

Consultation Document

Swindon Borough Community Governance Review (Stage Three)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A Community Governance Review for the whole Borough of Swindon was initiated in December 2015. The first stage of consultation on review commenced at the beginning of January and concluded on 31st March 2016. During Stage One, over 700 people attended 32 engagement sessions and 258 submissions were received.
- 1.2 Swindon Borough Council's Cabinet reviewed the submissions from the community engagement in Stage One at its meeting on 16th June 2016. The Cabinet agreed a number of recommendations, including:
- Engage with local communities in June and July to address issues raised in the first stage of the Community Governance Review; and
 - Authorise the Director of Law and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Communities, to prepare illustrative maps for use during the engagement process.
- 1.3 Two illustrative maps were prepared to support further engagement in Stage Two. Map 1 linked to submissions and boundaries proposed in Stage One of the Review, Map 2 linked to major roads and key boundaries. Illustrative Maps 1 and 2 are attached in Appendix Two A and Appendix Two B.
- 1.4 Following the Cabinet meeting in June, four workshop sessions and 8 public meetings have been undertaken. Officers have also engaged directly with key stakeholder groups and Parish Councils. A feedback form inviting comments on the illustrative maps was available on the Council's website as well as a link to make responses through survey monkey. Submissions were invited between 22nd June to 31st July 2016. 139 submissions and 2 comments were received. Submissions were received as follows:

Email submissions	30
Feedback Forms/Written comments	70
Survey Monkey returns	39

- 1.5 The submissions received have now been reviewed and analysed, and are summarised in the paragraphs below together with comments and, where appropriate recommendations / draft proposals.

2. Feedback from unparished areas

- 2.1 As part of public engagement in Stage Two, public meetings were held in six areas across the Borough. In addition to public meetings, four workshops were held in unparished areas to gain qualitative feedback on community identity and community priorities in response to the illustrative maps. Existing residents groups, ward councillors and a small number of residents who made detailed submissions in Stage One were invited to participate. A summary is as follows:

East Swindon
Mixed views on community identity and defined boundaries. Park North and Park South could be linked with Eldene but might more naturally link with Walcot East. Concern about community interest and capacity in the parish model and likelihood of getting involved. Could link the East grouping together as an East parish. Eldene and Liden look to have a natural fit geographically. Map 2 generally more favourable from residents living in Eldene and Liden.
West Swindon
General consensus that the West boundary on the maps reflects the area that represents West Swindon. Some agreement to renewing parish boundaries along previous ward boundaries rather than existing. General sense that the future would need to be about managing and protecting the assets and spaces that West Swindon has rather than taking on new responsibilities. Some interest in the option to reduce the West parish to smaller parishes at a future date if the community identity did not work as a result of the larger boundary.
North/Central Swindon
Some concerns about the scale of the non parished area. Can this genuinely reflect community identities, particularly in relation to the diversity of the local population. The diversity of the central area could mean that a larger parish covering the non parished area might serve the wider community. Concern about local impact of the town centre/shopping area on related services. Interest in smaller community groups joining Haydon Wick parish.
Old Town/South Swindon
Concerns about the concept of parishes and the imposition on communities. If non parished areas are to be parished, there is some consensus that a single parish for the non parished area would serve local communities' needs better than smaller arrangements e.g. economies of scale, opportunity to go smaller in the future. Concern about costs/viability if popular assets such as

Old Town gardens are transferred to parishes. Map 1 more preferable.

3.

3. **Feedback from Resident Groups, Forums or Associations** Feedback from groups, forums and associations is summarised as follows.

Badbury Park Residents Association

There was insufficient information on the proposed Community Governance Review to enable Badbury Park residents to express their views on the best way forward. The proposed recommendations for the new South Swindon parish does not bring about improved community engagement, better local democracy and will not result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services due to the anomalies with the precept and residents' Management Company. Badbury Park and Broome Manor already set local priorities for local service by having a management company. Making Badbury Park part of South Swindon will spilt the existing community, which will then become a large diverse community, that will not bring together the necessary benefits; unless Badbury Park is made a Ward of South Swindon.

