
Parish Electoral Review in Huntingdonshire – Final Recommendations

Report by the Head of Administration

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Huntingdonshire is a large rural District with a population of around 160,000 and an electorate of around 120,000. Some 8,000 residential properties have been built in the last decade and a further 6,000 are forecast in the next 10 years. In the same period the population has increased by some 15,000 and is forecast to grow to 163,700 by 2011.
- 1.2 The District covers an area of over 900 square kilometres (approximately 350 square miles) and approximately half the population of the District live in the four market towns of Huntingdon, Ramsey, St. Ives and St. Neots, with the remainder dispersed in rural villages. There are in total 84 parishes of which 73 have town or parish councils.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Under the Local Government and Rating Act 1997 “The Act”, the District Council has a duty to ensure that parishes continue to reflect local communities and that the related electoral arrangements secure effective and convenient local government. The Act 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.
- 2.2 The Council embarked upon a further review and this document outlines the Council’s final recommendations for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements.

3. SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

- 3.1 The review has looked at the potential need for the creation, alteration or abolition of parishes in order to provide a better reflection of community identities than the existing arrangements. In many cases a boundary change between existing parishes, rather than the creation of an entirely new parish, was considered sufficient to ensure that parish arrangements continue to reflect local identities as communities have expanded with new housing developments.
- 3.2 Electoral arrangements also have been considered, in an attempt to achieve electoral equality, which has included a review of the number of

councillors, whether or not any of the parishes should be, or continue to be, divided into wards and the name of any such ward.

3.3 As part of the review, the Council has considered –

- ◆ the alteration of the boundaries of parishes and parish wards;
- ◆ the formation of new parishes and parish wards;
- ◆ the dissolution of parishes and parish wards;
- ◆ the establishment of parish councils for new parishes; and
- ◆ changes to parish electoral arrangements, including a review of the number of councillors to be elected for each parish or ward of a parish.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 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.
- 4.4 Following consideration of the responses received by the Elections Panel, changes have been proposed to parish boundaries as detailed at Annex B. The changes proposed have taken into account past developments and future committed house building in order to reflect the identity and interest of local communities. A number of maps have also been prepared to illustrate the proposals and area attached. Where possible, the parish boundaries have been aligned with a geographical feature, such as rivers, roads and railways. For completeness a schedule is also included at Annex C, showing the electorate by parish as at 1st December 2005 and projected to mid-2011.
- 4.5 The electoral arrangements of the parishes have also been examined in the light of the proposed alteration of parish boundaries, the proposed new scale of parish council representation detailed below and the predicted

electorate growth in each parish as a result of forecast dwelling completions.

- 4.6 The proposed changes to council size of affected parishes are detailed at Annex A for implementation by the Council by Order at the next scheduled parish elections and Annex B for submission to the Secretary of State and Electoral Commission. As a result of the proposed new scale of parish council representation, the change in the level of representation for some of the parishes with relatively small populations is significant. The Elections Panel proposed therefore that in parishes with an electorate of up to 1,500 any change in the number of parish councillors should be limited to plus or minus two councillors within their new band.

5. COUNCIL SIZE

- 5.1 Parishes should have sufficient population to justify the establishment of a parish council. The Act requires that parishes with 200+ electors must have a parish council. Parishes between 150 and 200 electors must have a council if the parish meeting resolved in favour of one. Parishes with less than 150 electors can resolve in favour of a parish council, but it is at the discretion of the District Council whether or not to establish one. Parishes with no council must have at least two parish meetings of electors each year.
- 5.2 As part of the review, consideration also was given to the levels of representation in relation to electorate size for parishes. The only statutory requirement is that the minimum number of councillors that can be elected to a parish council is five. In practice there is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. Currently no statutory requirement regarding the ratio of electors to councillors for parishes of different electorate sizes exists.
- 5.3 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. Parishes in Huntingdonshire have encountered problems from time to time in attracting sufficient candidates for election and have had to resort to co-option to fill their full complement of Members. The Elections Panel felt that the scale had become out of date and did not reflect either past practice or the growth in the size of communities in Huntingdonshire. At the meeting of the Elections 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

5.4 The Council is invited to consider the adoption of the new scale of parish council representation as detailed above.

6. RELATED ALTERATIONS TO DISTRICT WARD, COUNTY DIVISION AND PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES

6.1 As a result of the proposed alterations to parish boundaries, some of the new ones are no longer coterminous with District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency boundaries. As there is a requirement for the boundaries of the latter to be aligned with parish or parish ward boundaries, the proposals will require consequential alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency boundaries. The affected parishes are referred to in Annex B.

