

**Committee: PARISH REVIEW WORKING GROUP**

**Date: 5 JUNE 2002**

**Agenda Item No: 2**

**Title: PARISH REVIEW**

**Author: Peter Snow - (01799) 510431**

### **Summary**

- 1 This report summarises all of the responses received as part of the parish review second stage consultation process and contains recommendations for changes to parish boundaries and to parish electoral arrangements.

### **Background**

- 2 On 21 March 2002, the Resources Committee adopted the recommendations of this Working Group to endorse seven proposals for change to parish boundaries and two proposals relating to parish electoral arrangements. Those draft proposals were duly published for consultation purposes on 25 March.
- 3 The next step is to examine the responses received and to decide whether to recommend that the proposals should go forward to the Secretary of State for confirmation and implementation. The two proposals relating to parish electoral arrangements can (if adopted) be implemented by order of this Council.
- 4 Although, in some respects, response to this consultation stage has been encouraging, the officers have been hampered in their preparation of this report by the disappointing lack of response by parish councils. Nevertheless, the following section of the report contains details of the responses that have been received and a recommendation, in each case, as to how the Council should proceed.

### **PARISH REVIEW PROPOSALS**

#### **Responses to the Second Stage Parish Review Consultation and Recommendations for Change**

#### **PROPOSAL DR3 – RINGERS FARM HOUSE, NEWPORT**

**‘that the Council supports a change of boundary to transfer Ringers Farm House and Ringers, Debden Road, Newport from Newport to the parish of Widdington and that the occupiers of the nearby property known as ‘Greenfield’ also be consulted on a possible change of boundaries (see plan 7 attached).’**

- 5 This proposal arose from the desire of the occupier of Ringers Farm House (Mr Willis) for the property to transfer to the parish of Widdington where there are said to be historic connections.

- 6 The proposed boundary change has been supported by the occupier of the adjoining property known as Ringers. Members suggested that a better boundary might be achieved by incorporating 'Greenfield' into this proposal. However, the occupiers concerned have not responded to the letter sent to them.
- 7 Newport Parish Council 'would like to object about placing this property into Widdington as it is more closely associated with Newport'. There has been no response from Widdington Parish Council.
- 8 The properties concerned are all on the fringes of Newport parish. The original report suggested that there was no pressing reason for any change. However, the wishes of the occupiers are probably the primary consideration and, on balance, it is felt that the adjustment requested should be allowed to proceed. It is felt that the broken line shown on plan 7 is the most appropriate line to follow.

**RECOMMENDED that proposal DR3 be endorsed (excluding Greenfield) and that the boundary line between Newport and Widdington be adjusted to follow the centre of Debden Road at that point.**

**PROPOSAL DR4 – formation of a new parish at Swards End**

**'that the Council supports the constitution of a new parish, and parish council, of Swards End, in principle, as a draft proposal for further consultation (see plan 8 attached).'**

- 9 Considerable detail about the background and implications of this proposal were included in the report to the PRWG on 13 March (see paragraphs 40-55). Five key tests were suggested in the report to justify proceeding with the proposed establishment of a new parish. Of these, four were satisfied already. The fifth, and crucial, test concerns whether there is sufficient evidence of public support.
- 10 Following the Council's approval of the draft recommendation, as shown above, a letter was addressed to all residential occupiers at Swards End, together with a detailed information sheet (attached as appendices 1 and 2) and questionnaire (see appendix 3). Enough questionnaires were sent to equate to the number of registered electors in each property. The results of this consultation exercise are as follows:

Questionnaires issued:	364	(100.0%)
In favour of the proposal	143	(39.3%)
Against the proposal	46	(12.6%)
Undecided	13	(3.6%)
Unmarked	2	(0.5%)
Not yet returned	160	(44.0%)

- 11 It is interesting to compare the results of this survey with that carried out by members of the village hall committee in January. Then, nearly 74% of forms were returned (only one per household was issued) and 70% of those voting supported forming a new parish. In the current survey, the equivalent figures are 56% and 71% respectively. Page 2

- 12 A direct comparison is difficult because the January survey was distributed to households whereas the March survey was intended for individuals. However, although a lesser proportion of the forms were returned this time, the proportions voting for and against are almost precisely the same. In very broad terms, the proportion of people or households voting 'yes' outweighs those voting 'no' by slightly more than three and a half times, in both surveys.
- 13 Another difference is that the Council's survey asked respondents to identify themselves by adding name and address details. This part of the survey form was completed by everyone who participated and so it is possible to say with reasonable certainty that the results reflect accurately the views of Swards End residents as far as they can be ascertained.
- 14 One difficulty that presents itself is that although the proportion voting 'yes' is undoubtedly overwhelming, it does not represent a majority of residents. In the previous survey, the number of 'yes' voters exceeded 50% of the total households in the village.
- 15 On the other hand, it may be considered impressive that more than 50% of local residents have taken the trouble to express their views. Such a proportion is relatively high as compared with most local election turnout figures. The previous survey was collected by hand at the doorstep and therefore deliberate abstention might have proved more difficult.
- 16 It may be possible to draw the conclusion that there is evidence of significant support for the establishment of a new parish in Swards End and that such evidence is sufficient, by any reasonable expectation, to justify proceeding. Certainly, the opposition, though vociferous, is not numerous enough to deny the evident wish of the large majority who have taken the trouble to express an opinion.
- 17 It is also probably the case that, as in many other areas of life, the bulk of the population doesn't much care one way or the other. However, what we have to consider in this case is the feeling of local community and the wishes of local inhabitants and to devise parish arrangements to reflect those feelings.
- 18 Bearing in mind all of the above, the officers are confident that the necessary tests of public opinion have been met as a result of the consultation arrangements described in this report and that the Council should be recommended to support the establishment of a new parish of Swards End accordingly.
- 19 Various other comments have also been received. Councillor Ron Dean, one of the Shire Ward representatives, has written a letter of broad encouragement for the principle of a new parish and has offered to 'assist in every possible way to fulfil the wishes of the majority of villagers'.
- 20 Mrs P Rumble of 5 Walden Road, Swards End has written to ask whether a 'start up' fund might be available to assist the new parish. Mr S Pritchard of The Towers, Swards End, has sent a long letter referring to various aspects of the consultation process. He expresses concern about the way in which the original survey was carried out, claims that most of the people who were

present at the meeting on 8 January were against the proposal, and suggests a referendum as the best way of resolving the matter.

