

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Abbotsley	Abbotsley Parish Council	<p>Accepts in principle the rationale of amalgamating the Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish and the remaining part of St. Neots Rural parish with Abbotsley.</p> <p>Concerns -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - considered that a larger area will be more difficult to manage - greater drain on resources, particularly Parish Clerk - considered that larger area will be much more difficult to monitor <p>Strong views that the area to the north of A428 should not be included in the new parish, this area is particularly alien to the village but due to difficulty of allocating this area of St. Neots Rural to any other area in relation to South Cambs boundary, that it was sensible for this area to be included – but demonstrates the general feeling that some new area outside the present village boundary has little relationship to the village.</p> <p>Prefer to retain name of – “Abbotsley Parish Council” and NOT – Abbotsley and Hardwicke Parish Council as smaller parishes are joining a much larger established parish.</p> <p>Also concern over number of councillors (seven at present) – will not be sufficient to cover larger area – as increased workload – could result in existing parish council from within the village being replaced by a majority from outside the village. Strongly opposed to any reduction in the number of councillors.</p>
Alconbury	Alconbury Parish Council	<p>Concerns – not in favour of changes to boundaries – The airfield is in close proximity and anything occurring on site directly affects Alconbury residents. Esp. traffic. Parish Council would like to be consulted on any major developments on the airfield.</p> <p>Also not happy if membership is to drop from 11 to 9 would put extra pressure on the whole council. Wants to be a professionally run council and has embarked on Parish Plan which requires a good deal of work and is ongoing.</p>

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Abbots Ripton	Abbots Ripton Parish Council	<p>Various Clerk posts would unfortunately cease to exist which would cause a problem. Insufficient thought and planning is evident here. Disappointing that clerks to be affected had no prior warning or consultation with CALC.</p> <p>Councillors unanimously agreed that the proposal to merge to form a new parish would not be in the best interests of parishioners – would lead to loss of identity for both villages.</p> <p>No problem filling current 6 councillor positions - against reduction in number of councillors.</p> <p>Suggest moving Bevills Wood into the parish.</p>
Alwalton	Alwalton Parish Council	Feel that current parish boundaries still meet criteria
Barham & Woolley	Barham & Woolley Parish Council	<p>Unanimously in favour of no change to present state and there should be no merger. Concerns -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - electorate numbers disproportionate between parishes - costs involved in employing more clerks to cover areas - would community be lost - would democratic right of electorate be lost - can merger be prevented from happening
Broughton	Broughton Parish Council	<p>Would rather have its present 7 councillors rather than be reduced to proposed 5</p> <p>Quorum might be difficult to achieve with lower number, due to councillor interests and restrictions with voting</p>
Buckworth	Buckworth Parish Council	<p>Strongly opposes any amalgamation or change – would be robbed of its own identity. Does not have trouble recruiting.</p> <p>Does not agree to reduction in Councillors.</p>
Bury	Mrs Carole M Crompton, Lioncroft Cottage, Bury	Would prefer that Bury Parish/Ramsey Town Boundary is moved to the boundaries between current properties as close to original historical boundary as possible to newer residents.
Bury	Bury Parish Council	<p>Bury villagers wish to remain in Bury and not become part of Ramsey - Petition held - Support of them remaining in Bury.</p> <p>Object to old Bury Industrial Estate, Signal Road becoming part of Ramsey</p> <p>Submitted alternative proposal.</p> <p>Arising from amended proposals circulated felt that clearer boundary would be achieved - If proposal A and B on map were amalgamated – if not proposal A would be alternative option</p>

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Bury	Malcolm Halliwell (Resident)	Following the publication of revised proposals totally against being incorporated into Ramsey Parish. Cannot see any benefits to be gained by changing boundaries at all and feel expenses associated with this would be better spent on local services.