7. NEXT STAGES AND IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 The District Council has the power to put in place any modifications that deal solely with the alterations of the parish electoral arrangements and the grouping of parishes under a common parish council, by Order, providing there are no changes to the parish’s administrative boundary. These changes will come into effect at the next scheduled parish elections for the parishes affected. Any consequential changes required to District Wards, County Divisions and/or Parliamentary Constituencies can only be implemented by the Electoral Commission.

7.2 The final recommendations will be submitted to the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission for consideration. The Secretary of State is responsible for making the Order implementing the parish boundary changes. Under the Act the Secretary of State may by Order give effect to (with or without modifications) or may reject the recommendations. The Secretary of State will only make an Order for the creation of a new parish or a change to the area of a parish when the Electoral Commission is ready to make the electoral arrangements Order for the parish. The Electoral Commission can accept the proposals, propose that alternative or modified electoral arrangements should be introduced or that the proposals be rejected and any existing electoral arrangements retained.

- 7.3 Once decisions have been made on changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements, consideration will be given to the timing of implementation of an Order by the Secretary of State and Electoral Commission. The timing will depend upon a number of factors. Boundary changes affecting many electors must come into force on 1st April before the next scheduled elections for the parishes concerned for precepting purposes. Changes to parish electoral arrangements should come into force at the next parish election and any new electoral arrangements must be made in time for the Council to reflect these changes in the Electoral Register.
- 7.4 Any interested party who wishes to comment on the process can make representations to the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission if they believe that either the statutory criteria or guidance has not been taken into account during the conduct of the review.
- 7.5 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 will devolve more power to local authorities in the form of community governance reviews and may affect the implementation of some of the changes proposed. At this stage it is not possible to assess the effect of the Act until further detailed Regulations emerge.

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Having regard to the representations received from interested parties following the publication of draft proposals for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements, the Council is invited to –
- (a) approve the new scale of parish council representation as outlined in the report;
 - (b) approve the final recommendations for changes to parish electoral arrangements as detailed at Annex A for the Council to implement these changes by Order at the next scheduled parish elections;
 - (c) support the proposal to invite the parishes of Buckden and Diddington to group under a common parish council; and
 - (d) approve the final recommendations for changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements as detailed at Annex B for submission to the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Local Government and Rating Act 1997

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

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, 19th February and 20th November 2007.

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

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>

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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>
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.</p> <p>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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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. Does not agree to reduction in Councillors.</p>
Bury	Mrs Carole M Crompton, Lioncroft Cottage, Bury	<p>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.</p>
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>
Bury	Malcolm Halliwell (Resident)	<p>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.</p>
Bury	Julie Matwijczuk, Taverners Drive, Bury	<p>Support proposal A – prefer to stay in Bury</p>
Bury	Julian Fisher, Taverners Drive, Bury	<p>Wish to remain in Bury</p>

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Bury	Mr N Arden, Grenfell Road, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
Bury	David Howells, Lioncroft Cottages, Bury	Wish to remain in Bury
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.

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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 & Jennifer 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.
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
Hail Weston	Hail Weston Parish Council	Do not wish to reduce members – inqorate 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.
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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	<p>Personally has no objection to proposed alterations to his Ward.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Supports proposals re: down sizing number of members – dependant on where etc.</p> <p>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</p>
Kimbolton & Stonely	Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council	<p>Opposed to proposal to reduce number of councillors appointed from 11 to 9.</p> <p>Believe that historic parish boundaries should remain and oppose the proposal to redefine them</p>
Leighton Bromswold	Richard Martin, The Avenue, Leighton Bromswold, past member of PC	Does not feel the amalgamation will benefit anyone

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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
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. Vigorously 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.

