

Appendix 6: Member Steering Group CGR Recommendations and full reasoning

This appendix details the full reasoning considering by the CGR Member Steering group for each Stage 2 proposal.

The maps associated with each recommendation are shown in appendix 4.

The high level data for stage 2 consultation is shown in appendix 8. The Members of the Steering Group also had access to interactive heat maps which provided a good special analysis of results. A sample of these are shown in appendix 3. The Steering Group also had access to anonymised raw data from the stage 2 consultation responses.

Isle of Sheppey

Proposal : Change the name of Warden Parish Council to Warden Bay Parish Council

Recommendation: To change the name of Warden Parish Council to Warden Bay Parish Council

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	11 responses supported changing the name. All 11 were from residents living in the affected area. No responses supported no change.
Stage 1 consultation (same question was asked)	14 responses supported changing the name and 1 response supported no change.
Parish council response	Warden Parish Council did not respond at Stage 2, but supported the proposal at Stage 1 and was the original proposer of the change.
Reason for recommendation	The consultation results from both stages show clear support for the name change, so the Member Steering Group recommends that the change is made.

Proposal: Create a Halfway Parish Council for the currently unparished area of Halfway

Recommendation: To create a Halfway Parish Council (as shown in Map 1) with 7 seats.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	28 responses supported creating a Halfway Parish Council, all from residents in the affected area. 8 supported joining Queenborough Town Council (6 of whom were living in the area), 26 supported remaining

	unparished (20 living in the area), and 7 were not residents of the area.
Stage 1 consultation	18 responses supported a new parish, 20 supported merging with an existing parish or town council, and 4 supported no change.
Other evidence considered	A petition to create a Halfway Parish Council was collected earlier in 2025 with 426 signatures. Queenborough Town Council indicated that it would be willing to accommodate existing properties from the unparished area.
Reason for recommendation	Although the response rate was low, the petition, Stage 1 responses and Stage 2 responses together show a clear desire for a new parish council. The greatest number of residents in the affected area who responded supported a Halfway Parish Council.

Proposal: Amend boundaries between the new Halfway Parish Council and neighbouring town and parish councils

Recommendation: To amend the Minster-on-Sea Council boundary to incorporate the properties shown within Map 2 (Appleford Drive area), Map 4 (Ovinia Chase area) and Map 5 (Minster Road) from the new Halfway Parish Council area, but to transfer the properties shown within Map 3 (Baird Way area) from Minster-on-Sea to the new Halfway Parish Council.

Proposal	Recommendation and reason
Move Appleford, Salmon, Mills and Marr Close into Minster-on-Sea Parish Council.	10 responses to change the boundary (3 from residents living in area); 19 no change (7 living in area); 38 not resident. Recommend to amend the boundary. Although more affected-area respondents requested no change, the number was very low and the natural boundary means residents cannot easily access Halfway Parish Council services.
Move Baird Way/Faraday Drive from Minster-on-Sea Parish Council to Halfway Parish Council.	12 yes amend boundary (8 resident in affected area); 9 no change (3 resident of area); 38 not resident. Amend the boundary. The greatest number of respondents living in the affected area supported the change.
Move Ovinia Chase estate into Minster-on-Sea Parish Council.	7 response to yes amend boundary (2 resident of affected area); 7 no amends (but 0 living in area). Recommend to amend the boundary. Affected-area respondents supported

	the change and access to the estate is through Minster-on-Sea parish land.
Move three properties on Minster Road into Minster-on-Sea Parish Council.	8 yes to amend boundary (1 living in affected area); 5 no change (but none living in area). Recommend to amend the boundary. The proposal affects only three properties and follows natural road boundaries.

Proposal: Amend boundaries between Queenborough Town Council and Halfway Parish Council

Recommendation: To amend the Queenborough Town Council boundary to incorporate land shown in Map 6, from the new Halfway Parish Council.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes amend boundary – 14 No change 10 Not resident of the area - 27
Parish council response	No response at stage 2, but Queenborough town council supported at stage 1.
Reason for recommendation	This proposal affects land only and is tidying an existing boundary line. The greatest majority of respondents replied to agree with the proposal.

