

Consultation responses from individuals, grouped according to geographic location

Haslingfield Parish

Respondent 1

This new development which is separated from original parish should be logically represented by a separate parish council. Its affairs have nothing to do with the current Haslingfield Parish. A new parish should be created, but if no new parish is formed a ward should be created. The M11 would form a natural boundary. A parish council is the right choice for community governance, but the style should be determined by residents of the new parish. The number of elected members should be 5 + proportional to headcount.

Respondent 2

The existing boundaries are just historic remnants and do not reflect the current geography of the area. Our parish council (Haslingfield) should be predominantly discussing and focusing on improving life in our village and surrounding homes. As the planning for Trumpington Meadows has gone through I feel a lot of time of the volunteers in our village has been taken up. I think a new parish should be set up as really it is a new suburb with its own facilities and hopefully community separate to any of the surrounding villages. A new parish over warding. I think it would be a good idea to bring them up to the M11 as this is likely to be a permanent break to any of the surrounding villages. A parish council would be the right choice for community governance, and be named Trumpington Meadows Parish Council. The viability of the new parish would be my main concern as I think a lot of the homes will not be owned by your typical "parish council members". I think although it would perhaps be best to have a parish council perhaps there could be a solution to form it into the existing solution for Trumpington even though this is the city council.

Respondent 3

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the map? Yes. If no new parish is formed, what alternative do you propose? Or the Cambridge City Council boundary could be moved.

Name: Trumpington Meadows, Byron Meadows

It seems to me that a parish council is the logical choice – it makes it feel more equal to the other parishes.

The draft recommendation is for the new civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes

Trumpington Meadows Development

Respondent 4 (SCDC)

Splitting a community should be avoided as it would be inefficient to coordinate services not to mention the resources and amount of committee meetings and management time that will take to make this happen. And if coordination is not possible neighbours within the Trumpington Meadows estate will have different services which is ridiculous. Instead, focus should be placed in considering where the city/district boundary lines are and change it so that the whole community falls within one or the other.

No new parish should be created; boundary lines should be re-evaluated. No intermediate arrangement should be made, for example a parish meeting.

Respondent 5

I would like to see Trumpington Meadows as a whole ward, crossing the present boundaries between the city and the district. I know this is not on the cards at the moment but the development when completed will so obviously be a whole community that it would work much better as a unit than any of the alternatives. I believe this should be the aim of any short term interim governance which is put in place.

Name: Trumpington Meadows South

Respondent 6

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No. Ultimately move the whole of Trumpington Meadows into Cambridge City. In the interim leave existing boundaries, maybe with a Trumpington Meadows ward in Haslingfield parish.

If not, should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting?

Yes. There is no recommendation for the new civil parish to be warded; should a new civil parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? Yes. The draft recommendation is for the new civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes. Ward in Haslingfield Council, maybe 3 members.

Respondent 7

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No. Pointless – the boundaries need to be amended so Trumpington Meadows is not split. Do not proceed, as this is not the right way forward.

Respondent 8 (SCDC)

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No. This is a terrible fudge and is to be avoided. Clearly all of Trumpington Meadows should be in one area, ideally Cambridge City. Then the solution becomes straight forward and workable. I do not support this solution as it will merely embed a ridiculous position. The solution should start with sensible boundaries that do not split Trumpington Meadows.

Should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? No

There is no recommendation for the new civil parish to be warded; should a new civil parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? No

The draft recommendations if for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? No

Respondent 9

My preference is to wait for a review of the city boundary so that the area of Trumpington Meadows which at present falls within S Cambs can, like the rest of the estate, be part of Trumpington Ward in the City of Cambridge. I would be willing to accept that AS AN INTERIM MEASURE ONLY until that review is completed a new parish in order not to deprive new residents in the S Cambs part of Trumpington a vote. S Cambs urgently needs to respond to the concerns of Trumpington Meadows residents who do not think that dividing their community in the way proposed by this review promotes the first principle of the review which states that “the council must have regard to the need to secure community governance within the area under review such that it reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area.” This objective cannot be achieved by these proposals.

Should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? Yes

Trumpington

Respondents 10 and 11

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outlined in the map – No. The area north east of the M11 should be in Cambridge City.

Respondent 12

Yes, the existing parish boundaries should be altered and a new parished area created as detailed in the proposal. The new civil parish should be named West Trumpington Parish. It should take on the style, “parish council”, *therefore being named* West Trumpington Parish Council. The draft recommendations are for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? - Yes

Respondent 13

Should the existing parish boundaries be outlined and the parished area be created as proposed? Yes. The new civil parish should take the name West Trumpington. Parish Councils seem to be the usual arrangement in South Cambs, so it seems sensible to follow established practice.

If not, should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? No.

What name should be taken by the new council representing the new civil parish? West Trumpington Parish Council. There is no recommendation that the new civil parish be warded, would you consider warding necessary? No.

The draft recommendations are for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes

Respondent 14

Should the existing parish boundaries be outlined and the parished area be created as proposed? No. I propose that the area along the A10 from the M11 should be part of Hauxton Parish. It fits together better with the new developments.

If not, should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? Yes.

