not the entire parish? This does not make sense.
20	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke												Yes	I believe that it is important for Beechingstoke to retain its independence and community identity. The previous chair of the Parish Council moved out of the village (although still listed on the Wiltshire Gov website) and this is probably the reason why things have gone into a void. There is a strong community feeling in the village and many people are very keen to get involved in a Parish Council, in all its forms. Previously there was a reluctance to fully embrace the process but this is now not the case. I believe that we would be able to easily find willing, effective and community minded people to run an effective Parish Council. The introduction of a Parish Council would also allow us to incorporate a village website, and other community based initiatives.	Disagree with the proposal		
21	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke		Yes		Woodborough	The village is closely connected with Woodborough and if could not retain its own status this would be the village most appropriate to join with. The Churches are part of the same Cluster and share a Vicar. The village has regularly provided Governors for Woodborough Primary School and I am currently a Governor there. The Church in Beechingstoke is very small so if weddings need more space they are usually held at Woodborough Church..							Yes	The Village identity in Beechingstoke is very strong and, if it is possible, the existing arrangements should remain in place. For example, we have a very successful Village Fete every year that involves at 40- 50% of the village running stalls, providing donations etc. It and other village activities are always incredibly well attended. I have lived here for more than 20 years and I have not received any letters or other documents addressed to me as a resident of the village advising that we needed to do something about the lack of a parish council. At least 2 of the Councilors, including the Chair, who were in post have moved out of the village and that is presumably why the Council has lapsed. The Council should ensure that communications are sent to all the villagers and not just a notice stuck up somewhere that may well not be seen. The village is very spread out and I live almost 1 mile for the centre so a notice placed there will not come to my attention.	Disagree with the proposal		Following discussions with other village residents I believe there are sufficient people who would be prepared to stand as Parish Councilors to ensure that the village can have the representation required.
22	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke												Yes	Beechingstoke is an active community that merits having its own democratic parish council.	Disagree with the proposal		
23	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke												Yes	I believe that Beechingstoke should have the opportunity to self governance . I moved into the village some three years ago and I have been impressed with the enthusiasm and commitment of people in the village. I would be prepared to put myself forward to stand for election to the parish council.	Disagree with the proposal		

31	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	Beechingstoke is a thriving community of people who support the Parish very well indeed by organising village events throughout the year. The identity of Beechingstoke is well worth preserving because other local parishes actually support the events which are put non here in Beechingstoke such as Christmas carols & Party; Summer Fete; Harvest Festival and Party and many other smaller events throughout the year. Without such an identity, the village would be mere houses which would be tragic, and would remove the reason that my husband and I decided to retire here having had a home in the parish of Beechingstoke since 2007. We retired here I permanently in 2017, and regard it as home.	Disagree with the proposal		I hope that the Council will work with the residents of Beechingstoke to create a Parish Council for the good of the Community
32	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes	I believe this is in the best interests of this ancient ,close knit and friendly parish and it would lose its unique identity by joining another local parish.											No opinion on the proposal		
33	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes										Yes		Disagree with the proposal		
34	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	It is essential to maintaining the community spirit which exists in the parish that our identity as a separate parish is maintained. Many local get-togethers derive from being part of Beechingstoke. If the identity disappears, the local community spirit will soon die	Disagree with the proposal		
35	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	Beechingstoke is an active community and I believe that if it there was proper publicity there would be sufficient interested residents to form a parish council.	Disagree with the proposal		I have not received any communication in the 15 years I have lived here that we were without a parish council or that we could form one!
36	A resident of a neighbouring parish to Beechingstoke			Yes	North Newton	Beechingstoke is sparsely populated . Concerns of Woodborough/Beechingstoke and North Newton are common.								Agree with the proposal		
37	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	Beechingstoke has a wonderful community identity	Disagree with the proposal		
38	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	My reasoning for retaining our current status is because we have been trying to establish a parish council for some time however our previous councillors did not transfer it to people who live in the village and also we as residents were not notified of when the Beechingstoke Parish Council elections would have been due. We, as a small village, have the right to retain our identity without being absorbed into a larger village. There are now a number of people who actively want to be a part of the council, so a full cohort of councillors and whole village support is assured.	Disagree with the proposal		
39	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke	Yes	Historic reasons and keeping Beechingstoke's identity.	Yes	Woodborough	Woodborough School, Social club and Reading rooms where we vote. We have attended Woodborough planning meetings that would have effected us.								Disagree with the proposal		We have lived here for 20 years and feel part of the Beechingstoke community - church, fete etc.

40	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke			Yes	Marden							Yes	If we can elect enough parish councillors we'd prefer to maintain our Beechingstoke parish as it is. We feel we have a good village community.	Disagree with the proposal		
41	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	The demographics and population of Beechingstoke have changed in recent years with new and existing members of the village who now have a desire to take the opportunity to be part of developing the villages unique identify and seeing their ideas of community in the village developed and extended.	Disagree with the proposal		The parishioners of Beechingstoke need the opportunity to develop their parish with new input.
42	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	Those residing in Beechingstoke are more likley to be able to give sound input on the unique needs of the village. The covid pandemic has highlighted the importance of local knowledge and the importance of local community and descreet regional areas in identifying what is best for that area.	Disagree with the proposal		
43	A resident of the parish of Beechingstoke											Yes	To retain the community	Disagree with the proposal		

Proposal to create a new parish for Derry Hill and Studley	
Agree	63
Disagree	19
No opinion	1
Ammended Proposal	2
Total	85

Amended Proposals
New parish for Derry Hill and Studley, but with 2 wards based on current West and Pewsham Wards. Geographically, they cover approximately 50% each of the Parish, and Pewsham ward represents approximately 1/9th of the population. 1 councillor for Pewsham Ward, and 8 for West Ward would be sensible.
It seems ridiculous to leave pewsham ward (the few houses near old derry hill) still within calne without given how far they are then away from the other areas

Options for the remainder of Calne Without	
The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area
33	39

Compton Bassett PC Proposal	
Agree	14
Disagree	8
No opinion	4
Ammended Proposal	0
Total responses	26

Calne TC Proposals						
	Agree	Disagree	No opinion	Ammended Proposal	Blanks	Total
Proposal 1- Beaversbrook	29	5	5	0	1	40
Proposal 2 - Land off Low Lane	29	4	6	0	1	40
Proposal 3 - Cherhill View/Rookery Farm	25	8	6	0	1	40
Proposal 4 - 3 areas, see maps	21	9	9	0	1	40

Comment	Status	Proposal to create a new parish for Derry Hill and Studley Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Details of amended proposal	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Options for the remainder of Calne Without	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Proposal of Calne Without Areas allocated to other Parishes Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Details of amended proposal	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)
5	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal				That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Agree with the proposal		
6	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I feel that the Councillors in Derry hill will seek to impose their ideas on us, and we would not have much of a say.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	As above, Certain people are interested in pushing their agenda without consideration of other people			
9	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal							
12	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				

15	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		DH has sufficient population and a distinct identity; local residents surveyed and their parish council were in favour - it would only be democratic to support them in their desire for their own pc.		No preference			
21	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal		This creation would surely create more governance work, therefore cost the tax payer more and be less efficient	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	As stated in Q7			
23	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The current status quo works well	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	My area moving to, for example, compton basset will mean we are under represented, as the parish decision will likely focus on compton basset.			
25	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
27	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The current west ward failed to get enough councillors at the local elections there are too few people willing to take on the role of Councillor to make the change an improvement to the current situation. This would be a poor use of public funds when there is no real reason for change.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	However moving the whole of middle ward to Haddington is ridiculous the area north and west of mile elm has no connection with Haddington .	Disagree with the proposal		Sandy Lane and the area west and north of the A3102 have no connection with Haddington and would certainly not be well represented if moved.

29	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		As an example of the poor management of our area here is a fact. There has been a grant of money that the existing Council have not been able to decide what to do. Every time a nomination is made other areas vote again it b/c it won't assist their parish. Derry Hill and Studley need a stand alone Council to progress. Derry Hill and Studley is classed as a large village for planning purposes so should have its own Parish Council to reflect this	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	None of the villages in the remaining area to my knowledge have wanted to form their own Councils.		
30	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area		Agree with the proposal	
31	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The parish is very large with very different communities within it, Derry Hill and Studley are larger and have an obvious 'parish centre' East Wards/ West wards would not necessarily relate with Derry Hill being the centre of their community and this can become an issue during council debates.		Without Derry Hill and Studley it would be very difficult for the Calne Without to exist because of the lack of facilities, I feel there may be no option than to match the remaining areas with the parishes more closely related to them in both geography and identity.		Studley in particular is desperately in need of a parish council that actually cares about it's particular issues eg. road safety, preserving it's rural nature, preventing more unsuitable housing estates.
32	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Current area is too spread out	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Councillors and residents of the other areas have no interest in Studley or Derry Hill. Mostly just voting for any houses that have to be built to go up there rather than in the area they are from!	Agree with the proposal	More descriptive of how we actually live our lives and how we refer to the place we live.

33	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		More descriptive of how we actually live our lives and how we refer to the place we live.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	More descriptive of how we actually live our lives and how we refer to the place we live.	Agree with the proposal		
34	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		For effective and convenient governance	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	Not sure			
35	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Issues in Derry Hill/ Studley not determined by influences from outside who are not affected.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	To give better service to these areas.	Disagree with the proposal		Green should not go to Derry Hill.
36	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		It's logical. The council will be best able to represent the community this way.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	The communities would be best served by being a part of the geographically local and established council.	Agree with the proposal		Same reasons as before. It's logical and local established councils would best serve the neighbouring communities.

