

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?			(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9			(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?				
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few	(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	This is fair representation.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I'm very much in favour of the establishment of a TWTC, that has appropriate representation from the parishes.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	It shouldn't exist at all!	-	No	-	There is no need for further representation, especially as the current elected officials interfere so much and achieve so little.		-	No	-	What a silly question! How on earth would drawing relatively straight lines on a map reflect community identity and interests. This is the work of people who have far too little concern for the work they are supposed to be doing and are paid to do.		-	No	-	They make very little sense	Too many	-	-	We already have far too many elected and unelected officials. My fervent wish is that some of them, any of them in fact, start to make a contribution. The very last thing we need is yet more elected officials with no real power or authority.	I wholeheartedly oppose this move. There is already far too much interference at all levels of our lives without even more relatively unaccountable elected officials sacking their oars in. I'm sure I speak for the majority of TW residents when I say that what we really want is basic services provided efficiently and on a timely basis. I have no doubt this can be delivered for considerably less than the current council tax we are all charged.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Having lived in smaller communities before in another area, splitting councils up just reduces their power, increases bureaucracy and prevents anything getting done.		-	No	-	Splitting areas will simply increase the division between those areas.		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Again, trying to get 3 people to agree to anything is nigh on impossible, 17 would be a nightmare.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Keeping it lean makes it more efficient both in terms of costs and decision making.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	I don't think it should exist at all	-	No	-	Even more bureaucracy		-	No	-	I don't live in a Parish! I don't go to church. The divisions are historic and meaningless. This is supposed to be about modernising local government and streamlining not wasting more public money		-	No	-	see above	Too many	-	-	Way to many. Who will be paying their expenses!	Yes. Citizens are more than capable of representing themselves in this day and age. I really do not need a representative of any political party to tell me how to run my life. Have the good grace to disappear for good you are no longer needed. If there must be some sort of bureaucracy to run any essential local services (that can't be run by a larger body) then officers can simply organise online voting and cut out the middlemen. What exactly are these busy bodies going to do
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	14-19 allows ward representation when a councillor may be unavailable for a decision.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	More bureaucracy and red tape to get things done. This will only complicate matters and the town should be dealt with as one entity rather than creating further subdivisions.		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	It seems like a very excessive amount of people there are only 6 wards surely two per ward so 12 in total would make more sense and save the council money that can be spent on the community.	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Reflects our current representation I TWBC	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-	Always minimise complexity's		-	No	-	The glade is excluded from the culverden ward and yet it's the only access via bishop down		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Too much complexity	Keep things simple !!
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Splitting areas in to smaller would be better. It would help specific areas in council decision making		-	No	-	3 should be split. Camden Road is a business and residential area with specific issues	Too many	-	-	Too many. 2 per ward is enough.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	Concerns about added bureaucracy and cost in terms of council tax. I'm not sure that the area we live in would benefit from greater, localised representation.		-	-	Unsure	Once again, not sure what community interests are within the Pantiles		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	17 sounds like a lot! More difficult to reach agreement on matters.	The response rate to the first phase of public consultation was 2.83% which is awful and can in no way can reflect the general consensus. I imagine those that want these changes responded, while those that do not, did not I'm not sure how you can improve this but really think a wider response is required before moving to next steps.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It might be hard to fill all vacancies	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	This is an opportunity to make the town council more cost effective	
-	-	-	Yes	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council - no need for the Royal	Yes	-	-			-	No	-	There is no representation for Rusthall, High Brooms or Pembury to name but three areas		Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I'd suggest two per area - so that would make 12, but three would yield 18. Not sure how we came to 17?	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Another Parish Council is unnecessary	-	No	-	An additional council is completely unnecessary		-	-	Unsure	We are one town and we don't need more bureaucracy in the form of		-	No	-	Not necessary	Too many	-	-	Too much bureaucracy	This proposal is a complete waste of money - an unnecessary increase in bureaucracy.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	A single set of representatives for a town is a small, specific enough entity. Further sub-division into even smaller interest groups would not help encourage a single identity.		-	No	-	It's cut up numerically above all else.		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	17 people needing to decide matters just for a town is far too many. Less than half would do.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Unnecessary additional expense of councillors and vague role responsibilities. What exactly will they be doing and at what cost? Its unclear.		-	No	-	This is a relatively small area that has been divided, and for the most part not a great deal of difference in constituents so I don't understand what benefit it would have having 6 different councillors running it. No doubt at a massive increase in cost!		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Where has this number been plucked from? Massive overspend without justification. Im assuming increased council tax employ these 17 people to run a relatively small area? Brilliant.	Disagree with proposed changes. A lot of the responsibilities of country, borough and parish councils are discretionary so what are the policies? All this will do is complicate council responsibility at an increased cost with no discernible benefit.
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	I don't think the town council is a good idea at all. It seems that it will just be another way of increasing council tax.		-	No	-	Culverden is too large and parts is closer to St John's which is also where we do our shopping and socialise.		-	-	Unsure	-	About right	-	not sure	As a resident I oppose the creation of a town council.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Maybe this could be reviewed at a date in the future to see if this is too many or too few	
Yes	Yes	-	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council - drop the Royal. Too long and pretentious. It's been a long time since we had anything to do with the Royals!	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems like a sensible number to both make decisions and share responsibilities.	No.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Potentially it gives the electorate more scope to balance the political stance of the council.	No.
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	In this role, they should act with one voice - the area is small enough for that to be feasible. They should consider what is good for Tunbridge Wells as a whole.		-	No	-	The boundaries of many are in the wrong place. There are more individual character areas than shown.		Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Compared to Southborough and High Brooms, this figure seems about right and enough to give an overall view if some councillors do not vote.	Representatives of the public and local organisations should have a formal role as a consultee to the town council.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	I don't think you should be undertaking this at all, but as a small number of people have decided that this is the way forward (without being given all the facts). The smaller number the less convoluted the process will become.		-	No	-	Much of the Pantiles area has very different needs to Sherwood area.		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	Ideally there would be none, but as this is likely to go ahead, one or two per area is surely plenty?	As usual the cost element (probably the most important information to divulge) has not been indicated. Manipulating the responses by withholding information. I believe when created wards won't have to adhere to the maximum percentage charged increases (year on year) imposed at higher levels of local council?	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	COST. I note a parish council can charge what they like and increase it without limits. My current council tax bill is already 25% of my net income and I deeply resent this obscene charge. The thought of any increase is terrible!		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	There would have to be enough to do the job but not more because of the cost.	Scrap them.
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	Residents don't care who looks after what. It's confusing enough as it is - "oh, no it's the Borough Council that does that". I don't care, just empty the bins!		-	No	-	These are boundaries just lazily copied from the borough wards. There's no "community" considerations there		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	The maximum amount should be capped at zero. I would prefer to have less councillors overall.	Don't do this. There are no tangible benefits to residents. We shall only see the increase in tax and all the councils will do is point fingers at everyone else.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Should be productive and cost efficient	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council	Yes	-	-			-	No	-	too many should be only 4 with St Johns and St James merged		-	No	-	3 does not refer to anything significant	Too many	-	-	maximum of 2 per ward +8	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	This amount seems to have worked in the past so if it ain't broken dont change it	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	-	Unsure	Division into wards has its advantages, such as local representation. However, a town-wide list allows for bigger ideas and politicians with higher profiles and wider appeal.		-	No	-	These wards are large in a way that works for borough elections, but if the new parish is divided into wards we should take the opportunity to be more specific so people have more focused representatives.		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	We certainly do not need 17 councillors to do the work of a town council. A smaller group of councillors will make the elections more competitive and improve the quality of candidates, especially if we have a single ward.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Large areas contain a diverse and broad range of people's needs and interests		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	The more you have, the more it costs. Really we need to reduce costs and not waste money especially after your recent survey asking where can we save/cut money!	Yes. Tell us how much this will cost and where the money is coming from	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Two many 12 is about right	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	ok	
Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It is on the same basis as the other parish councils within the borough.	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	2 to 3 in each ward seems right	The amount of discretionary duties of the parish council seem very large. Surely responsibilities should be much more clearly defined to avoid too many layers of government and possible conflicts.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The names are familiar and accepted. They have logical associations.	Possibly the proposed number of councillors is a little high, 2 per ward?
