

**PARISH ELECTORAL REVIEW – FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS  
(Report by the Head of Administration)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the present position in connection with parish electoral review of the District, including the consultation exercise and comments received during that process. Final recommendations are to be determined by the Panel for approval by the Council.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The District Council has a duty to keep under review the electoral arrangements of its parishes to ensure that parishes continue to reflect the identities and interests of local communities. The Local Government and Rating Act 1997 requires all district and unitary authorities to review the parish pattern in their area. The last parish electoral review in Huntingdonshire was completed in 1980.

**3. CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 The review commenced at the end of March 2006 and interested parties were invited to submit any proposals for changes to parish arrangements. Arising from the responses received, draft proposals were formulated for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements. The public consultation exercise on these draft proposals commenced in December 2006 and was concluded at the end of March 2007.
- 3.2 Throughout this consultation period, it was established that the issue of parish meetings had been omitted from the earlier consultation on the draft proposals and additional proposals were formulated and circulated for public consultation mid January 2007. In addition to this, as a result of extensive representations received regarding the proposals for Ramsey and Bury, alternative proposals were determined for these parishes and circulated for further consultation.
- 3.3 Attached as an Appendix to this report is a summary of representations received on the draft proposals for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements.

**4. COUNCIL SIZE**

- 4.1 The Council, at their meeting on 20th November 1974, approved a scale of parish council representation. The scale has remained in place despite significant changes to the size of parishes over the years. At the meeting of the Panel on 2nd October 2006, a new scale was devised and comments invited from parishes as part of the consultation exercise. The current scale and proposed scale are detailed below –

Current		Proposed	
Electorate	Members	Electorate	Members
Up to 250	5	Up to 500	5
251 to 500	7	501 to 1,000	7
501 to 1,000	9	1,001 to 1,500	9
1,001 to 1,500	11	1,501 to 2,000	11
1,501 to 2,000	13	2,001 to 3,000	13
2,001 to ,3000	15	3,001 to 5,000	15
3,001 to 5,000	17	5,001 to 10,000	17
5,001 to 10,000	19	10,001 to 15,000	19
Over 10,000	21	Over 15,000	21

4.2 **Members are invited to consider any revisions to the proposed new scale of parish council representation in the light of comments received prior to its submission to the Council.**

## 5. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Members are invited to consider the issues raised for each respective parish with a view to formulating final recommendations for approval by the Council prior to their submission to the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission. In order to assist the Panel, draft proposals for final recommendations are outlined in more detail below for further consideration.

5.2 The majority of the small parishes with either parish councils or parish meetings were opposed to the proposed amalgamation with neighbouring parishes. These proposals resulted from the difficulty experienced by some parishes in appointing clerks, attracting enough candidates for election and general lack of resources. The proposals met with universal opposition from the parishes affected and in view of the unpopularity of the proposals the Panel are invited to reconsider these proposals.

### **Abbotsley/Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish/part of St Neots Rural**

5.3 It was proposed to amalgamate the Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish, the remaining part of St Neots Rural parish following proposed amendments to the St Neots area (paragraph 5.86 refers) and Abbotsley parish to form a new parish of Abbotsley and Hardwicke consisting of 7 councillors.

5.4 Abbotsley Parish Council accepted the concept in principle, with some reservations. They would prefer to retain the existing name of Abbotsley Parish Council and were concerned that the 7 councillors would not be sufficient to cover the extended area. Eynesbury Hardwicke Parish Council also raised no objections to the proposals. A resident of St Neots Rural supported the proposal to merge with Abbotsley. St Neots and District Liberal Democrats submitted an alternative proposal for this area.

5.5 As the suggested number of councillors is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band, and the proposals for amalgamation do not result in a large increase of electors, only 332 to 430 there is no justification to increase the number of councillors.