37	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Support an amended proposal (eg for the area of the new parish to include the current West and Pewsham Wards)	New parish for Derry Hill and Studley, but with 2 wards based on current West and Pewsham Wards. Geographically, they cover approximately 50% each of the Parish, and Pewsham ward represents approximately 1/9th of the population. 1 councillor for Pewsham Ward, and 8 for West Ward would be sensible.	New parish for Derry Hill and Studley, but with 2 wards based on current West and Pewsham Wards. Geographically, they cover approximately 50% each of the Parish, and Pewsham ward represents approximately 1/9th of the population. 1 councillor for Pewsham Ward, and 8 for West Ward would be sensible.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
38	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				

39	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		With an electoral roll of 1274 which makes up practically 45% of the Calne Without council it makes good and practical sense for Derry Hill and Studley to have its own stand alone council. My limited experience of council work is that under current arrangements far too much time and effort is wasted by councillors from Derry Hill discussing matters concerning wards to the East of Calne with which they have neither knowledge nor interest and vice versa councillors from the East wasting time on Derry Hill issues. It's inefficient and denies residents proper representation at the local level. Since the Calne Without Council was established there has been significant development in Derry Hill and Studley which now needs to be recognised in the creation of a new parish Council for Derry Hill and Studley.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Pure common sense supported by practicality and efficiency dictates the dissolvment of the now outdated Calne Without Parish Council. It will enable far clearer delineation if boundaries and thereby better representation for local residents.	Agree with the proposal		As stated above, it simplifies current arrangements which can only benefit local residents.
40	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Having lived in Derry Hill since 1971, I feel the interests of residents will be better served by having local control not subject to decisions made by councillors outside our area.		I consider that residents in the remainder of Calne Without should make their own decision.			
41	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		More local control		They should decide themselves.			

42	A resident of the parish of Bremhill	Agree with the proposal			That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	A good opportunity to even up the area, ie green to Bremhill parish	Agree with the proposal		It will remove anomaly along Studley lane following the old train track
43	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I think having a larger parish bring benefits of scale including financial. Derry Hill & Studley are still too small to be a parish plus I am concerned that Studley will be over dominated by the larger village of Derry Hill	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	If Calne without continues it leaves the opportunity for Derry Hill & Studley to rejoin if this proposal goes ahead and causes issues.			
44	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Disagree with the proposal		I believe that the current size of Calne Without Parish Council gives it enough scale to operate effectively and an economy of scale for it to operate efficiently. The Parish Council has been in existence since 1890 and has stood the test of time. Realistically, the Parish is based around the village of Derry Hill in West Ward; I would understand if people in Middle Ward preferred to join Heddington, or people in East Ward preferred to join Cherhill, but I don't support West Ward (with Pewsham Ward) driving a breakaway.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	I don't believe that the remainder of the parish would be viable as a standalone parish. There are no community facilities or village hall in the rest of the ward and no natural centre. I think that Sandy Lane ward should remain with Derry Hill and Studley. Sandy Lane has much in common with Derry Hill (links to Bowood and A342 transport corridor) and I believe that residents are more connected to Derry Hill than Heddington.	Support an amended proposal	I think that Sandy Lane ward should remain with Derry Hill and Studley. Sandy Lane has much in common with Derry Hill (links to Bowood and A342 transport corridor) and I believe that residents are more connected to Derry Hill than Heddington.	The proposals above (except with Sandy Lane remaining with Derry Hill) would be the most sensible way of dealing with the remainder of Calne Without, but my preference would be to keep the current Parish intact. The key issue for me is how the residents of the other wards feel. If the residents of East Ward and Middle Ward felt a greater sense of identification with Cherhill and Heddington, then I could understand why. I do object to the idea of the rest of Calne Without being left high and dry by the secession of West Ward with Pewsham.

46	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The council is more effective and efficient by working as a whole. It has the size to currently support 15 councillors who can pool resources to work on areas such as neighbourhood planning, climate change, strategic planning, engagement and participation, footpaths etc. Smaller councils do not have the resources to deliver benefits to the community in such a way. There are also economies of scale as can be seen by the low precept in Calne Without vs our neighbours	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	I do not think that a new parish for Derry Hill should be approved but if it is I do not believe that Calne Without has the scale to deliver the required services to the community.	Agree with the proposal		This is the best worst option.
47	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The current CWPC is not fit for purpose. Only one ward (Pewsham) had the opportunity to vote for the councillor of their choice. The rest of the parish were not given a choice of who to elect, so the majority of CWPC are unelected. I find this sorry state of affairs extremely unhealthy and some may look upon it as joining a gentleman's club if your face fits. I would now like to see CWPC disbanded as soon as possible as they are no longer effective at governance or interested in the parishioners.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	None of the councillors apart from Pewsham ward have been elected by the parishioners. CWPC has NOT earned or deserves my respect.	Agree with the proposal		It is obvious that the current chairman of CWPC would like Derry Hill to have its own council, and the planned boundary changes make logical sense. The current CWPC is not looking after the parishioners and has become a club. The communities would be better served by the boundary changes and merging with current councils.
48	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal		Effective and efficient governance	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Effective and efficient governance	Agree with the proposal		Effective and efficient governance

49	A business or commercial concern in the area potentially affected	Agree with the proposal		To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question	Agree with the proposal		To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question
50	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Significant changes in community shape and size; particularly in the last 40 year, something not reflected in the size and shape of the Parish. Derry Hill and Studley have grown in that time resulting in an ever-increasing distinct identity with clear boundaries and little in common with many parts of the wider Calne Without Parish. Creation of a separate Parish would The general rule is that a 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 providing effective and convenient governance. The community has indicated support for such a change through a petition in 2019.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	When considered alongside the Calne Town Council proposals to absorb areas of the Parish, it would make sense for the balance of Calne Without to be absorbed by adjacent Parishes with which they already have a longstanding connection, for example Stockley with Heddington, Calston and Compton with Cherhill. This would provide Parishes that continue to reflect community identity and interest, and which are of a size that are viable as administrative units of local government.	Agree with the proposal		I would place the green boundary with Bremhill. My reasons are set out clearly in my responses to questions 7 and 8. The proposals would provide Parishes that continue to reflect community identity and interest, and which are of a size that are viable as administrative units of local government.
51	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		Democracy works better when more people are empowered to take part and power is not concentrated in the hands of few with very narrow interests. It is important that we embrace society at large rather than seeking to isolate ourselves.		I am vehemently opposed to the creation of a little new parish and therefore cannot support either option in Q8			

53	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The existing arrangement is working fine.				
54	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The existing parish of Calne Without works fine as it is; governance is effective and convenient and there is a healthy budget.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	CW is stronger together - if we are dissolved and transferred to other neighbouring parishes our interests will not be properly looked after. It is in the community's best interest to continue as a cohesive whole, with effective governance continuing. I don't think the lack of village hall is a particular problem; there are local venues which could serve that role.		
55	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The new parish would enable a more focused and effective governance	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	The term Calne without is vague and lacks identity.	Agree with the proposal	Clear and non confusing identification of parish areas and governance

56	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Broads Green is a small rural hamlet directly adjacent to Heddington Parish. For the 20 plus years we have lived in Broads Green, we have always felt that we should be part of Heddington Parish. The activities in the rural areas close to & around us are generally associated with the areas of 'Heddington, Broads Green & Stockley'. A parish covering these areas would be a much more natural 'fit', than the current 'Calne Without' doughnut-shaped Parish	Agree with the proposal		Broads Green is a small rural hamlet directly adjacent to Heddington Parish. For the 20 plus years we have lived in Broads Green, we have always felt that we should be part of Heddington Parish. The activities in the rural areas close to & around us are generally associated with the areas of 'Heddington, Broads Green & Stockley'. A parish covering these areas would be a much more natural 'fit', than the current 'Calne Without' doughnut-shaped Parish
57	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Disagree with the proposal		Calne Without is a stronger, richer parish united and can make more of a difference for the communities it serves if it stays together. It is now a new, effective PC.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Derry Hill & Studley are the heart of CW, without them it would be difficult to develop a strong identity and convenient governance. E.g. Where would PC meetings be held?	Agree with the proposal		As response in Q9
58	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		CW is currently an effective PC, it seems a waste of time and money to split it up. It is better together.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	There would be little point in continuing as CWPC as there would be no where to meet and conduct effective and convenient governance.	Agree with the proposal		As response in Q9

60	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The existing parish is a nonsense. Derry Hill and Studley has very little connection with the other parts of the existing parish. A new parish as outlined for Derry Hill and Studley, including the Pewsham ward would make a lot of sense as the residents there are connected by church, school, village shop and village hall.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	The wards other than West and Pewsham wards have always looked to other parishes nearest them be it Heddington, Cherhill, Bremhill or Compton Bassett.	Agree		Derry Hill and Studley is a cohesive settlement focused on school, church, pub, hall and shop. It is large enough to survive as a cohesive unit and compact enough to administer easily.
61	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill / Studley is large enough to have its own parish and has little in common with the rest of the existing parish, either geographically or socially.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	The current set up is cumbersome and really doesn't reflect what is needed now that Derry Hill and Studley have grown. Derry Hill and Studley have their own pub, shop, hall, church and school.	Agree		The remaining parts look to the other parishes anyway for things like school, social occasions and pubs.
66	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
70	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
71	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The current parish is far too big and geographically spread out in a disjointed way. This proposal is more likely to encourage engagement with the parish council from the community.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	It makes more sense for these parish areas to be aligned directly with their local area.	Agree with the proposal		