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	17 works out at about 3 per ward - possibly 1 extra for the largest ward. Gives each ward more than one point of contact.	No
Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Too much cost for no reason and total lack of coordination with everyone having their own agendas.		-	-	Unsure	Pantiles includes extremely expensive properties while it also has l		-	-	Unsure	-	About right	-	You have an intention of ploughing ahead with this WITHOUT taking into account an adequate number of responses from residents who come from all areas and all walks of life.	This is NO way to conduct a Consultation. All such Consultations relating to those who are affected should be based upon the ACTUAL majority of ACTUAL residents in the unparished area; not such a paltry number. It is hardly surprising to see that you had so few responses when you made no attempt at onset to indicate that Precepts are not governed in the same way as Council Tax and can be levied to whatever level the desiring few wish. While you note the pros and cons these are a tad selected. You do not show the cost benefits analysis, you do not show how much Special Expenses would reduce in relation to the ever increasing parish precept. The list of what a Parish Council could do is quite extensive but no indication has been made as to costs faced where the Borough	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Dilution and interference from even more busy bodies. We need a strong SMALL group to represent us and any high value proposals are always put to referendum. I		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	We currently have 30 councillors costing us over £500k per	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Too much dilution and opportunity for local busy bodies to jump in and interfere in local politics.		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	We currently have 38 costing us £500kpa + expenses. ONE for each ward is more than enough. And should be void of politics with their own agendas eg climate change or socialism	The exercise is good but not if it costs more or anybody at the council gets a pay rise. Costs should be contained and where possible REDUCED
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			-	No	-	2. Pantiles and St Mark's	-	About right	-	Good to have as many local voices as possible	Keep Royal Tunbridge Wells in the council name.

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?					
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called			(Q6a) If unsure, please tell us why			Yes			No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names			Too many			About right	Too few			
							Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure									Yes	No	Unsure						Yes	No	Unsure
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Too few	It depends on the electoral method. About right if the votes are centralised but too few if each ward is returning councillors separately.	Tunbridge Wells is a relatively affluent town but many of the population on whom we all depend, who both live and work here, have been historically underrepresented. A new town council would have the right to charge additional charges which many cannot afford and have expressed concern. If a new layer of administration is to be conceived it must protect and represent everyone.						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	I hope that there's widespread agreement on the above and the more intricate matters of what specific roles and responsibilities the town council will have can be focused on. I am unclear on what the borough council would still be responsible for under these proposals so would like some clarity on this.							
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	I think 17 as a group is too cumbersome to manage, govern and make decisions							
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-							
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	This seems the simplest and most logical answer - also least disruptive as follows what we have for TWBC today (whereas the West Kent wards are likely to be bigger, perhaps following KCC divisions)						
Yes	Yes	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	We need to be careful creating a situation that will push even more financially the people leaving from a set pension or the not so fortunate ones.						
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Too much debate, fewer decision makers and action-oriented councillors is better.						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	2 or 3 councillors for each ward enables reflection of the diversity of opinions in the ward. Also, the council needs to be large enough to represent this diversity whilst being sufficiently compact to have focused debate and effective decision making.						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Effective decision-making is inhibited with so many. 2 each is enough-elected Chairman for, say, 3 years who has a replacement Cllr elected in their ward	I note that several of those who said "no need" for a TC in Phase 1 also said TWBC does OK/ more bureaucracy, so misunderstanding that there won't be a TWBC, but even if the Unitary idea is not implemented, we should have a Town Council to remove the democratic deficit-even tiny flustahl has one!					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	The new council should be apolitical.						
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 councillors would seem to be the right level						
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Too much bureaucracy	We don't need another layer of government. It adds another layer of bureaucracy.					
-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	As above, believe it should be 3 wards so 6 per ward, but population counts may dictate rebalancing.	Impacts on neighbouring parish councils need to be included. Reducing number of wards would better reflect boundaries with Southborough, Pembury etc				
-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	From what I know they are doing the work adequately.					
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	no						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	none						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	Too many	-	-	More people = more cost and I disagree with the whole thing anyway.	Names all are acceptable but I disagree with the whole idea. This will add costs to council taxes which are high enough anyway. We should be seeking more efficiencies on a system which currently works well enough.					
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Decision making needs a smaller group however there could be a larger group to advise and react to decisions made	There needs to be a mix of representatives of each ward and some with other types of overall interests					
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	About three per ward allows some diversity					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	I think 2 councillors per ward could still be effective and help to manage costs	Would need very good explanation of why that number is necessary	None that I can think of			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3, should be called Dunorton					
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 + no comment as this should not be happening					
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	That's a lot of people being paid and taking money from pensioners	Stick with TWBC, forget wards				
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	See earlier response regarding bureaucracy and cost	The forecast population of the Borough of Tunbridge Wells in 2025 is 120,879. Given that 1044 responses have been received which equates to 0.86% of the population this is anything but an overwhelming mandate for change. Furthermore, 67% thought there should be one town council to represent the unparished areas. I completely agree. I trust that change is not being made for the sake of change.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	I'd suggest 2 per ward or 12 in total	I have not yet seen them				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Accountability will be split too widely, and there's a risk of inaction.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	About right	-	-	Need a reasonable number. The other option is to reduce by 1 for each ward but that would probably make it non functioning	Still think it is unnecessary and the concept is a real issue.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	All looks good, feels a similar number to the existing councillors					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 - Woodlands Ward	2				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	After reading the draft proposal & understanding the way it was calculated it made sense					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	The ratio of councillors to population seems right					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Seems about right to have a few per ward for collaboration and coverage in case of sickness, other issues for continuity					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No addition to the answer is required					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Approximately 3 per ward seems right.					
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Similar number of Councillors to other large Town Councils. Beshill for example.	Having read and fully understand the Draft Recommendations made by the Working Party, I give my support for the implementation of them. May the new Town Council adopt the Motto, Do Well Doubt Not. Democracy needs to flourish in such a well known town across the Globe. Frankly, a Town Council for Tunbridge Wells should have been created many years ago. The Town Forum was and is very poor substitute for a fully functioning Town Council.				
Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	About right	-	The number of Cllrs is sensible, although looking at the number of Cllrs in BMPC against the electorate it seems much larger. For example 6500 electorate in Sherwood has 3 Cllrs whereas the electorate in B&K is around 2500 with 3 Cllrs.	Having read the whole document and appendices I feel the proposal is entirely right and a sensible way forward. I know that both TWBC and KCC, and indeed the Government, are saying that there will be no change to the roles and responsibilities of Parish Councils in the LGR but that is not an honest reflection of the realities already being experienced by Parish Councils. The LDA has not been fully reviewed since 1972, much of what it contains is not fit for purpose and makes running Parish Councils difficult as the Borough and County Councils are making changes, but leaving the parishes to be confused. Whilst funding the concept is currently uncapped for PCs the proportion of staff salaries to budget is, or should be in the region of 35%, leaving many wondering why they are largely paying to cover employees. That is improved by a Town Council, taking Paddock Wood as an example. The aspect that this option, for a RTW Town Council, most benefits is the economies of scale, parishes suffer from not being able to do this - though this will hopefully work better if the LGR identifies local clusters of parishes, so yes a RTW Town Council does have financial benefits. It would also provide less of a "shock" to the town in general, albeit the Town Council is only a fraction of the current Borough Council, it does provide a clear central town governance that would be better than adding 6 fresh, inexperienced (both in terms of staff and Cllrs) parish councils. Inevitably there will be much greater likelihood of political factions on a RTW Town Council, whereas there is for these shouldn't be such allegiances on 6 new Parish Councils. I	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	About right	-	Number is adequate for the likely workload.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	About right	-	It's what I felt about the issue	Yes cost is most important and any changes should reduce costs and not increase the overall running cost of Tunbridge Wells.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	About right	-	Hard to say - not really my area of expertise - but happy to go with the recommendation by the panel	No thanks	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Too many	-	-	We don't need 17 councillors	

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?			(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?								
live in one of the unparished areas	work in one of the unparished areas	represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few	(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9		
Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	Yes	-	-	I think there should be two Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council and Culverden Town Council. Hear me out: Rusthall, Langton Green and Speldhurst are all beautiful places and have been swallowed by Tunbridge Wells. Culverden would act as a bridge and town.			-	No	-	I think that Culverden should be combined with St John's and St James.		-	No	-	Culverden, St John's and St James' should be grouped together and called Culverden and All Saints	-	About right	-	I think it is fine, because it's worked in the past and represents enough without being too divisional.	I really do think this should happen. I know it sounds mad at first but Culverden has its own unique history. It's got Culverden Castle, and the Great Culverden Estate and it is a really different place. Plus it is less affluent than Tunbridge Wells overall and it has its own unique identity, and deserves to be recognised for it. As well as this it would be a real shame for Rusthall, Langton and Speldhurst to get swallowed up, especially since I went to school in Speldhurst and would hate to see the place get urbanised and fade away. Culverden would act as a bridge, with enough countryside to feel like it could be a village but enough convenience to be able to say 'I come from Culverden' and 'I come from Tunbridge Wells' and both would be fair and true. Crime has been a problem there for too long. The place needs gentrification and identity and would be a great place for new families to move in.	
Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	-	No	-	Well yes I think it should but I also think the Culverden ward should have a separate town council as well as being included under the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council. Also I think it should be just Tunbridge Wells Town Council, that's more realistic	Yes, apart from Culverden which should have its own town council as well. But at the very least, call it more than a ward, at least call it a village or a town or even just a suburb or settlement in its own right, because it has its own identity.		-	No	-	I think this is not really necessary but would help with my view, which I know is also a shared view with many others) culverden and another ward, either Rusthall or St John's/St James or Southborough should be combined to make it more self sufficient		-	No	-	All wards are apart from Culverden, which I think should be either Culverden and Rusthall, Culverden and Southborough or Culverden and All Saints (if combined with St John's and St James)	-	About right	-	I think it is fine, it's worked in the past.	I have a lot of friends locally who agree that Culverden is more than just a ward. People grow up there for generations. It's a nice place, where people really look out for each other, but it has issues that too often get ignored because it is just a ward in a fairly okay town. Plus it would act as a strategic bridge between Rusthall, Langton Green and Speldhurst to stop them from being urbanised and taken over by the main town and keep them as their own communities. I think if this were to happen, St John's Road would most likely be the high street and town centre, with Culverden Down leading into the residential areas, both rich and poor. Please hear this community out, it needs to be at least recognised as more than just a ward like Park or Pantiles, because fundamentally it is. At least allow it to be recognised as a village or small town, and even if this doesn't happen this time the idea will only grow in popularity and next time we have a survey like this it will win anyway.	
Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-	No	-	Yes	-	-	I think it should be called Tunbridge Wells Town Council or The Wells Town Council, and it should not include Culverden.			-	No	-	The Pantiles and Park should potentially be combined, Culverden should either stand independent or be combined with either Southborough, Rusthall or potentially St John's/St James' to create an independent satellite town.		-	No	-	Well Park feels like a very boring and unrepresentative name. I recommend The Village or St Mary's. Culverden should keep its name or become Culverden and Southborough, Culverden and Rusthall, or Culverden and All Saints (if St John's+St James')	-	About right	-	Well it doesn't matter how many there is as long as they represent a good diversity of voices. But overall, I think it is fine.	I am sure you have read a lot of surveys suggesting the independence of Culverden, so I really wanted to emphasise why I believe in this. Culverden is a place with its own history. And it is a really nice community—there's a real sense of being looked out for. But there has been problems: it has one of the highest crime rates in Tunbridge Wells, and that's not just a statistic, that is people's lives getting ruined. It's less affluent. And it has its rich parts of course but overall as a community it has been through a lot of good times and bad times, which are seldom recognised by the councillors of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. It needs to be recognised, it needs to be addressed, and it needs to be seen as its own community because that is what it is. Please, we really ask you to consider us. Another thing which couldn't be fitted into the previous box about ward names: Culverden could be renamed as Great Culverden, Culverborough, West Dene, or West Farm. This would just solidify the identity and break the cycle of it being lumped into the main town, but obviously not necessary. I would like to really encourage you to appreciate this idea and seriously consider it. It would mean everything to this community. Another big reason is that Rusthall, Langton Green and Speldhurst are all beautiful places, and they are at a high risk right now of being swallowed by the urbanism of the main town. Culverden's town or village status would stop this, acting as a bridge that would make them feel more self sustained again as any satellite village should be, and feel more like a community of areas rather than a few scattered suburbs.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The allocations for each ward based on population seem right.	None, thank you for the opportunity to share comments.	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	Unsure			we need a smaller town council than the borough council but I am not sure how many councillors the proposal would generate		-	-	Unsure		I do not live in the affected area	Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Two per ward would suffice	Yes, it is not clear whether the Town Council would have control over the parks. This is the case in Sevenoaks and it is very effective.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-	Unsure	My area is st James but I identify more with the st Johns area because	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-	It will remain the same as it is now.	What about the plan for the old gas works in Sandhurst road had anyone said about the cars who park on Sandhurst road then go up to rail on the paths so people have to go on the road the paths need to be looking at all the mess on the path crap water running out of the drains in the walls	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I think two per ward is more appropriate and will ensure that councillors from the same ward need to compromise and work together instead of being about to overrule with a 2/3 majority.		
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Yes	-	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council. It will then not need to be changed when we abolish the monarchy			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Logic seems sound		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Not more than two councillors per ward is quite sufficient.	If wards are not roughly equal in population there should be one or two councillor wards, not two or three. Presumably a mayor of Royal Tunbridge Wells would be elected by the whole council. If not, why not?	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Enough to personally connect with ward and sufficient number to allow challenge.	No.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-	Unsure	I'm in favour of Parish Councils	Living in the Culverden area, I am not sure that one end of Culverden	Yes	-	-		-	Too few	-	I'm in favour of Parish Councils	I have no idea what workload there will be but if it works out at approx 3 councillors per ward then hopefully someone has worked this out.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-	Unsure			Yes	-	-		-	Too few	-	Each should have same number ie 3x3=18	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Without understanding details of the role and it's responsibilities it would seem to be too many - surely 1, max 2, per ward suffices		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	There needs to be representative government for all sections of the town. However, I am concerned that it may be hard to find people willing to stand for election if there is a transition period - i.e. we end-up with an RTW Parish Council, TWBC and KCC.	I am particularly concerned with what will happen to Tunbridge Wells' parks and recreation grounds if the local area gets run by a West Kent unitary authority. It's likely to be based in Maidstone, so won't have the same concern about the local green spaces that TWBC currently has. It will be such a shame to lose the marvellous TWBC Parks Department.....	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The numbers seem to reflect proportionately as far as possible the number of residents in each ward		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	3 each for the larger areas, 2 each for St John's and St James, total 16		
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think this is sufficient and an uneven number means a deciding vote is less likely to be needed		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Just about right	No	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-	Unsure	I only know about my own ward		Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I think it's the Same as at present	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	As long as it's a similar ratio of electoral role to councillors it could be OK		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Local representation would be extremely beneficial to reflect the nuances of each area.	The suggested areas and associated names seem relevant and appropriate.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Between 2 and 3 per ward seems appropriate.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Need clear relationship / accountability between proposed Unitary Authority and proposed RTW Town Council.		
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Yes	-	-	Who cares, I think the whole idea is wrong			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	We must keep costs low as possible	The total cost of council tax and related taxes must come down as it is not affordable so economy must be the only aim.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	No	-	I think the proposed Town Council is a waste of money during the cost of living crisis.	We already have local elected representatives. Effort could be better spent improving people's involvement in existing local democratic structures.		-	No	-	Wards are about dividing the local area into numerically representative areas rather than representing distinct communities in most parts of Tunbridge Wells.		-	No	-	I don't agree with the Town Council and don't believe the wards represent distinct communities.	Too many	-	-	Why do we need duplication of existing representatives. We already have ward councillors elected generally on very low turnouts. Just because Southborough and rural communities have parish and town councils, it does mean that TW should follow.	I do not support the recommendations which are being taken forward on a very low turnout. Effort should be spent on improving the effectiveness of existing local democratic structures. The Town Council is likely to become a talking shop for minority interest groups. I strongly support local democracy but do not feel the proposals will improve representative democracy in Tunbridge Wells. The associated costs will negatively impact poorer families.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	A larger number would, I think, become unwieldy. Fewer would risk limiting the scope for a representatively diverse group of councillors		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Shares workload appropriately, elevates chances of bias for concerns/queries that might be brought up with them		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	would the number for each ward be dependant on the population of each ward ?	see previous question	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems to be a representative number of councillors		

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?				(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?				