Proposal: Amend the boundary between Sheerness Town Council and Halfway Parish Council

Recommendation: To not amend the boundary between Sheerness Town Council and the new Halfway Parish Council, as shown in Map 7.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	0 responses supported amending the boundary and 3 responses supported no change.
Parish council response	No specific responses were received from existing parish or town councils at Stage 2.
Stage 1 consultation	This question was not specifically asked at Stage 1. The proposal was developed by the Member Steering Group in response to Stage 1 comments and as part of the Stage 2 proposals.
Reason for recommendation	The proposal affects land only and was intended to tidy an existing boundary line. However, the land is marshland

	and no local residents supported the change, although the response rate was very small.
--	---

Proposal: Move Lucas Close from Sheerness Town Council to Queenborough Town Council

Recommendation: To amend the boundary between Sheerness Town Council and Queenborough Town Council to move Lucas Close (Map 8) from Sheerness to Queenborough.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	1 response supported the transfer (lives in affected area), 3 supported no change (not residents living in affected area), and 19 were from people who were not residents of the area. The one resident living in the affected area who responded supported the transfer.
Parish and town council response	No direct response was received from a parish or town council at Stage 2. The question was not asked at Stage 1.
Previous Community Governance Review	In the 2022 Community Governance Review, 5 resident responses were received: 1 supported reviewing the boundary and 4 did not. The Council agreed the transfer at that time, taking account of ward councillor and parish council responses, but the transfer did not take place because the required paperwork was not signed off by Government.
Reason for recommendation	The proposal was included at Stage 2 to address the unresolved 2022 boundary issue. Although earlier resident responses were not in favour, the affected-area respondent at Stage 2 supported the transfer.

Faversham

Proposal: Increase the number of councillors representing Watling Ward from 4 to 6;

Recommendation: To increase the number of councillors representing Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council Ward) from 4 to 6 (3 per ward)

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	142 responses supported increasing councillor numbers, including 140 from residents living in the affected area. 107 supported no change, including 103 from residents living in the affected area. 57 responses were from people who were not residents of the area.
Parish and town council response	No direct responses were received from existing town or parish councils, although the proposal was put forward by Faversham Town Council.
Stage 1 consultation	25 responses supported splitting the ward and increasing councillor numbers. 12 supported keeping the ward as it is.
Reason for recommendation	More respondents supported increasing councillor numbers overall and among those living in the affected area. The Member Steering Group therefore recommends increasing the number of councillors from 4 to 6.

Proposal: To split the existing Watling ward (Faversham Town Council) into two

Recommendation: To split this ward into two.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	140 responses to splitting the ward (139 live in affected area); 111 no change (106 live in affected area); 55 not resident.
Parish and town council response	No responses directly from existing town/parish councils, however this proposal was put forward directly by Faversham Town Council
Stage 1 consultation	25 in support of the split, 12 keep it as is.
Reason for recommendation	Total number of responses favoured splitting the ward at both total response level and for those that live in

	the affected area. Therefore, recommended to split the existing Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) into two
--	---

Proposal: Increase the number of councillors representing Priory Ward from 2 to 3;

Recommendation: To increase the number of councillors representing Priory Ward (Faversham Town Council Ward) from 2 to 3

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	90 residents in favour of the increase (9 live in affected area); 97 no change (1 lives in affected area); 120 not resident of area.
Parish and town council response	No responses directly from existing town/parish councils, however this proposal was put forward directly by Faversham Town Council.
Stage 1 consultation	23 in favour of increasing; 13 keep as is, 25 not resident of the area.
Reason for recommendation	Although the total number of responses favoured no change in stage 2, upon reviewing those that live in the affected area, the majority wished for the number to increase

Proposal: To extend Watling Ward to include Perry Court

Recommendation: To extend the Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) to encompass Perry Court (Faversham Town Council owned land) from Ospringe parish council as shown in Map 9.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	112 residents responded to agree yes to the extension, with 140 advising wish for no change. 0 residents living within this area.
Parish and town council response	Initial proposal from Faversham Town Council. Ospringe Parish Council responded to a separate proposal, but did not provide views on this specific proposal as part of their stage 2 response, however at stage 1, they advised they oppose any boundary amends as could be considered just piecemeal changes.
Stage 1 consultation	Not included stage 1 consultation, as Member Steering group agreed this

	proposal only needed to be included to consult at stage 2.
Reason for recommendation	This proposal was put forward by Faversham Town Council as they are now the land owner of this piece of land, but it remains within Ospringe Parish Council area. The proposal would enable tidying of boundaries and would use a natural landmark as the boundary. There are currently no residents living within the affected area. The Heat Map provided of responses, showed that these were spread across a wider area of Faversham but those living nearest indicated a preference for the change to take place. Although the greater number of responses indicated residents preference to not make this change, as these are not residents living in the affected area and given the land ownership.