72	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		We are a community divorced from and very different from Calne. I believe we should have a local council which is aware of and represents local issues.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Local governance for local communities	Agree with the proposal		
73	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		There is no uniformity of community in the current arrangement and in some cases the interests of the area on the other side of Calne conflict with those of Derry Hill and its environs		I am unable to comment since I have no experience of the preferences of the community.			
74	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studley have increased in size such that it is now obvious that it should be a separate parish council. Having councillors who do not know the area (e.g. Compton Bassett representatives) voting on issues that just affect Derry Hill and Studley is ridiculous.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Most of the remainder of Calne Without would seem to be affiliated to their neighbouring villages and not to villages that are on the opposite side of Calne	Agree with the proposal		The new proposal is much more sensible, the new parishes are all distinct areas with the villages now linked to their neighbours.
75	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
76	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				

77	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Enable focus on local issues with appropriate representation	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Enable focus on local issues with appropriate representation	Agree with the proposal		The aim should be to bring local control of local issues, and to let those who are directly affected by issues be responsible and accountable for addressing them.
78	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		It gives Derry Hill better representation over issues that directly affect the village	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Closer integration with local communities	Agree with the proposal		See previous comments
79	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The numbers of people now residing within the Derry Hill and Studley parish are significant now to be separate given prior developments of housing. This would allow the remaining parishes to also have a fair representation.			
80	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Seems logical to govern local area only.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Again, to let local people control their respective area	Agree with the proposal		
81	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Calne without parish is too large a ward. Local decisions need to be made by local parish councillors. The current Calne without parish has no idea (or interest) in the local Derry Hill issues or needs.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	Need to reduce the size of the current Calne without parish. No need to dissolve the other parts.			

82	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		A village the size of Derry Hill and Studley should have its own Parish Council	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	These rural areas would have improved identity if they were attached to the proposed areas.	Agree with the proposal		Improved community identity
83	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The old model is outdated and provides opportunity for those living outside Derry Hill and Studley to directly influence activity that impacts the community. The new proposal would provide greater empowerment to the Derry Hill and Studley community which is growing in size and diversity	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	To be honest I'm not really fussed about other areas but if they have willing people ready to take on the local governance then I'm all for giving them the empowerment	Agree with the proposal		As per previous
84	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		It would make more sense to create the new ward at Derry Hill and Studley to ensure that local issues were actually being dealt with at a local level.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	It makes more sense to run the parishes at a more local level.	Agree with the proposal		I can't find anything to disagree with because this makes the most sense
85	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				

86	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Support an amended proposal (eg for the area of the new parish to include the current West and Pewsham Wards)	It seems ridiculous to leave pewsham ward (the few houses near old derry hill) still within calne without given how far they are then away from the other areas	Agreement if pewsham ward can form part of the new parish	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	If this is what the residents of those remaining areas want.			
87		Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
88	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Better local representation and decision-making to benefit local community interests	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	Better local representation and decision-making			
89	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area		Agree with the proposal		

91	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		As an ex PC with Calne without, I was one who opposed the original suggestion. No consideration was given to our colleagues in the surrounding rural area within the Parish. We had worked as areas supporting the views of the representative councillors from their area within the Parish and I see no reason to change. The ballot put to Derry Hill was bound to be a yes as electors were not given any options apart from being brow beaten. I know of several who said yes purely to get rid of a canvasser who overstayed their welcome.. Derry Hill does not need a separate council which would be more costly and increase the presently low precept. I would only accept the formation of a new parish if that is what the wards within, apart from Derry Hill ,		I do not support either option. Retention of Calne Without only unless the remainder wish to tr@nsfer to another parish.			
93	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studley is a large and populus area with needs which are different to those of many of the smaller villages. There is also a sense of community within this ward - as there are in the other newly proposed wards - which I think would benefit from its own governance	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	I think the small outlying villages of Calne without have specific needs which need to be represented and not swallowed up into other parishes.			
94	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Define the community	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	This should be decided by those in the areas affected	Agree with the proposal		Makes sense for local areas to deal with local matters

95	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Community interest - would prefer to be represented by people with more affiliation to our specific area.				
96	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The Pewsham & West wards cover the community of Derry Hill and Studley which is now larger than many parishes and has no connections with the rest of Calne Without which is miles away on the other side of Calne. Derry Hill and Studley should have been made a separate parish years ago. Having its own parish will engender even greater community spirit and improved governance.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Combining the various areas of the remaining part of Calne Without looks very logical as it reunites communities that have for too long been arbitrarily divided by bizarre parish boundaries. The neighbouring parishes and communities transferred would all benefit by becoming more cohesive communities with better governance arrangements where the whole community can participate in local decisions. If this was not acceptable the remaining part of Calne Without, minus Derry Hill and Studley could easily continue as a separate parish but it would not gain the mutual benefits of the proposal for joining with other parishes.	Agree with the proposal	As in Q9 the map of proposed areas to be transferred appears very logical. The residents of the houses in the green area between Black dog hill and Calne should be asked if they wish to be part of Bremhill or Derry Hill & Studley parishes. Most of the green area relates well to Bremhill particularly Ratford which is currently split between two parishes.
97	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The residents of Derry Hill and Studley should have a parish council, with members from within the area, who live in the heart of the community making decisions.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council			
98	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Would better represent the needs of our villages and community interest.				

99	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Agree with the proposal				The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council			
100	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		It will mean that councillors elected by the residents will determine the destiny of the new parish whereas with the current large parish council decisions pertaining to Derry Hill and Studley can be effectively decided by councillors from outside the area. Better, more appropriate governance		That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	It would appear the most expedient solution of good governance Better, more appropriate governance	Agree with the proposal	It would appear the most expedient solution of good governance Better, more appropriate governance
101	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	No opinion on the proposal		If Calne Without is broken up then the parts of it adjoining Bremhill Parish should be incorporated into Bremhill Parish. Bremhill is a rural parish and deals with the same issues as the rural parts of Calne Without.		That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Incorporating the rural parts adjoining Bremhill would fit well with the community interest and governance arrangements of Bremhill Parish. I have sent a detailed Bremhill Parish response to CGR@wiltshire.gov.uk uk	Disagree with the proposal	The green area should go to Bremhill for the reasons outlined in earlier questions. That slice of land has more in common with Bremhill than Derry Hill in terms of community interest. It is essentially a rural area with scattered farms and the predominant occupation farming as is the case with Bremhill Parish..

102	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal		To give Derry Hill And Studley a meaningful identity.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	More effective community governance.	Agree with the proposal		Once again more effective community governance.
103	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal			The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				
104	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The areas outside Derry hill and Studley act in their own interests which, at times, means they vote to deflect attention away from their area and on to Studley and Derry hill to those villages detriment. Derry Hill and Studley are large enough to stand on their own.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The villages outside of Studley and Derry Hill are large enough to stand on their own			
105	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		As Derry Hill and Studley is now growing larger, we need to be a thriving village with a vibrant community. We therefore need to have our own Council and Councillors. There is planning permission already granted for a lot more properties to be built we need to have more to offer.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	With all the new builds within the Calne Without Parish, the smaller Parishes will not be able to support themselves and the villages will just disappear.	Agree with the proposal		For the reasons above
106	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studley need their own identity	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The areas should have their own identity and voices			

107	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		Derry Hill outnumbers the residents of Studley and as such may support things that could be detrimental to Studley residents. I think that having representation from other villages (as per existing arrangement) may give a fairer view.	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	As per above	Disagree with the proposal		
108	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I think it is an unnecessary change with little benefit. Calne without represents the smaller villages on the environs of Calne which have similar concerns.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The villages around Calne identify with the town rather than for example Pewsham which is more aligned to Chippenham.			
109	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studely are clearly a community and for its size feels very under-represented at the parish level. Decisions about the village are made by those who live in very different parts of Calne Without and there is a feeling that many decisions are not made in the interests of Derry Hill and Studley. It is clearly time for a settlement that has expanded a great deal recently to have better representation.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The villages in the wider parish should continue as a voice for those outside Calne, but not part of Calne. To dissolve the parish would weaken those villages voices in planning and community decisions.			
110	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		Pointless with too many Councillors achieving nothing but costing residents extra money/tax	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	What has been achieved within these Wards would be wasted and absorbed within other parishes both financially and economically.			