Eldene Residents Association

Of the two choices, it would be a lot more preferable to go with Liden, Nythe and Covingham. This is due to the general feeling of being more of a similar area, as well as seeing the benefits that joining existing Parishes would bring, in terms of the administrative expertise and contacts of existing Parish Councillors.

Haydon View Community Association

Repeat position from Stage One: Haydon View Rd, Eastville Rd, Sunningdale rd, Mendip Close, Orchid Close to be linked to Haydon Wick Parish.

Kingshill Area Residents Association (KARA)

Only a referendum would prove support - KARA does not support the creation of new parishes that the real reason for creation is about raising additional income beyond council tax - if it had to support the creation of parishes, it would support West Swindon plus a warded super parish (as described in dia 2 Central and South Swindon.

Meres Residents Association

Comments on both maps. Interest in canvassing support for a separate Liden Parish.

Penhill Forum

We feel that linking to the Central Parish would give us very little say. We cannot set local priorities without knowing the areas/neighbourhood and

<p>communities within that planned area. Four choices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To seek to go in to Haydon Wick Parish Council, closer to services in Haydon Wick, shop in Haydon Wick, jobs available to us in Haydon Wick. Thamesdown Drive/Cricklade Road/Whitworth Road is a sensible main road boundary. 2. Blunsdon - or we are told that a new parish of St. Andrew may be created 3. Stratton Parish, from where Penhill originally came. 4. To become a new linked parish to the Central Swindon proposal but we felt that we may have problems finding enough capacity.
<p>Pinehurst Initiative Forum</p>
<p>The Central Swindon area (on maps 1 and 2) looks large, especially as it is densely populated and has significant 'issues' in several of the areas. Surely this will lead to a very 'stretched' parish, in terms of funding/work.</p>
<p>Pipers Way Residents Association</p>
<p>We would specifically and completely reject the idea of Map 2 which splits many in Old Town into a different parish than the local civic, cultural and commercial centre. This statement in no way support Map 1 either.</p>
<p>Shaw Residents Association</p>
<p>In view of the small number of people who've responded to the consultation and the fact that there is no evidence of a community request from non parished areas, we believe that to proceed would be undemocratic. The SRA therefore maintains its position that Swindon Borough Council does not have a mandate to continue. However, should SBC choose to ignore this opinion, we believe it would make sense to start with one big parish and then, if there's a popular appetite, divide it up over the coming years. Such a scenario would also preserve at least some of the economies of scale currently enjoyed by the Borough. It would also minimise the additional administrative burden the creation of several new parishes would place on the tax payer.</p> <p>Specifically, given that there is no petition or demonstrable public request for a West Swindon parish, we suggest it is more democratic to include West Swindon in the aforementioned central parish until such point in time that a public petition exists requesting it to become separate.</p>
<p>Swindon Tenants Voice</p>
<p>General commentary on the engagement/consultation process. No specific comments on any illustrative maps.</p>

Appendix 1

- 4.1 Redacted submission forms are available to view on the Council's website. A summary of the responses is as follows:

Comments	Number of responses <i>(not all responses responded to each category, responses below are not double counted)</i>
Responses with comments relating to either Map 1 or Map 2	<p>9 responses generally agreed with the illustrative maps</p> <p>13 responses partly disagreed with the illustrative maps</p> <p>18 responses disagreed with the illustrative maps</p> <p>6 responses proposed a single parish for non parished areas as a preference</p> <p>2 responses preferred a South Swindon parish (from Walcot and Park North ward)</p> <p>8 responses preferred illustrative map 1 (mostly residents in Walcot and Park North ward)</p> <p>39 responses preferred illustrative map 2 (majority of responses from Liden, Eldene and Park South ward)</p>
Do you think the potential parishes on the illustrative maps could give the opportunity for local people to set local priorities for local services?	<p>21 responses indicated yes</p> <p>38 responses indicated no</p> <p>13 responses indicated possibly</p> <p>10 responses said yes only in relation to illustrative map 2</p>
Do you think any of the potential parishes on the illustrative maps could help improve your neighbourhood area?	<p>10 responses said yes</p> <p>40 responses said no</p> <p>21 responses said possibly</p> <p>9 responses said yes if illustrative map 2</p>
Do you think any of the potential parishes on the illustrative maps could help grow a stronger sense of community feeling or identity	<p>8 responses said yes</p> <p>46 responses said no</p> <p>16 responses said possibly</p>

where you live?	6 responses said yes if illustrative map 2
-----------------	--

5. Comments and Recommendations

Bishopstone Parish Council

- 5.1 In Stage Two, Bishopstone Parish Council have responded as follows

We note the proposed marginal adjustments to the northern parish boundary and have no objection to either of the proposals.