Bury	Julie Matwijczuk, Taverners Drive, Bury	Support proposal A – prefer to stay in Bury
Bury	Julian Fisher, Taverners Drive, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	Colin Dorrington, Foundry Way, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	John Crompton, The Terrace, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	Mr F W Starmer, Foundry Way, Bury	Wish to remain Bury
Bury	Mr F Bell, Lion Walk, Bury	Is happy to identify as a Bury resident and wishes to stay in Bury. Areas to be moved do not make sense.
Bury	Mr & Mrs Beesley, Foundry way, Bury	Bought house because wanted to remain in Bury not Ramsey.
Bury	Mr R Frost, Lion Walk, Bury	Want to live in Bury not Ramsey.
Bury	Mr & Mrs G White, The Terrace, Bury	Upset at proposals. Do not wish to live in Ramsey – wish to remain as Bury.
Bury	Mr & Mrs K Snoad, Foundry Way, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	Bury Branch Conservative Association (Peter Hazell)	Extremely concerned about proposed changes. Totally opposed to any changes, particularly if it involves any degree of integration with Ramsey
Bury	Mrs M Dockerty, The Terrace, Bury	The Terrace is centre of Bury village – wish to remain in Bury
Bury	M E Clack, Lioncroft Cottages, Bury	No advantage to Bury residents – loss of social intercourse and community. Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	Mrs J Pilkington, Foundry Way, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	Mr N Arden, Grenfell Road, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	David Howells, Lioncroft Cottages, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Catworth	Catworth Parish Council	Wish to maintain the status quo of 9 councillors. Re: workload/planning applications/quorum/declarations
Catworth	Mr S Robinson, High Street, Catworth	Objection to reducing number of members from 9 to 5
Chesterton	Chesterton Parish Meeting	Request no change and remain as a Parish Meeting for foreseeable future
Covington	Marilyn Turrell (Chair of Covington Book Group)	Existing parish meeting attracts high turnout. Would have only one voice out of seven in decision-making of the newly formed PC. Wish to preserve unique identity
Covington	Convington Parish Meeting & Residents Petition	Do not wish to make ANY changes to parish boundary or to parish meeting. Would be under-represented after amalgamation. Lack of shared services, no additional benefits. Signed petition against proposals
Denton & Caldecote	Denton & Caldecote Parish Meeting	Unanimous support of Option 1 – no change
Diddington	Councillor R Bailey	Diddington would like to group with Buckden Parish Council. Diddington wishes to retain its identity as a Parish. If amalgamation does not offer this then parish would prefer not to change. Diddington would prefer NOT to be grouped or amalgamated with Southoe Parish Council.
Diddington	Diddington Parish Meeting	Not seek to join with Southoe – concur with Councillor Bailey's points
Easton	Beth Davies, Brook House, Church Road, Easton	Opposed to amalgamation as existing parish boundaries of great historical importance.
Easton	Easton Parish Council	Completely opposed to the proposal as distinct separate communities. Survey carried out ALL wanted separate parish council to be maintained. Local opposition to change of existing boundaries
Easton	David & Jenniffer Hyde, Fiddlers, Easton	Objection to the proposed amalgamation. Villages are vastly different/have different local issues/own council understands own village needs
Easton	Malcolm Halliday, Ford Cottage, Easton	Strongly prefers Easton to retain its own Parish Council and not to be combined with Ellington.
Easton	Mr & Mrs A W P Graham, The Lane, Easton	Should not be amalgamated with Ellington
Easton	Dr B Davis, Church Road, Easton	Opposes as it does not provide better reflection of community identities – never had close affinity with Ellington. Proposal to change boundary follows natural boundary of Ellington Brook – very old historical feature.
Easton	Charles W Nixon, Easton	Villages dissimilar and have different needs. Should be allowed to retain present state.
Ellington	Mike Jones, Spinneyfield, Ellington	Intense competition for election to PC. More Ellington residents who would vote for Ellington residents and not Easton.