To extend Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) to cover area currently within Ospringe Parish area.

Recommendation – To not extend the boundary of Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council) to cover area currently within Ospringe Parish Council (Map 10).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	79 residents supported extending Watling Ward (none of whom live in the affected area); with 168 (16 living in area) preferring no change. 59 responses advised 'not resident of area'.
Parish and town council response	No response directly from Faversham Town Council, however they put forward the original proposal. Ospringe Parish Council provided a detailed response, following an emergency council meeting to which 64 members of the public attended. Concerns raised included loss of identity, loss of allotments and financial viability of the council.
Stage 1 consultation	17 would prefer to extend the boundary; with 17 preferring to keep as it. 27 advised not resident of area.

Reason for recommendation	Given the clear indication to the survey responses in stage 2 and the consultation comments from Ospringe Parish Council, it is not recommended that the proposal to transfer land from Ospringe to Faversham Town Council takes place.
---------------------------	---

Proposal: To extend the boundary of Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) to cover land within Boughton Under Blean Parish Council and Selling Parish Council

Recommendation: To amend the Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council) boundary to incorporate land currently within both Boughton Parish Council and Selling Parish Council (Map 11).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes – extend Watling ward to include area within Boughton and Selling Parish area – 102 (4 residents within affected area) No change – 124 (0 residents within affected area) I am not a resident of the area – 80.
Parish and town council response	No response directly from Faversham Town Council, however they put forward the original proposal. Boughton Parish Council and Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan both responded to the consultation. Concerns raised were more specifically regarding the CGR process, than providing clear views on the proposal itself. Both groups did also express their dissatisfaction with the process at stage 1. They also raised concerns about the impact of this change on the Boughton and Dunkirk Neighbourhood Plan and felt it would be undermined by a boundary change. Selling Parish Council responded as part of the Stage 1 consultation and were opposed to this proposal – they were concerned about the impact of loss of this land should the Duchy of Cornwall go ahead.
Stage 1 consultation	Yes, extend the boundary – 22 No, keep it as is – 25 Not resident - 14

Reason for recommendation	Although the overall response rate showed a preference for no change at Stage 1 and Stage 2, when reviewing responses for those directly living in the affected area, the preference was to extend the boundary for Faversham Town Council. There are a very small number of properties within the affected area. This proposal was put forward by Faversham Town Council to tidy boundaries ahead of further housing development in the future. The Heat Map reviewed by the Member Steering Group of responses, showed the distribution of wider responses were not adjacent to the affected area. It is not possible to determine from the stage 1 consultation responses whether these were the same residents responding and due to the split nature of the responses at Stage 1, this is why it was agreed to consult as part of stage 2 to seek clearer indication.
---------------------------	---

Proposal: To transfer land from Faversham Town Council to Sheldwich Parish Council

Recommendation: To transfer land from Faversham Town Council and Sheldwich Parish Council (Map 12).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes – extend – 95 (0 residents within affected area) No change – 106 (0 residents within affected area) I am not a resident of the area – 80.
Parish and town council response	No response directly from Faversham Town Council, however they put forward the original proposal. No response from Sheldwich Parish Council at Stage 2, however they did respond at stage 1 to identify the error with the question, but to advice they would be in support of the land transfer to them.
Stage 1 consultation	There was an error in the wording of the Stage 1 consultation question which meant that any responses needed to be discounted.