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few	(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	see below	I support the establishment of a Tunbridge Wells Town Council and the recommendations that the existing wards remain unchanged in area and that the number of councillors is directly related to the projected populations of each ward which I assume is the current case. My answers in this survey do I hope reflect my views as stated here. It would have been helpful if this survey had been written in such a way that the questions, and thus responses, were linked directly to each of the recommendations with the opportunity for respondents to offer views as to why they do not agree with each recommendation.
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	-	Too few	At least 3 per ward and one more to avoid even number in total - 19	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Diverse area, not sure of Culverden/ Parishes/ Park borders - are the	-	-	Unsure		Too many	-	-	2 councillors per ward should be adequate	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure			-	-	Unsure		Too many	-	-	Why 17? 2 per council would seem more appropriate/ manageable unless it's weighted to numbers	
-	-	-	Yes	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council. Few people outside TW realise that it has the Royal prefix which means an internet (eg Google) search returns no result, which is frustrating (same issue as for Royal Wootton Bassett).	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It is broadly comparable to elsewhere, having been the subject of a Local Gov Boundaries Commission review which passed into law on 4 Jan 2024. https://www.lgbce.org.uk/	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Too many Wards reduce admin and increase mandate of councillor		-	-	Unsure		Too many	-	-	Why 17 - one or two per ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-		
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	-	Unsure	Seems to be used to justify increased costs/tax raising		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Don't have a view in the number. Fewer the better to expedite decision making	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I don't think it needs that many councillors	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Too much dilution and inevitably MORE Cost !!!!!!!		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	The more u have the more it costs => it just becomes a considered view. We need 12 wise men no more	
Yes	Yes	-	-	-	No	-	I think it should just be Tunbridge Wells Town Council, as do many others.	Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Cut off the part of Culverden closest to the town centre. Bishops Down Park Road and Culverden Down should be the start, with Tunbridge Wells Common still included. Make the cut off parts either part of Park, or their own ward.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	Well I think we need to try it out before you ask people, because the common public doesn't really understand the concept. Perhaps another COB should be conducted later on.	
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Similar in size to other nearby towns	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	About right for the people represented but more needed when the new builds are built	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The creation of this council would give local residents and representatives to work on behalf of local people.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Allows reasonably even representation for each ward and permits majority decision pre-eminence in most. Reduction to two per ward is preferable to increasing numbers.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Think 12 would be adequate	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	No need to make more changes than necessary to the new Town Council	
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	It has been very difficult to find information about these changes to our local government system. As a result many are unaware of the significance and will have a shock later in the process when they realise this is likely to reduce local democracy not increase it. TWBC has been silent! The new Town Council should take on as much as it can running local services leaving the unitary body to manage only the major services such as education, health, motoways, police etc.	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	6 individual wards would be far more complicated, cost more and add complexity. A single town council would still represent the 6 wards much as the current Town Forum does		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Having upto 3 councillors per ward seems to be duplicating roles maybe 2 per ward would be more appropriate	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		I dont know	Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Each Cllr needs to represent a simmilar number of residents	
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Equal representation based on demographic data	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	If my ward councillor is someone of a different party, they are less likely to help me on a matter they are opposed to. At least if they're all in one big council I can contact a councillor from my own party, if one has been elected.		-	-	Unsure		N/a	Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Too many councillors = too much bureaucracy	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	No reference to ROYAL. TWTC = Tunbridge Wells Town Council	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Two per ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think that number provides the right level of representation and spreads the load of responsibility adequately.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	3 each for the larger wards and 2 for the smaller wards. Or 3 for each.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	A realistic number of representatives	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	2-3 councillors per ward seems relatively fair, and under 20 people should be easy to manage.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Roughly 3 councillors per ward seems about right to create a manageable council	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Sufficient number of councillors for each ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Enough to challenge, not too many to get things done!	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	2/3 councillors per area is fine	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	That would give 2/3 councillors per ward, a job too big for just 1 councillor but 2 can support each other, discuss and make decisions	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	2 per ward ie 12	
Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Based on no of pop	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Just enough to represent all areas.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	There should be two for each ward.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Too many	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		population in each ward differs a lot there should be an equal split	-	-	Unsure		Too many	-	-	This allows a reasonable number per ward	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		How do you define a community?	-	-	Unsure		-	About right	-	Two councillors per ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems a sensible number given the population	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	About 3 per area seems appropriate	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	We need to save money have 2people for each borough and 1 chairman	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	They are too large. They should be 1/3rd of the size (one councillor per ward). They are easily split into smaller units by communities.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	Provided elections are done sensibly. The names of candidates and a page about each should be published by the Council.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.	
-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	RTW-West; RTW-South; RTW-North; RTW-North; RTW-NorthEast; RTW-SouthEast If RTW was instead divided by communities, then the community names would be more relevant. The large wards currently cover several areas effectively 'excluding' them.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	RTW-West; RTW-S	

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q4) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q5) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q6) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?			
live in one of the unparished areas	work in one of the unparished areas	represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5b) If no, please tell us why	(Q5c) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few	(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Park seems very vague	-	About right	-	The option you have created is the same as we currently have. Same number of councillors etc.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Weald of Kent Town Council	Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Where are the outlying parishes?		-	-	Unsure		-	About right	Too few	Given I believe Culverden and Park should be broken down, more councillors may be required	So this is just about Tunbridge Wells?
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Park and Culverden areas are too big to be effectively represented		-	-	Unsure		-	Too few	Keep it simple	This is a step in the right direction, but I feel Park and Culverden need to be split into more granular areas	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	IF THAT IS 3 PER WARD IT SEEMS ABOUT RIGHT	NO
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Too many councillors would make decisions in the council wards complicated	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Too many councillors would make decisions in the council wards complicated	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Too many councillors would make decisions in the council wards complicated	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I have no views	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Give n the 2030 projection of electors, the dist ribution of seats per ward seems reasonable.	No
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		Park seems enormous but I don't know the number of residents there		-	-	Unsure	-	About right	-	The wards are very large in general - is it possible to have more wards with the 17 or so councillors?	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Councillor numbers are adequate to reflect ward population	
Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	Unsure		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Not too clumsy	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Think that number is about right	
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	Too few	-	At least 3 per ward...in case of illness or absence there is always someone who should be available	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells isn't big enough to have to be split up anymore than totally necessary. There are not enough good councillors who do not have their own self-interest at heart to offer their best for each of the proposed council areas		-	No	-	Culverden and Park cover far too large an area with a very large disparity in housing. St James and St John's should either merge or both Culverden and Park should be split up.		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	I don't think there should be 6 council wards due to the small size of St John's and St James' wards in relation to Culverden and Park.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I imagine 2 is enough - after all we have an MP overall	Focus on basic things first, be honest and thorough. Be seen to move around the wards AND the whole area too.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	If the numbers are proportionate to the population in each ward.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		I'm concerned that Sherwood's voice may be underrepresented in it		Yes	-	-	Too many	-	-	18 seems fairer, 6 each.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	1 or 2 per ward is sufficient	It would be great to develop local parks such as St Johns Park as this has enormous potential but has had very little change in the 12 years I have lived in Tunbridge Wells.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	I think the Pantiles area has three very distinct separate communities. The Park area between Calverly and the train line is more closely connected with the Eastern edge of Pantiles (Grant Rd to the train line). Primarily due to the schools & pupil homes		Yes	-	-	-	About right	-	-	Each town ward has unique areas with their own characteristics which need separate representation eg Pantiles, Ramsley / WPARA / Broadwater Down / Station West	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	An overall council of 17 should be enough to allow a quorate representation. Any larger will make decision making too difficult	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	One Councillor per area so there is real focus would be good. We have 3 at the moment but we only use one	Only that it is vital we have a say, the Town forum had no clout although well meaning
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	More than sufficient for the likely workload.	Fully support.