- 5.6 **The Panel is invited to support the amalgamation of the Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish, the remaining part of St Neots Rural parish (see proposals for St Neots) and Abbotsley parish to form an expanded parish of Abbotsley consisting of 7 councillors.**

#### **Abbots Ripton/Alconbury/The Stukeleys**

- 5.7 It was proposed to amend various boundaries affecting the parishes of Abbots Ripton, Alconbury and The Stukeleys.
- 5.8 Alconbury Parish Council was not in favour of the proposed changes. Abbots Ripton Parish Council have suggested moving Bevills Wood into their parish from Woodwalton parish. The Stukeleys have expressed their support for the proposed boundary changes, with the exception of the part of Abbots Ripton parish.
- 5.9 It is illogical to leave the airfield split between two parishes and Alconbury Parish Council would continue to be consulted on major applications despite their concerns.
- 5.10 **The Panel is invited to support the proposed transfer of shaded areas A from Abbots Ripton parish to The Stukeleys parish, B from Alconbury parish to the Stukeleys parish and C from Abbots Ripton parish to The Stukeleys parish. It is also suggested that the Parish support the transfer of Bevills Wood from Woodwalton parish to Abbots Ripton parish. This transfer does not involve any properties, but aligns the parish boundaries more clearly with a geographical feature as the new boundary would follow the road.**

#### **Abbots Ripton/Kings Ripton**

- 5.11 It was proposed to amalgamate Kings Ripton parish and Abbots Ripton parish to form a new parish of The Riptons consisting of 5 councillors.
- 5.12 Abbots Ripton Parish Council and Kings Ripton Parish Council were unanimously against these proposals and wished to see no reduction in the current number of councillors.
- 5.13 **As the proposals were resisted by both parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Abbots Ripton Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 6 councillors and Kings Ripton Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors.**

#### **Alconbury**

- 5.14 Alconbury Parish Council expressed concern if their membership would decrease from 11 to 9 councillors. This did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary.

### **Barham and Woolley/Buckworth/Leighton Bromswold**

- 5.15 It was proposed to amalgamate Barham and Woolley parish, Buckworth parish and Leighton Bromswold parish to form a new parish of Leighton Bromswold consisting of 5 councillors.
- 5.16 Barham and Woolley Parish Council were unanimously against these proposals. Buckworth Parish Council strongly opposed such a merger. Leighton Bromswold Parish Council and residents of the parish did not support the proposals. The District Councillor for Ellington also found no support for the proposals.
- 5.17 **As the proposals were resisted by all of the parishes and there was no evidence to suggest an affinity of interest between the parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Barham and Woolley Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors, Buckworth Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors and Leighton Bromswold Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 7 councillors.**

### **Broughton**

- 5.18 Broughton Parish Council expressed concern if their membership would decrease from 7 to 5 councillors. This did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary.

### **Bury/Ramsey**

- 5.19 Following the publication of draft proposals for changes to parish boundaries in Bury and Ramsey extensive representations were received and as a result alternative proposals were formulated.
- 5.20 A large majority of residents in the affected areas wished to remain in Bury. Bury Parish Council submitted an alternative proposal, but supported proposal A if this was not achievable. They also objected to the old Bury Industrial Estate, Signal Road becoming part of Ramsey which formed part of the Ramsey Town Council submission. Ramsey Town Council rejected the alternative proposal.
- 5.21 It is imperative that the parish boundary between Ramsey and Bury is amended as it currently cuts directly through properties and is not easily identifiable. Where possible, boundaries should be tied to geographical features that are unlikely to change.
- 5.22 **As a result of the reasons outlined above, the Panel is invited to support alternative Option A as the new parish boundary which closely reflects the current parish boundary. It is also suggested that the Panel support the transfer of shaded Area B from Ramsey parish to Bury parish which includes realigning the boundary with a geographical feature rather than cutting directly through properties.**

### **Catworth**

- 5.23 It was proposed to decrease the membership of Catworth Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors.
- 5.24 Catworth Parish Council expressed concern with the proposal and requested that the status quo be maintained.
- 5.25 **As the suggested decrease in councillors is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to decrease the membership of Catworth Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors.**

### **Chesterton/Haddon/Elton**

- 5.26 It was proposed to amalgamate Chesterton Parish Meeting and Haddon Parish Meeting with Elton Parish Council. The membership would be reduced from 11 to 9 councillors.
- 5.27 Chesterton Parish Meeting have requested that no change be made to their existing arrangements. No response was received from Haddon Parish Meeting or Elton Parish Council.
- 5.28 **As no representations were received from Elton Parish Council and Haddon Parish Meeting, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to amalgamate Elton Parish Council with Haddon Parish Meeting to form a new parish of Elton consisting of 9 councillors. (See paragraph 5.116 ante). This is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band. It is also suggested that the Panel support the retention of Chesterton as a parish meeting following their views submitted.**