111	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		our villages over the past 40 or so years, Derry Hill and Studley has become a large and distinct community that for many years has needed its own parish council. It's more than big enough to be a viable parish council and would be the biggest parish in our area. Parish Councils are meant to be based on local communities with a recognisable identity - that cannot be said of the current parish of Calne Without, which is far too big! It wraps around Calne and stretches from Pewsham to the Cherhill monument. If someone proposed setting up a parish like this today the idea would be ridiculed. Derry Hill & Studley, in which I include Old Derry Hill & Pewsham, is a cohesive community with a strong identity and numerous community groups but has little or no connections with the rest of the parish. Calstone, Stockley and Lower Compton are some miles away and all physically divided from us by Calne itself and the Bowood Estate. There is huge local	That the parish of Calne Without should be dissolved and areas transferred to other parishes in the area	Last year Wiltshire Council felt that the remainder of parish, which currently represents slightly more than half of the council could not remain as a viable parish without the West and Pewsham wards. I disagreed with that conclusion but I do believe there is a much better solution whereby the remaining parts of the council could successfully combine with their neighbouring parishes were they already form important parts of those communities. Whilst no one would deny that the remaining part of Calne Without has very few facilities, that is because these settlements are all integral parts of other communities just across the parish boundary in adjoining parishes. People from Stockley, Calston and Lower Compton do not use the facilities in Derry Hill and Studley. Stockley residents use the school, pub, village hall and church in Heddington which is only a mile away. They join with Heddington for their Steam Rally, and the Heddington and Stockley firework display. Similarly, resid	Agree with the proposal		Whilst I think the residual area of Calne Without could easily continue as a perfectly viable parish council there would be great mutual benefits if the various communities were to be combined with their neighbouring parishes as shown on the coloured plan.
112	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The current community is strong. Narrowing the focus to Derry Hill and Studley would weaken the community by cutting ties. The rural community around Calne is stronger together. A broad community provides the diversity necessary to counteract strong vested interests within Derry Hill and Studley. A broad rural community is better for democracy.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	The current broad rural community is stronger and more democratic than a narrow-focused village council.			
113	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studley are classed together as a large village. We need our own group of Councillors to decide how to spend our Parish precept, not Councillors from areas who wouldn't know of the issues concerning local residents.	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council	I don't feel that destroying the existing Council simply b/c D.H. & Studley need their own representation makes sense. If they want to change it's not up to me to decide it's up to them.			

115	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		A more local representation					
116	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Derry Hill and Studley is now large enough to stand on it's own without councillors from other wards making decisions for it.		Surely it is up to those outside of Derry Hill and Studley to make their own decision as to whether they stay in Calne Without or it is dissolved.			
117	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		We need to be responsible for our own area, in such matters as road safety and cleanliness. Try a circular walk from the Black Dog via Norley Lane and see if you agree!	The remainder of Calne Without to continue under Calne Without Parish Council				

Comment	Status	Compton Bassett PC Proposal Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Details of amended proposal	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)
3	A resident of the parish of Compton Bassett	Agree with the proposal		We are a rural community and should stay as such
4	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal		The new boundary between Compton Bassett and Calne Town should not allow for any strips to remain with Calne Without.
9	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal		
10	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		The nature reserve and rural hamlet of High Penn are well served by Calne Without. The rural community and surrounding countryside has it's own identity which goes back hundreds of years. Governance under Compton Bassett will dilute the heritage of the area.
12	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		
16	A resident of the parish of Cherhill	Agree with the proposal		
17	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		
20	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		
21	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal		The community of these parishes use the facilities in Calne Town so therefore surely it would make sense to transfer the area to the Town rather than a village parish
22	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Disagree with the proposal		Hilmarton Parish Council would welcome the small extension to our boundary, namely High Penn, which would include a wildlife reserve and connect our present boundary with the beversbrook boundary to the east.
23	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I believe my area will be under represented, and decisions will most likely focus on what is best for Compton Bassett as it has the larger population
24	A resident of the parish of Hilmarton	No opinion on the proposal		
25	A resident of Calne Town	No opinion on the proposal		
28	A resident of the parish of Hilmarton	No opinion on the proposal		I cannot make a valid judgment without knowing the reasons behind these proposals. More information would be very useful.

31	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		This area seems more logical to be with compton bassett than with CWPC.
36	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	No opinion on the proposal		
46	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		The best worst option
47	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		This proposal makes logical sence. The communities affected by this proposal will be better served.
48	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal		Effective and efficient governance
49	A business or commercial concern in the area potentially affected	Agree with the proposal		To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question
52	A resident of the parish of Cherhill	Agree with the proposal		
54	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I live in this area and would prefer to remain part of Calne Without. High Penn is a small settlement and would be likely to be overlooked by Compton Bassett PC.
59	A resident of the parish of Cherhill	Agree		I agree in principal as it makes the boundaries neater - but would want to know what affect it will have practically in the local parish councils etc.
66	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		
82	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Improved community identity
111	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		I do not see any compelling reason to make this change. In the past it has been beneficial for the 3 parish councils covering the Hills waste sites to consider planning applications and operational changes and identify impacts on their residents and whist working together making individual comments. This may not work as well if the waste site were to be within a singe small parish council.

Comment	Status	Calne TC Proposal 1 Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Calne TC Proposal 2 Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Calne TC Proposal 3 Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)	Calne TC Proposal 4 Agree/Disagree/No Opinion/Amend	Reasons (community interest and identity, or effective and convenient governance)
1	A resident of the parish of Bremhill	Agree with the proposal	CANT COMMENT BECAUSE OF THE TERRIBLE SHOT.	No opinion on the proposal	NONE	No opinion on the proposal	NONE	No opinion on the proposals	NONE
2	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
4	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal	The land in question contains few if any residents and houses services and facilities provided by the town council and is only accessible from within the town boundary.	Agree with the proposal	The guidance states that new development should be considered for incorporation of expanding settlements.	Agree with the proposal	The guidance states that new development should be considered for incorporation of expanding settlements.	Agree with the proposal	
7	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
8	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
9	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	

11	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	Since Beaversbrook is under the town council's responsibility it makes sense to make it part of its jurisdiction.	Agree with the proposal	Would allow for proper incorporation of the development.	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposals	
12	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
13	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
14	A resident of Calne Town	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposals	
15	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	As the town grows it makes sense to incorporate areas that have been developed on it's boundaries. They become de facto part of Calne Town and	Agree with the proposal	As above.	Agree with the proposal	As above	Agree with the proposal	In all these cases as Calne expands - and the expansion is led by Gvt /WC demand for housing growth, it is right that the new residents, who identify with Calne town (and not with any particular village) are formally incorporated into the town.
17	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	Because the new houses on bottom of lane is in calne and so is Tesco's. yet we class calne without,	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposals	
18	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	This area is controlled by Calne Council so needs to be within our boundaries.	Agree with the proposal	New housing that uses Calne facilities needs to be paying Calne rates.	Agree with the proposal	Same reason as above.	Agree with the proposal	Same reason as above.

19	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	Both community interest and convenient and effective governance	Agree with the proposal	The development is an extension of the town, and residents will look to the town for services and governance	Agree with the proposal	Again, this is an extension to the town where residents will naturally look towards the town for services and governance	Agree with the proposal	as with all other proposals
21	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	The residents within this area use the facilities of the Town	Agree with the proposal	If future development were to happen here the residents would use the Towns facilities	Agree with the proposal	The residents within this area already use the facilities of the Town	Agree with the proposal	The residents within this area already use the facilities of the Town as will future residents
24	A resident of the parish of Hilmarton	Agree with the proposal	Positive for community interest and seems sensible	Agree with the proposal	Provides synergy	Disagree with the proposal	Don't see the point of the change	No opinion on the proposals	
25	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal	
26	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		Agree with the proposal	We have an allotment in Cherhill View; we use the amenities in Calne and we find it very inconvenient to vote at Derry Hill (a car journey), when if we were part of Calne Town Council, we could probably vote at the school - a short walk away The residents of Cherhill View use the amenities of Calne. The current arrangement means our polling station is at Studley Cross which is very inconvenient. It makes sense for the estate to become part of Calne	No opinion on the proposal	
31	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		Agree with the proposal	that development has no identity to Calne without	No opinion on the proposals	

36	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	It's logical that this is part of Calne.	Agree with the proposal	It's logical. The developments are part of Calne.	Agree with the proposal	It's logical. The developments are part of Calne.	No opinion on the proposals	
44	A representative of a parish council affected by any proposal, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Agree with the proposal	The Town Council holds the lease on the site and operates it as a sports facility. The proposed change makes sense.	Agree with the proposal	The proposal essentially redraws the boundary of Calne Town Council around overspill from the town and therefore makes sense.	Agree with the proposal	The proposal essentially redraws the boundary of Calne Town Council around overspill from the town and therefore makes sense.	Disagree with the proposals	The land is open countryside and therefore has a better fit with the rural nature of Calne Without Parish Council. The proposals appear to be purely speculative.
45	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	As identified Sports facility is as being under the Town Council remit.	Agree with the proposal	These areas are an extension of Colemans Farm Estate which is already part of Calne Town.	No opinion on the proposal		Agree with the proposals	This brings these area with the associated facilities located within them under Calne Town Council.
46	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposals	
47	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	The proposal makes logical sense. The communities affected will be better served by the change.	Agree with the proposal	The proposal makes logical sense. The communities affected by the boundary changes will be better served.	Agree with the proposal	The proposal makes logical sense. The parishioners will be better served by the boundary changes.	Agree with the proposals	The proposal makes logical sense. The parishioners will be better served by the boundary changes.
48	An interested party not necessarily from any of the parishes affected	Agree with the proposal	Effective and efficient governance	Agree with the proposal	Effective and efficient governance	Agree with the proposal	Effective and efficient governance	Agree with the proposals	Effective and efficient governance