- 5.2 Members may feel that there is no need to change the northern boundary of this parish until there is sufficient development of the New Eastern Villages that would create new identities and community interests.

5.2.1 Recommendation - It is recommended that there be no change to the parish arrangements relating to Bishopstone Parish Council.

Blunsdon St Andrew Parish Council

- 5.3 CGR Stage 1 - Blunsdon St Andrew formally submitted a request to retain the existing boundaries for Blunsdon St Andrew Parish. The Parish submitted that it serves the existing Parish with community facilities that promote cohesion.

- 5.4 A petition containing 899 signatures was submitted to the Community Governance Review at the close of Stage One seeking the creation of a new Parish Council for St Andrews.

- 5.5 In Stage Two, Blunsdon St Andrew submitted a detailed submission with a petition statement comprising 390 signatures. Their response includes the following statements:

This submission demonstrates why the Parish of Blunsdon St Andrew should not be split and how it operates efficiently and effectively for the benefit of its residents across the entire Parish. Furthermore, Blunsdon St Andrew PC, is fully committed to and capable of taking on the designated services from April 2017.

Blunsdon St Andrew Parish Council submit that it should continue to operate on its current boundaries, with the exception of the proposal from Haydon Wick to assume Abbey Meads into its boundary, which we believe has merit, provides clarity and would benefit those residents.

The Parish Council is firmly of the view, as demonstrated in this paper, that the boundaries set out in the Illustrative Maps would not be beneficial to residents and would in fact be more expensive.

- 5.6 Given the strength of the petition from residents within the St Andrew area calling for a separate parish for St Andrew to be created, Members may wish determine that the existing parish area be split into two parishes, unless it is felt that the arguments put forward by Blunsdon St Andrew Parish Council outweighs this.

- 5.6.1 Recommendation – It is recommended that the consultation map show a redrawn and renamed Blunsdon parish, with the A419 as its boundary, and with a new St Andrew Parish covering that area south west of the A419 that is presently part of the Blunsdon St Andrew Parish and that the parish have 11 parish councillors.

Castle Eaton Parish Council

- 5.7 No parish boundary line changes have been proposed on illustrative maps 1 and 2.
- 5.7.1 Recommendation - It is recommended that there be no change to the parish arrangements relating to Castle Eaton.

Chiseldon Parish Council

- 5.8 In Stage One, Chiseldon Parish Council submitted a request to keep their current boundary arrangements with regard to the villages and hamlets that make up Chiseldon Parish. Badbury Park Residents Association submitted a separate proposal to create a new Parish for Badbury Park.

- 5.9 In Stage Two, Chiseldon Parish Council have submitted with comments as follows:

Chiseldon Parish Council voted to retain its existing Parish Boundaries. A vote was taken on Monday 14th March 2016 and further ratified at the last Parish Council meeting on Monday 11th July 2016 . The members also voted in favour of retaining both Badbury Village and Badbury Park within the boundary of Chiseldon Parish.

Chiseldon Parish Council proposes that Badbury Village is moved back under the Ward of Chiseldon & Lawn.

Chiseldon Parish Council request an increase in the number of Parish Councillors from 15 to 16 with effect immediately.

- 5.10 As set out in the main report, Members may wish to note the greater shared community identities and common interests between those neighbourhoods that lie north of the M4, which may be better reflected for the purpose of convenient and effective local governance in joining a newly created South Swindon parish. Alternatively, Members may be convinced of the Parish's arguments.