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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
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

Parish	Representations Received	Comments
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

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO PARISH ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY THE COUNCIL BY ORDER

1. Parish Affected

Catworth

a) Draft Proposal

Decrease the membership of Catworth Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

b) Representations Received

Catworth Parish Council expressed concern with the proposal and requested that the status quo be maintained.

c) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Catworth Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

2. Parish Affected

Tilbrook

a) Representations Received

Tilbrook Parish Council expressed support for a reduction in councillors from 7 to 5. This did not form part of the draft proposals.

b) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Tilbrook Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

c) Reasons

To meet the wishes of the parish council, to be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

3. Parish Affected

Godmanchester

a) Draft Proposal

Increase the membership of Godmanchester Town Council from 15 to 17 councillors.

b) Representations Received

Godmanchester Town Council supported the proposal for an increase in membership.

c) Final Recommendations

Increase the membership of Godmanchester Town Council from 15 to 17 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

d) Reasons

To meet the wishes of the parish council, to be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

4. Parishes Affected

Holme

a) Draft Proposal

Decrease the membership of Holme Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

b) Representations Received

Holme Parish Council objected to the proposal and indicated their preference to remain as they are.

c) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Holme Parish Council from 9 to 7 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation,

whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

5. Parish Affected

Upwood and The Raveleys

a) Draft Proposal

Reduce the membership of Upwood and The Raveleys Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Upwood and The Raveleys Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors with the new band.

6. Parishes Affected

Elton

a) Draft Proposal

Decrease the membership of Elton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors.

b) Representations Received

No representations were made in respect of these proposals.

c) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Elton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

7. Parishes Affected

Great Staughton

a) Draft Proposal

Decrease the membership of Great Staughton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors.

b) Representations Received

No representations were made in respect of these proposals.

c) Final Recommendations

Decrease the membership of Great Staughton Parish Council from 11 to 9 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

8. Parishes Affected

Yaxley

a) Draft Proposal

Increase the membership of Yaxley Parish Council from 13 to 17 councillors.

b) Representations Received

No representations were made in respect of these proposals.

c) Final Recommendations

Increase the membership of Yaxley Parish Council from 13 to 17 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

9. Parishes Affected

**Buckden
Diddington
Southoe and Midloe**

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate Diddington Parish Meeting with Southoe and Midloe Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

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 1 shall be elected to represent the parish of Diddington. This is subject to the consent of the parish meeting of each of the parishes.

d) Reasons

To meet the views of the parishes involved and to provide the electors of the area with more effective local government in that the parish to which the other parish will be amalgamated with has a more active and vibrant parish council.

This page is intentionally left blank

**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON
THE REVIEW OF PARISH ARRANGEMENTS AND DRAFT
PROPOSALS TO THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION ON
CONSEQUENTIAL ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS**

1. Parishes Affected

**Abbotsley
Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke
Part of St Neots Rural**

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate the Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish, the remaining part of St Neots Rural parish following proposed amendments to the St Neots area and Abbotsley parish to form a new parish of Abbotsley and Hardwicke consisting of 7 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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.

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.

c) Final Recommendations

That the Spinney Ward of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish, the remaining part of St Neots Rural parish (see proposals for St Neots – paragraph 9) and Abbotsley parish be amalgamated to form an expanded parish of Abbotsley as shown on map 16.

d) Reasons

To provide the electors of the area with more effective local government in that the parish to which the other parishes will be amalgamated with has a more active and vibrant parish council.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the amalgamation of Eynesbury Hardwicke parish, the remaining part of St Neots Rural parish and Abbotsley, the number of councillors of the expanded parish of Abbotsley will consist of 7.

2. Parishes Affected

**Abbots Ripton
Alconbury
The Stukeleys**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend various boundaries affecting the parishes of Abbots Ripton, Alconbury and The Stukeleys.

b) Representations Received

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.