Reason for recommendation	Respondents are relatively split on this proposal, however there are no affected residents living directly in the affected area. This proposal was put forward by Faversham Town Council to transfer this boundary as it would ensure the entirety of the National Landscape is within the boundary of Sheldwich, and it is therefore recommended that this boundary amendment takes place.
---------------------------	---

Proposal: To extend Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) to transfer School Farm along Graveney Road, Graveney Road from Graveney with Goodnestone Parish Council

Recommendation: To extend Watling Ward (Faversham Town Council ward) to transfer School Farm along Graveney Road, Graveney Road from Graveney with Goodnestone Parish Council (Map 13).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes – 98 (2 residents within affected area) No change – 124 (1 residents within affected area) I am not a resident of the area – 84.
Parish and town council response	No response directly from Faversham Town Council No response from Goodnestone and Graveney Parish Council
Stage 1 consultation	This question was not specifically asked as part of the Stage 1 consultation – this proposal was developed by the Member Steering Group in direct response to the Stage 1 consultation comments and as part of the development on the Stage 2 proposals.
Reason for recommendation	There are only 4 affected properties within this area (School Farm) and the majority of respondents do not live adjacent to the affected area. This proposal was put forward as a result of the stage 1 consultation where residents within this affected area requested this boundary tidy. Therefore, it is recommended that this boundary change takes place.

Sittingbourne

Proposal: To amend the Iwade Parish Boundary, moving previously unparished land into Iwade Parish Council,

Recommendation: To amend the Iwade Parish Council boundary to incorporate previously unparished land (Map 14).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes – 2, change the boundary No change – 1
Parish and town council response	No response directly from any parish or town council at stage 2.
Stage 1 consultation	Yes, move the boundary – 37 No, keep it as is – 20 Not resident of area - 125
Reason for recommendation	This proposal was developed by the Member Steering Group to tidy this boundary line. There are only a small number of residents living within the affected area, but of those that responded, the greater number were in favour, at both stage 1 and 2.

Proposal: To amend the Bobbing Parish Boundary, moving land from Bobbing Parish Council into Iwade Parish Council,

Recommendation: To amend the Bobbing Parish Boundary, moving land from Bobbing Parish Council into Iwade Parish Council (Map 14).

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Yes, change the boundary – 1 No change – 5
Parish and town council response	No response directly from any parish or town council at stage 2
Stage 1 consultation	Yes, move the boundary – 37 No, keep it as is – 20 Not resident of area - 125
Reason for recommendation	This proposal was developed by the Member Steering Group to tidy this boundary line. There are no affected residents living within the affected area and although the majority of residents that responded were not in favour of this change, there are no houses in the affected area and is a boundary tidy.

Proposal: To create a Murston Parish Council

Recommendation: To create a Murston Parish Council as per the area within Map 15, with 9 number of seats.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	I want a Murston parish council – 44 (25 resident in affected area) I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 4 (respondents live in Shortlands Road area which is already proposed to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council). No change – 12 (9 resident in affected area) Additional analysis taken place in relation to the Vincent Park area specifically which had been proposed to be part of Sittingbourne town council – 0 residents wanted to be part of Sittingbourne town council; 35 part of Murston parish council; and 11 no change.
Parish and town council response	N/A
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked 'should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council'. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals
Reason for recommendation	The majority of respondents have said that they would like a Murston Parish Council, with this number increasing when including the Vincent Park area.

Proposal: To create a Great Easthall Parish Council moving land from Tonge Parish Council/ to merge the currently unparished area of Great Easthall with Tonge parish council

Recommendation: To amend the Tonge Parish Council Boundary as per Map 16, incorporating the currently unparished area of Great Easthall, increasing their number of councillors from 5 to 7.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Total responses: I want a Great Easthall Parish Council – 28 I want to be part of Tonge Parish Council - 21 I want to be part of Murston parish council – 2 I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 4 No change – 28 Further analysis has taken place between Great Easthall Residents and those living on Heron Fields (already part of Tonge Parish Council: Great Easthall residents – Murston PC (2); Sittingbourne TC (3); No change (14); Tonge (9); Great Easthall PC (9) Heron Fields/Tonge PC area – Sittingbourne TC (1); Murston (0); Tonge (10); Great Easthall (7)
Parish and town council response	Tonge Parish Council responded – they raised concerns regarding the financial viability of their council if they lost the Heron Fields development.
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked ‘should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council’. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals.
Reason for recommendation	The majority of respondents have said that they would like a parish council of some kind. Of comments made, there were concerns regarding payment to management companies with additional payments to a new parish council for those currently unparished – however a new parish council could take on functions of the management company. It is felt by the steering group that great

	easthall needs to be treated as one area, not spilt in two as it currently is with regard to parish coverage. Although there is a mixture of parish council options preferred by respondents, with concerns raised by Tonge Parish Council of their financial viability if they lost a large proportion of housing, the member steering group therefore felt that the whole of this estate should be covered by Tonge Parish Council.
--	---

Proposal: To create a Kemsley Parish Council

Recommendation: To create a Kemsley Parish Council as per the area within Map 17, with 9 seats

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	I want a Kemsley parish council – 68 I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 5 No change – 38 (all responses were from residents of the area)
Parish and town council response	N/A
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked ‘should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council’. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals.
Reason for recommendation	The majority of respondents have said that they would like a Kemsley Parish Council.

