

## PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSES

PARISH	RESPONSE RECEIVED	COMMENTS	OUTCOME
Arkesden	23/9/10	<i>Email from Arkesden Parish Clerk</i> "Arkesden Parish Council (5 councillors at present) will make every effort to secure 6 nominations for office at the next election. However, one long-standing member will be standing down and we will therefore need 2 newcomers. Should this prove difficult will we still be able to function with the existing statutory minimum of 5? Your recent attachment showed Arkesden with 6+1. Does this mean 7? or is the +1 someone we second to the council?"	?
Ashdon	16/9/10	<i>Letter from Ashdon Parish Clerk</i> "Following careful consideration Ashdon Parish Council is of the opinion that the size of the parish, the number of parish councillors and current arrangements within the parish of Ashdon allow optimum representation for the electors of the parish and see no need to change them at this time."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Aythorpe Roding	30/9/10	<i>Email from Aythorpe Roding Parish Council</i> "Aythorpe Roding Parish Council wish to make the comment that they do not see the need to increase the number of Councillors from 5 to 6, it should be noted that representing a very small community it is felt that 5 Councillors is an adequate number, in fact it has proved very difficult in the past to even reach this number. They also wish to make no comment with regard to the possible merging of other parishes in the Uttlesford area."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Barnston	28/9/10	<i>Letter from Barnston Parish Clerk</i> "Barnston Parish Council met on the 13 <sup>th</sup> September and unanimously RESOLVED that they recommend 'No Changes' to the Community Governance Review 2010/11 for Barnston Parish Council."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Berden	14/9/10	<i>Email from Berden Parish Clerk</i> "The Council confirmed that they were happy to continue the existing electoral arrangements in response to your Community Governance Review."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Birchanger		<i>SEE APPENDIX A FOR COMMENTS</i>	
Broxted	15/9/10	<i>Letter from Broxted Parish Clerk</i> "(a) The Council still believes that seven is the correct number of Councillors for Broxted (b) The Council has no suggestions to make regarding boundary changes (c) The Council has no wish to merge with any other Council."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Chrishall	9/9/10	<i>Letter from Chrishall Parish Clerk</i> "Chrishall Parish Council decided at its meeting held on the 7 <sup>th</sup> September that it considers nine Councillors to be the correct number for the parish, and wishes to retain this status until the next review."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Clavering	28/9/10	<i>Email from Clavering Parish Clerk</i> "Clavering Parish Council is happy with the arrangements they have now, i.e. 11 Councillors and no change in boundaries, and have no reasons to change this."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Debden	6/9/10	<i>Email from Shaun Ruffles – Debden Parish Councillor</i> "1 Size of parish councils – we believe that the current level of councillors is appropriate for a village of the size of Debden 2 Parish Warding – we believe that this is a good idea in principle and something we try and achieve the reality is that we take whoever is willing to put in the time to help us achieve our parish goals."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>

Elmdon & Wenden Lofts	15/9/10	<i>Letter from Mrs K A Chambers – Chairman - Elmdon and Wenden Lofts Parish Council</i> “Elmdon and Wenden Lofts Parish Council decided at its meeting held on the 8 <sup>th</sup> September that it wishes to remain as three separate wards.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Elsenham	19/9/10	<i>Email from Elsenham Parish Clerk</i> “Elsenham Parish Council discussed this matter at their meeting on 6 <sup>th</sup> September where it was agreed there is no requirement for any change to the number of councillors, and no alteration to the Village boundaries. Elsenham Parish Council would, therefore, wish to retain the same number of Councillors with no alteration to the Village boundaries.