- 5.10.1 Recommendation – That the existing parish boundary be redrawn to exclude all parts of the Parish north of the M4, the area so removed to form part of a new South Swindon parish. It is further recommended that the number of parish councillors remain at 15, since there would be a slight reduction in the current population.

Covingham Parish Council

- 5.11 Covingham Parish Council made no submission for parish boundary changes in Stage One. In Stage Two Covingham Parish Council have submitted with comments as follows:

Covingham Parish Council do not consent to being grouped for the following reasons: Covingham Parish Council do not want to be grouped with areas which were fundamentally very different. Covingham Parish Council has been established for many years and has a good reputation for providing for the residents of Covingham.

5.11.1 Recommendation – Covingham Parish Council boundaries and the number of councillors remain unchanged.

Hannington Parish Council

- 5.12 No parish boundary line changes are proposed.

5.12.1 Recommendation - Hannington Parish Council boundaries and the number of councillors remain unchanged.

Haydon Wick Parish Council

- 5.13 Proposals from Rodbourne Cheney Residents Association and Haydon View Community Association were received in Stage One merging these areas into the existing Haydon Wick Parish. In Stage Two, Haydon Wick Parish Council have made a detailed submission including comments as follows:

Following a discussion on the illustrative maps, a presentation from the Haydon View Residents Association and a brief summary by the Chair of Blunsdon St Andrew Parish Council on their draft submission the Councillors wish to make the following comments:

a) In recognition of the wish of the majority of the residents in Haydon View (Haydon View Road, Eastville Road, Mendip Road & Sunningdale Road) to become part the Parish of Haydon Wick the Councillors resolved to fully support the application made to the Borough Council for the boundary of the Parish to be amended to include Haydon View ;

b) The proposal to extend southern boundary as shown on Illustrative Map 1 & Map 2 is accepted (with a variation to incorporate Haydon View and the section of Whitworth Road from Lime Avenue to footpath leading to Seven Fields {Pond Street}). Boundaries to run behind properties in Whitworth Road;

c) The Councillors have taken no view with regard to the proposals made on Illustrative Map1 & Map 2 north of the current boundary as they relate to the Parish of Blunsdon St Andrew;

d) The Parish Council propose that the section of Abbeymeads currently within Blunsdon St Andrew be moved into the Parish of Haydon Wick. The new boundary to run from the junction of Thamesdown Drive and Elstree Way (eastern junction) to the junction of Thamesdown Drive and the A4311 (Cricklade

Appendix 1

Road). The boundary then to run along the centre line of Cricklade Road to the point where the HP5 footpath (Sherwood Walk) joins the Cricklade Road. This footpath runs between the areas of Abbeymeads and Penhill. All the properties to the north of the footpath will be in Haydon Wick. This will remove the operational issues which currently arise with the two Parishes providing services & the confusion caused to residents over which Parish serves Abbeymeads and enable a cost efficient service to be provided. It is understood that this proposal is supported by Blunsdon St Andrew Parish Council;

e) The Councillors wish to reiterate the need to remove Ray Ward with one (1) Councillor position and merge this position into Haydon End Ward giving nine (9) Councillor positions;

f) The Councillors wish for a minor adjustment to the boundary to be considered in regard to the boundary line Oakhurst Way to Tadpole Lane. Currently the boundary leaves Oakhurst Way and traverses a field before joining Tadpole Lane, it is proposed that it runs for the length of Oakhurst Way to the roundabout for the entrance of Tadpole Garden Village and then along Tadpole Lane. This would give a hard and easily recognisable boundary by following the highway.

5.14 Members may note that the area of Abbeymeads is included in the petition to create a separate St Andrew parish and Haydon Wick parish has provided no equivalent evidence to support expanding to the north. In addition, Members are advised that the other increases to the parish boundary may have adverse consequences on a proposed North Central Swindon parish and its ability to provide convenient and effective governance whereas Haydon Wick is already of a sufficient size and establishment to do this.

5.15 If this is agreed by Members, the new parish area be warded as follows: Haydon Wick – 9 councillors; Haydon End – 9 councillors; and it would mean abolishing the Ray Ward.

5.15.1 Recommendation That the existing parish boundary be retained and that the parish be warded as set out above with 18 parish councillors.