Proposal: To create a Milton Regis Parish Council

Recommendation: To create a Milton Regis Town Council as per the area within Map 18, with 9 seats

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	I want a Milton Regis parish council – 123 I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 10 No change – 73 (all responses from residents living within proposed area)
Parish and town council response	N/A
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked 'should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council'. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals. A petition was also collated in November 25 with approx. 142 signatures. Although it didn't specifically ask the same question as this CGR consultation, it did show the desire of the local population for a parish/town council, but there could be a cross over with respondents to the stage 2 consultation.
Reason for recommendation	The majority of respondents have said that they would like a Milton Regis Parish/Town Council.

Proposal: To create a Meads Parish Council moving land from Bobbing Parish Council/ To extend Bobbing Parish Council to encompass all of the unparished area of the Meads

Recommendation: To extend the boundary of Bobbing Parish Council, as per the area within Map 19, to include the unparished area of The Meads.

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	I want a Meads parish council – 10 I want to join/remain part of Bobbing Parish Council - 23 I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 5 No change – 38 (all responses were from residents of the area)
Parish and town council response	Bobbing Parish Council have confirmed that they would be happy for such an extension to take place.
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked ‘should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council’. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals.
Reason for recommendation	The majority of respondents have said that they would like a parish/town council with the majority having indicated they would prefer to join/remain part of Bobbing Parish Council. Part of The Meads is already part of Bobbing Parish area.

Proposal: To create a Grove Park Parish Council/extend Bobbing Parish Council to encompass all of Grove Park

Recommendation: To create a Grove Park Community Council as per the area within Map 20, with 7 seats, incorporating the part of this estate previously within the Bobbing Parish boundary

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	I want a Grove Park parish council – 39 I want to join/remain part of Bobbing Parish Council – 28 (5 already part of Bobbing) I want to be part of Sittingbourne Town Council – 23 No change – 31 Of the existing unparished area of Grove Park – Grove Park parish council(29); remain unparished (26); Sittingbourne Town Council (18); join Bobbing parish council (15).
Parish and town council response	Bobbing Parish Council have confirmed that they would be happy for such an extension to take place, but have raised concerns regarding the loss of any properties within this area and the impact on their financial viability.
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked ‘should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council’. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals.
Reason for recommendation	The greatest number of respondents have said that they would like some kind of parish/town council, with a new Grove Park Council being the highest response within those. Although concerns were raised by Bobbing Parish Council as to the loss of any properties within this area in their boundary, as per another proposal, they would gain a number of properties within the Meads area.

Proposal: To create a Sittingbourne Town Council merging some land from Tunstall and the remainder of unparished areas.

Recommendation: To not create a Sittingbourne Town Council as per Map 21

Evidence area	Summary
Stage 2 consultation	Total responses: 256 want a Sittingbourne town council; 318 no change Further analysis was undertaken and this number reconciled a number of times to factor: in any incorrect responses on other locations e.g. some responded to Grove park survey rather than Sittingbourne Town Centre.
Parish and town council response	Tunstall Parish Council – Have responded and requested that a boundary change be considered – they do not feel that the proposed development at Ufton Court Farm should sit within their boundary; and have also recommended another area should also be moved from within their boundary due to heritage reasons.
Stage 1 consultation	As part of the Stage 1 consultation, residents were asked 'should the currently unparished areas of Sittingbourne have its own town council or a local parish council'. 55 responded yes to a town council; 70 to a local council; 20 to no keep as is; and 19 as other. If responded yes to a local council, residents were asked to which area they felt the strongest connection and these were used to develop the stage 2 consultation proposals.
Reason for recommendation	Following the review of the responses from all of the wider Sittingbourne area, the greatest number of respondents were not in favour of a town council being established.