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer shaded areas A from Abbots Ripton parish to The Stukeleys parish, B from Alconbury parish to the Stukeleys parish, C from Abbots Ripton parish to The Stukeleys parish and D from Woodwalton parish to Abbots Ripton parish as shown on Map 1.

d) Reasons

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 and avoid the splitting of the airfield which potentially could be subject to development in the future.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area A and C from Upwood and The Raveleys Ward to Alconbury and The Stukeleys Ward, Warboys and Upwood Division to

Huntingdon Division and North West Cambridgeshire Constituency to Huntingdon Constituency.

3. Parishes Affected

**Bury
Ramsey**

a) Draft Proposal

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.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

That the boundary between Ramsey and Bury be re-drawn in accordance with Option B and transfer shaded area A from Bury parish to Ramsey parish and B from Ramsey parish to Bury parish as shown on map 11. It is also suggested that the Panel support the realigning of the boundary affecting the properties to the rear of Fairfield Drive, Ramsey rather than cutting directly through properties.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes as the current boundary cuts directly through properties and is not easily identifiable. This option affects the least number of properties.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area A from Warboys and Bury Ward to Ramsey Ward and from Warboys and Upwood Division to Ramsey Division.

Transfer shaded area B from Ramsey Ward to Bury Ward and from Ramsey Division to Warboys and Upwood Division.

4. Parishes Affected

**Chesterton
Haddon
Elton**

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate Chesterton Parish Meeting and Haddon Parish Meeting with Elton Parish Council. The membership would be reduced from 11 to 9 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Amalgamate Elton Parish Council with Haddon Parish Meeting to form a new parish of Elton consisting of 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.

d) Reasons

To provide the electors of the area with more effective local government in that the parish to which the other parish will be amalgamated with has a more active and vibrant parish council and to be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

5. Parishes Affected

**Fenstanton
St Ives**

a) Draft Proposal

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.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Amend the southern boundary of St Ives South to follow the Low Road up to the junction with London Road and transfer the shaded area as shown on map 3 from Fenstanton parish to St Ives South.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes as the current boundary cuts directly through properties in Enderby's Wharf and is not easily identifiable and the properties to transfer have a clearer affinity of interest with St Ives as they are quite detached from Fenstanton.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the amendment of boundaries and transfer of properties between Fenstanton and St Ives, the number of councillors of Fenstanton parish will reduce from 15 to 13.

f) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area from Fenstanton Ward to St Ives South Ward and from The Hemingfords and Fenstanton Division to St Ives Division.

6. Parishes Affected

Hamerton
Winwick
Steeple Gidding
Great and Little Gidding

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate the parish meetings of Hamerton, Winwick and Steeple Gidding with Great and Little Gidding Parish Council consisting of 7 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

That the parish of Steeple Gidding be amalgamated with Hamerton parish to create an expanded parish of Hamerton. Reduce the membership of Great and Little Gidding Parish Council from 8 to 7 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

d) Reasons

To provide the electors of the area with more effective local government in that the parish to which the other parish will be amalgamated with is larger and more active and electors from Steeple Gidding already vote at Hamerton. To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

7. Parishes Affected

**Hemingford Grey
Holywell-cum-Needingworth
St Ives**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundaries between the parishes of Hemingford Grey and St Ives.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the shaded areas A and B from Hemingford Grey parish to St Ives South Ward of St Ives Parish as shown on map 4 and 5.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes as the current boundary cuts directly through units and the site of The Dolphin Hotel and also cuts directly through Holt Island and is not easily identifiable.

e) **Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries**

Transfer shaded area A and B from The Hemingfords Ward to St Ives South Ward and from The Hemingfords and Fenstanton Division to St Ives Division.

8. **Parishes Affected**

**Holywell-cum-Needingworth
St Ives**

a) **Draft Proposal**

Amend the boundaries between the parishes of Holywell-cum-Needingworth and St Ives.

b) **Representations Received**

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.

c) **Final Recommendations**

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 shaded area C from Holywell-cum-Needingworth to St Ives parish as shown on map 4 and 5.

d) **Reasons**

To take account of existing and planned development and the comments of the interested parties.

e) **Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries**

Transfer shaded area C from Earith Ward to St Ives South Ward and from North West Cambridgeshire Constituency to Huntingdon Constituency.