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I am assuming that this is the number of current councillors. More than this would be excessive	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It is about right for the size of population of the inner wards, and is consistent population wise with current TWBC number of councillors	Draft recommendations refer to allotments being only responsibility that is obligated to be transferred. Real consideration needs to be given to the question of assets and the needs of people in Royal TW unparished areas with consideration given to parks, play areas, leisure facilities, community centres, conveniences etc. Then there are Special Expenses already paid by residents of these areas with over-larg service costs that need urgent review, these special expenses need to be taken account of when a precept is being decided for a futureTown Council. Some future responsibilities could be shared by a Town Council with the Unitary authority.
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Drop the Royal	Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		The historic areas of the town (Pantiles, Village , Nevill Ground etc)		-	-	Unsure	-	-	Too few	It depends on what functions the council will undertake, but 17 may be too few to provide proper oversight.	My inclination is for a non-political Town Council.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Should be 15, but 17 is maximum.	We desperately need our own council and retain the name "Royal".
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	We need enough councillors to deal with all the issues now and looking ahead .	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The number of councillors for each ward is currently appropriate and should continue.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Reduce my council tax	-	No	-	Tired of paying for public sector waste		-	-	Unsure		There are too many areas. Just have one. Anyone who lives in TW re		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	It would be better to have 5 effective, well paid people who work hard for the whole town.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	The number could be slimmed down to 2 per ward to save money.	It is only equitable that Tunbridge Wells town has a town council to allow local decisions for some services to be determined) rather than rely on a remote unitary authority with potentially little knowledge or interest in the unparished parts of Tunbridge Wells. Once established, the Town Council should take control of at least of the Common, parks and cemetery and the Art Club in the Pantiles.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I think two from each ward	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Royal Tunbridge Wells Council. Calling it a town council underplays its importance regionally .	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	-	Too few	Weed more councillors to handle local casework	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	generally happy with proposals	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		Not clear about socio economic range within areas.		Yes	-	-	-	About right	-	Not too many, not too few, and important to have an 'odd' number of councillors.	
-	-	-	Yes	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council	Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		Variability of size too great		-	-	Unsure	Too many	-	-	Too cumbersome adding 17 councillors	Could create unrest and inequality depending on demographic and quality of councillor
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	RW has its own identity and shouldn't be dissolved with neighbouring places, some of whom have far worse financial management	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		Affects outlying parishes we think...its our TW as well.		-	-	Unsure	-	About right	-	Too many cooks etc	If the town events of November 15th 2025 were organised by the council it may be preferable to have alternative wide governance because that I thought out event caused more problems for many than did benefit a few also it could have been held elsewhere, Calverly grounds for example.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	We need appropriate local representation for the different areas of Royal Tunbridge Wells.	Fully support the draft recommendations.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	-	Too few	Should be 3 Councillors per ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Not sure if the work load necessitates this many???	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	variety of opinions	
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	-	-	Only need one from each of the six town council wards.	Each of the wards should have one town councillor representing them but each ward should form a small committee to make sure everyone's views are fairly represented.
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Na	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	1. What are the services that a parish or town council can deliver? (Only allotments are obligatory.) Who will decide which of these services will be delivered? 2. How will the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council (RTWTC) be funded in the period after Vesting Day and the transfer of assets from TWBC? 3. How, for example, will the Amelita Scott Cultural Centre be funded?	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure		My home area not even on the map, some areas seem bigger than o		Yes	-	-	Too many	-	-	Not sure	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Matches the current representation	A Town Council is essential to ensure that the views of the population in the currently unparished areas are directly represented. For a town the size of Royal Tunbridge Wells not to have a Town Council is an anomaly, when much smaller population groups have parish councils. This anomaly has existed since 1974.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	A good dispersion of councillors against current/future population	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I'm not sure how many there usually are for this size	
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I have no reason to know whether it should be increased or decreased.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It is a fair representation of each ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Although it would probably be useful to have more Town CouncillorS in regards to sharing the workload. I think any more could turn into herding cat. It's better for those town councillors to have assistance from Adam.	
Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Sufficient to be effective and have different voices/expertise/judgment in the room.	Responding as a resident but declaring an interest as a TWBC cllr

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?			(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?			
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called			(Q6a) If no, please tell us why					(Q7c) If 'Unsure', please tell us why			Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names					Too many	About right	Too few
							Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure			Yes	No	Unsure				Yes	No	Unsure					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-							The Town Centre should be a distinct and core area represented separately from the other wards - recommend using the Town Centre Boundary as outlined in the Local Plan			-	No	-	Insert a Town Centre Ward, re-consider the naming to be north, north central, south, east, west around the at centre	Too many	-	-	2 councillors per the 7 wards I suggest above = 14	Work should be undertaken asap to outline and analyse the cost-value benefits of the potential assets currently under TWTC ownership/control w/in the suggest future RTWTC boundary including but not limited to parks, historic buildings, parking structures, RVP/Place, etc so that the community can weigh future decisions re: control and management of these assets over the long term (as income-generating assets to offset the costs of local initiatives) vs. Turning over ALL of these to the future Unitary Council based in Maidstone.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-				-	About right	-	It allows for proper discussion and allocation of responsibility without becoming cumbersome			
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-				Too many	-	-	I reckon two councillors per ward should be sufficient	I am very aware that as an organisation that is entirely run by volunteers we should have just as much say as we currently have and we can only continue to do the work we do in preserving the cemetery by working closely with TWBC who currently do a great job on that front.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	-	Unsure	It is very difficult to read the map provided as the detail is very blurry			-	About right	-	The splits between areas/populations seems reasonable			
-	-	-	Yes	-	No	-	Tunbridge wells town council									-	-	Unsure	Some areas are bigger than others			-	About right	-	Some areas are much larger than others and cover more recreational land than communities			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	Understand that the current arrangement works satisfactorily. If a majority of existing councillors feel differently, I am willing to be guided by them.	I think that it is important that a town council based in Tunbridge Wells has control over the towns most important assets - such as The Amelia, the parks etc. These should not be controlled by a unitary council in a distant location. I am not clear how the existing parish councils in e.g. High Brooms and Rushhall would be affected by the establishment of a TW Town Council under a new unitary council. Perhaps they should be given the opportunity to merge with the new TW Town Council. Obviously, any extra costs associated with the establishment of a new TW Town Council should be controlled. I would accept a relatively small increase in costs		
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	Looking at the previous documents it matches the populations of each ward.	There are other assets of the town, which should be managed at the local level, by the proposed town council. I don't think this would incur much additional cost, but would ensure the views and needs of local residents are paramount. These assets include the RVP shopping centre, the Amelia and Assembly Hall, the 3 parks (Dunorlan, Culverley and Grosvenor and Hibern) and the Nevill Ground.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	-	Unsure	Difference in size of wards - Park is 3 times as big as St James and			-	About right	-	15 to 20 is a good size for diversity of views and for sensible decision making	Town Council should be responsible and accountable for local parks, town centre amenities - public lavatories and car parking		
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	I think there ought to be an additional ward representing the 'town centre'.				About right	-	I think there should be 7 town council wards.	I think the 'town centre' needs a distinct representation as an additional ward, perhaps the area of the old Trinity Church Parish, comprising parts of Culverden, Park and Partles. I believe, in particular, the traffic / parking needs of town centre residents is always going to be different from the more peripheral areas.		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	There is an average of at least 2 per area, which makes sense, logistically			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	not too many nor too few, odd number is good			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	Fewer than 3 per ward would give inadequate representation. More than 4 per ward would become unwieldy.	Royal Tunbridge Wells is an important and significant historic town, with a name that is recognised nationally as well as locally. It is ridiculous that Royal Tunbridge Wells is the only part of the Borough of Tunbridge Wells that does not have a Town Council. The town's residents need a voice, and a Town Council would provide it with that voice.		