- 21 As far as the last point is concerned, a parish poll can only be held if demanded by either ten or one third of electors present at a parish meeting. This, of course, would apply to Saffron Walden parish as a whole and the cost would be in the region of £3,000 to £3,500. An account of the meeting of 8 January was included in paragraphs 44-46 of the report to the PRWG on 13 March.
- 22 If consent is given to proceed with the formation of a new parish, a number of 'house-keeping' arrangements will have to be made. These will include the identification of any assets to be transferred to the new parish and the chosen method for setting the parish council's first precept and budget. These are not really matters that can be dealt with in this report as the parish review is concerned primarily with the principle of whether a new parish should be established and with the proposed boundaries of that parish. However, members must be aware that these matters will have to be resolved before the new parish can begin to operate.

**RECOMMENDED that proposal DR4 be endorsed and that the area of the new parish should be identical to the parish ward of Swards End, as described in The District of Uttlesford (Electoral Changes) Order 2001, due to come into effect on 1 May 2003.**

#### **PROPOSAL DR5 – NORTH PARK COTTAGE, LITTLE CHESTERFORD**

**'that the Council supports a change of boundary to transfer North Park Cottage, Little Walden from the parish of Little Chesterford to the parish of Saffron Walden (see plan 9)'.**

- 23 This proposal was put forward by officers as there is no direct access from North Park Cottage to the parent parish of Little Chesterford. Access to the property is gained via Little Walden.
- 24 Councillor O'Neill (Castle Ward) has written to express his support for the proposal which has also been endorsed orally by the Town Clerk on behalf of the Town Council. Little Chesterford Parish Council has not commented on this proposal at all.

**RECOMMENDED that proposal DR5 be endorsed and that the adjusted boundary line should broadly follow the line indicated on plan 9.**

#### **PROPOSAL DR6 – STONEY COMMON ROAD, STANSTED**

**'that the Council supports a change of boundaries south of Stoney Common Road, Stansted so as to place all of the residential properties at Brook View, Rochford Close and Stoney Place wholly within the parish of Stansted (the new boundary to run along the line of the northern development limit of the Rochford Nurseries site), but that any further action to adjust the boundary between Birchanger and Stansted to take account of the Rochford Nurseries site be deferred pending the occupation of a significant proportion of the new development site; at**

**that stage the review process be reactivated and a process of full consultation be carried out (see plans 10, 11, 12A and 12B).**

- 25 The rationale for this proposal originated in the discovery during the Periodic Electoral Review that a number of properties south of Stoney Common Road are located beyond the line of the Stansted parish boundary. Electors registered in all of the properties concerned have consequently had to be transferred to the parish of Birchanger.
- 26 Of itself, this would be a relatively straightforward matter, but the position is, of course, complicated by the fact that the Birchanger/ Stansted boundary runs through the Rochford Nurseries development site just to the south.
- 27 In the report to the meeting on 13 March, officers expressed reservations about recommending a short term boundary adjustment to deal with the immediate anomaly at Stoney Common Road (see paragraphs 70-78 of that report for a detailed analysis of the options available to deal with these matters).
- 28 It is entirely understandable that members should wish to deal with this anomaly, but the officers feel they must reiterate the advice to that meeting about the wisdom of dealing in ad hoc solutions. The reaction of the DTLR cannot be predicted but there seems a strong likelihood that it will resist endorsing a short-term boundary adjustment in the full knowledge that a further process of review will be carried out.
- 29 The results of the public consultation exercise are set out below:
- Of the 30 properties at Brook View, Stoney Place and Rochford Close presently included in Birchanger, 14 occupiers have responded to the consultation. Of those, 13 have expressed a preference to transfer to Stansted, and one preferred to remain in Birchanger.
- 30 County Councillor Richard Wallace has written in support of the proposal. He says 'as you will have seen from local press correspondence many residents are puzzled and confused and in view of the Rochford development which now seems imminent a holding position might be for the best'.
- 31 Stansted Parish Council has commented: 'The proposals are all agreed by this Council and we hope they will be confirmed in due course. However, members do not agree that a decision over the Rochford Nursery site should be deferred and believe that the question of the boundaries between Stansted and Birchanger should be addressed now.'
- 32 Rather surprisingly, Birchanger Parish Council has not responded in any way to this consultation. However, the Electoral Services Officer has now discussed this matter with Councillor Elizabeth Godwin (Birchanger Ward). Her view is that the anomalies caused by the position of the boundary south of Stoney Common Road should be dealt with as quickly as possible but that the boundary at Forest Hall Road should be left to a future review. For the Parish Council's previous comments, refer to paragraph 79 of the report on 13 March.

- 33 It seems that the Council must now decide whether to proceed with a proposal to alleviate the difficulties created by the over spilling of the boundary fixed in 1986 (see paras 64-68 of previous report), or whether to take the pragmatic view that the boundary will eventually be reviewed and resolved in terms of a long term solution and to leave well alone at this stage.
- 34 Members may wish to press ahead with change now, but should be prepared for the possibility that the DTLR will decide to defer any recommendation because the review of boundaries at this location is incomplete. It has been assumed for the sake of this report that members will not be in a position to take a long-term view now as to where the boundary should ultimately run.

**RECOMMENDED that members determine whether proposal DR6 should be confirmed as a final proposal (bearing in mind that the Birchanger/Stansted boundary will be subject to final review in due course).**

**PROPOSAL DR9 – READJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES ALONG THE A120 (WEST)**

**‘that the Council supports a realignment of boundaries in the vicinity of the existing A120 road between the M11 and the western edge of Takeley parish, affecting the parishes of Birchanger, Great Hallingbury, Hatfield Broad Oak, Stansted and Takeley, and that, in principle, the option of suggesting a realignment of boundaries so as to include the whole of Stansted Airport in the parish of Stansted be supported for consultation purposes (this latter option might also involve transferring Highfields Lodge, Burton End, Stansted from Elsenham to Stansted). The effect of this would be:**

**transfer from Birchanger to Great Hallingbury the following properties: Greencroft; Barnmead; Marstons; Uplands; Henbury; Melbourne; Karmel; Hillcrest; Allandale; Hillside; South View; Ariston; and Thatched Cottage;**

**transfer from Hatfield Broad Oak to Great Hallingbury the following properties: 1-4 Thremhall Priory Cottages;**

**and from Hatfield Broad Oak to Takeley the following properties: Grasmere; Latymer; Silverdale; Lolands; 2 & 3 Stanes Cottages; Hawthorns; and Cranwellian;**

**transfer from Stansted Mountfitchet to Great Hallingbury the following properties: Thremhall Priory Farm; and Thremhall Priory Lodge;**

**to accomplish the above changes, the M11, Thremhall Avenue and the southern section of Bury Lodge Lane, and the disused railway line to be utilised as the new boundary between the five parishes (refer to plans 16, 17, 18 and 35).**

- 35 This proposal arose from a combination of circumstances affecting the A120 west of Takeley village. Previous boundary changes and Airport related development, including the construction of the new A120, have led to a gradual increase in the isolation of properties along this stretch of road from

their parent parish. For a brief account of these circumstances, see paras 95-98 of the previous report.