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Farnham	16/9/10	<i>Letter from Farnham Parish Clerk</i> “The current structure of 7 councillors is ideal for the village of Farnham because it enables each of the ‘hamlets’ to be represented and although this cannot be built into the electoral process, the various areas of the village tend to nominate a representative. This has ensured that in general the village rarely has an unfilled position of councillor. The Parish Council does have a serious concern over matters relating to the change of electoral boundaries and the possible changes in links between villages. We understand that a possible scenario that is being considered amongst a list of options revolves around the electoral links with Birchanger and that a suggestion has been made which would link Farnham with Birchanger in order to balance electoral numbers. We do not feel that this is in any way acceptable. The current links that Farnham has with Manuden, Berden and other villages is very strong and the best link, in our view, considering the number of issues that these Parish Councils work on together. The villages are linked by a network of lanes and Public Rights of Way which enable joint activities. One of the Parish Councils has started work on a booklet to publish this information in a joint format and a change to the current links would place an additional stress on a very small group of Councillors. The Parish Councils also have a sound experience of working together to tackle issues such as the BAA application to add a further runway and the NATS exercise of changing the existing flight paths. These are more recent issues that have enabled the parishes to pool resources and work together by jointly employing consultants where necessary. Groups are established to continue working on these areas as well as others in the future and any move to separate Farnham would add an unnecessary pressure on these groups and the strong relationships that exist currently. I trust that if it is the intention of Uttlesford District Council to go forward with a proposal of linking Farnham and Birchanger that there will be a very full and meaningful consultation and discussion before any regrettable decision is taken.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Felsted	2/10/10	<i>Email from Felsted Parish Clerk</i> “Felsted Parish Council considered the points contained in the schedule to your letter of 12 August concerning possible changes to the electoral arrangements for the Parish, and agreed at its most recent meeting that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• splitting the parish into two wards was <u>not</u> desirable, as it seems likely that this would make it more difficult to fill seats</li> <li>• the current representation of 11 councillors is appropriate and should continue.</li> </ul> I trust that these views will be taken into account in the forthcoming review.”	
Fritch Green	23/9/10	<i>Email from Fritch Green Parish Clerk</i> “Fritch Green Parish Council discussed the review at their meeting on Monday. At this time (especially given that it is such a new parish), they see no need to propose any changes to the status quo.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>

Great Canfield	28/9/01	<p><i>Letter from Great Canfield Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>"This letter is sent in reply to your request to respond to the consultation on parish electoral arrangements.</p> <p>Cllr Sams, Chairman of Great Canfield Parish Council, attended the workshop on 1<sup>st</sup> September and provided a brief summary to the Parish Council meeting held in September. A discussion followed on the key points and questions, as set out on slide 27 and 28 of the Parish Reviews Workshop. The Parish Council were unanimous in their response.</p> <p>As Great Canfield currently has less than 400 electors the Parish Council discussed its <b>viability as a separate Council</b>. They felt the current status with existing boundaries is correct. It allows them to satisfactorily represent the issues and views of all residents of Great Canfield.</p> <p>Elections were held in order to form the current Parish Council. Seven <b>councillors</b> were successfully elected and have remained in situ since this date. It is felt seven is the correct number and there are no concerns that it will be difficult to get people of good <b>calibre</b> to continue to serve on the Parish Council.</p> <p>The Parish Council did not feel <b>grouping with another parish</b> appropriate at this stage, particularly due to potential boundary changes between Little Canfield and Takeley. The Parish Council have requested they be updated on any changes to the boundaries of these parishes which border Great Canfield. Once it is clear how these boundaries will be restructured it may be appropriate for Great Canfield to re-consider this point.</p> <p>The Parish Council considered '<b>warding</b>' but did not feel the hamlets within the village had any 'distinct community identity'. Therefore it was felt appropriate not to ward.</p> <p>In summary it was unanimously agreed that the current boundaries and seven Councillors was correct for the Parish of Great Canfield.</p> <p>Should you require any further information or clarification please contact me."</p>	NO CHANGE