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	Culverden Ward, which also contains Nevill Park and Brighton Lake, well outside the main Culverden area, and Partles, which includes Showfields. I would suggest possibly reconfiguring the wards naming them Central, North, South, East and West.				About right	-	Its a odd number of councillors which does not give an even number per ward			
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure										Yes	-	-					About right	-	I agree with the rationale set out with the draft recommendations			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	I am unsure how many there should be - but 2 to 3 per area sounds about right.			
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	St Johns extends beyond the London Road (A26)			Too many	-	-	Two per ward might be about right	No thanks		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-				Too many	-	-	I think 2 councillors per ward is adequate, more would be costly and unnecessary.			
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	I live very close to High Brooms train station & have always felt I was in High Brooms Not Sherwood			3	-	About right	-	Its a odd number of councillors which does not give an even number per ward	Yes scrap it.. it Not what I want to see happen	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					Too few	-	-	Three for each would make sense		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					Too many	-	-	This is just adding extra costs and complexity to the system and is unnecessary. Just great meddling in local area by the few.	It bothers me that the cost increases are not restricted. Is it really necessary to have three representatives for approx. 7000 people? We already have a Residence Association, which is run by a few and decides 'improvements' to the area (which often ill thought through). Do we really need this? Reduce costs, don't increase them.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	I don't believe there's a need for this authority									Yes	-	-	No need for a town council				Too many	-	-	Cost	Moving to a unitary authority is meant to simplify service provision and bring decisions closer to the community than the current County/district structure. A town council with extremely limited powers is unnecessary.	
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure										Yes	-	-					Too many	-	-	Need to keep cost down and number of councillors reduced	None	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					Too few	-	-	I believe that 21 Councillors would be a better option. Otherwise we will have Councillors who are overloaded with committees and unable to deal with the issues raised by the residents.		
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	It is a fair and reasonable reasonable suggestion given the size and diversity of the various wards involved costs would be useful	Some information with regards to the costs of recruiting and training the councillors and their staff and funding for start up	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	More than, say, 20 councillors would be too many, given the size of the town, and less than, say, 15 councillors would be too few, given the need to stay equitable, staff committees, etc. Large committees are unworkable, as well.	The residents of Tunbridge Wells need to be able to control - have ownership over - the assets of the town, beyond allotments, and including the public parks, the Amelia, the funding through the 'special expenses' levy as part of Council Tax for residents of the unparished area of Tun Wells, so far hidden to most people, etc. And it should, most importantly, have a community voice in terms of planning applications and local planning policy for the town, as a committee of the unitary authority. It would be best if it could work jointly with Rushall and perhaps Southborough, so that the built up area can be developed and protected cooperatively, but it should certainly have its own voice, like all those towns and villages with town and parish councils. This is important with the new Local Plan likely to be adopted very soon.	
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	No population data provided so voting for 'about' the number enables a flexible approach.	What do we want the Town Council to be responsible for? Ask us that.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	I don't feel like part of Sherwood				About right	-	-	Diversity in representation is important		
-	-	-	Yes	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. The Area presently designated is limited in area. It would be presumptuous to alter this without Royal Consent.									Yes	-	-	There are far too many Councillors Now!				Too many	-	-	As stated before, there are too many. As soon as they are elected they set out to reduce the numbers actually DOING things to those chosen by the Chair!	Get in with it and don't just Talk about it.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					Too many	-	-	2 Councillors per ward should be sufficient. 2 x 6 = 12 councillors.	As there will be an increase in Council Tax due to the formation of a new Town Council and the functions are mostly covered by the County Council and Borough Council, the costs should be kept low by having fewer Town Councillors. It seems that the only two statutory roles are allotments and neighbourhood plans (app C). These could easily be covered by the TW Borough Council. So, I feel we should have these Town Councillors more as a local voice, checking and holding Borough and County Council work to account. That should not be too expensive.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					Too many	-	-	Two in each would be better		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	About right assuming they do more than simply look after allotments.	Would be sensible to consult on what assets the town council should hold and thus what it could do in practice	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	Approx three councillors per ward		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										-	No	-	The areas are too large and need to be more reflective of local concerns			1. Culverden and a separate one called Neville Park	Too many	-	-	Their should be one representative for each ward but more wards than 6 to ensure a more local response, e.g. 11		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-										Yes	-	-					About right	-	-	Each ward needs at least two elected councillors and, as some of the wards are substantially larger, they should be represented accordingly by more councillors.	Some of the negative responses to Phase 1 show that many people do not yet understand that the current borough already has local elected parish councils - with the only exception being the town centre. The town centre affects not only its residents but the surrounding existing parishes and it is critical that it also has its own parish council. The proposed Tunbridge Wells town council has local knowledge and expertise which would be missing from the remote unitary authority. It will become a critical consultee to all future decision making.	

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?				(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?	
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure		(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few		
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Essential for fairness and true representation of local needs.	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority). Thanks all!
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It is realistic.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	One councillor for St James enough	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Our current elected representatives all live on the wealthy side of the common and appear oblivious to the real and urban challenges and traffic experienced by those on the town side		-	No	-	Both Culverden and Pantles reflect poces of wards and not the mass of same.	Too many	-	-	More appropriate to link to the range of responsibilities carried which will be less than present.	The information required is too limited by the simplicity of the questions
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Too few or too many would make it unworkable and possibly unrepresentative.	We want the strong identity of our town to be recognised and represented by our own elected members to serve our interests to the fullest.
-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	About 3 councillors per ward is about right	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems fine.	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Councillors aren't paid so it's necessary to ensure there is enough capacity to serve the public effectively	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Between 13 and 17 is the right number	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think 2-3 per ward is enough!	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think three councillors to each ward would be best.	I think it is terribly important that we keep our autonomy.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Given the different sizes of the wards seems appropriate needs the full range of normal parish council services from the start.	Government Community Governance Review guidance requires fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	If councillors worked as a team whilst focusing on their specific	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority). Thanks all!
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	3 persons per ward so 18 persons would give a overall vote per subject	A surgery for people to voice their minds in the centre of town once a month would be a good idea.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	We want effective representation from people actively engaged	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Better to have a more consistent single body		-	-	Unsure		a single area covering all the wards could be more effective	-	-	Unsure		-	About right	-	too many cooks spoil the broth	There is an obvious need for a town council for RTW!
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Looks fine	I have massive misgivings about the phased approach you've chosen; it seems to me that there is a huge risk of the TC being created with minimal authority but raising an unpopular precept, which is then at the mercy of the UA to hand over the stuff that people want (parks, The Amelia etc). If I read it right there's 12 months after creation of the TC in which it would need to establish commitments with TWGC to transfer assets that are then binding on the new UA; I'm dubious on how possible this might be, and where the willpower to do so will come from on TWGC's side when its days are numbered. Right now, this phased approach is politically expedient but is storing up problems. Needs greater clarity up front or this year will be wasted and the TC will be on the back foot for years.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Nearly 3 town councillors per ward sounds like too many to me	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	max 12. 17 seems inefficient.	St James has an important role in the "feel" and success of the top part of town. Wide ranging abilities to manage this area in the interests of both its many residents and the wider community is essential and cannot be decided by Maidstone. The more local the control the better!
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	The new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council must be established with comparable services and assets to other town and parish councils (see 11). It must therefore be resourced to deliver for residents in terms of representation and service provision.	In line with the Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council must be established with comparable services and assets from the outset. This will ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Either 2 or 3 per ward so that's 12 or 18. Not sure how 17 would represent each ward equally.	
Yes	-	-	-	No	-	-	remove the word Royal as this is now a discredited brand	-	No	-	Do Sevenoaks and other towns have wards, we should not to leverage impact		-	No	-	A single ward please - no more ineffective local politics. This is now a need to cohesion		-	No	-	1 one		-	-	no more than 6, please do not forget you will be fighting for funds - you need a fast response and coherent voice, any more than six does not work, you are failing to recognise local government is changing.	They are poor. Much more traction is needed, with a single democratic voice to be heard, the days of the protection of TWGC are gone - the town needs a solid unified voice - please do wards
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	This number of councillors will ensure parity in terms of representation.	I believe the only way for residents in the unparished areas to keep control of local matters is to have a Town Council to represent their local interests
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	-	Too few	3 for each ward would seem sensible.	Regrettably there is nothing in this survey about what services and assets our town council would have. From the meetings it would seem only Aliments. Have been very impressed by the reach and assets of Sevenoaks Town Council plus Southborough, Paddock Wood and Cranbrook also have control over various assets.