9. **Parishes Affected**

**Houghton and Wyton
Hemingford Grey
St Ives**

a) Draft Proposal

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.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Amend the boundary and transfer shaded area A from the parish of St Ives to Houghton and Wyton parish and transfer the shaded area B from Hemingford Grey parish to Houghton and Wyton parish as shown on map 6. Amend the boundary so as to split Houghton and Wyton parish as shown on map 7, currently warded, 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 as shown on map

d) Reasons

To take account of existing and planned development and representations submitted and to provide a clearly defined boundary between the parishes. Houghton and Wyton parish is currently warded and in separate Parliamentary Constituencies, Electoral Divisions and District Wards.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the splitting of Houghton and Wyton parish, Houghton and Wyton parish will consist of 9 councillors and Wyton-on-the-Hill will consist of 7 councillors. This is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

f) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area A from St Ives South Ward to The Hemingfords Ward and from St Ives Division to The Hemingfords and Fenstanton Division.

10. Parishes Affected

**Huntingdon
The Stukeleys**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend various boundaries affecting the parishes of Huntingdon and The Stukeleys, with an increase in the number of councillors on Huntingdon Town Council from 16 to 19 and decrease in the membership of The Stukeleys Parish Council from 13 to 7 councillors.

b) Representations Received

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 at this stage and would lead to confusion for the public distinguishing between District and Town Councillors. The matter would be addressed in more detail as part of a Community Governance Review. The Stukeleys Parish Council supported the proposals for boundary changes, but requested a minimum membership of 10 councillors.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the shaded areas A and B (Hinchingsbrooke Ward of The Stukeleys parish) from The Stukeleys parish to Huntingdon West Ward of Huntingdon parish as shown on map 8. Increase the membership of Huntingdon Town Council from 16 to 19 councillors and decrease the membership of The Stukeleys Parish Council from 13 to 9 councillors.

d) Reasons

To take account of existing and planned development. To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the amendments to the parish boundaries Huntingdon parish will consist of 19 councillors and The Stukeleys parish will consist of 9 councillors. This is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

f) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area A from Alconbury and The Stukeleys Ward to Huntingdon West Ward.

11. Parishes Affected

**Kimbolton and Stonely
Stow Longa**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundary between the parishes of Kimbolton and Stonely and Stow Longa.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the area of land as shown on map 22 from Kimbolton parish to Stow Longa parish.

d) Reasons

To meet the views of the parishes involved as the properties affected have more affinity of interest with the parish they are transferring to.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area from Kimbolton and Staughton Ward to Ellington Ward, Brampton and Kimbolton Division to Sawtry and Ellington Division and from Huntingdon Constituency to North West Cambridgeshire Constituency.

12. Parishes Affected

Little Paxton

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundary to include the Island site within the parish of Little Paxton.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

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 as shown on map 9.

d) Reasons

To take account of existing development and to provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes as the current boundary cuts directly through properties on the Island site and is not easily identifiable.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area from St Neots Priory Park Ward to Little Paxton Ward.

13. Parishes Affected

**Offord Cluny
Offord D'Arcy**

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate Offord Cluny parish and Offord D'Arcy parish to form a new parish of The Offords consisting of 9 councillors.

b) Representation Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Amalgamate Offord Cluny parish and Offord D'Arcy parish as shown on map 17 to form a new parish council of Offord Cluny and Offord D'Arcy consisting of 11 councillors.

d) Reasons

To meet the wishes of both parishes affected. To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the amalgamation of both parishes, the new parish of Offord Cluny and Offord D'Arcy will consist of 11 councillors. This is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

14. Parish Affected

St Ives

a) Draft Proposal

Increase the membership of St Ives Town Council from 16 to 19 councillors.

b) Representations Received

St Ives Town Council strongly opposed the increase in membership.