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Ellington, Easton, Spaldwick, Stow Longa, Leighton Bromswold, Buckworth and Barham & Woolley	District Councillor M Baker	Found no support whatsoever for any mergers – urge to leave present system as it is. Not aware of any struggle to find candidates either
Ellington	Ellington Parish Council	No problem recruiting Councillors – 7 councillors essential to represent number of electors. Supports transfer of part of its area to Spaldwick. Against proposal to amalgamate with Easton
Eynesbury Hardwicke	Eynesbury Hardwicke Parish Council	Raise no objection – in principle to draft proposals, however, concern about elections/precepts/unlikely to support early interim implementation arrangements which would benefit the Town Council and disadvantage the residents of Eynesbury Hardwicke
Eynesbury Hardwicke	R E Barnes, Chairman of Parish Council	For the amalgamation
Eynesbury Hardwicke (Rural)	St. Neots & District Liberal Democrats	This should simply be wound up with the bulk of the Parish joining with Abbotsley and the part between the St. Neots bypass, the railway line and Cambridge Road, which will eventually be built on, joined to the proposed St. Neots Cromwell Ward, so saving the need for a future revision
Eynesbury Hardwicke (Urban)	St. Neots & District Liberal Democrats	As this Parish now forms part of both the District and County Divisions of Eynesbury, we would propose that this becomes the new Ward, St. Neots Eynesbury Hardwicke, with one or two seats on the Town Council
Fenstanton	Fenstanton Parish Council	The decision of the Parish Council is that current boundaries remain the same. Wish to remain within the parish of Fenstanton
Fenstanton	E Gridle, Greenfields, St. Ives	Wish to remain in Fenstanton
Fenstanton	Cynthia Bu-Rashid, Greenfields, St. Ives	Wish to remain in Fenstanton
Fenstanton	M P Clarke, Elizabeth Court, St. Ives	Many residents have long standing connections with Fenstanton – remain in Fenstanton
Fenstanton	Various Residents in Greenfields, Maytrees, Elizabeth Court, London Road and Bridge Terrace	All signed same letter – wish to remain in Fenstanton
Fenstanton	Hally Hardie, Elizabeth Court, St. Ives	Furiously object to being under St. Ives. Wishes to keep status quo. St. Ives not interested in their area
Fenstanton	Gail Wase, Greenfields, St. Ives	Not acceptable to come under jurisdiction of St. Ives. Not interested in their area/Fenstanton Parish Council have always looked out for their interests

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Fenstanton	Mr and Mrs Foster, Greenfields, St. Ives	Object to proposals – wish to remain in Fenstanton
Fenstanton	Len Abbot, Elizabeth Court, St. Ives	Fenstanton PC always looked after my interests – wish to remain
Fenstanton	Jean Chandler (former-Councillor)	Concerned at the impact of removing 400 houses from the village – make services vulnerable Residents in the Low Road, Elizabeth Court, Greenfields, London Road and Maytrees wish to remain in Fenstanton.
Folksworth & Washingley	Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council	No problem with retaining membership of 9 councillors – do not wish to reduce to 7
Godmanchester	Godmanchester Town Council	Supports the recommendation to increase number of councillors to 17
Great & Little Gidding	Great & Little Gidding Parish Council	Prefer Option 1 and with 8 members as present – no change If Option 2 decided – happy to join Winwick
Great Gransden	Great Gransden Parish Council	If figures are to be 7 instead of 9 – this council objects strongly to reduction
Hail Weston	Hail Weston Parish Council	Do not wish to reduce members – inqurate etc. – Quality Status would be difficult to achieve – councillors could be over-burdened and resign
Hamerton	Hamerton Parish Committee	Little enthusiasm for a merger, remain as separate parish
Hemingford Grey	Hemingford Grey Parish Council	Map 4 – Hemingford Grey/St. Ives South – Object and wish the area to stay as part of Hemingford Grey Parish Holt Island/River Ouse – shaded area B – have no objection to this proposal
Holme	Holme Parish Council	Not in favour of proposal to reduce members from 9 to 7 – have no councillor vacancies
Holywell-cum-Needingworth	G Britton, resident, Holywell-cum-Needingworth	Against changes to boundaries – use Harrison Way and Somersham Road
Holywell-cum-Needingworth	Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	Objects strongly to change of parish boundary with St. Ives. Prefer no change – as previously stated. But accept change of boundary/to follow physical boundary Harrison Way is logical.