### **Covington/Tilbrook**

- 5.29 It was proposed to amalgamate Covington Parish Meeting with Tilbrook Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.30 A signed petition was received from Covington residents against the proposals. Tilbrook Parish Council objected to the proposals, but expressed support for a reduction in councillors from 7 to 5. This did not form part of the draft proposals. The Ward Councillor for Kimbolton and Staughton supported the concerns of Tilbrook Parish Council.
- 5.31 **As the proposals were resisted by both parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no change to the existing arrangements. Covington will remain as a parish meeting. It is also suggested that the Panel support the reduction of membership of Tilbrook Parish Council from 7 to 5 councillors, which is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation.**

### **Denton and Caldecote/Stilton**

- 5.32 It was proposed to amalgamate Denton and Caldecote Parish Meeting with Stilton Parish Council consisting of 11 councillors.
- 5.33 Denton and Caldecote Parish Meeting have requested that no change be made to their existing arrangements. No response was received from Stilton Parish Council.
- 5.34 **As the proposal was resisted by one of the parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no change to the existing arrangements. Denton and Caldecote will remain as a parish meeting and Stilton Parish Council will retain their current membership of 11 councillors.**

### **Diddington/Southoe and Midloe**

- 5.35 It was proposed to amalgamate Diddington Parish Meeting with Southoe and Midloe Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.36 The Ward Councillor for Buckden has suggested that Diddington would prefer to group with Buckden and not Southoe and Midloe, thereby retaining their own identity as a parish. If this could not happen then Diddington Parish Meeting would prefer to remain as a separate entity. Diddington Parish Meeting has concurred with the Ward Councillors views.
- 5.37 **As the parishes have indicated their resistance to the original proposed amalgamations, the Panel is invited to support the recommendation to group Diddington parish with Buckden parish to form a new parish council of Buckden consisting of 15 councillors, of whom 14 shall be elected to represent the parish of Buckden and one shall be elected to represent the parish of Diddington. This is subject to the consent of the parish meeting of each of the parishes. It is also suggested that the Panel support the retention of Southoe and Midloe Parish Council with the current membership of 7 councillors.**

### **Easton/Ellington**

- 5.38 It was proposed to amalgamate Easton parish and Ellington parish to form a new parish of Ellington consisting of 5 councillors.
- 5.39 A survey was carried out by Easton Parish Council who were completely opposed to the proposal. Ellington Parish Council were strongly against the proposal and indicated their preference to retain their existing membership. Residents of Easton parish and Ellington parish did not support the proposals for amalgamation. The District Councillor for Ellington also found no support for the proposals.
- 5.40 **As the proposal was resisted by both parishes, the Panel is invited to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Easton Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors and Ellington Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 7 councillors.**

### **Fenstanton/St Ives**

- 5.41 It was proposed to amend the boundaries between the parishes of Fenstanton and St Ives. This would result in a reduction of membership of Fenstanton Parish Council from 15 to 13 councillors.
- 5.42 Fenstanton Parish Council rejected the proposal and requested that the boundaries remain unchanged. Residents in Greenfields, Maytrees, Elizabeth Court, London Road and Bridge Terrace also objected to the proposals. The former Ward Councillor for Fenstanton found no support for the proposals. St Ives Town Council disagreed with the proposals, but suggested alternative arrangements.
- 5.43 **Taking into account the representations submitted, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to amend the southern boundary of St Ives south to follow the Low Road up to the junction with London Road as it is felt that the properties in London Road have more affinity of interest with St Ives. The membership of Fenstanton Parish Council will remain unchanged consisting of 15 councillors which is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.**

### **Folksworth and Washingley**

- 5.44 Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council expressed concern if their membership would decrease from 9 to 7 councillors. This did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary.