49	A business or commercial concern in the area potentially affected	Agree with the proposal	To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question	Agree with the proposal	To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question	Agree with the proposal	To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question	Agree with the proposals	To allow better and more effective governance of the areas in question
52	A resident of the parish of Cherhill	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal			
62	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without							Disagree with the proposals	
63	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	Its an area of land used, maintained and for the residents of Calne.	Agree with the proposal	Enables a restriction of housing if need be in the future by the Town council.	Disagree with the proposal	Cherhill view allotments (I agree with this part only). I disagree that the Cherhill View estate should come under Calne Town Council. This is a Privately funded estate, with a very active Housing Management Company (Cherhill View Estate Management) which is funded by the residents of the estate. The Park, Orchards, Bat House, Ponds are all funded and managed by this. Unless the Town council state that they are going to be responsible for the Maintenance of this estate, which has Acres of open grassland, trees, hedgerows, fencing, paths etc, then i disagree that until this has been resolved, and the residents are informed that the current (Very expensive) Service charges are to be made extinct, then it's a no. Most people on the estate use Blacklands for Sports, as the access to the Calne Sports centre/Beversbrook is unacceptable. Most shop in Devizes, as it's quicker and easier to get to, rather than fight through the centre of Calne to find a parking space near a supermarket.	Disagree with the proposals	I agree with 1 and 3. I disagree with 2. No 2, is infill land between Cherhill View and Stoke Meadow. Yes, a path should have been built with the Development of the Cherhill View estate, with Section 106 funds, however a change in boundary is NOT required, there is already room for this to be completed within the existing boundary. I presume this is being proposed as the land owner (Bowood) are hoping to sell this land for more housing, that, is the only advantage of this happening.

64	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal	This will ensure higher council tax for no benefit	No opinion on the proposals	
65	A resident of Calne Town	Disagree with the proposal	Infrastructure cannot absorb many more vehicles pressure on doctors , schools ans general services all poor in Calne at present	Disagree with the proposal	For same reasons above	Disagree with the proposal	Same as above	Disagree with the proposals	Same as above infrastructure unable to cope town is gridlocked already , pressure on schools , dentist , doctors and services
66	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposals	
67	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	No opinion on the proposal		No opinion on the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposals	
68	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposals	
69	A resident of Sandy Lane, Middle or East wards within the parish of Calne Without	No opinion on the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposal		Disagree with the proposals	
82	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	Effective and convenient governance.	Agree with the proposal	Effective and convenient governance.	Agree with the proposal	Effective and convenient governance	Agree with the proposals	Effective and convenient governance

90	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal	To become part of the community in whole	Agree with the proposal	Makes sense	Agree with the proposal	To become part of the community in name	Agree with the proposals	Makes sense
92	A resident of Calne Town	Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposal		Agree with the proposals	
96	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Agree with the proposal	This is open countryside and should remain part of a rural parish not an urban town council	Agree with the proposal	This housing area is clearly part of Calne	Agree with the proposal	This housing estate is clearly part of Calne and should have been incorporated into the town long ago	Disagree with the proposals	I can see no reason why these wholly rural areas should be part of the Town Council - they should remain part of rural parishes.
111	A resident of West or Pewsham wards within the parish of Calne Without	Disagree with the proposal	There is no reason why the boundary should be changed to include land leased to CTC for the sports ground and allotments. The area identified goes well beyond the sports ground and allotments and if rural countryside and therefore should remain within a rural parish Council not an urban town councils.	Agree with the proposal	I strongly support the incorporation of these areas of housing estates into CTC's boundaries, they can only be accessed from within Calne	Agree with the proposal	I strongly support the incorporation of the Cherhill View housing estate into Calne's boundaries again the only access is from within Calne and would be consistent with previous decisions to incorporate the adjoining housing at The Knowle. The change is long overdue as residents of the new housing use the facilities in Calne not Calne Without.	Disagree with the proposals	Calne Town Council give no logical reason why these areas of land should be part of Calne. As there is no planning permission or planned development in any of these areas they should certainly remain part of the rural parishes surrounding Calne.

Any other comments or alternative suggestions

Re Derry Hill & Studley: when the local residents clearly desire this change it would be wrong for others on Calne Without to block it.

I think Calne needs alot more for young people where they can go and feel safe from ones doing drugs.

CIL payments made to the parishes affected by these changes which remains unspent, should also be transferred to Calne TC, but the parishes consulted on how it should be spent

Extending the Hilmarton boundary will also form a buffer for any future development in Calne.

This change is unnecessary and is driven by a promise to stop development which is not possible.

Maps on their own with no explanation as to the reasoning behind the proposed changes and the possible consequences thereof, provide insufficient information upon which to base a valid judgement regarding agreement or disagreement.

I heard that someone stated at a meeting that if DH & Studley had their own Council, she wouldn't be able to worship at DH & Studley. That's the level of naivety that appears prevalent in small communities !

The consultation and this questionnaire is very difficult to understand. The language used and the way it is laid out is too complicated.

Imperative that the needs of Derry Hill/Studley are not frustrated again.

I sincerely hope these changes can at last be made. There is no doubt that they will lead ti much improved representation at the local level.

We need to take the opportunity to ensure parish councillors do not serve beyond 70 years of age and 20 year max service. PS I am over 70. Need to ensure that chairs of parish councils are appropriately trained for the role.

Please just leave the parish as it is

If the proposal for a new parish of Derry Hill and Studley were to go ahead, I would like to see some sort of warded structure retained. I like the concept of councillors having a direct relationship and responsibility for a specific part of the parish, and a ward structure ensures that no part of the parish is left behind.

The proposed changes will benefit all of the parishioners.

Only that the boxes are not particularly user friendly in attempting to construct answers.

This whole drive for a new little parish has been initiated and driven by one individual for his own personal reasons. This is not how local democracy should work.

The quality fo the maps is very poor and needs to be improved before the next phase of the public consultation - if people can't see where their house is, how can they comment on the proposals?

The sooner this happens the better!

I would like Wiltshire Council to get on with this reorganisation which is long overdue.

Why would we want to become part of the town council and pay more tax when I'm not going to receive any increase or better services. I pay a hefty service charge for the estate that the council are not going to pick either the maintenance or my bill. Unless you intend on maintaining the estate and paying the legal fees to rrmive my service charge then please leave the boundaries alone.

The infrastructure is totally unable to cope with more housing , Calne is gridlocked already ... we have to drive through town to a supermarket no shops one side of town which is crazy so many houses here and one has to drive through the centre of town to do grocery shopping adding to the huge volume of traffic already . Services in town are very limited no decent restaurants, pubs or cafes , town centre needs a massive upgrade !

The Cherhill view site should have been done at the last review. Very unfair that other residents near this area that are further from Calne town were moved from Calne without but unable to vote for Calne town councillors for several years even though the steeply increased council tax was being paid to Calne town council throughout this period.

The villages of Derry Hill and Studley overwhelmingly voted for Derry Hill and Studley becoming a separate new parish some time ago, please can this finally be achieved.

This change is long overdue.

The proposed changes are long overdue.

No thank you. Calne Without has worked well together since formation in the late 1800s. I see no benefit in destroying what worked well before some new councillors went on an ego trip.

The maps are very poor and difficult to understand.

Derry Hill and surrounding villages need to keep their character and scenery not to merge them

The boundaries based on the Pewsham and West Wards as proposed by the petition are a good representation of the Derry Hill & Studley community. However the boundaries of the Pewsham and West wards have been changed since the new parish was proposed. There is an good argument for including all the property close to the A4 between Studley and the Calne boundary in a Derry Hill and Studley parish. I believe that whilst most of the 'Green area' shown on the plan has closer links to Bremhill PC, the

Only that a door to door survey has been taken and that result should be binding. The residents of areas outside our Parish should not be able to overcome the Democratic will of the Parishioners.

This page is intentionally left blank

Charlton and Wilsford Survey - formally become a joint parish council

Comment	Status	Agree/Disagree/Amend	Reasons	Other comments
1	Resident	Agree	Convenience.	
2	Interested Party	Agree		
3	Resident	Agree	Historical continuity	
4	Resident	Agree	I believed this was already in place, and tghat we were already officially joined. The joint parish council of which I am a member works very well from my point of view so good to see it officially organised.	
5	Resident	Agree	It seems very odd that I have lived here for nearly 22 years and the Parish Council has always been 'joint', so there has been an oversight somewhere!	Number of Councillors could be reduced as seven for two small villages appears to be unnecessary given the minimal issues the PC needs to consider
6	Resident	Agree		
7	Resident	Agree	Wilsford and Charlton St Peter have little in the way of a natural bond or relationship, yet the single Parish Council has served the two communities well.	
8	Resident	Agree	It has always been a joint parish council since we have lived in Charlton St Peter.	No