Highworth Town Council

5.16 Highworth Town Council have submitted in Stage Two as follows:

There are no apparent proposed changes to the Highworth Town Council Parish boundary shown in illustrative maps 1 and 2 so we have no comments to make on this.

5.17 The Town Council has stated subsequently:

On the indicative map...we do not have any objection to South Marston Parish Council (SMPC) assuming responsibility for the south east corner of our Parish area, adjacent to the A420 that includes part of the NEV development at Rowborough (shown in yellow).

Appendix 1

We do not have a violent objection to the suggestion that the whole of Supermarine Sports Field be included in the same Parish area but would rather suggest that the boundary be set at the roadway at the bottom end of the sports fields so that they are wholly within the Highworth side of the Parish boundary.

- 5.18 Given that there is agreement between two parishes to transfer the entire area of industrial land in the most southern part of the parish to South Marston parish, polling district BHF of the Blunsdon and Highworth Borough ward would need to be amended by creating a new polling district BHJ.
- 5.19 Since there is no agreement between the Highworth Town and South Marston Parish Councils concerning the Sports Field, no change is recommended.
- 5.20 Recommendation – To amend the southern boundary of the parish as reflected above and there be no change to the number of parish councillors.

Inglesham Parish

- 5.21 No parish boundary line changes have been proposed.
- 5.21.1 Recommendation – Inglesham parish boundaries remain unchanged.

Liddington Parish Council

- 5.22 No parish boundary line changes have been proposed.
- 5.22.1 Recommendation – Liddington Parish Council boundaries and the number of councillors remain unchanged.

Nythe Parish Council

- 5.23 Nythe Parish Council has submitted Stage Two comments as follows:
- Nythe Parish Council would like the Nythe allotments included within the Parish Boundary and are open to grouping of Parishes.*
- 5.24 Evidence from some residents and ward councillors as set out in the main report indicates that extending the Nythe parish to include Eldene and Liden, which do not have a parish at present, would unite an area with shared community interests as well as providing for effective local governance and representation.
- 5.25 An present Nythe has 7 parish councillors and it is suggested that this be increased to 11 if the parish is expanded.
- 5.25.1 Recommendation – To extend the parish of Nythe to include the currently unparished areas of Eldene and Liden to create an Eldene, Liden and Nythe parish with 11 parish councillors.

South Marston Parish Council

- 5.26 In Stage 2, South Marston Parish Council have submitted as follows:

Appendix 1

1. *The South boundary with Wanborough: Oppose the proposed change: Retain the River Cole as the boundary: Traffic egress onto A420 and towards village: Proposed NEV development intimately linked with development north of the A420: [The Parish has] considerable familiarity with the NEV proposals and emerging policies.*

2. *North boundary with Stanton: Accept change from a meandering line within the South Marston Industrial Park to A361. Accept western portion of Supermarine Sports Field (but see 4. below)*

3. *East boundary with Highworth:*

a) *If 2. Above is implemented, then this would run across the middle of the Supermarine sports site. We Recommend that the whole of the site is included in our parish.*

b) *Part of the easternmost development area of the NEV at Rowborough is within the Highworth boundary.*

5.27 As stated above, Highworth Town Council is happy to transfer the land at Rowborough but the Town Council would like the area of the sports field in Highworth, not South Marston.

5.27.1 Recommendation – it is recommended that the boundary with that Parish be aligned to the A361 as per the illustrative map, that the Rowborough part of Highworth be added, and that the remaining boundaries and number of parish councillors be left unchanged.

Stanton Fitzwarren Parish Council

5.28 In Stage Two it has been proposed to change the boundary between South Marston Parish Council and Stanton Fitzwarren to follow the A361. Discussion has indicated that this is acceptable to Stanton Fitzwarren Parish Council. No formal submission has been received.

5.28.1 Recommendation – To amend the parish boundary to the A361 as agreed by the parish councils of Stanton Fitzwarren and South Marston. It is further recommended that the number of parish councillors remain unchanged.