36 To a large extent, the proposals described above are inter-locking. However, the element that has caused most comment is the suggestion that the whole of Stansted Airport should be included in Stansted parish. This aspect of the proposal is discussed later in this report (see paragraphs 52-62).

37 The result of the public consultation is as follows:

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Property</b>	<b>Preference</b>
Birchanger	Greencroft	Birchanger
	Barnmead	Gt Hallingbury
	Marstons	
	Uplands	
	Henbury	Gt Hallingbury
	Melbourne	
	Karmel	
	Hillcrest	Gt Hallingbury
	Allandale	
	Hillside	Birchanger
	South View	
	Ariston	Gt Hallingbury
	Thatched Cottage	
	Gt Hallingbury	Old Tithe Hall
Gt Hallingbury End		
Hatfield Broad Oak	Grasmere	Takeley
	Latymer	Takeley
	Silverdale	HBO
	Lolands	HBO
	3 Stanes Cottage	
	2 Stanes Cottage	Takeley
	Hawthorns	HBO
	Cranwellian	HBO
	1 Thremhall Priory Cot	
	2 Thremhall Priory Cot	no preference
	3 Thremhall Priory Cot	Gt Hallingbury
4 Thremhall Priory Cot	HBO	
Stansted	Thremhall Priory Farm	
	Thremhall Priory Lodge	
Elsenham	Highfields Lodge	

38 It will be seen from the above that the outcome of this consultation exercise is somewhat inconclusive. Broadly speaking, it is possible to say that nine occupiers are in favour of the proposed changes whilst seven are against. One occupier expressed no preference and 13 chose not to respond. It is possible to refine this slightly as follows:

Proposed transfer from Birchanger to Gt Hallingbury –  
4 for, 2 against, 8 no view

Proposed transfer from HBO to Gt Hallingbury –

1 for, 1 against, 2 no view

Proposed transfer from HBO to Takeley –  
3 for, 4 against, 1 no view

Proposed transfer from Stansted to Gt Hallingbury –  
2 no view

Proposed transfer from Elsenham to Stansted –  
1 no view

The occupiers of Old Tithe Hall and Gt Hallingbury End were included in the consultation as they closely adjoin the Great Hallingbury eastern boundary with Takeley at a point where four parishes nearly meet. One of these occupiers has responded.

- 39 The report first concentrates on the question of the residential properties listed above and will discuss the boundary in relation to the Airport separately. This sequence of suggested changes was put together as a set of inter-locking proposals designed to produce sensible and viable long-term boundaries. To a large extent, they are inter-dependent.
- 40 However, it would be possible to isolate the changes between Birchanger and Great Hallingbury (with an exchange of some land between Birchanger and Stansted) without affecting Takeley and Hatfield Broad Oak (although a minor readjustment of the Takeley boundary might be necessary). In a strict sense this would reflect the views of the local population as far as it has been possible to ascertain them.
- 41 It seems reasonably clear that there is no well-defined sense of community identity in this locality (as might have been suspected). No doubt there remains some residual affinity among the older residents with the parish of Hatfield Broad Oak. Furthermore, the solution suggested in paragraph 40 would not overcome the practical difficulties caused by the virtual stranding of the two properties at Thremhall Priory from Stansted parish and would leave unresolved the rather unsatisfactory northern promontory of Hatfield Broad Oak west of Takeley.
- 42 This being so, and despite the fact that it does not command the support of a majority of the local residents concerned, the officers feel that the Council would be justified in proceeding with this proposal as published. Neither, of course, does the status quo, or any element of it, apparently command majority support. It appears that no kind of consensus is available to guide us in this matter.
- 43 That brings us neatly to the matter of the configuration of parish boundaries in relation to the Airport. It will be helpful at this stage to summarise the other representations received. Stansted Parish Council has written agreeing with all of the draft proposals made.
- 44 Takeley Parish Council agrees with the proposal to transfer the group of properties west of the parish from Hatfield Broad Oak as this makes administrative and geographical sense. The letter goes on:



'They do however, have **strong objections** to the transfer of the whole of Stansted Airport to the Parish of Stansted. The majority of business, road communications, noise & inconvenience from the airport is focused on the eastern side of the boundary and directly affects residents in Coopers End, Smiths Green, Takeley and especially Mole Hill Green.

Takeley Parish Council would be very unhappy about not being directly involved in the consultation & monitoring of developments at Stansted Airport and recommend no change to the existing model. Takeley Parish Council would even suggest that they have a better argument for the whole of Stansted Airport to be transferred to Takeley Parish.'

- 45 Almost inexplicably, none of the parish councils at Birchanger, Elsenham, Great Hallingbury, or Hatfield Broad Oak has offered any comment although Mrs Godwin has said orally that she agrees with the proposed change of boundary affecting Birchanger east of the M11 at Start Hill.
- 46 County Councillor Richard Wallace has commented: 'I agree with the proposals for the adjustments to the boundaries of Birchanger-Stansted & the remaining villages which make sense in current circumstances. I attended a meeting of the Birchanger PC who also somewhat reluctantly agree.'
- 47 Councillor Jackie Cheetham (Takeley Ward) confirms that she has had discussions with the Parish Council about the change to the boundary concerning Stansted Airport and they are very unhappy about the proposal. Her letter continues:

'I totally agree with them and feel that to move all the airport into the parish of Stansted would not be in the interests of the residents of Takeley and of the District. My reasons are that all the recent expansion at the airport has affected the village of Takeley far more than it has Stansted. The new terminal and any expansion to it, the aprons and stands are much closer to Molehill Green and Takeley. Therefore when planning applications, whether big or small are submitted to the District Council it is much more sensible that Takeley Parish Council is consulted as such applications have more impact on Takeley residents than other residents in the district.

Therefore I would object to any changes in the parish boundary with regard to the airport and would want the boundary to remain as it is.'

- 48 Comments have also been received from Councillor Richard Smith (The Canfields Ward) who states: 'I am against this proposal and believe that the area is best served by leaving the boundary in its present position giving equal status to both Takeley and Stansted, as they are the villages most affected.'
- 49 County Councillor Susan Flack says that 'the proposals seem eminently suitable, moving from a situation where 5 parishes are represented along this length of the A120, to a situation where it is just Great Hallingbury and Takeley. I believe that the boundary as defined is suitable and that we should consult on this basis'.
- 50 A communication has also been received from Paul Westlake, writing in a personal capacity, who states that he wishes to support Takeley Parish

Council's objection to moving the airport entirely into Stansted, on the basis that they don't want to lose their rights as statutory consultees. Mr Westlake is a parish councillor for Hatfield Broad Oak.