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Houghton & Wyton	Houghton & Wyton Parish Council	Split Wyton-on-the-hill, not until 2010. Support extension of boundary to How Lodge and The How Request Houghton Lock becomes part of Parish – presently in Hemingford Abbots. Adjust boundary so that houses and property at top of Mere Way and Sawtry Way become part of Parish and Houghton Hill Farm and Sawtry Way Cottages move into villages ward
Huntingdon	Huntingdon Town Council	No need for increase in councillors, already sufficient. Supports changes to boundaries
Huntingdon	Huntingdon Liberal Democrats	Submitted alternative proposal to expand the number of wards of Huntingdon.
Huntingdon	M Anderson, Main Street, Hartford	No clear association with a specific councillor. High multi representation is bad for democracy – confusing mix of councillors on all tiers
Kings Ripton	Kings Ripton Parish Council	Both villages have completely separate identities, although close together. Object to amalgamations
Kimbolton & Stonely	Councillor Jonathan Gray	Personally has no objection to proposed alterations to his Ward. However Kimbolton & Stonely PC objected to alterations to their boundaries around Stow Longa – historical issues – happy to endorse their objection. Tilbrook & Covington – wish to leave their current arrangements as they are – village meeting unchanged. Supports proposals re: down sizing number of members – dependant on where etc. Recommend Councils with an electorate +/- 10% of the proposed bands are re-organised in size as per proposals or given the option of retaining/increasing/decreasing their size
Kimbolton & Stonely	Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council	Opposed to proposal to reduce number of councillors appointed from 11 to 9. Believe that historic parish boundaries should remain and oppose the proposal to redefine them
Leighton Bromswold	Richard Martin, The Avenue, Leighton Bromswold, past member of PC	Does not feel the amalgamation will benefit anyone
Leighton Bromswold	Leighton Bromswold Parish Council	Can see no advantages to the proposals – and does not support them. Fewer councillors covering a wider area – would not work. Administratively amalgamation of parishes would be more difficult and more expensive to manage.
Leighton Bromswold	John Auty, The Avenue, Leighton Bromswold	By adding other parishes – local knowledge would be diluted. Little awareness of other villages and vice versa

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Leighton Bromswold	Elizabeth Baxendale, resident, Member of PC but personal comments	Would not like proposed changes come into effect – Members will have responsibility for unfamiliar parishes
Leighton Bromswold	S Hansen, The Avenue, Leighton Bromswold	Have some concerns that issues for each separate village on newly merged parish council may be lost
Leighton Bromswold	Marianne & Peter Mallace, residents, Leighton Bromswold	Wish for Parish Council to retain its individual identity. Strongly feel that proposed amalgamations would be of no benefit to the community
Leighton Bromswold	Bohdan Mysak, Leighton Bromswold (Parish Councillor)	Proposal would lead to a dilution of the local voice. Opposed to the proposals.
Leighton Bromswold	Ian Bentley, The Avenue, Leighton Bromswold	Would not wish Leighton Bromswold to amalgamate with other parish council. At present has excellent sense of community, geographically separate and isolated from other parishes
Little Paxton	Little Paxton Parish Council	Present level of membership allows adequate cover at present. No benefit to be gained in reducing council size. Would wish that current membership remains unchanged. Happy with proposed boundary change to include the Island site within Little Paxton
Little Paxton	St. Neots & District Liberal Democrats	The island site, currently under development appears, according to our reading of the maps to be partly in St. Neots Priory Park Ward. If so, this is an anomaly which requires rectification by incorporation of the whole site into Little Paxton.