Great Chesterford	20/9/10	<p><i>Email from Joanna Francis – Chairman – Great Chesterford Parish Council</i></p> <p>"It was agreed that no changes were required for Great Chesterford."</p>	NO CHANGE
Great Dunmow	30/9/10	<p><i>Email from Great Dunmow Town Clerk</i></p> <p>"Great Dunmow Town Council resolved unanimously at its meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September to retain the status quo, ie 7 councillors in the north ward and 9 in the south ward."</p> <p>Clarification received on 13/10/10 as follows</p> <p>"Sorry for the confusion. At the Council meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November, members voted to keep to the status quo on the number of town councillors. That is 6 in the north and 9 in the south ward, totalling 15."</p>	
Great Easton and Tilty	23/8/10	<p><i>Letter from Cllr Lewis – Chairman – Great Easton and Tilty Parish Council</i></p> <p>"The Parish Council of Great Easton and Tilty are in receipt of your letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> August referred to the Community Governance Review 2010/11.</p> <p>As Chairman of the Parish Council I should like to make the following observations/comments regarding the number of Councillors representing the Parish.</p> <p>We currently have 748 electors in the Parish, represented by 8 Councillors and according to general guidelines of the criteria adopted in 2006 we should have between 9 and 12 Councillors. This is based on parishes with between 701 and 2500 electors, so we are just over the parameters by some 48 electors.</p> <p>As you are aware, we grouped together with Tilty in 2006, and this has worked well and to my knowledge there have been no adverse comments made towards the Parish Council that we have been unable to carry out our responsibilities because we are 'light' in numbers of Councillors.</p> <p>In point of fact, may I suggest, that we have been able to carry out our work effectively, and have been pro-active on a number of issues within the Parish with our current compliment of eight</p>	NO CHANGE

	1/10/10	<p>Parish Councillors.</p> <p>These are my personal views, the difficulty arises that this cannot be discussed with my Council colleagues until our next meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> September and the response to your letter is required by that same date.</p> <p>To call an emergency meeting would be impractical due to other commitments and holidays, so at this stage I am seeking your advice as how best we can pursue this matter, or whether you feel that our present number Parish Councillors are sufficient.”</p> <p><i>Further letter from Cllr Lewis dated 1 October</i></p> <p>“I refer to your letter of 26<sup>th</sup> August and my earlier letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> August regarding the Community Governance Review.</p> <p>This matter was discussed in great detail at our Parish Council meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> September with the Councillors, the meeting was also attended by a number of residents from Great Easton and Duton Hill.</p> <p>Those present were more than satisfied with the manner in which the Parish Council conducts its business and could see no advantage whatsoever in having to increase the number of Parish Councillors from its current number of eight to nine.</p> <p>I appreciate the details set out for numbers of Parish Councillors in your original letter of the 12<sup>th</sup> August are only guidelines but would respectfully suggest that the eight councillors representing Great Easton and Tilty are perfectly adequate.”</p>	
Great Hallingbury	23/9/10	<p><i>Email from Great Hallingbury Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“Following attendance at the workshop presentation held on 1<sup>st</sup> September and discussion at our Council meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> September, my Council have no proposals for any changes to our electoral arrangements. It is noted from the Parish Election forecast document that our number of Councillors may be reduced from 9 to 8, and this is acceptable to my Council.”</p>	<b>REDUCTION FROM NINE CLLRS TO EIGHT</b>
Hadstock	1/10/10	<p><i>Email from Hadstock Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“Further to our earlier correspondence, the Hadstock Parish Council at its meeting last night resolved as follows: -</p> <p>“The Council has considered possible amalgamations but feels that Hadstock has no natural partners. The Council will continue to investigate informal clustering. The Council supports the change to 6 Councillors.”</p>	<b>INCREASE FROM FIVE CLLRS TO SIX</b>