- 51 The final representation comes from Chris Bush, the Planning Director of Stansted Airport Limited. STAL was consulted directly as it seemed to officers that the Airport has a close interest in matters that might affect future consultation arrangements. Mr Bush notes the proposal to transfer certain properties owned by the Airport from Birchanger to Great Hallingbury and goes on: 'We have no substantive comments to make regarding the latter decision in principle,' (ie. Moving the whole of the airport into Stansted) 'we have had no difficulty with dealing with the four Parish Councils whose boundaries intersect with the airport. Nor would we see any ongoing difficulty if this was to be consolidated under one of those four.'
- 52 What are we to make of these representations and how should this affect the decision-making process in relation to this review? It must first be noted that none of the consultees has specifically welcomed the proposal to realign parish boundaries around the airport. On the contrary, there is significant and vocal opposition to this proposal.
- 53 From one point of view the extent of consultation on airport matters is irrelevant to the question of determining suitable parish boundaries. The latter process is based firmly on the principle of ensuring proper and adequate community representation. On the other hand, the matter of consultation to do with airport matters can be said to be crucial to the interests of local communities.
- 54 Bearing this in mind, it is perhaps pertinent to examine current procedures and try to reach a verdict as to whether the fears expressed are justified.
- 55 First though, the report examines options for the realignment of the boundary on the basis that members will approve the changes affecting those properties listed above between the M11 and Takeley village.
- 56 At present parish boundaries cross the airport site in a haphazard fashion, presumably following long lost physical features in the landscape. This would not matter at all were it not for the proposed changes to the south and west. The runway is divided between Stansted and Elsenham while the terminal, car parks and other airport buildings lie mostly in Takeley. Further to the south-west a small part of the airport site is included in Birchanger. Great Hallingbury, which has claims to be most affected by aircraft noise, has no physical attachment to the airport itself.
- 57 On the assumption that the changes already described are approved, the question remains of where the boundary should run once Thremhall Avenue meets the existing (undefined) boundary which crosses it from south to north from the A120. The officers have been unable to identify any other suitable point of definition on the airport site other than the internal road system (or the airport perimeter itself).
- 58 In fact, it seems that the objections might have been based on a misunderstanding of the Council's intentions. The draft proposal stated that the whole of the airport site would be included in Stansted parish. This bald

statement was not accompanied by a deposit plan and the precise boundary definition was never explicitly shown. The plan shown to members at the meeting on 13 March was based on an idea devised by Councillor Alan Dean but it attempted to align the boundary with Thremhall Avenue, Terminal Road South and then following the northern and north-western perimeter of the airport as far as Burton End. Even as a result of this suggestion, parts of the airport site would have been retained in Takeley and part would have been transferred into Great Hallingbury for the first time.

- 59 A closer examination of boundary options now suggests that the adjusted boundary could follow Thremhall Avenue as far as the first main roundabout, and then Bassingbourn Road to the Pincey roundabout, and then Pincey Road and the outer perimeter road as far as Burton End. This would leave a larger portion of Takeley within the airport site, and part of Elsenham as well.
- 60 In any event, it will almost certainly be necessary for Ordnance Survey to advise on the most appropriate boundary definitions given that they will have to follow defined features, where possible. It is suggested that members agree a set of general principles bearing in mind the likely Ordnance Survey involvement. However, Environment Circular 11/97 (the most recent advice available) says that new boundaries should be defined as accurately as possible to follow rivers, the edge of a road or track, or the fence of canals or railways.
- 61 To summarise the above paragraphs, the following options appear to be available:
- (a) minimal change which would leave the boundaries largely undefined, as at present, from the point where Thremhall Avenue meets the existing Stansted/Takeley boundary;
  - (b) the most radical option would be for the boundary to follow the outer perimeter of the airport, which would leave the whole of the site in Stansted parish as implied by the draft proposal published in March;
  - (c) a new line as suggested in paragraph 59 above, which would leave parts of Elsenham, and Takeley included in the airport site.
- 62 Under all three options presented above, Birchanger would no longer be incorporated in any part of the airport site. Under options (a) and (c), the airport site would include parts of Great Hallingbury parish.
- 63 Let us now return to the question of planning and other consultation procedures mentioned in paragraph 52-54. Planning officers have offered assurances that consultation arrangements affecting airport matters will not be affected by the question of whether a particular parish, or parishes, are included, or excluded from the site of a particular application, or from the airport site as a whole. This does not seem to be a material consideration as planning protocols allow for wide ranging consultation with both immediately affected and adjoining parishes. It seems evident that none of the parishes affected by any of the parish review proposals will be, in any way, disadvantaged by their implementation.
- 64 Members are therefore advised not to be influenced in their decisions by the question of airport consultation but to confine their deliberations to matters of direct and immediate community interest and representation.

65 Probably the tidiest solution would therefore be option (b) above, but option (c) would be equally practical, given the availability of physical features for boundary definition purposes. The latter option would also have the advantage of being seen to address the concerns of Takeley Parish Council and local district councillors, even though it is believed that the adoption of a different solution would not disadvantage the parishes concerned. Option (a) would not be a very satisfactory solution as it would involve leaving a long section of undefined boundary joining onto a properly redefined line to the west. A map will be shown at the meeting indicating the various options under consideration.

**RECOMMENDED that proposal DR9 be endorsed subject to the redefinition of the proposed boundary, subject to advice from Ordnance Survey, to follow Thremhall Avenue, Bassingbourn Road and the outer perimeter road as far as Burton End; it is further suggested that Highfields Lodge should be transferred to Stansted, in common with other adjoining properties in Burton End, and that the boundary be adjusted accordingly.**

#### **PROPOSAL DR10 – LATCHMORE COTTAGE, LITTLE HALLINGBURY**

**‘that the Council supports a change of boundary to transfer Latchmore Cottage from Little Hallingbury to the parish of Great Hallingbury (see plan 19)’.**

66 This proposal arose entirely from the desire of the occupiers (Mr and Mrs Carter-Ruck to vote and participate in parish affairs in Great Hallingbury where they have always considered their community interests to lie. For many years, the occupiers have been included, erroneously, on the Great Hallingbury register. This error has now been corrected.

67 Little Hallingbury Parish Council has commented: ‘Although the property has been in this parish for a great many years and the change of boundary seems illogical, the Council does not object to the proposal’. Great Hallingbury Parish Council has not responded to the letter of consultation. However, Councillor Alan Row (Little Hallingbury Ward) has raised no objection and Mr Carter-Ruck has reiterated his approval. This proposal is entirely straightforward.

