

ANNEX D - RESPONSES AGAINST GLATTON & CONINGTON PROPOSALS

RESPONDENT	ADDRESS	COMMENTS
Miss D	Resident of Conington	I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes. As a resident of Conington for over 30 years, I have built my life and raised my son in this village. I do not support any changes to Conington's boundaries, nor do I want to see Roundhill transferred to a neighbouring parish. These changes are unnecessary and unwelcome. I urge decision-makers to reconsider. Thank you
Mr V	Resident of Conington	What a waste of public funds this proposal seems to be. The time, energy and financial cost of having the boundaries changed would be better spent on local initiatives that could improve the lives of both Glatton and Conington communities. The boundaries have been in place for hundreds of years, and like many other parishes up and down the country, are occasionally dissected by roads, railways and water courses. I sincerely hope common sense prevails and this whimsical notion is put to bed.

Mr R	Resident of Conington	As a Conington parishioners I would like to keep the boundaries of our parish the same as they are now and have been for hundreds of years. Glatton has no right to change them. I have every faith in our parish chairperson and members to doing a good job of running our parish and all matters that arise.
Mr P	Resident of Conington	With regards the suggested boundary change I have no objections unless the review process is going to cost money. Whilst the change would look aesthetically pleasing on a map I cannot see any benefits to Conington parish. Glatton parish may consider itself in a stronger position regarding development along the Sawtry to Glatton road but the government's plans to cut red tape will negate this advantage and therefore I believe it will not be a cost effective exercise.
Mrs B	Resident of Conington	Please leave as is, no need to waste time or money in making a change.
MR D	Resident of Conington	I formally object to any proposed changes to the parish boundaries in the area where I have lived since 2008. Conington's ancient boundaries have remained unchanged for over 1,000 years, preserving the village's rich history and natural beauty. These boundaries are an essential part of our heritage, and

		<p>there is no justifiable reason to alter them now.</p> <p>As a small community with limited amenities, we already share resources with our neighbouring parishes. Our historical boundaries are one of the few defining aspects of Conington, and they should be safeguarded.</p> <p>Conington Round Hill is important due to its historical and archaeological significance. As a prominent landscape feature, it holds cultural value and may have ancient origins, contributing to the rich heritage of the area.</p> <p>Governance and Land Swap Concerns- It has come to our attention that Glatton Parish wishes to alter our ancient boundaries due to concerns over potential future development. However, Conington Parish Council, along with its residents, has no plans to develop or modify the land within our boundaries. This area is one of natural beauty, historical significance, and archaeological importance, and we take great care and pride in preserving it. Conington Parish Council currently maintains these boundaries and ensures the needs of all parishioners are met. A land swap would offer no benefits to either Conington or Glatton and would</p>
--	--	---

		<p>only serve to disrupt the historical integrity of our parish.</p> <p>Division by the A1(M) Is Not Justification for Boundary Changes.</p> <p>The presence of the A1(M) dividing the parish is not a valid reason to alter Conington's ancient boundaries. The road does not prevent the community from maintaining or enjoying the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>Moreover, 23 other parishes in Cambridgeshire are also divided by historic roads, with 19 of them still retaining parish land on both sides. There is no logical reason why Conington's boundaries should be changed due to the existence of an established roadway, especially when similar cases across the county have preserved their historical integrity.</p> <p>Cost Concerns- The financial burden on the public purse would be significant, and in my opinion, it would be a complete waste of public resources to alter something that residents do not wish to change.</p> <p>These funds could—and should—be allocated to far more important and urgent projects within Cambridgeshire. I do not believe this expenditure can be justified.</p>
--	--	--

		I strongly urge you to reconsider any changes that would impact the heritage and character of Conington.
Mr H	Resident of Glatton	I have lived in Glatton all my life I see no reason why the parish boundary now needs to be changed, there is no benefit to this being changed and I imagine this entails quite a lot of costs at a time when budgets are tight, councils are looking to save money. In the grand scheme of things, I don't see this as being one of the most important things that needs changing. I believe this is a historic parish boundary established over 1000 years ago. As for the argument that Conington Parrish's divided by the A1M does this mean that all parishes divided by motorways should have their boundaries changed, this makes no sense at all, my point is this all-costs money and I believe this money could be spent more wisely on important issues like homelessness, children in poverty, fly tipping transport etc.
Mr W	Resident of Glatton	I believe implementing this would be a waste of time and resources especially when there is so much review of councils currently taking place. These boundaries have been in place for a thousand years and has caused little issue.