Hatfield Broad Oak	16/9/10	<p><i>Email from Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“The Council considered this matter at it September meeting and given that it appears to have no impact on our parish decided not to take any action.”</p> <p>In response to a follow up message given the lack of information provided, Richard Ridler confirmed on 20 September that ‘the councillor for Bush End was not present at the meeting but the councillors for the village ward were happy with the present boudaries and balance’.</p>	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Hatfield Heath	30/9/10	<p><i>Email from Hatfield Heath Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“I confirm that Hatfield heath Parish Council are satisfied with the number of councillors (9) that we currently have.”</p>	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Hempstead	8/10/10	<p><i>Email from Hempstead Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“.. following review of your estimates of the electorate of Hempstead Parish we do not believe there is any need for change to our electoral scheme at the moment. The reason that no change is needed is that the voting population will remain pretty much the same going forward due to little or no development within the parish and we have been able to fill the 7 councillor places without too much problem.</p> <p>I trust this is sufficient for your purposes and apologise once again for the delay.”</p>	<b>NO CHANGE</b>

Henham	8/9/10	<i>Letter from Henham Parish Clerk</i> "The decision of the council was that, considering there are no boundary changes relating to Henham and that the number of councillors presently incumbent met the number recommended, the council had no proposals to make to the review."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
High Easter		No response received	
High Roothing	9/9/10	<i>Email from High Roothing Parish Clerk</i> "For the record High Roothing do not wish to change their current boundary nor do they wish to change the number of parish councillors presently allocated."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Langley		<i>Email from Langley Parish Clerk</i> "This was discussed at the Council's meeting on 13 September. The Chair proposed that no changes were made with respect to the parish of Langley and all Councillors agreed."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Leaden Roding	30/9/10	<i>Letter from Leaden Roding Parish Clerk</i> "After discussion at our Parish Council meeting on 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2010 Parish Councillors decided that the number of Councillors in Leaden Roding Parish should remain at 5. Although the suggested number of Councillors in our parish is 6 it was felt that as 'recruitment' of new Parish Councillors is usually very difficult and that at most Parish Council meetings a full representation of Councillors attend, it would be best at this time to retain the present number. If this is acceptable they will review this periodically if circumstances change."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Little Bardfield	13/10/10	<i>Email from Little Bardfield Parish Council</i> "On behalf of Little Bardfield Parish Council I would like to apologise for not contacting you by the 30 September, 2010. I broke my arm quite badly and the Council meeting had to be postponed until 11, October. The council is in total agreement that it has no need for the members to be increased to 7. It has great difficulty in getting 5 members when elections take place and one nearly always has to be co-opted."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Littlebury	29/9/10	<i>Letter from Littlebury Parish Clerk</i> "Thank you for your letter dated 12 <sup>th</sup> August, 2010 concerning numbers of Parish Councils. Littlebury Parish Council does not agree with the numbers of Parish Councillors being reduced to 8. Littlebury Parish includes Catmere End and Littlebury Green and the PC has representatives from the hamlets on the Parish Council. Littlebury Parish Council is a very active Parish Council and would like nine Parish Councillors to spread the workload."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Little Canfield		<i>SEE APPENDIX B FOR COMMENTS</i>	
Little Chesterford		No response received	
Little Dunmow	12/10/10	<i>Email from Little Dunmow Parish Clerk</i> "Apologies for not responding, Little Dunmow Parish Council had no comments to make on the review. They felt they had already dealt with enough when they went through their own review process not that long ago."	