### **Godmanchester**

- 5.45 It was proposed to increase the membership of Godmanchester Town Council from 15 to 17 councillors.
- 5.46 Godmanchester Town Council supported the proposal for an increase in membership.
- 5.47 **In accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to increase the membership of Godmanchester Town Council from 15 to 17 councillors.**

### **Hamerton/Winwick/Steeple Gidding/ Great and Little Gidding**

- 5.48 It was proposed to amalgamate the parish meetings of Hamerton, Winwick and Steeple Gidding with Great and Little Gidding Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.49 Hamerton Parish Committee expressed the view that they would prefer to remain as they are. Winwick Parish Meeting would not like to be forcibly amalgamated with any other village. Great and Little Gidding Parish Council would prefer to remain as they are with 8 members, but if they were to amalgamate they would prefer to join Winwick.
- 5.50 **As no representations were received from Steeple Gidding Parish Meeting and given the small size of the electorate of 19, the Panel is**

invited to support the amalgamation of Steeple Gidding parish with Little Gidding parish to create a new parish of Little Gidding. It is not possible to amalgamate with Great and Little Gidding Parish Council as these parishes have already been grouped as a common parish council under an Order made in 1979. Under the proposed new scale of parish council representation, the Panel is invited to support the reduction in membership of Great and Little Gidding Parish Council from 8 to 7 councillors. As the proposals were resisted by the parishes of Hamerton and Winwick, the Panel is also invited to support the proposal to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Hamerton Parish Committee and Winwick Parish meeting will remain in existence.

#### **Great Gransden**

- 5.51 Great Gransden Parish Council expressed concern if their membership would decrease from 9 to 7 councillors. This did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary.

#### **Hail Weston**

- 5.52 Hail Weston Parish Council expressed concern if their membership would decrease. This did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary.

#### **Hemingford Grey/St Ives**

- 5.53 It was proposed to amend the boundaries between the parishes of Hemingford Grey and St Ives.
- 5.54 Hemingford Grey Parish Council objected to the proposals for the area adjacent to The Dolphin Hotel, but were content with the proposals for Holt Island. St Ives Town Council supported the proposals for the boundary changes.
- 5.55 It is illogical to retain the current parish boundary between St Ives and Hemingford Grey, in particular the shaded area A, as the boundary currently cuts directly through units and the site of The Dolphin Hotel. The boundary also cuts directly through Holt Island and should be amended to follow the centre course of the River Great Ouse.
- 5.56 **The Panel is invited to support the proposed transfer of shaded areas A and B from Hemingford Grey parish to St Ives South Ward of St Ives Parish.**

#### **Holme**

- 5.57 It was proposed to reduce the membership of Holme Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors.
- 5.58 Holme Parish Council objected to the proposal and indicated their preference to remain as they are.
- 5.59 **In accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band, the Panel is invited to support the**



**reduction in membership of Holme Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors.**

#### **Holywell-cum-Needingworth/St Ives**

- 5.60 It was proposed to amend the boundaries between the parishes of Holywell-cum-Needingworth and St Ives.
- 5.61 Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council and a resident of the parish objected strongly to the proposals, but accepted that change to follow the physical boundary of Harrison Way was logical. St Ives Town Council supported proposals to amend the boundaries, but suggested alternative arrangements to extend the boundary further north.
- 5.62 **In order to take account of existing and planned development and the comments of the interested parties, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to amend the boundary between the parishes of St Ives and Holywell-cum-Needingworth to follow Harrison Way/St Ives bypass up to the roundabout and along the A1123 to follow the boundary of the Depot and Compass Point and transfer this area from Holywell-cum-Needingworth to St Ives parish.**