Mrs O	Resident of Glatton	<p>A poll has been held this week of all Conington residents using WhatsApp. Out of 25 responses, 24 were in favour of NOT changing the boundary, and 1 was in favour of a change.</p> <p>The Parish Council ventures to suggest that this is representative of the views of the full population (approx 100 households) and that there is no appetite for disturbing the status quo.</p>
Mr S	Resident of Conington	<p>I live in the parish of Conington and had members of Glatton PC on my doorstep regarding this change, I told them that I agree with Conington PC and want no changes to our boundaries because the boundary belongs to us, not Glatton and I hope you aren't forced into an unpopular change.</p>
Mr A	Resident of Conington	<p>I do not agree to any changes. It should stay as it is.</p>
Mr & Mrs S	Resident of Conington	<p>My wife and I are totally opposed to the proposal from Glatton P.C to review and revise the boundaries of the two Parishes. There is no good reason to waste time and money on a change at present and upset and changes the historical boundaries. Should there in the future be a need to oppose developments having historic boundaries, could well be a useful feature if undisturbed.</p>

Mrs H	Resident of Conington	I feel it is a waste of money and a total waste of time.
Mrs O on behalf of Conington Parish Council:	Resident of Conington	<p>Conington Parish Council: The Parish Council feels very strongly that this review is unnecessary and is a diversion of HDC costs and time to no benefit. Only a few households are affected and the costs and expense to be incurred are entirely out of proportion. The Council would strongly petition Huntingdon District Council to conclude that no change should be made to the boundaries.</p> <p>The area south of Glatton has been in Conington Parish for hundreds of years. The area which Glatton PC has suggested exchanging, east of the A1M and north of the B660, near Ermine Lodge Farm, does not relate to Conington any more than it does to Glatton and it is pointless to change the boundary there. Conington PC would like to continue to respect the historical boundary and the ancient connection with Conington Round Hill (within the area specified) and not change this.</p> <p>One could argue that boundary changes for Parishes that straddle the A1M (23 parishes in Cambs) should be considered but this, if it were to become a project, should be done as a wholesale exercise during or after the current Reorganisation</p>

		<p>and not by picking off small areas like this on the whim of one Parish.</p> <p>As so few properties are affected by the proposal it cannot be seen as beneficial to the majority of the general public to change the boundaries and the Parish Council would implore you to conclude this review, changing nothing, and concentrate on more pressing matters.</p>
Mrs B	Resident of Conington	<p>I was born in Conington 75 years ago and have been here since. I do not want the parish boundaries to change. The land in question has history dating back hundreds of years, which is Conington's history, not Glatton's.</p> <p>Also, I strongly object to the costs that would be involved in a change of boundaries.</p>
Mrs L	Resident of Conington	<p>I don't see any advantage in changing an historical boundary established around 1000 years ago.</p> <p>Council taxes are already increasing - why create extra unnecessary expenditure?</p>
Mr E	Resident of Conington	<p>I would like to object to the changing of the Conington Parish Council Boundary as proposed in the Community Governance Review, I can see no benefit to Conington Parish from this change and do wonder what Glatton Parish are trying to gain,</p>