c) Final Recommendations

Increase the membership of St Ives Town Council from 16 to 19 councillors which is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

d) Reasons

To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

15. Parishes Affected

**St Neots
Hail Weston
Eynesbury Hardwicke
St Neots Rural**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend various boundaries affecting St Neots and the surrounding parishes and increase the number of councillors on St Neots Town Council from 18 to 21.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the shaded areas from Hail Weston parish to St Neots Eaton Ford Ward of St Neots parish, from Eynesbury Hardwicke parish (Town Ward of Eynesbury Harwicke 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 as shown on maps 13, 14 and 15. Increase the membership of St Neots Town Council from 18 to 21 councillors in accordance with the proposed new scale of parish council representation.

d) Reasons

To take account of existing and planned development and to meet the wishes of the parishes affected. To be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation, whilst allowing some flexibility to plus or minus 2 councillors within the new band.

e) Final Proposed Consequential Electoral Arrangements

That as a result of the amendments to the parish boundaries St Neots parish will consist of 21 councillors. This is in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

f) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area on map 13 from St Neots Eaton Ford Ward to Kimbolton and Staughton Ward and from Little Paxton and St Neots North Division to Brampton and Kimbolton Division.

Transfer shaded area on map 15 from Gransden and The Offords Ward to St Neots Priory Park Ward and from Buckden, Gransden and The Offords Division to St Neots Eaton Socon Division.

16. Parishes Affected

**Pidley-cum-Fenton
Somersham**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundary between the parishes of Pidley-cum-Fenton and Somersham.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Proposal

Transfer of the shaded area from Pidley-cum-Fenton parish to Somersham parish as shown on map 10.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes.

17. Parishes Affected

**Spaldwick
Ellington**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundary between the parishes of Spaldwick and Ellington.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the shaded area from Ellington parish to Spaldwick parish as shown on map 21.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes.

18. Parishes Affected

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

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundaries between the parishes of Warboys, Pidley-cum-Fenton, Wistow and Ramsey.

b) Representations Received

Warboys Parish Council accepted the proposals for changes. Pidley-cum-Fenton Parish Council approved the proposed changes.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer of the shaded areas from the parishes of Pidley-cum-Fenton, Wistow and Ramsey to Warboys parish as shown on maps 18, 19 and 20.

d) Reasons

To meet the views of the parishes involved as the properties affected have more affinity of interest with the parish they are transferring to.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area on map 18 from Somersham Ward to Warboys and Bury Ward and from Somersham and Earith Division to Warboys and Upwood Division.

Transfer shaded area on map 20 from Ramsey Ward to Warboys and Bury Ward and from Ramsey Division to Warboys and Upwood Division

19. Parishes Affected

**Woodhurst
Oldhurst
Houghton and Wyton
St Ives**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundaries affecting the parishes of Woodhurst, Oldhurst, Houghton and Wyton and St Ives.

b) Representations Received

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.

c) Final Recommendations

Transfer the shaded areas A1 from Woodhurst parish to St Ives parish, A2 and C 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 as shown on map 12.

d) Reasons

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 and avoid the splitting of the airfield which potentially could be subject to development in the future.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area A1 from Somersham Ward to St Ives West Ward, Somersham and Earith Division to St Ives Division and North West Cambridgeshire Constituency to Huntingdon Constituency.

Transfer shaded area A2 and C from Somersham Ward to Upwood and The Raveleys Ward and from Somersham and Earith Division to Warboys and Upwood Division.

Transfer shaded area B from Somersham Ward to Upwood and The Raveleys Ward and from Somersham and Earith Division to Warboys and Upwood Division.

20. Parishes Affected

**Buckden
Offord Cluny**

a) Draft Proposal

Amend the boundary affecting the parishes of Buckden and Offord Cluny.

b) Representations Received

No representations were made in respect of these proposals.

c) Final Recommendations

Amend 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 as shown on map 2.

d) Reasons

To provide a clearly defined boundary between the two parishes as the current boundary cuts directly through properties in the Mill House and is not easily identifiable.

e) Related Alterations to District Ward, County Division and Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Transfer shaded area from Gransden and The Offords Ward to Buckden Ward.