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

Beechingstoke


Comment	Status	Written Statement
1	Resident of Beechingstoke	<p>To Whom it may concern</p> <p>I am filling out the survey regarding the above as a resident of Beechingstoke.</p> <p>Question 5. B1, B2, B3. Now the community has had brought to their attention there is no Parish Council, option B4 should be form a parish council. This would be my preferred choice and speaking to others theirs too.</p> <p>I shall put my opinion In Q. 15 but I am also sending it to you in writing as I feel it is very important.</p> <p>Regards</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Comment	Status	Written Statement
1	Resident	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I have received a note from the St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council regarding the proposed boundary changes. I understand that the Wiltshire Council will soon consider these proposals and propose alternative ideas.</p> <p>I wish to take this opportunity to forward my observations for consideration during this consultation period and strongly oppose any change in the current arrangements. I would support the Parish Council in their continued activities and modus operandi. The current arrangements for one Councillor to represent the whole parish is a tried and tested method which has served us well and will continue to do so. There can be no benefit in changing a practical and fully functioning system and I wish you to record my support to retain the existing system.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
2	Chair, Brokenborough Parish Council	<p>Dear Martin</p> <p>Community Governance Review 2021-2022</p> <p>Councillors Kim Power and Gavin Grant drew my attention to this review. They explained their approach to the matter and pointed out where it might impinge on Brokenborough Parish. I was also invited to consider having our parish become a ward of Malmesbury. As you are aware the main changes suggested would transfer quite large areas of St Paul Without into the care of Malmesbury Town Council. I found their historical arguments unconvincing and I am sure that places such as Milbourne would resist the change, as they would become subsumed into the town organisation and lose their particular identity. Roger Budgen and his team at St Paul Without are very attentive to the wishes of their parish, which would carry far less weight as part of any Malmesbury action list. Clearly the same arguments would apply if Brokenborough became part of Malmesbury. Our village is sensitive to its special character and we always have good turnouts and lively discussion when significant topics arise. As an example, recently there were meetings at Malmesbury Town Hall and Brokenborough Church to publicize the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Public attendance was much higher at Brokenborough!</p> <p>In terms of planning for the future I believe that keeping the Malmesbury Town boundary tight will help discourage over population caused by simply absorbing field after field within an enlarged perimeter.</p> <p>In summary I am against these unnecessary and unwelcome changes.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

<p>3</p>	<p>Chair of St Paul Malmesbury Without PC</p>	<p>I hope you had a happy and healthy Christmas.</p> <p>Please find attached a letter from Cllr Bob Tallon, Chair of Brokenborough Parish Council to our Wiltshire Councillor Martin Smith. Cllr Tallon has given me permission to forward it to you as the views expressed mirror many of those from the various settlements within the StPMW parish. I wondered whether the document might be of interest to members of the committee.</p> <p>During the public session earlier in the month, several statements made by MTC councillors were factually incorrect, however I suspect the committee would not find it useful at this point if I provided a brief statement to add balance to these comments; please let me know. At that session the Chairman asked a question about area 1 (north of the B4014 Filands), which I believe was not answered, again if it is useful, this area is overwhelmingly rural (open countryside) with only about 12 properties to the north of the boundary line separating the two parishes.</p> <p>I hope you find the foregoing and the attachment helpful,</p> <p>Happy New Year,</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Milbourne resident</p>	<p>I took part in the Teams on line meeting on this CGR issue before Christmas, during which it was announced that all concerned parties had been informed (theoretically, I gather, at the end of September or October 2021) by County that the review was active, with the deadline for comments of the end of the year. (The requirements for consultation are, I gather: The Council is required to consult the local government electors for the area under review and any other person or body who appears to have an interest in the review.... I cannot see how it can be denied that all householders affected by changes proposed in the review should be informed of the review? They certainly have an interest.)</p> <p>We - as Milbourne residents - received no such information and would have been totally unaware of the review with its critical implications for the St Paul Malmesbury Without parish status had some word not been passed on by Parish Councillors. Anecdotally, no one else in Milbourne we have spoken to had received a letter or email.</p> <p>If this is the case, with many / most / all the affected population unaware of the review, it makes a nonsense of any claim that this is in any way a democratic process. It must be down to County to ensure that such a review is democratically informed. If County has failed to inform all the interested</p>

		<p>households, it should declare the current timetable void and plan afresh.</p> <p>Will you please confirm that County is exploring this apparent consultation failure, that it will explain why letters were not received by St Paul Without parishioners, and what it now intends to do to rectify the situation that appears to have arisen.</p> <p>I would, naturally, expect confirmation of receipt of this email, and, in time, answers to the above questions.</p>
5		<p>Thanks for your full and swift response to my email. It is good to get an insight into the thinking behind the CGR. While I am sure the Council has followed guidelines and that the later consultation stage will be given its due attention I am still surprised by the relative lack of publicity given to the CGR so far, given the potentially major changes under consideration.</p> <p>The CGR system launched an on-line survey to allow electors in the two affected council areas to understand what was proposed and to comment, and so inform the CGR process of opinions and attitudes - but took astonishingly few measures to let those electors know the survey existed. Putting details on your website or offering press releases and briefing notes have, unsurprisingly, left most electors totally unaware of its existence. The survey is thus likely to be less than useful. An online meeting is clearly not the vehicle for mass communication - the mass did not know it was taking place anyway - hence the meeting's population overwhelmingly by councillors who unsurprisingly support their own council's position.</p> <p>A letter to all council households at this stage would certainly be expensive but the cost of the publicity will come at the later stage anyway. (Surely publicity via email or social media means would be possible; the council must have email contact details for residents of the two councils? Also vehicles like Alexa Davies' Community Matters weekly email for Malmesbury could be used.) As it is the Council will have - without having tasted the feelings and thoughts of electors - put together a proposal, and once formulated such proposals are difficult to alter even if heavily criticised by comment at the later stages. Far better,</p>



surely, to put the original proposals clearly to all affected at an early stage and then, informed, the council can formulate its proposal. I am glad to read that further representations can be received beyond the 31st December - but if the public still don't know the CGR process exists you are unlikely to receive many.

I quite understand this is not a public vote, that the Council needs to make the decisions but must surely want to understand the reactions of the councils' populations. Can you please confirm that the CGR later stage consultation will involve contact with all affected households: your letter said that changes "may mean it is appropriate to write to potentially affected persons directly." "May" does not inspire total confidence - though if changes are made I can only imagine the disbelief that decisions could have been reached without all affected being informed and consulted earlier.

Finally, and in passing, several people complained about the survey interface, how the single line comment box with no indication of its maximum wordage and no word/character count system was very unhelpful and made editing on tablet or phone very awkward. Perhaps that could be passed on to the relevant IT unit; it is a small detail but irritating, and a possible hindrance to involvement.

6	Malmesbury TC	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Please find attached Malmesbury Town Council's revised Community Governance Review submission to the Wiltshire Council Electoral Review Committee.</p> <p>Regards.</p>
---	---------------	--

7	Resident	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I have received a note from the St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council regarding the proposed boundary changes. I understand that the Wiltshire Council will soon consider these proposals and propose alternative ideas.</p> <p>I wish to take this opportunity to forward my observations for consideration during this consultation period and strongly oppose any change in the current arrangements. I would support the Parish Council in their continued activities and modus operandi. The current arrangements for one Councillor to represent the whole parish is a tried and tested method which has served us well and will continue to do so. There can be no benefit in changing a practical and fully functioning system and I wish you to record my support to retain the existing system.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
---	----------	--

BrokenboroughWilts, SN16

27th December 2021

Councillor Martin Smith
Sherston
Wilts SN16

Dear Martin

Community Governance Review 2021-2022

Councillors Kim Power and Gavin Grant drew my attention to this review. They explained their approach to the matter and pointed out where it might impinge on Brokenborough Parish. I was also invited to consider having our parish become a ward of Malmesbury.

As you are aware the main changes suggested would transfer quite large areas of St Paul Without into the care of Malmesbury Town Council. I found their historical arguments unconvincing and I am sure that places such as Milbourne would resist the change, as they would become subsumed into the town organisation and lose their particular identity. Roger Budgen and his team at St Paul Without are very attentive to the wishes of their parish, which would carry far less weight as part of any Malmesbury action list.

Clearly the same arguments would apply if Brokenborough became part of Malmesbury. Our village is sensitive to its special character and we always have good turnouts and lively discussion when significant topics arise. As an example, recently there were meetings at Malmesbury Town Hall and Brokenborough Church to publicize the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Public attendance was much higher at Brokenborough!

In terms of planning for the future I believe that keeping the Malmesbury Town boundary tight will help discourage over population caused by simply absorbing field after field within an enlarged perimeter.

In summary I am against these unnecessary and unwelcome changes.