#### **Houghton and Wyton/St Ives**

- 5.63 It was proposed to amend the boundaries between the parishes of Houghton and Wyton and St Ives. This resulted in the split of Houghton and Wyton parish, currently consisting of 13 councillors and resulting in the Houghton and Wyton Ward of the parish consisting of 9 councillors and the Airfield Ward of the parish (Wyton-on-the-Hill) consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.64 Houghton and Wyton Parish Council agreed with the split of Wyton-on-the-Hill and extension of the boundary to include How Lodge and The How. They also requested that consideration be given to including Houghton Lock, presently in Hemingford Abbots and amending the boundary between the wards of their parish. St Ives Town Council rejected the proposals.
- 5.65 **In order to take account of existing and planned development and representations submitted, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to amend the boundary between the parishes of St Ives and Houghton and Wyton to extend the Houghton and Wyton boundary to include How Lodge and The How and the transfer of Houghton Lock from Hemingford Abbots parish to Houghton and Wyton by way of amending the boundary to follow the centre course of the river. It is also suggested that the Panel support the amendment of the boundary between the current wards of Houghton and Wyton parish, whereby the properties at the top of Mere Way and Sawtry Way transfer to the Airfield Ward and Sawtry Way Cottages and Houghton Hill Farm transfer to Houghton and Wyton Ward of the parish. The Panel is invited to support the split of Houghton and Wyton parish to create a new parish of the Houghton and Wyton Ward consisting of 9 councillors and a new parish of the Airfield Ward (Wyton-on-the-Hill) consisting of 7 councillors.**

### **Huntingdon/The Stukeleys**

- 5.66 It was proposed to increase the number of councillors on Huntingdon Town Council from 16 to 19 and proposed various amendments to the existing boundaries with adjacent parishes. This resulted in a proposed reduction of membership of The Stukeleys Parish Council from 13 to 7 councillors.
- 5.67 Huntingdon Town Council supported the proposals for changes to the parish boundaries, but requested that there be no change to the existing membership. Huntingdon Liberal Democrats submitted an alternative proposal for Huntingdon whereby Huntingdon would be split into smaller areas. It is felt that this area would not lend itself to such proposals and would lead to confusion for the public distinguishing between District and Town Councillors. The Stukeleys Parish Council supported the proposals for boundary changes, but requested a minimum membership of 10 councillors.
- 5.68 **In order to take account of existing and planned development, the Panel is invited to support the transfer of shaded areas A and B from The Stukeleys parish to Huntingdon West Ward of Huntingdon parish. As the electorate of Huntingdon has increased over the years and is likely to increase further as a result of the amended boundaries, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to increase the membership of Huntingdon Town Council from 16 to 19 councillors and the reduction of membership of The Stukeleys Parish Council from 13 to 9 councillors. This is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.**

### **Kimbolton and Stonely/Stow Longa**

- 5.69 It was proposed to amend the boundary between the parishes of Kimbolton and Stonely and Stow Longa.
- 6.70 Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Council objected to the proposals to redefine the boundaries. They also objected to a reduction of their membership from 11 to 9 councillors. As the latter did not form part of the original draft proposals, no change is necessary. The Ward Councillor for Kimbolton and Staughton endorsed Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Councils' concerns. Stow Longa Parish Council supported the proposals to amend the boundary, but suggested that Rookery Farm had not fully been included in the proposals.
- 5.71 **Subject to clarification from Stow Longa Parish Council, the Panel is invited to support the transfer of land to include fully Rookery Farm from Kimbolton parish to Stow Longa parish.**

### **Little Paxton**

- 5.72 It was proposed to amend the boundary to include the Island site within the parish of Little Paxton.
- 5.73 Little Paxton Parish Council supported the proposals to amend the boundary and also objected to a reduction of their membership. The latter did not form part of the original draft proposals and therefore no change is necessary. St Neots and District Liberal Democrats also supported the proposals for the boundary changes.

- 5.74 **The Panel is invited to support the proposal to amend the boundary between Little Paxton parish and St Neots Priory Park Ward of St Neots parish to follow the southern reach of the River Ouse.**

#### **Morborne/Folksworth and Washingley**

- 5.75 It was proposed to amalgamate Morborne Parish Meeting with Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council consisting of 9 councillors.
- 5.76 A petition was enclosed with the representation from Morborne Parish Meeting outlining their rejection to such proposals. Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council made no comment on this issue, except reference to membership as outlined in paragraph 5.44 above.
- 5.77 **As the proposal was resisted by one of the parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no change to the existing arrangements. Morborne Parish Meeting will remain in existence. Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 9 councillors.**