		<p>I understand that the existing boundary has been in place for about 1000 years. I have lived in Conington Parish on the side of the A1 all my life and do not consider the A1 to be a boundary,</p> <p>In fact now that there is a flyover on the B660 over the A1, the A1 is less of a boundary now than it was in the past. I can only wonder why anyone would think that this process is a good way of spending rate payers money and councillors time when there are so many other issues that need attention!</p>
Mrs C	Resident of Conington	<p>I have lived in Conington since 1981 and I am writing to express my objection to the change in Parish boundaries that Glatton Parish Council are seeking. These boundaries were established some 1,000 years ago; Conington Parish and its church are actually mentioned in the Domesday Book. The land to the south of Glatton, incorporating Conington Roundhill is part of the history of Conington Parish and this historical value should be respected and kept as part of Conington itself.</p> <p>Many parishes in the county have land either side of the A1 Motorway, so the existence of this road is clearly no reason to alter boundaries.</p>

		<p>I fail to understand why Glatton Parish Council are so keen to bring about this change in boundaries as I cannot see how it would be of benefit to either parish, or their residents.</p> <p>A change in boundaries is absolutely bound to involve costs, which ultimately come from peoples Council Tax. This money would surely be better spent on other projects that would actually be of benefit to residents of both parishes.</p>
Mr B	Resident of Conington	<p>This must not go ahead.</p> <p>Conington Parish was established around 1000 years ago and there is no reason to change it.</p> <p>19 of the 23 parishes which traverse the historic Great North Road retain land either side of the A1(M) so Conington and Glatton are not and have never been unique in this regard.</p> <p>Spending even more resources on this matter is an unjustified waste of taxpayer funds and any change to boundaries will drive even more costs for HDC and all taxpayers within the district.</p> <p>So, to reiterate, I believe that the boundaries should remain where they are. No change is required nor necessary, and this should not be priority for HDC and their limited resources.</p>

Mr B	Resident of Conington	I am a Conington resident and am totally against redrawing the parish boundaries to suit the residents of Glatton.
Mr H	Resident of Conington	I don't think that the boundaries should be changed.
Mrs R	Resident of Conington	Seems to be a completely unnecessary cost and works for very little/no gain. Not sure exactly why Glatton think this would be beneficial to anyone. Why change if it is not broken?
Miss C	Resident of Conington	I do not agree with the proposed boundary change. I feel this is an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money and an insult to assume that Conington PC would want to destroy the rural area.
Mr H	Resident of Conington	I am completely opposed to the proposed changes to Conington Parish boundaries.
Mrs C	Resident of Conington	The boundary was established 100 years ago and should remain as it is.
Mrs F	Resident of Conington	I see no good reason to change the current boundaries. The money it would cost will be much better spent on providing community services not unnecessary bureaucracy.
Dr B	Resident of Conington	I feel that the proposal to change the historic boundaries of Glatton and Conington is without merit.

		<p>There is nothing to be gained by it and the money and time which would be spent on it could be better used on projects which would benefit the community.</p>
Mr W	Resident of Conington	<p>I wish to reject strongly to the proposed changes to the Conington and Glatton Parish boundaries.</p> <p>I am a resident of Conington and (i) have never at any time been asked to either complete, comment, or even seen the petition that was raised, handled and submitted by Glatton Parish Council last year,</p> <p>(ii) consider this is a huge waste of Huntingdonshire District Council's meagre resources at a time of extremely difficult funding cuts, (iii) ignores 940 years of history for this parish whose boundaries stem from the Domesday book, long before the A1(M) was in place, and (iv) amounts to blatant gerrymandering of parish boundaries to include land and resident addresses who had previously been administered well by Conington (increased litter picking and local bin placement) and substitute with mainly farmland near Holme. As a Conington resident, I object strongly to this proposal, and urge HDC to save a</p>

		significant amount of money by rejecting this (wholly self-centred) parish boundary application immediately.
--	--	--

Mr H	Resident of Conington	<p>Questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who owns the land to the south of Glatton? 2. Who on Glatton PC proposed the transfer of land? 3. What links do two these persons have? 4. Have these people been approached by persons or businesses showing an interest in the land, to buy or develop in some way? <p>I personally feel this whole proposal is needless, and is likely to be costing too much time and money to implement. Surely any money spent by the district council on this matter could be better spent, say on fixing the numerous potholes in the local villages.</p>
------	-----------------------	---