

Responses from Parish Councils on the Boundary Review

APPENDIX 5

<u>Parish</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>	<u>Comment</u>
Babraham	N/A	N/A	All Councillors have had a look at proposals but feel that no comment is necessary.
Great & Little Chishill			Will respond after their meeting of 30th June.
Great & Little Eversden	Y		The Parish Council has no objection to the boundary changes provided that the people living in the affected areas have been consulted and the majority are content and there are no adverse implications for South Cambridgeshire especially with regard to new housing quotas.
Fen Ditton	IN PART	IN PART	Feel it appropriate to rezone properties in Dunsmore Close. If Dunsmore Close is taken into the City Fen Ditton PC wants the boundary change to include all of the former railway alignment where it has been converted to the Millennium Cycleway. The weed control and upkeep of the cyclepath needs to be done in its entirety and not shared across councils in neighbouring stretches. Object to houses along High Ditch Road beyond the bridge over the former railway being rezoned as their road access and rubbish collections all tie directly to the village and not to the north works development area. The properties form an extension of the linear village of Fen Ditton and follow High Ditch Road. This is an ancient connection directly to the village, church and river. Have already responded to SCDC about proposed green belt changes and feel these properties and High Ditch Road should be kept separated by the green tree belt along High Ditch Road. Support proposal to rezone north works development area as part of the City. Do not want to see previous decision regarding north works taken by SCDC overturned by the City Council. Would wish SCDC to continue to have a role in the planning and Fen Ditton PC to be consulted on developments in this area. Fen Ditton should retain its rural connection with SCDC.
Harston	IN PART	IN PART	There is no merit in carrying out a large and costly Parish Boundary Review at this time. The only matters requiring urgent attention are the realignment of the City Boundary to incorporate Trumpington Meadows and Clay Farm to avoid single developments coming under the control of 2 authorities, and any other developments around the city where similar circumstances could arise. The boundary should be extended to the limit of the proposed housing/office developments and no further.

Hauxton	IN PART	IN PART	Re areas 12 and 13, Hauxton PC would prefer to see the city boundary run along the edge of the new developments on the city side of the M11 rather than up to the motorway. It may also make sense to amend the boundary between Haslingfield and Hauxton as there is a sweep of Haslingfield which goes up to the M11 and down to the A10. Would also like to endorse the comments of Harston PC.
Hinxton	N/A	N/A	The proposed boundary review does not have an impact on Hinxton Parish Council. The Councillors do not have strong views either way.
Impington	IN PART	IN PART	Supports the move of Kings Meadow, Minerva Way and Arbury Park to the City. Strongly supports the retention of the Parish status of Arbury Park. Does not support the move of the six properties to the north of Blackhall Road to the City, wishing to retain the status quo given that there is no clear view of those residents. However, the land to the west of the B1049 and south of the A14 may still be released for development through the LDF process. Should this occur, the Council would ask that this is also transferred to the City. If this area should be put in the same status as the NW Cambridge area. Supports the retention of the whole of Girton Parish in SCDC. Supports the view of Milton Parish Council that the Science Park, and the Fen Road area (Milton detached) should be transferred to the City. The latter, detached in reality as well as name, clearly looks to the City for services, and makes no sense to be retained in SCDC. The Council can only support the transfers if the associated demands from central Government for housing build, traveller sites etc etc are transferred with the land and if the financial impact is both clear, and acceptable.
Milton	IN PART		Milton Parish Council has consistently argued that the natural boundary between Milton and Cambridge is the A14 and that both the Science Park and Chesterton Fen should now be incorporated within the city. Responses to our consultation exercise now show support for this and we therefore ask South Cambs District Council to support our view.
Teversham		Y	Proposal would cut parish by two thirds. From the initial development of Foxgloves estate Teversham Parish Council have invested considerable time and money into the estate. As boundary would be close to Teversham (old village) we think that the residents here should also have been polled. Leaflets and maps distributed were of poor quality. Poor communication from SCDC giving an impression of a rushed process.

Little Wilbraham	In principle	The Parish Council are in principle against these changes. Some of the proposals such as the transfer of the 'vacant' areas, would seem sensible and would probably not have a great effect on the District. However, the transfer of existing residential areas will present many problems. In particular the councillors ask for detailed proposals to make good any losses of Council Tax income resulting from the redefining of the City boundaries, without increasing the council tax rates for the remaining South Cambs District.
Great Shelford	IN PART IN PART	The Parish Council has no objection to areas 11 and 12 but would prefer area 10 to remain in the parish. They hope that housing target figures will be amended to reflect the boundary changes.
Waterbeach	? ?	If the objective of the boundary review is to tidy up the boundaries then the review does not achieve its objective.