Morborne	R W Dalgliesh, Morborne	Registers an objection to amalgamation
Morborne	Morborne Parish Meeting	Petition enclosed – from residents against proposals to amalgamate
Offord Cluny	Offord Cluny Parish Council	Not satisfied with proposed number of Councillors – consider 11 to be appropriate Councillors content with proposed amalgamation of two parish councils but would like it to be named “Offord Cluny & Offord D’Arcy Parish Council”
Offord Cluny	Mr and Mrs Brown, High Street, Offord Cluny	Strongly support amalgamation of the two Offord parishes
Offord Cluny	Mr L Small, Asplins Lane, Offord Cluny	Support amalgamation but would like to retain local identity – ie. Be known as “Offord Cluny & Offord D’Arcy”
Offord Cluny	Mr and Mrs Reece, Manor Court, New Road, Offord Cluny	Happy with amalgamation – but would want to keep it called “Offord Cluny & Offord D’Arcy”
Offord D’Arcy	Offord D’Arcy Parish Council	Not satisfied with proposed number of Councillors – consider 11 to be appropriate Councillors content with proposed amalgamation of two parish councils but would like it to be named “Offord Cluny & Offord D’Arcy Parish Council”
Offord D’Arcy	Mrs J Griffiths, Apple Close, Offord D’Arcy	Fully support a combined parish council to represent parishes of Offord Cluny and Offord D’Arcy

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Offord D'Arcy	Dennis Walker, Bramley Drive, Offord D'Arcy	View that parishes would be better served by united Parish Council
Offord D'Arcy	Liz Howes, Pippin Close, Offord D'Arcy	The principle of one council to represent the Offords would be a good idea
Offord D'Arcy	G Sherlock, High Street, Offord D'Arcy	Best for Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy to amalgamate
Offord D'Arcy	Mrs J Griffiths, Apple Close, Offord D'Arcy	Fully support a combined parish council and to combine Offord Cluny and Offord D'Arcy
Offord D'Arcy	Mr S Clayden, Bramley Drive, Offord D'Arcy	Positive view on Offord Parish Councils becoming one – stress though – that would like to keep identity of the Offords intact
Offord Cluny/Offord D'Arcy	St. Neots & District Liberal Democrats	Offord D'Arcy and Offord Cluny have for some considerable time formed a contiguous community. Having separate Parish Councils would seem to us to be no longer necessary, especially in view of the commonality of interests and the difficulties of filling two separate Parish Councils.
Perry	Perry Parish Council	Parish Council does not consider that any changes to Parish boundaries are necessary or desirable
Pidley-cum-Fenton	Pidley-cum-Fenton Parish Council	Wish to record their approval of planned changes to boundaries
Ramsey	Ramsey Town Council	Rejected the alternative proposal as a much bigger area of Ramsey is proposed to be moved into Bury than is necessary – involves moving large number of residents who have long standing identity with Ramsey
St. Ives	St. Ives Town Council	Suggested alternative proposals for Map 3. Agreed to Maps 4 and 5, with an amendment to Area C. Rejected Map 6 and agreed Map 12.
St. Neots	St. Neots Town Council	Town Council content with the proposals for the town of St. Neots and wished to make no further comment
St. Neots Rural	Mr A Sharp, New Cottages, Lower Wintringham Farm, St. Neots	Supports merger with Abbotsley
St. Neots Rural	St. Neots & District Liberal Democrats	The development of Loves Farm will turn this Parish into an urban area and effectively become part of St. Neots. We would propose that it becomes the new Ward, St. Neots Cromwell Ward (after the Cromwell Plantation, which is not on the estate but is the key feature of the area east of the railway line).The projected population would also make it appropriate for the ward to have one or two members of St. Neots Town Council
Somersham	Somersham Parish Council	No objection to the proposed boundary change and increased area for Somersham – however strongly objects to the proposal in item 5.3 to reduce the ratio of Councillors to electors. This would be an immense strain by reducing from 15 to 13

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Southoe & Midloe	Southoe & Midloe Parish Council	Very concerned about proposal to reduce the number of Councillors from 7 to 5. Against the amalgamation with Diddington if they are not in favour
Spaldwick	Mr Grahame Leach, High Street, Spaldwick	Took vote at village meeting – unanimously rejected idea of merging. The villages have different needs.