#### **Offord Cluny/Offord D’Arcy**

- 5.78 It was proposed to amalgamate Offord Cluny parish and Offord D’Arcy parish to form a new parish of The Offords consisting of 9 councillors.
- 5.79 Offord Cluny Parish Council and Offord D’Arcy Parish Council supported the proposed amalgamation but considered a membership of 11 councillors to be more appropriate and preferred it to be named Offord Cluny and Offord D’Arcy Parish Council. Residents of both parishes were all strongly in support of such a merger. This view was also supported by St Neots and District Liberal Democrats.
- 5.80 **The Panel is invited to support the proposal to amalgamate Offord Cluny parish and Offord D’Arcy parish to form a new parish council of Offord Cluny and Offord D’Arcy consisting of 11 councillors.**

#### **St Ives**

- 5.81 It was proposed to increase the membership of St Ives Town Council from 16 to 19 councillors.
- 5.82 St Ives Town Council strongly opposed the increase in membership.
- 5.83 **In accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to increase the membership of St Ives Town Council from 16 to 17 councillors.**

#### **St Neots**

- 5.84 It was proposed to increase the membership of St Neots Town Council from 18 to 21 councillors and make various amendments to the boundaries.
- 5.85 St Neots Town Council supported the proposals for changes to the boundaries and made no comment on the increase in membership. St Neots

and District Liberal Democrats have submitted an alternative proposal for this area which was considered and discounted by Members at an earlier stage of the consultation process.

- 5.86 **The Panel is invited to support the proposal to transfer the shaded areas from Hail Weston parish to St Neots Eaton Ford Ward of St Neots parish, from Eynesbury Hardwicke parish to St Neots Eynesbury Ward of St Neots parish and from St Neots Rural parish and Eynesbury Hardwicke parish to St Neots Priory Park Ward of St Neots parish. It is also suggested that the Panel support the proposal to increase the membership of St Neots Town Council from 18 to 21 councillors in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation.**

#### **Somersham/Pidley-cum-Fenton**

- 5.87 It was proposed to amend the boundary between the parishes of Somersham and Pidley-cum-Fenton.
- 5.88 Somersham Parish Council raised no objection to the proposed boundary changes but strongly objected to any decrease in their membership. As the latter did not form part of the original draft proposals, no change is necessary. Pidley-cum-Fenton Parish Council also supported the proposed changes to the boundary.
- 5.89 **The Panel is invited to support the proposed transfer of the shaded area from Pidley-cum-Fenton parish to Somersham parish in order to re-align parish boundaries.**

#### **Stow Longa/Spaldwick**

- 5.90 It was proposed to amalgamate Stow Longa parish and Spaldwick parish to form a new parish of Stow Longa consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.91 Stow Longa Parish Council and residents of the parish objected strongly to the proposed merger. Spaldwick Parish Council vigorously opposed the amalgamation of the two parishes. A vote was also taken at a village meeting where they unanimously rejected the proposals.
- 5.92 **As the proposal was resisted by both parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Stow Longa Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors and Spaldwick Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 7 councillors.**

#### **Spaldwick/Ellington**

- 5.93 It was proposed to amend the boundary between the parishes of Spaldwick and Ellington.
- 5.94 Spaldwick Parish Council supported the proposal for the change to the boundary. Ellington Parish Council also supported transfer of part of their parish to Spaldwick.

- 5.95 **The Panel is invited to support the proposed transfer of the shaded area from Ellington parish to Spaldwick parish in order to re-align parish boundaries.**

#### **Toseland/Yelling**

- 5.96 It was proposed to amalgamate Toseland parish and Yelling parish to form a new parish of Toseland consisting of 5 councillors.
- 5.97 Toseland Parish Council and its electorate voted unanimously against the proposals. Yelling Parish Council unanimously agreed that the status quo should be retained which was supported by 100% of the electorate at a Special Parish Meeting.
- 5.98 **As the proposal was resisted by both parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no changes to the existing arrangements. Toseland Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 5 councillors and Yelling Parish Council will remain in existence consisting of 7 councillors.**

#### **Upwood and The Raveleys**

- 5.99 It was proposed to reduce the membership of Upwood and The Raveleys Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors.
- 5.100 Upwood and The Raveleys Parish Council objected to the proposed reduction in members. This view was supported by the Ward Councillor for Upwood and The Raveleys.
- 5.101 **As the suggested decrease in councillors is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors with the new band, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to decrease the membership of Upwood and The Raveleys Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors.**