**RECOMMENDED that the Council endorse proposal DR10, the adjusted boundary to follow the eastern edge of the road leading from the A1060 road to the road leading to Great Hallingbury village.**

#### **PROPOSAL DR11 – READJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES ADJOINING THE A120 (EAST)**

**‘that the Council consults upon a possible realignment of boundaries between the parishes of Great Dunmow, Little Dunmow and Stebbing in the vicinity of the existing A120 (see plans 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, 36, 37, 38 and 39).’**

68 This proposal arose from a number of suggestions made by Stebbing Parish Council for a possible change of boundaries north of the existing A120. This

was based on a perception that the heavily trafficked A120 road was acting as a virtual barrier for community representation purposes, with Little Dunmow lying to the south. It is likely that this situation will be exacerbated following construction of the new A120.

69 Discussions have taken place between the two parish councils but no grounds for agreeing any change could be found because no consensus view could be identified. At a later stage the position of residents at Tooley's Farm (in Great Dunmow parish) was raised. The Council agreed that the boundary was potentially unsatisfactory and decided to consult to see if any agreement can be found.

70 The results of the consultation are as follows:

<b>Parish/Road</b>	<b>Property</b>	<b>Preference</b>
Little Dunmow		
Braintree Road	Gatefield	
	Rookwoods	
	Little Blossom	Little Dunmow
	4 Stebbing Ford Cottis	
	5 Stebbing Ford Cottis	Stebbing
Throws Corner	Bridge Farm	
	1/2 Throws Cottage	Little Dunmow
	The Round House	
	Tumbleweed	
	1 Throws Farm Cottis	Stebbing
Brookend	2 Throws Farm Cottis	
	Old Farm House	
	Olde Whitehouse	
	Brook End House	Stebbing
	Brook End Cottage	
Haydens	Brookend Barn	
	Easterlee Barn	Little Dunmow
	Haydens Farm	
	Haydens Cottage	
Great Dunmow		
Tooleys	Lindwood	
	Tooleys Farm	Stebbing
	Hoppetts Barn	Stebbing
	The Cottages	

71 Again, as in the case of the A120 consultations further west, it is disappointing to report a somewhat inconclusive outcome to this consultation. Unfortunately, several occupiers have chosen not to respond at all and, of those that have, there seems no clear view about what, if anything, should be done. It is particularly disappointing that only two of the nine occupiers of addresses at Brookend and Haydens have replied and this has produced one in favour of change and one against. Brookend and Haydens are, of course, the settlements closest to Stebbing village and it might have been expected that they would have close connections with that area.

- 72 The position here is also complicated by the imminent building of the new A120 which will run south of the existing road and may be seen to be a further barrier to community representation. However, by adding Tooleys Farm to the equation, some sense of local community feeling begins to emerge. The occupiers of the Farm said 'we always use the pub in Stebbing!'.
- 73 There is nevertheless, a sense that the area along the A120 is considered 'no-man's land'. It is interesting in this context that one occupier at Stebbing Ford, and one at Brookend both asked for the erection of road signs to help with identification. These requests have both been referred to the County Council for action.
- 74 Great Dunmow Town Council has commented, quite fairly, that it would support whatever was the view of the local residents. Little Dunmow Parish Council has not responded at all to this stage of the consultation.
- 75 A lengthy letter has also been received from Stebbing Parish Council. This is quoted below:

'Stebbing Parish Council notes with pleasure that a consultative process is now in progress to review the various proposals for re-alignment of boundaries between Great Dunmow, Little Dunmow and Stebbing in the vicinity of the A120. The Parish Council has only made earlier suggestions on the basis of representation it had itself received from residents of the affected area and has no interest in promoting any change which does not have their wholehearted support. We thus applaud your intention to consult with such residents and will happily accept the results of such consultation.

The Parish Council is thus diffident in making any proposals which might be considered as too specific in advance of the results of your enquiries. In the interests of aiding the process however, we suggest the following changes could be advantageous to all parties:-

The western boundary of Stebbing parish could run due south from its current intersection with the B1057 at map reference TL648222. (This would mean Tooley's Farm and Homelye Farm (plus water tower) were included in Stebbing but would just exclude Dunmow Farm. (Line 'A' on the attached map). If the residents of Homelye Farm were unhappy the boundary could run south to map reference TL648228 and then dog-leg in a south-easterly direction to intercept the current A120 at TL654223 (Line 'B').

The boundary could then continue in an easterly direction along the line of the existing A120 until it meets the current boundary at Stebbing Ford (map reference TL672226). This would, subject to their agreement, transfer properties to the north of the existing A120 and west of Stebbingford (Line 'C').

It is for further consideration whether Stebbing's southern boundary should follow the line of the existing A120 or the new alignment (Line 'D') but of course there must be consultation.'

- 76 Following the receipt of the letter quoted above, letters were sent to the occupiers of properties at Homelye Farm and Homelye Chase (nos 1-4)

seeking reaction to the parish council's suggestion. The occupier of the Farm responded orally to say that they were content to remain in Great Dunmow and a letter of objection has now been received from the occupier of 3 Homelye Chase. However a letter has now been received from the occupiers of 1 Homelye Chase agreeing with the possible transfer of this area to Stebbing.

- 77 Trying to make sense of all the suggestions and representations made is a difficult task. In arriving at a preferred solution, members must bear in mind that the original purpose of the review is to secure proper and reasonable community representation based on local community links and identities. Again, as with proposal DR6, it will be helpful to take a long-term, rather than a short-term view. What then are the options available?
- 78 The report attempts to summarise these below:
- (a) do nothing on the basis that no firm sense of community identity is apparent;
  - (b) the minimum change option, primarily designed to comply with the wishes of those occupiers at Tooleys Farm who are cut-off from Great Dunmow and feel a close affinity with Stebbing; this would inevitably involve devising a boundary which would have the effect of transferring these properties, as well as those at Brookend and Haydens to Stebbing;
  - (c) simply realign the boundary to run east to west along the existing A120, thus placing all of those properties listed above (except for those at Homelye and Bridge Farm) into Stebbing;
  - (d) a slightly more radical solution to realign the boundary with the new A120 which would have the effect of transferring more land to Stebbing, together with Bridge Farm as well;
  - (e) defer the entire review so far as it applies to this part of the A120.
- 79 Whatever is done, members should bear in mind the importance of ensuring that a boundary is settled that will not have to be re-examined in the near or medium future. If members take the view that the matter should be reopened at some future stage it would be best to defer any change now.
- 80 The two most satisfactory solutions of those offered appear to the officers to be (b) and (d). If the former option is taken, a suitable boundary line will need to be devised. This should be based on physical features. It is unlikely to be acceptable to draw a straight line on a map. If the latter option is selected, it will have the effect of compressing the area of Little Dunmow into a small, but closely defined area and there will be less likelihood of future boundary questions arising.
- 81 It is really for members to exercise their judgement in this matter and to determine a preferred boundary accordingly. To assist members in exercising that judgement, suggested boundary definitions are set out above and maps 36, 37, 38 and 39 are attached illustrating the effects.
- 82 On balance, the officers feel that option (d) is probably preferable, if only for the reason that any question of reopening the boundary line in future is less likely to arise. However, there is some trepidation in saying this in the absence of firmer evidence of support from local residents. On the other

hand, everyone concerned has had the opportunity to comment and there seems little residual loyalty to Little Dunmow.