Little Easton	13/9/10	<i>Email from Little Easton Parish Clerk</i> "The arrangements for Little Easton Parish Council were reviewed at our meeting on Wednesday 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2010. The Parish Council is happy with the current boundaries and wishes to continue to operate with six parish councillors."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Little Hallingbury	23/9/10	<i>Email from Little Hallingbury Parish Clerk</i> "Following attendance at the training Page 5 of the Community Governance Review, and on discussion at our Council meeting held on 7 <sup>th</sup> September, my council have no proposals to make for any change in our electoral arrangements."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>

Manuden	26/9/10	<i>Email from Manuden Parish Clerk</i> "Manuden Parish Council sees no reason to change electoral arrangements for Manuden, including the number of Councillors. Geographically Manuden is clearly separated from its neighbours. The present arrangements have worked reasonably effectively (within the limitations of the authority delegated to Parish Councils) over many years. They properly reflect the identity and interests of the village and we are not aware of any pressure for change within our community. We note that of the 60 parishes in Uttlesford, 35 are smaller than Manuden. There is no case for a merger with any of our neighbours; such a move would dramatically weaken the link between the council and the community it is intended to serve."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Margaret Roding	23/9/10	<i>Letter from Margaret Roding Parish Clerk</i> "In reply to your letter of 12 August and following much discussion Margaret Roding Parish Council consider that their Parish Council should be retained and possibly appoint another councillor – to increase the number to six." I subsequently spoke to Tom Whirledge, Chairman of the Parish Council and he is keen to see the election of a further parish councillor to provide additional support within the parish.	<b>INCREASE FROM FIVE CLLRS TO SIX</b>
Newport	8/10/10	<i>Letter from Newport Parish Clerk</i> "Thank you for your letter dated 12 <sup>th</sup> August. The Council discussed the matter at their meeting earlier this week following a report from Cllr. John Smith who attended your workshop on 1 <sup>st</sup> Sept. I have been asked to respond as follows: 1. The Council does not wish to make any changes to the current number of Councillors, i.e. 11. 2. The Council considers that wards are not necessary. 3. The Council does not wish to actively pursue links with other Councils. My apologies for the delay in replying."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Quendon and Rickling	5/10/10	<i>Email from Quendon Parish Clerk</i> "From the information given, it appears that there is no change in the number of electors in Quendon and Rickling Parish and it is felt that we have the ideal number of Councillors to serve the Parish."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Radwinter	23/9/10	<i>Email from Radwinter Parish Clerk</i> "The matter of the Community Governance review was raised at the last meeting of the Parish Council, and it was agreed that no changes were necessary."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Saffron Walden	29/9/10	<i>Email from Saffron Walden Town Council</i> "... at the Council meeting last night it was unanimously agreed that there would be no change to the number of councillors at the present time."	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Sewards End	10/5/10	<i>Letter received from Sewards End Parish Clerk in May this year</i> Sewards End PC would like to increase the number of Councillors from 5 to 7 at the next local elections. The PC is in agreement that the number of Councillors needs to be increased because there are a number of times during the year that the meetings are only just quorate. There have been at least two occasions that the Parish Council meeting has had to be cancelled due to not enough Councillors being able to attend. The PC hopes that UDC will consider the request to increase the membership from 5 Councillors to 7 Councillors at the next election."	<b>INCREASE FROM FIVE CLLRS TO SEVEN</b>
	29/9/10	<i>Further letter from Sewards End Parish Clerk</i> "Thank you for your letter dated 12 <sup>th</sup> August, 2010 concerning numbers of Parish Councils. Sewards End would like to increase the number of Councillors to 7, as per my letter dated 10 <sup>th</sup>	

		May, 2010. Your list shows that the increase in Councillors will be to 6, which is an improvement but the PC would like to increase to 7 Councillors to spread the workload of the active Parish Council.”	