21. Parishes Affected

**Tetworth
Waresley**

a) Draft Proposal

Amalgamate the parish meeting of Tetworth with Waresley Parish Council consisting of 5 councillors.

b) Representations Received

No representations were made in respect of these proposals.

c) Final Recommendations

Amalgamate Waresley Parish Council with Tetworth Parish Meeting to form a new parish of Waresley-cum-Tetworth consisting of 5 councillors.

d) Reasons

To provide the electors of the area with more effective local government in that the parish to which the other parish will be amalgamated with has a more active and vibrant parish council and to be consistent with other parishes and in accordance with the new scale of parish council representation.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ELECTORATE AND FIVE YEAR FORECAST

Parish or Town Council/Parish Meeting	Current Number of Councillors	Electorate Dec-05	No. of Electors per Councillor	Parish wards	No. of councillors	Electorate	No. of Electors per Councillor	Electorate mid-2011	District Ward
Abbotsley	7	332	47					340	Gransden & The Offords
Abbots Ripton	6	245	41					250	Upwood & The Raveleys
Alconbury	11	1162	106					1180	Alconbury & The Stukeleys
Alconbury Weston	7	580	83					590	Alconbury & The Stukeleys
Alwalton	5	258	52					260	Elton & Folksworth
Barham & Woolley	5	42	8					40	Ellington
Bluntisham	11	1483	135					1500	Earith
Brampton	15	3716	248					3,780	Brampton
Brington & Molesworth	5	187	37					190	Ellington
Broughton	7	198	28					200	Somersham
Buckden	15	2175	145					2210	Buckden
Buckworth	5	93	19					90	Ellington
Bury	9	1257	140					1270	Warboys & Bury
Bythorn & Keyston	5	225	45					230	Ellington
Catworth	9	268	30					270	Ellington
Chesterton	Meeting	100						100	Elton & Folksworth
Colne	9	626	70					660	Somersham
Conington	5	163	33					170	Sawtry
Covington	Meeting	68						70	Kimbolton & Staughton
Denton & Caldecote	Meeting	48						50	Stilton
Diddington	Meeting	72						70	Buckden
Earith	11	1241	113					1260	Earith
Easton	5	129	26					130	Ellington
Ellington	7	491	70					500	Ellington
Elton	11	555	50					560	Elton & Folksworth
Eynesbury Hardwicke	9	1408	156	Spinney Ward	3	46	15	50	Gransden & The Offords
				Town Ward	6	1362	227	1380	St. Neots Eynesbury

Parish or Town Council/Parish Meeting	Current Number of Councillors	Electorate Dec-05	No. of Electors per Councillor	Parish wards	No. of councillors	Electorate	No. of Electors per Councillor	Electorate mid-2011	District Ward
Farcet	11	1348	123					1370	Yaxley & Farcet
Fenstanton	15	2452	164					2490	Fenstanton
Folksworth & Washingley	9	750	83					760	Elton & Folksworth
Godmanchester	15	4571	305					5090	Godmanchester
Great & Little Gidding	8	265	33					270	Sawtry
Glatton	5	251	50					250	Sawtry
Grafham	7	463	66					470	Brampton
Great Gransden	9	761	85					770	Gransden & The Offords
Great Paxton	9	782	87					790	Gransden & The Offords
Great Staughton	11	657	60					670	Kimbolton & Staughton
Haddon	Meeting	39						40	Elton & Folksworth
Hail Weston	7	482	69					490	Kimbolton & Staughton
Hamerton	Meeting	74						80	Sawtry
Hemingford Abbots	7	510	73					520	The Hemingfords
Hemingford Grey	13	2075	160					2110	The Hemingfords
Hilton	9	755	84					780	The Hemingfords
Holme	9	471	52					490	Stilton
Holywell-cum-Needingworth	13	1962	151					1990	Earith
Houghton & Wyton	13	2247	173	Houghton & Wyton Ward	9	1292		1470	The Hemingfords
				Airfield Ward	4	955		970	Upwood & The Raveleys
* Huntingdon	16	14328	896	West No. 1	5	5773	1155	6880	Huntingdon East/Huntingdon West
				West No. 2	3	1519	506		Huntingdon North
				North	8	7036	880		Huntingdon East/Huntingdon West
Kimbolton & Stonely	11	1065	97					1080	Kimbolton & Staughton
Kings Ripton	5	141	28					140	Upwood & The Raveleys