**RECOMMENDED that the Council agree to a change of boundaries between Great Dunmow, Little Dunmow and Stebbing, as envisaged by proposal DR11, based on either option (b) or option (d) identified in this report; it is possible that the DTLR will not agree to sanction option (d) until the construction of the new road is complete.**

**Proposals that the Council decided not to pursue at the second consultation stage**

**PROPOSAL DR1 – AMALGAMATION OF PARISHES OF ELMDON AND WENDEN LOFTS**

**‘to amalgamate the separate civil parishes of Elmdon and Wenden Lofts, so as to mirror the area of the existing parish council, and to make adjustments to the existing warding scheme.’**

- 83 The Working Group decided not to pursue this proposal because it did not have the support of the Parish Council. It must be said that no satisfactory reason has ever been advanced as to why these two parishes should not be amalgamated, especially since the requirement in the 1976 grouping order to hold separate parish meetings has never been complied with. It makes little sense to officers to insist on a division into three separate wards when no conduit exists for the views of the three separate communities to be expressed.
- 84 The Parish Council did not respond to the second stage consultation letter and no assurance has ever been received that separate parish meetings will take place as required. It has to be said that this is highly unsatisfactory although, ultimately, it is a matter for the Parish Council to resolve, or for local electors to challenge the position.
- 85 Officers have now spoken to David Hill, the Parish Chairman, who has asked for the legal position to be checked as to whether the requirement to hold separate parish meetings can be removed by order. Advice on this matter will be given to members at the meeting. In the meantime, members are asked whether they wish to ask for an assurance that the provisions of the 1976 grouping order will be met.

**RECOMMENDED that this matter be not pursued but that members consider seeking further assurances from the Parish Council.**

**PROPOSAL DR2 – EXCHANGES OF LAND BETWEEN NEWPORT, WENDENS AMBO AND WICKEN BONHUNT**

- 86 It will be recalled that Newport Parish Council requested a change of boundaries involving exchanges of land either side of the M11. The request was never properly defined and it became apparent, although not mentioned by the Parish Council, that such an exchange would involve the transfer of two properties from Wicken Bonhunt.



- 87 Newport Parish Council has commented ‘regarding the proposals to change the boundaries with Wicken Bonhunt and Wendens Ambo they feel the two houses at the bottom of Wicken Road fall naturally into the boundary of Newport’. Neither Wendens Ambo Parish Council nor Wicken Bonhunt Parish Meeting have offered any direct comment but Councillor Jan Menell (Littlebury Ward) has commented that the Parish Council meeting on 8 April ‘seemed rather surprised’ at this suggestion.
- 88 Mrs Bruce of Wicken Cottage has written expressing her concerns. She states that ‘we are very involved with the village and people of Wicken Bonhunt, and would wish to keep within the village’. Her letter goes on to mention her concern about the provision of transport to Clavering School for her children and says that her family does not want the boundary to be altered.
- 89 A further letter has been sent to Newport Parish Council seeking more information about the reasons for suggesting this change (which were never explained) but no reply has yet been received.

**RECOMMENDED that this proposal not be pursued further.**

**PROPOSAL DR7 – POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE TAKELEY/LITTLE CANFIELD BOUNDARY AT PRIORS GREEN**

- 90 Consideration of the possibility of changing the boundary between Takeley and Little Canfield, which divides the Priors Green development site, was considered to be premature pending actual development of the site. The only representation made as part of this consultation stage was a telephone call from Councillor Derek Jones (Takeley Ward) who suggested a joint meeting between officers, district councillors and the two parish councils concerned. However, such a meeting has not materialised.

**RECOMMENDED that the question of the boundary between Takeley and Little Canfield is considered further after occupation of the site has taken place.**

**PROPOSAL DR8 – BACON END, GREAT CANFIELD**

- 91 Consultation has taken place on a suggestion made by Little Canfield Parish Council to transfer part of the hamlet known as Bacon End from Great Canfield. The outcome of the public consultation is as follows:

<b>Property</b>	<b>Preference</b>
Woodlands	Gt Canfield
The Elms	
Hobbs Farm	Gt Canfield
Stone Hall	Gt Canfield
Stone Hall Cottage	
Reeds	Gt Canfield
Woodnut House	
Thriftwood	
Woodside Cottage	Gt Canfield

92 The result of this consultation is absolutely clear-cut. Mr Hockley of Reeds stated 'I am astonished that this has even been considered – to break a community in two is nonsensical'. Mrs Inglis of Stone Hall said 'it would be a great pity to interrupt more than six centuries of Bacon End's membership of Great Canfield without good reason'. All of the comments made lend credence to the view that all relevant social and community links are with Great Canfield.

93 Great Canfield Parish Council responded by saying 'the present position in Great Canfield is acceptable and that any changes relating to parish boundaries would be detrimental to the area'.

**RECOMMENDED that proposal DR8 not be pursued.**

### **PROPOSAL DR12 – OAKWOOD PARK, LITTLE DUNMOW**

94 Consideration was given to the possibility of changing boundaries, or creating a new parish, at Oakwood Park but there seems to be no demand for any change to be made, either on the part of the parish councils, or of the local occupiers concerned. Felsted Parish Council wrote to say that no change to existing boundaries was felt necessary.

95 At some stage in the future it might be necessary to consider introducing parish wards to enable separate representation for the established village and the Oakwood Park site.

**RECOMMENDED that no suggestions for any change at this location are pursued.**

### **General Representations**

96 At the beginning of March, Paul Westlake wrote on behalf of the Saffron Walden Constituency Liberal Democrats to express support for the draft proposals, subject to full consultation. The letter went on 'the proposals are clear, well founded on the basis of community identity and are geographically rational'.

### **Consequential changes to electoral wards as a result of the proposed changes**

97 Changes to District wards and to County electoral divisions consequent upon parish boundary alterations must be clearly identified. The possible changes to be made are listed below, together with a note of the number of current electors affected. All references to District wards are to those new wards that come into effect on 1 May 2003.