#### **Warboys/Pidley-cum-Fenton/Wistow/Ramsey**

- 5.102 It was proposed to amend the boundaries between the parishes of Warboys, Pidley-cum-Fenton, Wistow and Ramsey.
- 5.103 Warboys Parish Council accepted the proposals for changes. Pidley-cum-Fenton Parish Council approved the proposed changes.
- 5.104 **The Panel is invited to support the proposed transfer of the shaded areas from the parishes of Pidley-cum-Fenton, Wistow and Ramsey to Warboys parish.**

#### **Water Newton/Sibson-cum-Stibbington**

- 5.105 It was proposed to amalgamate the parish meeting of Water Newton with Sibson-cum-Stibbington Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.
- 5.106 Water Newton Parish Meeting strongly objected to being forcibly amalgamated with any other village.

- 5.107 **As the proposal was resisted by one of the parishes, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to make no change to the existing arrangements. Water Newton will remain as a parish meeting and Sibson-cum-Stibbington Parish Council will retain their current membership of 7 councillors. Views of the Panel are invited.**

**Woodhurst/Oldhurst/Houghton and Wyton/St Ives**

- 5.108 It was proposed to amend the boundaries affecting the parishes of Woodhurst, Oldhurst, Houghton and Wyton and St Ives.
- 5.109 Woodhurst Parish Council opposed the proposals for changes to the boundaries affecting their parish. They submitted alternative proposals. St Ives Town Council supported proposals to amend the boundaries and transfer an area of land from the parish of Woodhurst to St Ives. They also suggested alternative arrangements for the transfer of other areas of land to Wyton-on-the-Hill.
- 5.110 **In accordance with the proposal for Alconbury Airfield, it is illogical to leave Wyton Airfield split between parishes. The Panel is therefore invited to support the transfer of shaded areas A1 from Woodhurst parish to St Ives parish, A2 from Woodhurst parish to the Airfield Ward of Houghton and Wyton parish and B from Old Hurst parish to the Airfield Ward of Houghton and Wyton parish.**

**Buckden/Offord Cluny**

- 5.111 It was proposed to amend the boundary affecting the parishes of Buckden and Offord Cluny.
- 5.112 **As no representations were made in respect of these proposals and as the boundary between Buckden parish and Offord Cluny parish cuts directly through the properties in the Mill House, the Panel is invited to support the amendment of the boundary to follow the course of the River Ouse to the east of the Mill House and transfer the shaded area from Offord Cluny parish to Buckden parish.**

**Tetworth/Waresley**

- 5.113 It was proposed to amalgamate the parish meeting of Tetworth with Waresley Parish Council consisting of 5 councillors.
- 5.114 **As no representations were made in respect of these proposals, the Panel is invited to support the proposal to amalgamate Waresley Parish Council with Tetworth Parish Meeting to form a new parish of Waresley-cum-Tetworth consisting of 5 councillors.**

**Elton/Great Staughton/Yaxley**

- 5.115 It was proposed to decrease the membership of Elton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors, decrease the membership of Great Staughton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors and increase the membership of Yaxley Parish Council from 13 to 17 councillors.

5.116 **As the suggested increase and decrease in councillors is in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band, the Panel is invited to support the proposals to decrease the membership of Elton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors, decrease the membership of Great Staughton Parish from 11 to 9 councillors and increase the membership of Yaxley Parish Council from 13 to 15 councillors.**

## **6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 Having regard to the representations received from interested parties following the publication of draft proposals for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements, Members of the Panel are invited to consider –

- (a) the determination of final recommendations for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements for approval by the Council; and
- (b) the formulation of a new scale of parish council representation for approval by the Council.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Local Government and Rating Act 1997

Guidance and procedural advice for periodic electoral reviews – The Electoral Commission July 2003.

Guidance on the establishment and review of parish electoral arrangements and related alterations to district ward and county division boundaries – The Electoral Commission August 2006.

Minutes and Reports of the meetings of the Elections Panel – 22nd August, 2nd October, 15th December 2006 and 19<sup>th</sup> February 2007.

**Contact Officer** – Lisa Jablonska, Central Services Manager  
☎ (01480) 388004