Stratton St Margaret Parish Council

5.29 In Stage Two, Stratton St Margaret Parish Council have responded as follows

Stratton St Margaret Parish Council strongly believe that it is important to maintain its existing boundary especially to the East of the Parish to include the Honda site, the A419 should not be used as the boundary line. The one provision is to include a small housing estate within the Blunsdon boundary (Branwell Close, Pearce Close and Loveridge Close on the Hyde Road)

The Parish Council is not looking to take on other areas but if Penhill is imposed on us then we would work for the best of the community.

Appendix 1

If the civil parish of St Margaret is to remain within its current boundary, we would wish to reduce the number of Councillors from 23 to 19.

The wards to be made up of the following:

<i>Coleview</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Lower Stratton</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Lower Coleview</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Upper Stratton</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Merton</i>	<i>1</i>

If Penhill is included in the Parish then it is suggested that the number of Councillors increase by an additional 2 for the Penhill ward making the total for the whole Parish Council at 21.

- 5.30 Since the Parish Council has not made a formal submission to include Penhill, and there might be adverse consequences for a proposed North Central Swindon parish that would diminish its ability to be effective if such a change were made, Members may choose to leave this boundary unchanged.

5.30.1 Recommendation – That the only amendment to the existing parish boundary be the inclusion of polling district PSD of the borough ward of Penhill & Upper Stratton from the existing Blunsdon St Andrew parish area. It is further recommended that the number of parish councillors be reduced from 23 to 19 as requested by the parish council, to take effect from the next full parish elections.

Wanborough Parish Council

- 5.31 Wanborough Parish Council have submitted as follows:

We note the proposed marginal adjustments to the northern parish boundary and have no objection to either.

- 5.32 Members may feel that there is no need to change the northern boundary of this parish until there is sufficient development of the New Eastern Villages that would create new identities and community interests.

5.32.1 Recommendation - Wanborough Parish Council boundaries and the number of parish councillors remain unchanged.

Wroughton Parish Council

- 5.33 Wroughton Parish Council have submitted as follows:

In April 2016 Wroughton Parish Council resolved that 'Swindon Borough Council be informed that the Parish Council would like the boundary of the parish of Wroughton extended to include East Wichel in accordance with the boundary

indicated on the attached map.' Our position has not changed from that resolution.

We are disappointed to see that all of Wichelstowe has been removed from the Parish of Wroughton in both illustrative maps. We believe that the existing community of East Wichel and the communities of Middle and West Wichel when they develop, will be best served by Wroughton as an experienced and well established Parish Council.

If it would not be possible to include East Wichel within the area of Wroughton Parish Council, then we would wish to retain Middle and West Wichel within our existing boundary.

- 5.34 As set out in the main report, Members may wish to note the greater shared community identities and common interests between those neighbourhoods that lie north of the M4, which may be better reflected for the purpose of convenient and effective local governance in joining a newly created South Swindon parish in an area that does not have a parish at present. In particular, Members may note the views of some residents in Badbury Park as well as the views of some Ward Members that confirm a distinct sense of community that such a parish could promote. Alternatively, Members may be convinced of the Parish's arguments.

5.34.1 Recommendation – That the parish boundary be amended to exclude the area north of the M4 in the current WWB polling district and that there be no change to the number of parish councillors.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1 Following a decision by Cabinet, it is anticipated that Stage 3 will commence the formal public consultation. As with the previous 2 stages, residents, groups, associations, stakeholders and Parish Councils will have the opportunity to comment on the proposal. Consultation will run from Tuesday 23rd August to 30th September 2016.

Stage 3	23 rd Aug to 30 th September 2016	Draft recommendations published and comments sought
Stage 4	3 rd October to November 2016	Consider final submissions and prepare recommendations
Final recommendations	November 2016	Publish final recommendations
Implementation order	January 2017	Council to make order

- 6.2 The Swindon Borough Council website will host a range of materials to assist with public feedback including information about the process to date, access to

Appendix 1

the relevant Cabinet papers, redacted copies of the submissions to date and access to information about the proposal for consultation.

- 6.3 Feedback will be requested in any written format and a feedback form will be available from reception areas at Swindon Borough Council and libraries, and also available via the Council's website www.swindon.gov.uk/parishes.