**Proposal DR3 – 5 electors to be transferred from Newport to the parish of Widdington; this will have no effect on District or County electoral arrangements as both parishes are contained within Newport Ward and Stansted ED.**

**Proposal DR4 – 363 electors to be transferred from Saffron Walden to the new parish of Swards End; this will have no impact on other electoral arrangements as the potential area of Swards End had already**

been included in the new Ashdon Ward and both areas are included in the Saffron Walden ED; however, it should be noted that the removal of Swards End from Saffron Walden parish will reduce the number of wards on the Town Council from four to three and the number of councillors from 16 to 15.

**Proposal DR5 – four electors to be transferred from Little Chesterford to Saffron Walden; this will also involve a transfer from The Chesterfords Ward to Saffron Walden Castle Ward but will have no impact on County divisions.**

**Proposal DR6 – if this proposal proceeds, 46 electors will be transferred from Birchanger to Stansted Mountfitchet; they will also transfer from Birchanger Ward to Stansted South Ward but this will have no impact on County divisions.**

**Proposal DR9 – transfer 23 electors from Birchanger to Great Hallingbury; transfer six electors from Hatfield Broad Oak to Great Hallingbury and 15 electors from Hatfield Broad Oak to Takeley; transfer four electors from Stansted Mountfitchet to Great Hallingbury; as a result of these changes, 23 electors will transfer from Birchanger to Broad Oak and the Hallingburys Ward and from Stansted to Dunmow ED; 15 electors will transfer from Broad Oak and the Hallingburys Ward to Takeley and the Canfields Ward and from Dunmow to Thaxted ED; and four electors will transfer from Stansted South Ward to Broad Oak and the Hallingburys Ward and from Stansted to Dunmow ED; the transfer of six electors from Hatfield Broad Oak to Great Hallingbury will have no impact on other electoral arrangements.**

**Proposal DR9 – transfer two electors from Little Hallingbury to Great Hallingbury; this will have no impact on other electoral arrangements.**

**Proposal DR11 – the effect will depend on which solution is adopted; under option (b), five electors will transfer from Great Dunmow to Stebbing and 15 electors will transfer from Little Dunmow to Stebbing; this will have the effect that five electors will move from Great Dunmow North Ward to Stebbing Ward and from Dunmow to Thaxted ED, and 15 electors will move from Felsted Ward to Stebbing Ward but will remain in Thaxted ED;**

**Under option (d) the numbers affecting Great Dunmow parish and Great Dunmow North Ward will be unchanged but the number of electors transferring from Little Dunmow to Stebbing will increase from 15 to 34, and the impact on District ward and County EDs will change correspondingly.**

## **PROPOSALS FOR PARISH ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS**

- 98 Various comments have been received as part of this review as set out below. Please refer to paragraphs 144-156 and to appendices 1 and two of the previous report.

## **PROPOSAL PEP4 – NUMBERS OF PARISH COUNCILLORS**

**‘that consultation be carried out with the following parishes to confirm that the present number of parish councillors allocated to those parishes is the appropriate number (in the light of historical information that difficulties may have been experienced in filling all of the vacancies for election):**

**Barnston, Clavering, Elsenham, Great Canfield, Great Chesterford, Great Easton, Henham, High Easter, Littlebury, Manuden, and Widdington;**

**and that Hatfield Heath and Thaxted parish councils be asked to confirm whether the existing number of parish councillors allocated to those parishes is considered to be sufficient in relation to their population.**

99 The following responses (or lack of them) have been received.

**Barnston** – a letter has been received stating that the Parish Council should continue to operate with nine parish councillors. A reply was sent asking the Parish Council for more supporting information, including an indication as to whether the parish has ever experienced recruitment difficulties but no response has, as yet, been received.

Comment: Barnston has been seriously under-subscribed at the two most recent elections and, in terms of electorate, is in the middle range of those parishes electing nine councillors.

**Clavering** – no official response has been received from the Parish Council although some informal comments have been made that will be summarised at the meeting.

Comment: Clavering is the smallest of those parishes electing 11 councillors, but should be large enough to support that number and was only one short in 1999.

**Elsenham** – no response whatever has been received.

Comment: Elsenham should easily be able to support 11 members and has been only one short at the two most recent elections. There is currently one unfilled vacancy following a resignation last year.

**Great Canfield** – an initial letter said that ‘whilst your comments were noted, it was agreed that in respect of Great Canfield, any change was unnecessary’. Further information was requested and another letter was sent commenting: ‘the parish councillors continue to agree that no problem exists in the Parish relating to the recruitment of councillors. The turnover of councillors and low nominations was a momentary issue that existed for only a short time and the Parish Council now has a sound basis of seven parish councillors. It is considered that no change is necessary.’

Comment: Great Canfield is one of the smallest parishes electing seven councillors; there is particular concern because there were only three nominations received in 1999 and an unusually large turnover of members has occurred since then (eight, including the four co-opted in the aftermath of the 1999 election), although all of these places have been filled. However, for

a lengthy period of time following this election, and also more recently, there has been a continuing shortfall.

**Great Chesterford** – no immediate response has been received but the parish clerk has telephoned to say that the Parish Council still wishes to be granted an additional councillor (refer to paragraph 142 of the previous report). This request was originally made some time ago but, in spite of requests for more supporting information, nothing further has been received.

Comment: Concern was expressed about the position at Great Chesterford because the parish was under-subscribed by four in 1995 and by two in 1999. However, the parish is the second largest of those with nine councillors. It is felt that no additional councillors should be granted without solid supporting information.

**Great Easton** – no response of any kind has been received.

Comment: there is concern because Great Easton was under-subscribed in both 1995 and 1999, in the earlier year to the extent that only one nomination was received. However, it appears that no changes can be made at the present time because the electoral scheme was amended recently to accommodate changes made as part of the PER.

**Henham** – no response of any kind has been received.

Comment: a major problem arose in Henham in 1999 because only three nominations were received for nine places. The remaining places have since been filled by co-option. Henham is in the middle range of those parishes with nine councillors.

**High Easter** – the Parish Council has responded to say they are ‘not aware that there has ever been a problem in recruiting candidates to stand as councillors and therefore respectfully request the system .... remain unchanged. We are fortunate that all our Councillors take a very active part in the Parish itself and upon checking my records I can only find two occasions when one Councillor was absent and this was due to illness.’

Comment: Although there was a shortfall in both 1995 and 1999, High Easter does not seem to have experienced any real difficulty in recruiting candidates and seven is probably the appropriate number for a parish of its size.