																										It would be a good idea to transfer those assets to a prospective Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council now or at the very least at the beginning of a new council. In particular parks, open spaces and cemeteries. We have a number of very effective Friends groups who work very closely with our existing councillors and if these assets are not transferred it will be increasingly difficult to work with a distant bigger council whose members may not be aware or have time to devote to our unique assets. Plus we would lose any potential income from the beginning if we do not retain those services and it may be difficult to bring them back under a town council in the future. Why do we need to fight for those assets in the future when it is going to be a complex period of transition at the outset, surely it is far better to retain assets and then invest time and money into a developing a new town council with potentially new councillors, who may not be familiar with the workings of a council.
																										Local residents care deeply about our town and our facilities, parks and open spaces and we wish to retain those under the control of a town council. If the assets such as parks and cemeteries don't transfer to our town council we may lose control over planning issues. There is land used by Foresters Football team which is owned by the existing council, designated for future burials, if this does not transfer to a town council, it may be allocated to building or sold off by a unitary if thought to be a more viable option. Let's give our new town council a strong identity with a good set of assets and services from the very beginning. This will help attract councillors to stand to represent and look after facilities we own and feel passionate about, especially our green open spaces and places.
																										In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?		
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes			No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Too many	About right	Too few					
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council	Yes	-	-				-	No	-	they are too internally different, esp west wards proposed			Unsure				-	About right	-	how does one answer q11, without any notion of the remit of the council, or cost of councillors	twic not wkc should own and control local cultural assets currently possessed or part owned by twbc. including the common, parks, public spaces, community and cultural centres. The current twbc town hall complex performed district wide and town functions. Its asset value and utility should be shared between a future wkc and twic. In a reasonable proportions. The twic should be granted a golden share to be able to determine its future built impact on the town centre.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Working so far	It should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils
-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I have worked on a town council myself and believe this allows a good spread of views without being too unwieldy	I would very much like to see a town council for Tunbridge Wells. It seems highly undemocratic that smaller towns and areas have their own councils but not Tunbridge Wells
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				-	-	Unsure	Don't know enough about the areas but Culverden looks too varied			Unsure				-	About right	-	I have put about right because there's no 'unsure' option. But I don't know because I don't know what they will be doing.	18 would be better - 3 each for each wards.
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	18 would be better - 3 each for each wards.	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the Standard representation per community across the county and country please.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Could maybe go to four per ward	Standard representation per community across the county and country please.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				-	No	-	Not much in common between Ramsaye and Pantiles or Broadwater Down			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Two per ward should be sufficient for the limited responsibilities of the new authority	I would like information on what precise responsibilities new 'parish-type' authorities would have, what funding carved off what other cases, reporting to who/what?
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	2 per ward should be sufficient	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Asked a current councillor	Town Council should cover parks as well as allotments as well as planning and licensing
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				-	-	Unsure	We have only lived here 6 years. But also, we are in Park Ward and z			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems about right, and of course an odd number is important. I do feel strongly that representation should be proportional. If a larger council is necessary to ensure proportionality and diversity of views I would also support that.	I strongly believe that, in accordance with the Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority). I am a member of the Civic Society and a Friend of the Common and both groups strongly support the need for a Town Council. I was actually shocked to discover we did not have one! This seems long overdue and more important than ever in the current polarised and divisive national political climate. We need responsive and proportional local democracy as close to the people as possible!
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	3 reps for each area spreads the responsibility reasonably. Meetings of more than 20 would be too unwieldy.	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Unclear why more than two per ward are required	Yes, the proposed set of responsibilities are far too limited. In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	One for 1,000+ electors seems about right, and certainly no smaller than 2 per ward.	I believe that it is essential for a Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council to be established at the start of any change to a new unitary authority, with comparable assets and services to the existing Town/Parish Councils within that unitary authority, and especially the parished areas within the TW Borough. It is particularly important for RTW to be responsible for the parks, the relationship with the Commons Conservators and the owner at the time, and also looking after other local interests in the Pantiles, the Assembly Hall, and the Amelia Centre.
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	2 for smaller, 3 for larger	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	18 makes more sense, 3 per ward	
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Approx 3 councillors for each ward seems a reasonable way to share the workload and ensure fair representation	A new RTWTC is needed to make sure that residents are adequately represented and that services and assets for the town have are fairly allocated in comparison with other town and parish councils. The needs of the town are not necessarily the same as for the surrounding more rural settlements.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Needs to be an odd number. Wards should be proportional to voters	No
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				-	-	Unsure	The ward areas are large and the boundaries seem arbitrary.			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It works at present	It seems unreasonable to only give the new town council responsibility for the allotments. Surely other parish councils have further responsibilities and this one should be similar
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	I favour a maximum of 2 councillors per ward.	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority).
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	A good balance.	In line with Government Community Governance Review guidance requiring fairness of representation and service provision, the new Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council should be established with comparable services and assets from the start to ensure parity with other town and parish councils in the borough (and any future unitary authority). I also strongly believe that the three unitary council model submitted gives Kent the best chance to deliver a transformative agenda for residents and businesses. Specifically, it would lead to three councils with the right size and resources to respond to the residents' growing needs for council services. The new council areas would fit in neatly with other public services areas such as the NHS, police and fire services to encourage much closer collaboration. It would also deliver a sense of belonging – aligning new council structures with residents' natural sense of place!
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	I don't support the creation of a new town council.	-	No	-	Increased operational overheads and bureaucracy - inefficient decision-making and increased compromise.			Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Far too many new officials - which will unnecessarily increase operating costs (and thereby taxes) and not guarantee an improvement in service delivery.	I don't support the overall recommendations to form a TW Town Council.
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-				Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	It would replicate the current borough council structure	I am responding on behalf of the Culverden Residents' Association and its 117 members living on Culverden Park, Culverden Park Road, Culverden Avenue and parts of Culverden Down and Reynolds Lane. Our AGM in April 2025 voted unanimously to support one Town Council for RTW and we support the review part II recommendations. We consider that it will be vital to ensure an appropriate division of assets with TWBC beyond allotments to ensure assets for the Town Council eg parks other than Dunrobin, some smaller car parks like John Street, benches, and an asset suitable to be an office, council chamber, meeting rooms and community centre for the Town Council, akin to the Southborough Hub and Camden Centre, the latter having been specifically built as a community centre for the residents of RTW as part of the RVP project in the late 1980s. This replacement asset somewhere in the town should be a key asset of the fledgling Town Council when the Market Square redevelopment goes ahead and should be financed from the revenues accruing from the redevelopment.

(Q3) What is your interest in this Community Governance Review?				(Q5) Do you think the proposed TC should be called 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council'?			(Q6) Do you think that the proposed TC should be split into wards?				(Q7) Wards divided to reflect community identity?			(Q8) TC wards named appropriately?			(Q9) Is 17 town councillors appropriate?			(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9			(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?							
I live in one of the unparished areas	I work in one of the unparished areas	I represent an organisation	Other	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q5a) If no, please tell us what a new TC should be called	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q6a) If no, please tell us why	(Q6b) If unsure, please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q7a) If 'No', please tell us why	(Q7b) If 'Unsure', please tell us why	Yes	No	Unsure	(Q8a) If no, suggested ward names	Too many	About right	Too few	(Q10) Please briefly explain your response to Q9	(Q11) Any further comments you would like to make about the Draft Recommendations?				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	These wards and the population are currently represented by 17 councillors and so its seems sensible and reasonable to start with the same number of town councillors to speak the voice of the wards.	At the moment the draft proposal gives the new Town Council responsibility for allocations only which is a statutory service. This will not work and will not give the town councillors the ability to represent the views of the people in local matters that are important to them. The purpose of creating a parish/town council is that the needs and wishes of the local people can be more effectively represented by their local councillors who also have knowledge of the needs and views of the local population instead of by a nameless bureaucrat many miles away from the area where they live. This should lead to more accountability and transparency in decision making. For example, open spaces, parks, public seating, cemeteries, recreational grounds, leisure facilities, community centres, events, and engagement; street cleaning, car parks, memorials and all the parish responsibilities listed in Appendix C 'Functions of county, borough and parish councils' should all be available to be run by the new town council from the start to ensure parity with other town councils in the borough and any future unitary authority. This would also ensure fairness of representation and service provision.				