Stansted		<i>SEE APPENDIX A FOR COMMENTS</i>	
Stebbing	9/9/10	<i>Email from Stebbing Parish Clerk</i> “For the record Stebbing do not wish to change their current boundary nor do they wish to change the number of parish councillors presently allocated.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Takeley		<i>SEE APPENDIX B FOR COMMENTS</i>	
Thaxted	3/9/10	<i>Email from Thaxted Parish Clerk</i> “The Council met last night and considered the suggestion that the number of seats in Thaxted increases from nine to eleven. The Council has agreed that it supports this proposal.”  <i>Extract from the minutes of that meeting of Thaxted Parish Council</i> Members agreed that the community should have the opportunity to increase the level of elected representation in the Town and considered that the current councillor workload could be spread further with more councillors.	<b>INCREASE FROM NINE CLLRS TO ELEVEN</b>
The Sampfords	24/9/10	<i>Letter from The Sampfords Parish Clerk</i> “Following discussion at our recent Parish Council meeting on the above, it was agreed that the electoral arrangements should remain as detailed in your document, but with the balance of Councillors in Great and Little Sampford to be 6:3 rather than 5:4 as at present. This to reflect the numbers of electors in the two wards.”	<b>NO CHANGE IN NUMBER OF CLLRS BUT A CHANGE IN BALANCE OF EXISTING NUMBER OVER THE TWO WARDS</b>
Ugley	14/9/10	<i>Email from Ugley Parish Clerk</i> “This review was discussed by Ugley Parish Council at its recent meeting. I confirm that Ugley Parish Council considers that it would remain the same as it is at present.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>
Wendens Ambo	7/9/10	<i>Letter from Wendens Ambo Parish Clerk</i> “Further to your letter of 12 August regarding the Community Governance Review, Wendens Ambo Parish Council discussed the matter at its council meeting last night. The outcome was a request that Wendens Ambo remains unchanged to the existing arrangements for the following reasons: Parish Boundaries: Wendens Ambo retains an individual community identity and is a self contained village being physically well separates in all directions from nearby settlements in adjoining parishes. It also hosts Audley End Railway station on of the main stations on the Kings Lynn and Cambridge line into London. There has been no large scale residential development since the last Parish Review and such development as there has been is within the village envelope. The PC therefore cannot see a need to seek a review of the parish boundaries nor consider merging with adjoining parishes. The PC requests that the boundaries remain unchanged. Council Size: The number of electors within the parish has increased marginally from 337 last year to 340 this year. Our Council presently consists of 7 Parish Councillors which accords with Uttlesford District Council guidance for the size of parish (6-8 Councillors). The PC decided to retain the same number of Councillors (seven) for the future. Consideration was given to reducing to six in the light of previous uncontested elections but they feel more comfortable with an odd number which eases decision making and the practicality of achieving a quorum for meetings, cheque signing and so on. The PC therefore request that the Parish Council comprises 7 (seven) Councillors as at present. Parish Warding: Given our size this does not apply.”	<b>NO CHANGE</b>

White Roothing	30/9/10  2/10/10	<p><i>Email from White Roothing Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“White Roding is of the same opinion as Aythorpe Roding regarding increasing the Councillor numbers.</p> <p>I do not think either of the parishes I clerk for would like to be grouped with another parish. Clustering when required i.e. if there was a proposed development that affected more than one parish can be beneficial, but more often than not no benefit is felt. I certainly know Aythorpe and White Roding would prefer to be parishes in their own right and not joined with any other parish in the area. It could lead to the loss of people willing to serve as councillors.”</p> <p><i>Email from Peter Trendall – Chairman –White Roding Parish Council</i></p> <p>“In response to your recent communications we reply as follows.</p> <p>Each councillor was solicited for their opinion to your proposals but unanimously we felt that 5 parish councillors was the correct number to administer this parish council.</p> <p>Historically we have experienced problems in finding five councillors and based on this data we have concluded that five councillors is the right number.</p> <p>Should you wish to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact us.”</p>	NO CHANGE
Widdington	12/10/10	<p><i>Email from Widdington Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>Following last week's Parish Council Meeting I am writing to inform you that Widdington Parish Council are in agreement with the number of 6-8 Councillors and although there are only 7 Councillors at present a resident has shown interest and will attend December meeting. Naturally, you will be advised if this person is co-opted.</p> <p>The Parish Council feel that the May date should be adhered to for Parish Elections.</p>	NO CHANGE?