Yours sincerely

R C Tallon
Chair, Brokenborough Parish Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Comment	Status	Written Statement
1	Cllr Ioan Rees Chairman Calne Without Parish Council	<p>Hi Kieran</p> <p>I hope you're well and thank you for all your, and your team's, work in organising the latest stages of the Community Governance Review.</p> <p>I've recently received a growing number of adverse comments from local residents about the quality of the maps in the survey documents. The plans of the areas of land that Calne Town Council have requested be transferred to the Town Council are frankly awful.</p> <p>I appreciate that these are the same plans produced by the Town Council back in 2019 but they show barely any identifiable features and are almost impossible to understand. Please can I ask that you to replace these very poor plans with new ones that the public can clearly identify exactly what areas of land are being requested. I would also suggest that a plan of Calne and the immediate surrounding area be published which identifies all the areas that Calne are seeking to include in their boundaries, that way the public can better identify where these sites are and can give a more considered response.</p> <p>It would also be helpful if the plan showing the 5 wards within Calne Without identified the names of the all the wards as residents are not always aware of which ward they live.</p> <p>On a related point, the description of the Beversbrook site Calne TC are seeking to incorporate into the towns boundaries is highly misleading. The description of the area refers only to the sports ground and allotments but in fact Calne's request is for not just the sport's complex and allotments it also includes a very large area of open countryside which is not evident from the description or the inadequate plan (see below) [picture of initial maps used]</p> <p>I think it would be more informative if much better plans and a more accurate descriptions were substituted as soon as possible. My final points relates to how the survey is analysed after the closing date. The previous CGR survey covered multiple areas and was necessarily quite complicated but there was no summary of the survey results. I fully understand that the survey is not a referendum but for the current survey it would be helpful, not least to the Electoral Review Committee, for there to be a accurate summary of the responses with an indication of the number of comments supporting and opposing the various proposals.</p> <p>It was clear from the previous CGR survey that there had been multiple responses from some individuals which was</p>

		<p>acknowledged by you but still allowed to go forward as if they were legitimate comments. I think it's very important that individual respondents are not allowed to submit multiple responses to the survey as this can give misleading impressions of public opinion. I can understand that resources are limited but I would urge you to try to ensure there is only one response per person.</p> <p>Many thanks again for your time and energy in managing what is undoubtedly quite a complicated and challenging review. Your efforts are greatly appreciated</p>
2		<p>Arguably, the interests of wildlife, biodiversity, conservation, carbon storage and capture may be better served in a rural parish by a rural community than by an authority that has continued to push industrial development, infrastructure and housing towards the North Wessex Downs AONB (and, partly as a result, has since been obliged to review its traffic policies in light of climate concerns).</p> <p>In particular, it would be good to find the impact of the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Penn Wood site expanded and extended by WCC's Nature Recovery Network and Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy to preserve a much-needed wildlife corridor and a green space for local inhabitants, from Calne and without.</p>
3	Hilmarton Parish Council	<p>Good afternoon Kieran and Lisa,</p> <p>Thank you for your patience to enable us to map our proposal. In the end the only suitable map we could find to use was the Wiltshire Council Rights of Way Explorer Map as this enabled us to show the existing Parish Boundary alongside our proposal. I've attached a pdf showing the area in question with a close-up more detailed map on the second page showing The Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Also attached is an arial photograph that may help the committee identify specifically the High Penn farm buildings and cottages.</p> <p>Please can you ask the committee to read these bullet points in conjunction with the attached - thank you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Parish boundaries can be identified on the maps by the black dotted lines. These lines are already layered on the Wiltshire Council Rights of Way Explorer Map. • The existing Hilmarton boundary comes almost down to the Tesco Roundabout. • The green field adjacent to Tesco and the roundabout is where a new Lidl is going to be built so the shape of that part of the boundary is correct. • On the close-up map you can clearly see the new housing estate on the edge of High Penn Road and the Calne Without

		<p>boundary line crossing at this point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed new Hilmarton Parish boundary largely follows part of the existing Calne Without boundary but creates a new boundary between New Cottages on High Penn Road and The Quag, which is on the edge of the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve. <p>I trust this will give the committee sufficient detail but should any additional information be needed please do come back to me.</p>
--	--	---

4	Bremhill PC	<p>The Bremhill Parish Council Review Team have considered changes to the external boundary of Bremhill Parish to be considered in the ongoing Community Governance Review. Some of these arise from extending the community cohesion, heritage and historical cohesion of Stanley in the Tytherton Lucas Ward and increasing community cohesion in Avon, in the Foxham Ward. Others arise from the proposal to form a new parish council of Studley and Derry Hill.</p> <p>Bremhill Parish is a rural parish consisting of three villages (Bremhill, East Tytherton and Foxham) with small hamlets (Stanley, Tytherton Lucas, Bremhill Wick, Charlcott, Spirhill and Avon). Community facilities are limited to a village hall and church in Bremhill and Foxham, a church in East Tytherton and Tytherton Lucas and two pubs. It has four wards – Bremhill, East Tytherton, Foxham and Tytherton Lucas and 13 councillors. The issues faced by BPC are those faced by many rural parishes - supporting agricultural economy, protecting the open countryside from inappropriate development, working with Wiltshire Council to maintain rural lanes and protect them from being used as rat runs as well as making them safe for all roads users vehicles, horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians, maintaining access to open space for the peoples’ health and wellbeing, preserving and enhancing the natural habitat and preventing flooding.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the external boundary of Bremhill Parish detailed below would bring in areas to the parish that face the same problems as those in Bremhill Parish and would fit well with the community cohesion already existing in the parish as well as with the local governance issues faced by the parish. There are currently about 390 properties in the parish. These proposals would mean an increase of around 28 properties. No new wards or councillors would be required.</p> <p>Proposed Change Reasons</p> <p>1 Include Rose Cottage, Stanley Abbey Farm and the historical remains of Stanley Abbey</p> <p>Rose Cottage sits on a small part of Calne Without Parish which is isolated from the rest of the parish by land in Bremhill Parish. Its residents are part of the Bremhill Parish. The Bremhill Pariah Calne Without Parish boundary runs between the Stanley Abbey Farm farmhouse and its barns. The Farmhouse is in Calne Without Parish and the barns are in Bremhill Parish. The other buildings in this location are in Bremhill Parish. The site of Stanley Abbey is linked historically to Old Abbey Farm in Bremhill Parish and its history has been researched as part of the Bremhill History Project showing its links with the parish and particularly the hamlet of Stanley</p> <p>For community, heritage and historical cohesion the boundary of Bremhill Parish should be changed to include these sites. This proposal would increase the number of dwellings in Bremhill Parish by two which would not require a change in ward</p>
---	-------------	--

		<p>boundaries or an increase in Councillors.</p> <p>The proposed new boundary follows identifiable water courses from the junction of Pudding Brook to the bottom of Studley Hill and then hedge lines around the site of Stanley Abbey to the railway line on the west boundary of Great Bodnage Copse.</p> <p>2 Change boundary to follow the disused railway line/ cycle route from the western end Great Bodnage Copse to Black Dog Bridge.</p> <p>This provides an easily identifiable hard boundary to Bremhill Parish. It is a rural area compatible with the community interests of rest of Bremhill Parish. It does not include any extra dwellings falling into Bremhill Parish.</p> <p>3 Extend boundary from Black Dog Bridge to the area of GR 988706 on the disused railway line/cycletrack and then north following field boundaries and A4 to A4/A3102 junction This is a rural area with two farms (Berhills Farm and Studleybrook Farm). It is compatible with the community interests of Bremhill Parish. It includes two extra dwellings. It would not require additional wards in Bremhill Parish or additional councillors.</p> <p>4 Extend boundary along A3102 beyond the junction with Oxford Road to boundary of first dwelling on left. Then follow Hilmarton Parish boundary NW to Fisher’s Brook and continue NW along the hedge line to the hedge on the left. Follow the hedge SW and then SE to Fishers Brook. Follow the brook in a westerly direction until the hedge going NNW towards Whitley Farm. At the bridleway follow it towards Cowage Wood to join the current Hilmarton Parish boundary and follow this to the current Bremhill Parish boundary at the weir south of Bremhill House Cottages.</p> <p>This is a rural area with scattered dwellings similar to Bremhill Parish. The current boundary with Calne Without Parish runs through the small hamlet of Ratford. The properties are mainly located on the Ratford to A4 lane and Turf House Lane from Mead Cottage to A3102. The farms are Swerves Farm, Lower Whitley Farm, Whitley Farm and Lickhill Farm. It is compatible with the community interest of Bremhill Parish. It can be incorporated into the current Bremhill Ward. No additional councillors are required.</p> <p>5 In Foxham Ward include Brook Farm, Christian Farm and Foxham Farm in Bremhill Parish. To the west of Foxham Farm change the boundary to run to small pond on footpath 17 on the north side of the farm. At Brook Farm and Christian Farm extend the boundary north on the lane to Christian Malford and at the railway line follow it SW to connect with the existing Bremhill Parish boundary.</p> <p>These farms are on the periphery of Christian Malford Parish, have strong economic and social ties with Bremhill Parish. Their residents are part of the Bremhill Parish community. These farms can be incorporated into Foxham Ward without the need for additional councillors.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>6 Bremhill Parish boundary at Avon Lane. Currently the majority of the properties in the hamlet of Avon are in Bremhill Parish. Some fields to the west of the southern part of Avon Lane are also in Bremhill Parish. Change the boundary to follow the River Avon from the wood south of Carpenter's Farm to the sluice and then turn SE to follow the drain to the NE of Manor Farm to the current Bremhill Parish boundary. On reaching Avon Lane at Partridge View it would follow Avon Lane to Maud Heath's Causeway.</p> <p>This would provide a more distinct Bremhill Parish boundary and add to the community cohesion of Avon and its links with Bremhill Parish. It would add three additional properties to Bremhill Parish and would not require additional wards or councillors.</p>
--	--	--