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure	Just Tunbridge Wells Town Council	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems about right.					
Yes	Yes	-	-	-	No	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Culverden should be considered its own area. In my view, Culverden, Rusthall, Denny Bottom, and Bishops Down should be grouped together as the Hurst wood Area. This should be its own administrative ward. St John's and St James' should be one ward.		-	No	-	1, Hurstwood/Rydal Green, 3, Middle Green/The Village, 5 and 6 should be called either Town or All Saints	-	About right	-	I think we need enough voices to let everyone be heard, so all ages, sexes and races, but we need to make sure we are one, not lots of different scattered voices.	In my view, Culverden should be considered its own settlement, governed under the new Hurstwood Ward, which should cover anywhere west of Langton, north of Wellington Rocks, south of Southborough. Culverden and Rusthall share strong ties and Culverden has its own unique village identity. This should be used to its advantage to develop the area into a nice thriving community, with both urban amenities and lots of green space.				
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	That number should provide an appropriate forum for the representation of various interests	Responsibility for only allotments is absurd. The largest 600 plots allotment site is run independently and the other very small sites involve only managing annual rentals - purely clerical task. If it is to mean anything, the Town Council must have genuine responsibilities.				
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems just right to enable fair representation	Very much in favour of a Town Council for Tunbridge Wells				
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Takes time and commitment and encourages different views	Unitary Authorities are not the way forward at all.				
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Unsure		-	No	-	I think we have more ability to make change town wide is it's kept together as a town council		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think it works pretty well as it is					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	We need enough people to represent wards properly - councillors who genuinely know each area and its character.	I think it is very important that critical town services are decided upon by people in the town and not in another far off metropolitan centre. It is better for transparency, accountability and delivery.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I doesn't. It believe any more would add anything and it also means representation is not in the hands of a single individual for any parish.					
Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Seems fine					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Large area that requires representation, we need advocates for residents.	concerned that decisions made for residents of TW are made by those of who live here or by their representatives. Keeping decisions local is crucial and to this end a TW Town council is a necessary step. Thank you.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Costs. Ability to contact if required.	We need to see and have a grip on what is going on, not have impositions from afar! We also need firm control re parks and grounds and ability to contact an office when needed on foot.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Under 12 - not enough Over 20 - too many					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	2 per ward is better	Only 1 Mayor please Royal Tunbridge Wells				
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	No views.	None.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	-	Unsure	Each ward should be a representative sample of the whole of RTW		Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	An uneven number is needed for identifying a majority decision	The new RTW Town Councils responsibilities should be the same as the Borough's statutory and discretionary services thus ensuring control whilst allocating "public" or location wide services to the unitary authority, eg roads, education, social services etc				
Yes	-	-	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Town Council. These days "royal" is an affect	Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			-	No	-	1, Culverden & Ramsleye 2, Pantiles & St Marks These allow for new housing developments proposal for Ramsleye & St Marks	-	About right	-		Some handwriting on this form was illegible so we were unable to include the further comments made.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	To have a balance of opinion / be able to manage workload of at least 2 councillors per ward would be required - in some areas 3 may be needed.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	I think 2 councillors per ward is sufficient					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	YES, I feel very strongly that it should be called the "Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Council". The Royal pre-fix was granted to the town by King Edward VII in 1909 at the request of the the Mayor, and has been used widely ever since, serving as a reminder of its unique and rich history, growing up around the Stuart Court. Moreover, the pre-fix has a particular useful function in distinguishing between the Town of Royal Tunbridge Wells, and the wider Borough of Tunbridge Wells.	Yes	-	-	I am concerned that the Town Council should be a strong voice for the whole town of Royal Tunbridge Wells, and especially so if a Unitary Authority is formed in the future. However, this is also a case for councillors to be drawn from the various different parts of the town, and for town-folk to be able to get in touch readily with their "local" councillor when necessary. On the basis, and given good quality councillors, it may be that "Yes" is a preferable answer to "No".		Yes	-	-	Within the extensive Park Ward, for example, there is a clear "community identity" within the Calverley Park enclave, and an equally clear, but quite different community identity, within Hawkenbury Village. However, to divide the town up into its many identity areas for this purpose would result in an excessive number of wards, and there could be a case for living with the recently defined pattern of ward boundaries. However, I personally favour a different pattern, as explained in my response to the next question, no.8.		Yes	-	-	It is hard to see much logic in Nevill Park, the railway station or Brighton Lake, for example, being within a ward named Culverden. Nor does there appear much logic in Showfields, for example, being in a ward called Pantiles. More logical might be five wards, simply named Central, North, South, East, and West, each with 3, or perhaps 4 councillors.		-	No	-		-	About right	-	The re-establishment of a Town Council for Royal Tunbridge Wells is long overdue. It seems strangely illogical that Southborough has a Town Council, whereas Royal Tunbridge Wells does not, and that the Town of Royal Tunbridge Wells is the only part of the Borough of Tunbridge Wells that does not have a Town or Parish Council. The setting up of the Town Forum by the Borough Council some years ago, represented a step towards giving the town a voice of its own, but it was never a proper substitute for a Town Council, and now that the Borough Council has withdrawn support for it, the Town Forum is now a shadow of the original concept. Royal Tunbridge Wells is a very special post-medieval historic town of national significance, and there is a strong case for establishing its own Town Council with all possible speed.
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	No	-	Am very much in favour of simplifying and streamlining local government.		-	No	-	Should at the very least include 'High Brooms' and 'Rusthall'.		-	-	Unsure	Not applicable.	Too many	-	-	Maximum 12 elected by the people of Tunbridge Wells.	Bearing in mind the whole point is to simplify and improve local gov't these recommendations have been slanted.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	Because of lower scope of responsibilities and cost unless they become unpaid as previously.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	If 6 wards, it gives the right balance. Plus with an odd number, it prevents a stalemate of equal votes.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	If the population of each ward is divided by the number of councillors it is approx 2000 + per councillor. However will 3 councillors be adequate for 'Pantiles' which includes both Showfields + Ramsleye?					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		-	-	Unsure	Councillors will need to understand the needs at the boundaries of smaller communities & not be 'fighting' for all the money for those they represent.		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-						
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	19 would allow for 3 from each ward with a 4th that rotates out every year. Having 3 for each ward would increase chances that each ward's councillors have true debate on topics rather than blindly agreeing/disagreeing w/each other.					
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		Too many	-	-	With the redivision of the wards 15 sufficient					
Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			-	No	-	Current allocation doesn't make sense.		-	No	-	Believe the six wards can be redivided in 4 (South, North, West and East Tunbridge Wells)	Too many	-	-	Divide into four areas and call them North South East West	Should be 15 over the four as mentioned above.	Text taken from letter included with survey form: Please find attached the Community Governance Review. I have completed the but on question and page five I wish these comments to be considered. I think there should be 15 councillors. There should be four wards and I would put St John and St James together with Culverden. I would change the lines drawn and would make Pantiles in the areas of Nevill Park Ramsleye Showfields making four wards each with approx. 5000 and with the largest one having the extra councillors. So basically, each of the four wards would have 3 councillors and then the larger ones could be allocated the extra three. I would also like to know which assets TWBC will seek to retain. I look forward to hearing the outcome of the.			
Yes	-	Yes	-	-	No	-	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council - I never use the 'Royal' prefix, and think it outdated & irrelevant.	Yes	-	-			-	No	-	There is a need for a 'Centre' or a 'Town' designation - TN1, for example, could comprise the Centre ward.		-	No	-	See box 7.	Too many	-	-	Two per ward is quite sufficient. Large committees can be unwieldy.	Obviously, if a 'Centre' ward is created, there would be seven wards, meaning 14 (2/ward) Councillors, which seems an ideal size to me.				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	Why change?	Why change this?				
Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-		Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-			Yes	-	-		-	About right	-	We need a Town Council! It would be of great benefit to our town and its residents	We need a Town Council! It would be of great benefit to our town and its residents				