**Littlebury** – the Parish Council has commented as follows: ‘The last time there was a vacancy on the Parish Council two people applied to be co-opted, local residents do not generally want to get involved in an election process which is costly for the parish. Littlebury Parish Council represents Littlebury, Littlebury Green and Catmere End and for the first time in a long while the Parish Council has members that live in all three of the villages, which may not be possible if the adoption of a lower amount of Councillors took place. The Parish Council hopes that there will be enough interest to generate an election in May 2003 and hope that UDC will understand the need for Parish Councillors to represent Littlebury Parish.’

Comment: Littlebury has been under-subscribed by two at each of the last two elections but it is understandable that the Parish Council should wish to

maintain representation in all parts of the parish. It is one of the smaller parishes with nine councillors.

**Manuden** – no response of any kind has been received.

Comment: Manuden now seems to have resolved its difficulties following the election in 1999 when the parish had only two nominations and was inquorate for a time. The number of seven councillors seems broadly in the correct range.

**Widdington** – no letter has been received but the parish clerk has telephoned to refer to the matters raised. The parish had actually requested an additional member but has not followed the request through. The parish clerk feels that the current workload justifies eight members.

Comment: Widdington was granted an increase of councillors from seven to eight prior to the 1999 election. In view of this it is disappointing that only six nominations were received. A reasonable compromise would be perhaps to leave the number as it is.

**Chrishall** – a representation was received at the first stage of consultation suggesting a reduction in the number of councillors in Chrishall. No formal response has been received. Chrishall is the smallest parish electing nine members but has apparently experienced no difficulties in attracting recruits.

**General comments** – it seems that there is a case for reducing the number of parish councillors in some of the above parishes. Where the parish council has not troubled to respond to the consultation letter it is hard to make a proper judgement. It is particularly the case in Great Canfield that difficulties have been experienced and there is probably the greatest justification for a reduction to be made.

**RECOMMENDED** that members determine the appropriate number of parish councillors in each of the parishes concerned.

#### **PROPOSAL PEP5 – WARDING IN QUENDON AND RICKLING**

**‘that the Council consults on the following two options for future electoral arrangements at Quendon and Rickling:**

**option 1 (the first preference) – abolish the warding scheme altogether because the communities of Quendon and Rickling are considered to be merged and there is considered no justification for the two areas to be separately represented; the parish would still be entitled to seven parish councillors and the cost of parish elections would be reduced;**

**option 2 (the second preference) – realign the ward boundary to run southwards along Willis Lane from the parish boundary west of Quendon Park to join with Rickling Green Road and then following the western boundary of Mistletoe Cottage and Quendon Garage to join Cambridge Road; it would then follow the centre of the road to the parish boundary with diversions to follow the boundaries of Ventnor Lodge and Broomwood. The effect of this would be:**

**revised Quendon Ward: 171 electors – 3 councillors**  
**revised Rickling Ward: 262 electors – 4 councillors**

**if it is considered appropriate to retain parish wards at all, then this option provides a better balance between the wards and a more clearly defined boundary line;**

**(refer to plans 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34).**

- 100 Quendon and Rickling Parish Council seem not to have taken the formal second stage consultation very seriously. A follow up letter was sent because no response had been received. This prompted a telephone call from the parish clerk who merely repeated that the Parish Council does not wish for any change.
- 101 However, Members have already decided that no change is no longer an option. For a detailed explanation of the background to this matter, refer to paragraphs 167 to 176 of the report to the meeting on 13 March.

**RECOMMENDED that option 1 listed above be adopted for use at the parish election due on 1 May 2003 and that the necessary order be made.**

**Parish electoral proposals not to be pursued**

**PEP1, 2 and 3 – CHRISHALL, GREAT CHESTERFORD AND WIDDINGTON**

- 102 These requests for a variation in the number of parish councillors have already been covered earlier in the report.

Background Papers: Local Government Act 1972  
Representation of the People Acts 1983 and 1985  
Local Government and Rating Act 1997  
Department of the Environment Circular 11/97  
Various letters of representation and other communications received from parish councils and individual respondents at stage 2  
Various parish warding and boundary change orders and maps and background files  
Final Parish Review Report to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, October 1983  
UDC's PER submission to the Local Government Commission of February 2000  
Final Periodic Electoral Review Recommendations of the Local Government Commission for England, November 2000

Attachments: Appendix 1 - Letter to residents in Swards End  
Appendix 2 – Information sheet about the proposal for a parish council in Swards End  
Appendix 3 – Questionnaire sent to residents in Swards End  
Plan 7 - Ringers Farmhouse, Newport  
Plan 8 - Swards End

- Plan 9 - North Park Cottage, Little Walden
- Plan 10 - Rochford Nurseries site, Birchanger / Stansted
- Plan 11 - The Mount / Forest Hall Road, Birchanger
- Plan 12A - Stoney Common West, Stansted
- Plan 12B - Stoney Common East, Stansted
- Plan 16 - A120 Takeley / Stansted / Hatfield Broad Oak
- Plan 17 - A120 Birchanger / Stansted / Hatfield Broad Oak
- Plan 18 - A120 Birchanger / Great Hallingbury
- Plan 19 - Latchmore Cottage, Little Hallingbury
- Plan 20 - A120 Little Dunmow / Stebbing
- Plan 21 - A120 Throws Corner, Little Dunmow
- Plan 22 - Brook End, Little Dunmow
- Plan 23 - Haydens, Little Dunmow
- Plan 24 - Tooleys Farm, Great Dunmow
- Plan 25 - A120 Great Dunmow / Little Dunmow / Stebbing
- Plan 27 - Quendon / Rickling ward boundary 1
- Plan 28 - Quendon / Rickling ward boundary 2
- Plan 29 - Quendon / Rickling ward boundary 3
- Plan 30 - Quendon / Rickling ward boundary 4
- Plan 31 - Quendon / Rickling ward boundary 5
- Plan 32 - Quendon / Rickling suggested ward boundary 1/option 2
- Plan 33 - Quendon / Rickling suggested ward boundary 2/option 2
- Plan 34 - Quendon / Rickling suggested ward boundary 3/option 2
- Plan 35 - Proposed new boundary line between Birchanger, Great Hallingbury, Hatfield Broad Oak, Stansted and Takeley (as far as the existing western boundary of Takeley parish)
- Plan 36 - Proposed new boundary line (option b) between Great Dunmow, Little Dunmow and Stebbing (west)
- Plan 37 - Proposed new boundary line (option b) between Great Dunmow, Little Dunmow and Stebbing (east)
- Plan 38 - Proposed new boundary line A120 (option d) – east
- Plan 39 - Proposed new boundary line A120 (option d) – west