Wimbish	29/9/10  6/10/10	<p><i>Letter from Wimbish Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“Wimbish Parish Council's comments on the Community Governance review are as follows: With regard to the question as to whether parishes should have, or continue to have, elected parish councils it is not clear as to what alternative is being offered. Since much of the work of a Parish Council is carried out on a voluntary basis it is difficult to see how the district council could perform the tasks more economically.</p> <p>Although there may be a case for merging small parish councils we do not consider this an option for Wimbish.</p> <p>Wimbish currently has seven councillors. We are aware that taking into account Carver Barracks then the Parish could justify a larger number of Councillors. However many of the soldiers are only at the barracks for a short period, typically no more than three years. In these circumstances we believe that the current arrangement whereby a representative from the Barracks has observer status of the council should continue.”</p> <p><i>Email from Wimbish Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“Wimbish: We have a representative from Carver Barracks that attends most months, unless they are away, which works really well. They have never expressed an interest on serving on the PC as they are normally in post for 2/3 years. The arrangement works very well and it is good to have a representative coming to the meetings and taking an active role.”</p>	NO CHANGE
Chickney Parish Meeting		No response received	
Lindsell Parish Meeting	24/9/10	<p><i>Email from Lindsell Parish Clerk</i></p> <p>“The parishioners of Lindsell would like to continue to have their parish operated by a meeting rather than a council.</p> <p>In November 1998, when there were 183 on the electoral role, you addressed the meeting about</p>	NO CHANGE



		<p>the possibility of setting up of a council as a result of which it was decided not to make any immediate changes but to review the situation if the electorate became much bigger. By May 2005 the number on the electoral role had become 202 and Joy Sheppard from the EALC was asked to address the meeting which was attended by 28 parishioners. We had been told that by law we had to have a council because we had over 200 on the electoral role. After a lively debate it was acknowledged that Lindsell was very well organised with a Village Hall Committee, Planning Committee and an active Chairman and Clerk and that the advantages of having a council were not clear. Information leaflets were distributed to help parishioners decide whether they would be better served by a council and it was decided that the matter would be discussed again at the next meeting. At this meeting it was clear that the parishioners would prefer to remain under the operation of the meeting. The number on the electoral role went below 200 for several years so the matter was not discussed again but since 2008 has risen to 216. As a result of the setting up of the Community Governance Review, a detailed article was put in our monthly magazine asking parishioners if they felt they were properly served by a meeting or whether they felt they would be better represented by a council. The overwhelming view is still that they feel there would be no great advantage to having a council and that they would like to remain as they are.</p> <p>We hope, therefore, that at the present time we will not be forced to have a council.”</p>	
Strethall Parish Meeting	24/9/10	<p>Letter from Kelvin Whitfield, Chairman of the Parish Meeting</p> <p>“Your letter of 12<sup>th</sup> August makes the point that, for communities with fewer than 150 electors and no Parish Council, this review must recommend that such a situation should continue. It cites Strethall – from where I now write – as an example.</p> <p>You ask for a reasoned response to the Review by the 30<sup>th</sup> of this month and in that respect I would make the following points:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A proposal to abolish Strethall as a separate parish and amalgamate it with Littlebury was withdrawn in 1983 after vigorous opposition from the ratepayers. A letter from the then Chairman of Uttlesford Council, dated 28<sup>th</sup> January 1983, stated that “... <i>Strethall Parish Meeting will continue as heretofore. -..... as the ratepayers of Strethall were unanimous in their opposition to the proposed amalgamation with Littlebury parish we were able to take advantage of the paragraph [in the legislation] which allows exemption in cases such as your Parish.</i> <li>2) Since that time 27 years ago, at least five different residents have chaired the regular Parish Meetings. No individual has monopolised it.</li> <li>3) Every adult in the Parish is invited to attend and representation from 60% or 70% of the households is not uncommon.</li> <li>4) Such a high degree of participation would be impossible in a larger parish.</li> <li>5) The meetings work well and contribute greatly to a feeling of community which is all too easily lost in these days. This arrangement is particularly well suited to a small parish the size of Strethall.</li> <li>6) It is the wish of the present parishioners of Strethall that this most appropriate system of governance should continue and we would be glad to be reassured that this will be the case.</li> </li></ol> <p>I hope that this response is sufficient for your Review but I would be happy to help with any further information that you need. Finally, I should just like to say that I found your recent workshop on the governance review extremely informative and was pleased to hear you say, during that presentation, that a parish meeting could be regarded as the purest form of local governance democracy ; we certainly believe so in Strethall.”</p>	

Wicken Bonhunt Parish Meeting		No response received	
----------------------------------	--	----------------------	--