Parish or Town Council/Parish Meeting	Current Number of Councillors	Electorate Dec-05	No. of Electors per Councillor	Parish wards	No. of councillors	Electorate	No. of Electors per Councillor	Electorate mid-2011	District Ward
Leighton Bromswold	7	164	23					170	Ellington
Little Paxton	15	2438	163					2710	Little Paxton
Morborne	Meeting	22						20	Elton & Folksworth
Offord Cluny	7	401	57					410	Gransden & The Offords
Offord D'Arcy	7	634	91					640	Gransden & The Offords
Oldhurst	7	214	31					220	Somersham
Old Weston	7	158	23					160	Ellington
Perry	9	578	64					580	Brampton
Pidley-cum-Fenton	7	302	43					310	Somersham
Ramsey	17	6424	378					6590	Ramsey
St. Ives	16	12231	765	East	6	5097	850	5190	St. Ives East
				South	6	4851	809	4980	St. Ives South
				West	4	2283	571	2490	St. Ives West
St. Neots	18	20135	1119	Eaton Ford	3	5352	1784	5440	St. Neots Eaton Ford
				Eaton Socon	5	4211	843	4290	St. Neots Eaton Socon
				Eynesbury	6	5971	996	6840	St. Neots Eynesbury
				Priory Park	4	4601	1151	4800	St. Neots Priory Park
St. Neots Rural	5	52	10					760	Gransden & The Offords
Sawtry	15	4080	272					4150	Sawtry
Sibson-cum-Stibbington	7	343	49					350	Elton & Folksworth
Somersham	15	2910	194					2950	Somersham
Southoe & Midloe	7	321	46					330	Buckden
Spaldwick	7	436	62					440	Ellington
Steeple Gidding	Meeting	19						20	Sawtry
Stilton	11	1841	167					1870	Stilton
Stow Longa	5	97	19					100	Ellington
The Stukeleys	16	1232	77	Stukeleys Ward	13	774	60	1500	Alconbury & The Stukeleys
				Hinchingbroke Ward	3	458	153	470	Huntingdon West
Tetworth	Meeting	33						30	Gransden & The Offords
Tilbrook	7	201	29					200	Kimbolton & Staughton

Parish or Town Council/Parish Meeting	Current Number of Councillors	Electorate Dec-05	No. of Electors per Councillor	Parish wards	No. of councillors	Electorate	No. of Electors per Councillor	Electorate mid-2011	District Ward
Toseland	5	65	13					70	Gransden & The Offords
Upton & Coppingford	5	178	36					180	Sawtry
Upwood & The Raveleys	11	932	85					950	Upwood & The Raveleys
Warboys	15	2997	200					3050	Warboys & Bury
Waresley	5	207	41					210	Gransden & The Offords
Water Newton	Meeting	53						50	Elton & Folksworth
Winwick	Meeting	80						80	Sawtry
Wistow	7	429	61					440	Warboys & Bury
Woodhurst	7	296	42					300	Somersham
Woodwalton	5	168	34					170	Upwood & The Raveleys
Yaxley	13	6259	482					6910	Yaxley & Farcet
Yelling	7	235	34					240	Gransden & The Offords
TOTAL		120,778							

**Under the District of Huntingdonshire (Electoral Changes) Order 2002 the existing wards of the parish of Huntingdon are abolished. The parish is divided into three parish wards bearing the names Huntingdon East, Huntingdon North and Huntingdon West. Each parish ward is coterminous with the District Wards bearing the same name. The number of Councillors for each parish ward is outlined below –*

Parish or Town Council/Parish Meeting	Current Number of Councillors	Electorate Dec-05	No. of Electors per Councillor	Parish wards	No. of councillors	Electorate	No. of Electors per Councillor	Electorate mid-2011	District Ward
Huntingdon	16	14328	896	East	8			6880	Huntingdon East
				North	4			4010	Huntingdon North
				West	4			4400	Huntingdon West