

Community Governance Schemes.

Area A1, A2 and B7- Salisbury and Surrounding Parishes

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

1,480

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

Area A1, A2 and B7- Salisbury and Surrounding Parishes

CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

1. Properties within Britford Triangle

Summary of proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

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

Summary of proposals

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

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

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. Website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

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

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

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendations

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

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

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

4. Properties within Halfpenny Road Estate

Summary of proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

5. Properties near Skew Road/Wilton Road Junction

Summary of proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

6. The Avenue and Fugglestone Red Area

Summary of proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

7. New cemetery land - The Avenue and A360 Area

Summary of proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

List of E-mails and hard copy

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

Area A3 and A4 - Trowbridge and Surrounding Parishes

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

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

1,081

Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party

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

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

Area A3 and A4 - Trowbridge and Surrounding Parishes

CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Maps:

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

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

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

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Maps:

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

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

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

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

21. Properties within Shore Place (TTC Area 1)

Summary of Proposal

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

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

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

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

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

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

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

Maps:

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

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

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

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

23. Properties within Area 3c Hulbert Road

Summary of Proposal

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

Maps:

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

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

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

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

Schemes not put to consultation by the CGR Working Party

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

Mapping

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

Scheme 18 to 29 Trowbridge TC Proposed Boundary

Letters and other documents

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

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

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

30. Chippenham

Summary of Proposal

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

Maps

(None at this stage)

Consultation method: None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

31. Chippenham Without – Change of Name

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

Area A5 - Chippenham area (No Council maps)

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

Area A6 B6 Devizes area

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

8,725

Area A6 B6 Devizes area

CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

32. and 33. Properties within Roundway and Devizes parishes

Summary of Proposal

That the parishes of Devizes and Roundway be merged.

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

35. Bishops Cannings to Roundway (Broadway House southwards)

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

35c Bishops Cannings Warding

Summary of Proposal

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

Map: (No map)

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

To be updated at Council

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

A7 Calne area

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

6

36 Sandpit Road area

CONSULTATION BY LETTER

Summary of Proposal

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

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

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

No residential properties affected

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

37. Wenhill Heights area – no residential properties affected

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

38. John Bentley school area – no residential properties affected

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

Area A8 - Corsham and Box

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

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

687

Area A8 - Corsham and Box

CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

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

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

Summary of Proposals:

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

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

Maps:

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

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

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

Consultation method: Public meeting. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

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

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

None

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

Mapping

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

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

E-mails and hard copy

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

Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

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

11,304

Area A9 - Melksham and Melksham Without

CONSULTATION BY PUBLIC MEETING

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

Summary of Proposal

A merger of the parishes of Melksham and Melksham Without.

Maps:

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

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

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Map:

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

Scheme 46 - Streets - George Ward School from MWOPC

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

No residential properties appear to be affected by this proposal.

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

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

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

Summary of Proposal

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

No residential properties appear to be affected by this proposal.

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

Consultation method: Three public meetings. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

Area B1- Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard

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

Area B1- Lyneham and Clyffe Pypard
CONSULTATION BY LETTER

49. Properties within Preston excluding Thickthorn Area

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation

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

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

50. Properties within Thickthorn Area

Summary of Proposal

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

See comments on proposal 49 above

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:-

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

No.	From	Date	For / Against
1	(None)		

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

Area B2- Bishopstrow

CONSULTATION BY LETTER

51. Properties within Sutton Veny (A36 area)

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

Map: Scheme 51 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 2

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

Two letters were sent out, and none were received back

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

52. Properties within Barrow House Area

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

Map: Scheme 52 - Area B2 - Bishopstrow Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

None

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consultation method: None.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

Area B3- Nomansland (Redlynch and Landford)

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

340

Area B3- Nomansland (Redlynch and Landford)

CONSULTATION BY LETTER

53. Properties within Nomansland Proposal Only

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

Map: Area B3 – Redlynch and Landford Map 1

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

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

Main Considerations

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

Community Governance Working Party Recommendation

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

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

54. Properties within Hamptworth

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

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. CGR website consultation.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

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

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

Hard copy survey response (summary):

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

Main Considerations

As proposal 53 above

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:

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

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

Mapping

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

Area B4 - Tisbury and West Tisbury

Schemes on which the CGR Working Party consulted

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

1,467

55 and 56 Tisbury and West Tisbury

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

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

Maps

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

Consultation method: Individual letter. None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

Main Considerations

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:

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

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

Maps

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

Letters and other documents

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

Summary of e-mails received

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

56b Tidworth warding

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

Map: Scheme 56b - Tidworth 2004 Map with Order

Consultation method: None yet.

Feedback from CGR website survey consultation (summary):

N/A

Hard copy survey response (summary):

N/A

Main Considerations

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

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

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

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

Community Governance Working Group Recommendation:

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

Mapping

Map: Scheme 56b - Tidworth 2004 Map with Order

Letters and other documents

No.	From	Date
1	Tidworth 2004 Order Text	

Summary of e-mails received

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

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

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

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

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

What is a Community Governance Review (CGR)?

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

A CGR must:-

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

Consequently, a CGR must take into account:-

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

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

Why is the Council doing this now?

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

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

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

How many councillors can a Parish Council have?

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

Will my post code change?

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

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

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

Will this affect my council tax bill?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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