

Recommendation 1 - Westbury/Heywood

1.1 That the areas marked as A in the map below be transferred from Westbury Town to the parish of Heywood.

1.2 That the area marked as B in the map below be transferred from Heywood to Westbury Town, as part of the Westbury East Ward and Westbury North Ward respectively.

1.3 That the parish of Heywood be unwarded, with seven councillors.

1.4 To request that the LGBCE amend the Westbury North, Westbury East, and Ethandune Electoral Divisions to be conterminous with the proposed revised parish boundaries of Westbury and Heywood.

1 parish rep (amend), 6 from affected area (3 agree, 3 disagree), 11 from Heywood not from area proposed to be transferred (10 agree, 1 amend)

	Status	Agree/Disagree/ Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons
A1	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		
A2	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Agree with the proposals		Heywood best represents our sense of community identity
A3	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Agree with the proposals		
A4	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Agree with the proposals		
A5	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Disagree with the proposals		
A6	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Disagree with the proposals		
A7	A resident of the area directly affected by the proposals (Areas A or B)	Disagree with the proposals		
A8	A resident of the town of Westbury not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		

A9	A representative of a parish council affected by the proposals, or a unitary representative from the area affected	Suggest an amended proposal (for example agreement/disagreement with some but not all the recommendation)	Community Governance Review 2022/23 Draft Recommendation of the Electoral Review Committee February 2023 Westbury/Dilton Marsh/Heywood/Bratton/Edington Recommendation 1.1 Heywood Parish Council believes that the CGR's draft recommendation has significant merit in that it reconnects the Ham as a community and sets the boundary line more closely on the southern edge to the Westbury to Pewsey railway line, providing a physical alignment with what is a clearly identifiable feature. However, the inclusion of the area of land within the triangle of railway lines formed by the Westbury to Trowbridge line, the Westbury to Pewsey line and the 1942 spur line and including Vivash Park brings into the parish of Heywood an area with no community relevance as it has no residents. Additionally, the area has benefitted from significant investment from Westbury Council which has financial, administrative and political capital investment from that Council and would best be maintained within Westbury. A	
A10	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		I agree with the proposals of moving the boundary and slightly enlarging the parish of Heywood and not moving the boundary so that I would become a resident of Westbury as I would like to remain a resident of the parish of Heywood and not be moved into the parish of Westbury.
A11	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		I agree with the proposals of moving the boundary and slightly enlarging the parish of Heywood and not moving the boundary so that I would become a resident of Westbury as I would like to remain a resident of the parish of Heywood and not be moved into the parish of Westbury.
A12	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		clarification of the boundaries between heywood & westbury, unify ham residents into one zone controlled by the existing larger portion already in Heywood
A13	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		I agree that the proposal will benefit the the areas marked A, as they will especially for The Ham area make them inclusive with the opposite side of the road and make a natural boundary with the railway line.
A14	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		The boundaries make the most sense.
A15	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		
A16	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		

A17	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Suggest an amended proposal (for example agreement/disagreement with some but not all the recommendation)	in response to recommendation 01 above I agree with the Heywood Parish Recommendation ref Point 46 of the Community Governance Review 2022/23. With the exception being as per Point 53 of the same recommendation REF Appropriate management take over of the Vivash Urban Park	The Parish proposal makes common sense. It is important that the Parish maintains its own historical identity and character that includes the Ham as an integral part. The integrity of the Neighbourhood Plan remains.
A18	A resident of the parish of Heywood not from the areas proposed to be transferred	Agree with the proposals		Heywood should have the original boundary lines

Recommendation 2 - Ludgershall and Tidworth

2.1 That Tidworth Town Council be reduced from nineteen councillors to fifteen.

2.2 That the North & West Ward contain eight councillors.

No survey responses received

Recommendation 4 - Grittleton, Castle Combe, Nettleton

Recommendation 4

4.1 That the area shown as F in the map below be transferred from the parish of Nettleton to the parish of Grittleton.

4.2 That the area shown as G in the map below be transferred from the parish of Castle Combe to the parish of Grittleton.

4.3 That the area shown as H in the map below be transferred from the parish of Grittleton to the parish of Castle Combe.

	Status	Agree/Disagree/ Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons
C1	A resident of the areas directly affected by the proposals (Areas F, G or H)	Suggest an amended proposal (for example agreement/disagreement with some but not all the recommendation)	4.2 G - Our house & sliver of front garden only is marked as recommended to move from Castle Combe to Grittleton. The rest of our property, driveway, large garden etc is in Castle Combe. We suggest therefore that the roadway should be the boundary here and leave us alone and whole.	We are the only property on our side of the road at The Gibb so why are you not using the roadway as the boundary instead of proposing to cut us in two. We were originally built as Castle Combe Estate gatehouse and wish to remain as such!

Recommendation 5 - Yatton Keynell/Castle Combe

5.3 That the area shown as K in the map below be transferred from the parish of Castle Combe to the parish of Yatton Keynell.

5.1 and 5.2 relate to Biddestone and Slaughterford and have already been approved

	Status	Agree/Disagree/ Suggest amended	Amended Proposal	Reasons
D1	A resident of the areas directly affected by the proposals (Areas I or J)	Disagree with the proposals		i do not feel like i identify any more with Biddestone than Yatton Keynell, i do not wish to pay the extra Council tax costs.