Spaldwick	Spaldwick Parish Council	Agrees to the proposed parish boundary changes between Spaldwick and Ellington. Vigourously opposed to amalgamation of parishes of Stow Longa and Spaldwick Also strongly oppose reduction of councillors from 7 to 5
Stow Longa	Stow Longa Parish Council	Council has considered the proposed merger with Spaldwick and concluded that they are strongly against the proposals. Support proposals to amend boundaries – with suggested amendments for inclusion.
Stow Longa	Mr Ajit Kotwal & Mrs Julie Kotwal, Spaldwick Road, Stow Longa	Dismay and resolute opposition to the proposal to amalgamate Stow Longa with Spaldwick No problem with candidate numbers in Stow Longa
Stow Longa	Jane and Maurice Croft, Stow Longa Residents	Reducing numbers could lead to it not being democratic. Also could lead to conflict. No purpose to the proposed amalgamation.
Stow Longa	Peter Webster, Spaldwick Road, Stow Longa	Concerned at consequences. Village issues only affect <i>that</i> village. Each village has own separate identity. What about costs – and one village could lose its voice.
Stow Longa	Mrs V M Schorer-Nixon, Hunters Downe, The Lane, Stow Longa	Objects to the proposed amalgamation. Stow Longa is a small community and very different from Spaldwick. It is perceived that “bigger is better” this is not always the case. It is more likely that the residents of Stow Longa would become side-lined
The Stukeleys	Councillor T D Sanderson	Cannot see justification behind moving Northbridge development out of The Stukeleys and into the town. Development is clearly going to be part of Great Stukeley.
The Stukeleys	The Stukeleys Parish Council	Supports proposals for boundary changes – except part of Abbots Ripton Parish. Does not agree with the proposed reduction of parish councillors for the Stukeleys Ward from 13 to 7. Minimum of 10 is required

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Tilbrook	Tilbrook Parish Council	Do not support the proposal to create a combined PC for Tilbrook and Covington – no geographical link and history Do not object to proposed reduction in Members from 7 to 5
Toseland	Toseland Parish Council	Unanimous vote that two separate Parish Councils be retained. Evidenced by representation. Opposed by 81.5% of electors Opposed to reduction in Members also.
Upwood & The Raveleys	Upwood & The Raveleys Parish Council	A reduction in number of members could mean certain areas of parish have no representation. Appropriate for number to remain at 11
Upwood & The Raveleys	Councillor T Bell	Reduction of members would introduce some difficulty with representation due to the geographics of the parish
Warboys	Warboys Parish Council	As District Council has accepted Parish Council's recommendations for changes to the boundaries with Wistow, Ramsey and Pidley-cum-Fenton Parishes, the council supports the draft proposals
Water Newton	Water Newton Parish Meeting	Would like there to be no change
Winwick	Winwick Parish Meeting	Winwick has strong identity and has no wish to be forcibly amalgamated with any other village
Winwick	Neil Brine, Knott Cottage, Winwick	A revision of the boundary would enable controlled expansion, particularly affordable housing
Woodhurst	Woodhurst Parish Council	Fundamentally opposed to the changes as proposed Concern at reducing number of members from 7 to 5 Submitted alternative proposal.
Woolley	Maggi Harris, New Manor Farm, Woolley	Strongly opposed to changes, better as it is already
Yelling	Yelling Parish Council	Unanimously agreed that Yelling Parish Council should retain its status quo. Supported by 100% of electorate at Special Parish Meeting Clearly defined parish boundaries, well served by existing 7 members of the parish council