5	<p>ClIr Ioan Rees (survey question responses as quite long so might have gotten cut off)</p>	<p>Q7 - With the major growth in housing in our villages over the past 40 or so years, Derry Hill and Studley has become a large and distinct community that for many years has needed its own parish council. It's more that big enough to be a viable parish council and would be the biggest parish in our area. Parish Councils are meant to be based on local communities with a recognisable identity - that cannot be said of the current parish of Calne Without, which is far too big! It wraps around Calne and stretches from Pewsham to the Cherhill monument. If someone proposed setting up a parish like this today the idea would be ridiculed.</p> <p>Derry Hill & Studley, in which I include Old Derry Hill & Pewsham, is a cohesive community with a strong identity and numerous community groups but has little or no connections with the rest of the parish. Calstone, Stockley and Lower Compton are some miles away and all physically divided from us by Calne itself and the Bowood Estate. There is huge local support for a separate Parish Council with over 95% of the 800 or so residents canvassed, choosing to sign the petition for a new council. Their wishes should be respected to ensure that Parish Council decisions are made by locally elected residents not by a majority of councillors that are elected and live in communities the other side of Calne.</p> <p>I fully support the proposal for an unwarded council as Derry Hill and Studley is a single cohesive community recognised in planning terms by Wiltshire Council as a large village. An unwarded council would encourage a "one Council" approach and avoid the current situation where there are contested elections in one ward and vacant seats in adjoining wards.</p> <p>The boundaries based on the Pewsham and West Wards as proposed by the petition are a good representation of the Derry Hill & Studley community. However the boundaries of the Pewsham and West wards have been changed since the new parish was proposed. There is an good argument for including all the property close to the A4 between Studley and the Calne boundary in a Derry Hill and Studley parish. I believe that whilst most of the 'Green area' shown on the plan has closer links to Bremhill PC, the area close to the A4 relates better to Derry Hill and Studley.</p> <p>I think Wiltshire Council should also consider two minor changes to rationalise the boundary between Studley and Bremhill by transferring to Bremhill, the very long narrow finger of land adjacent to the road from the old canal to Stanley Lane including nos 1 & 2 Rose Cottages. Secondley, transferring from Bremhill to Derry Hill & Studley, the small area of land north of Stanley Abbey Farm, between the old railway and the River Marden. This includes Old Abbey Farm and Stables, which are residential</p>
---	--	---

		<p>properties that are only accessible from within the boundaries of Studley</p>
		<p>Q9 - Last year Wiltshire Council felt that the remainder of parish, which currently represents slightly more than half of the council could not remain as a viable parish without the West and Pewsham wards. I disagreed with that conclusion but I do believe there is a much better solution whereby the remaining parts of the council could successfully combine with their neighbouring parishes were they already form important parts of those communities.</p> <p>Whilst no one would deny that the remaining part of Calne Without has very few facilities, that is because these settlements are all integral parts of other communities just across the parish boundary in adjoining parishes. People from Stockley, Calston and Lower Compton do not use the facilities in Derry Hill and Studley. Stockley residents use the school, pub, village hall and church in Heddington which is only a mile away. They join with Heddington for their Steam Rally, and the Heddington and Stockley firework display.</p> <p>Similarly, residents of Calstone and Lower Compton use the school, pub, village hall and church in Cherhill which is again only a mile or so away. Derry Hill & Studley are over 5 miles away on the other side of Calne and have no recognisable links or cohesion with these communities. Residents of Stockley, Calstone and Lower Compton even have to use polling stations in Heddington or Cherhill to vote in Calne Without Parish Council elections.</p> <p>Whilst I think the residual area of Calne Without could easily</p>

		<p>continue as a perfectly viable parish council there would be great mutual benefits if the various communities were to be combined with their neighbouring parishes as shown on the coloured plan.</p>
7	Bremhill PC	<p>I have used the Bremhill PC footpath map and an extract from the OS Explorer map 156 to draw on our proposals. I am sending as photos so may need to send them in a few emails.</p> <p>The 4 photos show the changes by ward and there are 2 photos for Bremhill Ward. The changes are shown in yellow. On the 3 photos of the BPC footpath map the red crosses show where the current boundary will change.</p> <p>I hope this all makes sense. If you have a digital map of the area you can forward and I can draw on then just let me know.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p>
8	Cherhill PC	<p>I completed the online questionnaire on behalf of the Parish Council and supporting the proposal to incorporate the suggested area's from Calne Without in to Cherhill. The parish council also supports the proposal from Compton Basset to incorporate some of what is currently within Cherhill PC into Compton Basset PC.</p> <p>We have not prepared any further submissions. Please let me know if you need any further information from the PC.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Electoral Review Workshop 25 January 2022

Purpose

To clarify the next steps for the Community Governance Review ahead of the meeting of the Committee on 8 February 2022

To brief the Committee on the evidence provided within the Information Pack, including:

- Page 278
- Details of the initial schemes received by the Committee**
 - Session notes for discussions with parish and unitary councillors**
 - The public responses to the initial schemes**
 - Alternative options suggested during sessions or in the responses**

Next Steps

Workshop for the Committee to seek clarity on any of the information, potential options, and implications of various options.

Committee to meet in public on 8 February 2022 to determine Draft Recommendations, if any, on changes to parish governance arrangements in the areas under review.

Formal Consultation to take place on those Draft Recommendations

Statutory Criteria

Committee Members should keep in mind at all times the statutory criteria, to ensure the governance arrangements in the areas reviewed:

Page 280

- **Reflect the identity and interests of local communities**
- **Ensure effective and convenient local governance**

Members should read and review the LGBCE guidance on Community Governance Reviews – in particular paragraphs 55 onwards in considering whether the above criteria have been met by a proposal.

Beechingstoke Summary

Charlton and Wilsford Summary

Charlton and Wilsford are separate parishes.

An anomaly was identified in that they have elected to a single council, rather than each parish elect to a joint parish council, as they believed was the legal situation.

Page 282

8 responses were received to correcting the anomaly and formally creating the joint parish council that is already, in practical terms, in effect.

A separate name change survey for Charlton and the parish council will also be presented to the meeting on 8 Feb – both processes are necessary so that:

- i) A name change can be implemented immediately for Charlton, to be called Charlton St Peter**
- ii) A CGR decision will formally pair the parishes together, under their preferred name, at the next elections in 2025**


Beechingstoke Summary

43 responses to online survey
(approximately 1/4 of the parish electorate)


- 28 in favour of retaining current arrangements
- 11 to become a Parish Meeting
- 6 to be merged with another parish
- 7 to be grouped with another parish

Surrounding councils not requesting to be merged.


Transfer of Bottlesford – 10 agree, 29 against





Malmesbury Summary



Page 285



1. Backbridge
2. Malmesbury North
3. Milbourne
4. Malmesbury South
5. Burton Hill and Cowbridge
6. Common Road, Foxley Road and Kings Heath
7. Malmesbury West



Malmesbury Amendments

Town Council submitted amended proposal

Agreed Milbourne/King's Heath and Cole Park Estate should stay with the parish


Burton Hill/Cowbridge has suggestions for all going into Town (with Milbourne being joined with another parish or becoming its own parish), a proposal to retain some in SPMW

Common Rd/Foxley Rd, the TC feel there is a strong case for inclusion, but withdraw the proposal to be constructive.

They also suggest a more precise change in the Filands area around some housing and some employment land.

St Paul Malmesbury say that they discussed proposal – agreed to some of Burton Hill going to town

Appendix A – Map of Burton Hill/Cowbridge




Page 288

Page 57

- Current Boundary
- MSPW Parish Council position
- MTC position to allow MSPW to retain Milbourne
- MTC position if Milbourne joins another Parish

Appendix B – Map of Filands/Employment Area



- MTC position
- MTC preference if MSPW retain Milbourne
- MTC preference if Milbourne joins another Parish

Calne Without Summary

Calne Without and Calne Town

2019/20 review initiated by petition for new parish, which is why that was the surveyed option – however, important to note that that the petition review has concluded, and this is a fresh review,

Survey asked about new parish area at Derry Hill, and what should happen to remainder of parish area (eg remain as one, or be transferred elsewhere)

Town Council had also asked for transfer of areas of Calne Without into the town


Prior to the start of the survey Compton Bassett requested transfer of areas of Calne Without and Cherhill

'New Parish' Derry Hill – 63 in favour, 19 against

Of those preferring above, 33 in favour of continuation of Calne Without over remaining area, 39 believing it should be dissolved and transferred.


4 areas requested, 40 responses on each. Between 21-29 in favour, 4-9 against


14 in favour, 8 against. Cherhill PC in favour.



Page 291

Blue to Heddington, Red to Cherhill, Orange new parish of Derry Hill and Studley, Green to Bremhill or Derry Hill.





North town boundary - incorporate
Beaversbrook Sports facility & Allotments


East to incorporate
Land off Low Lane & New Dev

South west to incorporate:
- Cherhill View Allotments
- Cherhill View Housing Est
- Rookery Farm

To extend the town boundary
to the east to connect the A4 in
to the south to the A3102 and to
to the west by Kingsbury Green
cademy i) to incorporate
enhill Farm to Abberd Lane ii)
to incorporate land to the west
of Kingsbury Green Academy
iii) to incorporate land to the
north of Quemerford

Legend for right map:

- Blue square = original
- Red square = revised / added
- Green square = removed




Additional Proposal

Cherhill PC confirmed that they would support the area of Lower Compton (Calne Without) being transferred to their parish.

Page 294

Hilmarton PC proposed transferring an area of Calne Without to their parish.



Bremhill PC proposed transferring an area of Calne Without to their parish, and also a few minor transfers from others



Area highlighted yellow is the existing southern part of Hillmarton Parish.



Area highlighted light green is part of existing Calne without incorporating High Penn farm buildings, cottages and Wiltshire Wildlife Nature Reserve.




zzBremhill - Proposed Pari...  

104 views
Published 2 days ago

[SHARE](#)

- Bremhill - Current
-  Bremhill - Current
- Bremhill - Proposed
-  Bremhill - Proposed 2025



Questions