What name should be taken by the new council representing the new civil parish? Trumpington Meadows Parish Council.

There is no recommendation that the new civil parish be warded, would you consider warding necessary? Yes.

The draft recommendations are for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes

Hauxton Parish

Respondent 15

I propose that the alterations to the boundary should go ahead but be incorporated as part of Hauxton Parish. The area under question borders very closely to the current Hauxton Parish and therefore affects Hauxton residents the most. The M11 already forms a natural boundary between Trumpington Meadows and what would be the newly extended Hauxton Parish. Any development proposals on this area would affect Hauxton residents most and therefore should fall within the remit of Hauxton Parish Council.

Respondent 16

Like the Hauxton Parish Council proposal: incorporate this area into Hauxton Parish. Build the Park and Ride at Foxton with bus connection to the city centre via Harston and Hauxton.

An intermediate arrangement should be made, for example a parish meeting.

Respondent 17

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

Area beside the A10 from Hauxton Mill and the sports ground up to the M11- currently part of Haslingfield Parish – should become part of Hauxton Parish, not part of a new Trumpington Meadows Parish

Respondent 18

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

Haslingfield want to divest themselves of this remote part of their parish. Hauxton Parish Council made a proposal – supported by Haslingfield Parish Council – to incorporate this area south of the M11 into Hauxton Parish.

If a new civil parish is not created, should an intermediate arrangement be for example a parish meeting – Yes

The draft recommendation is for the new civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? – No

Respondent 19

I note that the Haslingfield Parish Council wish to divest themselves of a remote part of agricultural land immediately South of the M 11 and West of the A10 (immediately adjoining junction 11.) This appears eminently sensible since it is agricultural land and is entirely severed from their Village. It does however adjoin the Western boundary of the village of Hauxton and could be merged with the Rectory Farm land to produce an efficient and viable agricultural land holding. Simultaneously this would do much to ensure that the new housing development west of the A10 is set in a rural environment, compensating for the increasing density of the population of the Village of Hauxton.

I can see no good argument for extending the boundary of Trumpington South of the M11. simply because it is no longer of relevance to the administration of Haslingfield. The planning policies of the South Cambridgeshire District Council to maintain the rural character of their "Neckless Villages" has been commendable over the last fifty years and the recent policy of permitting light industrial development within the villages has enabled them to be sustainable conurbations within a rural setting has ensured a clear distinction between the character of the urban development of the City of Cambridge and that of the rural environment of South Cambridgeshire. Indeed it should be held up as a model for Garden Villages of the future.

Respondent 20 (also represented on Hauxton Parish Council)

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

I am happy for a new parish to be formed but I am totally against its boundary coming south of the M11. South of the M11 should become part of the Hauxton Parish as the M11 marks a definitive boundary between Trumpington and Hauxton. Once Trumpington creeps south of the M11 then the chances of development will cause

Hauxton to eventually be part of the City. If land south of the M11 becomes part of Hauxton then we have greater influence over plans for development and we will be able to prevent Hauxton from being swallowed up by Trumpington. The M11 is the natural boundary between SCambs and the City.

Respondent 21

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

We feel strongly that the land on the south side of the M11 should be part of Hauxton Parish and not part of Trumpington Meadows which is proposed.

Respondents 22 and 23

We feel compelled to write to you in relation to South Cambs consultation with regard to the proposed changes to Hauxton's Parish Boundary. As residents of the village we have had a number of changes to adjust to in recent years with the ongoing development of Hauxton Meadows and the gradual morphing of Hauxton into Harston and Great Kneighton and Trumpington Meadows. Hauxton is a small village sandwiched between two large and growing conurbations and we are in danger of losing our identity particularly if Trumpington Meadows is allowed to take ownership of the parcel of land to the South of the M11 joining our village. We will lose any influence that we have on the development of our lovely village which has already had significant development recently with the onset of the new housing estate. If this change is allowed to take place, Hauxton will lose control over land abutting the village and with it no doubt our identity and ability to make changes that are appropriate for village people. Unlike Trumpington Meadows, Hauxton is a well established village - it has a strong sense of community and many residents have lived in the village for many years. It would be a devastating loss for these residents if others outside of the village were able to make decisions about land adjacent to the village, that would impact living standards for our local people.

Respondents 24 and 25

As a resident of Hauxton, my wife and I write to express concern over the decision reached in the Review of the area south of the M11, which currently lies within Haslingfield Parish, and which they are wanting to divest themselves of, because of its remoteness from Haslingfield village itself.

We understand the proposal from Hauxton Parish Council, which is supported by Haslingfield Parish Council, is that this area should be incorporated into Hauxton; but pressure from the Trumpington Residents Association led to the Review Meeting taking the decision that the area should be incorporated into Trumpington.

Our concerns are several:

To our mind this is an unhappy further encroachment of the City of Cambridge into the Green Belt and makes the future engulfing of the villages around the city more and more likely.

The M11 will cut right through this proposed extension to 'Trumpington Meadows' and therefore will divide the area anyway, so will give no cohesion. Whereas, the area already has a natural link with Hauxton, especially with the extension of Hauxton by the new development at 'Hauxton Meadows', as well as the fact that Hauxton already has a finger of land extending up towards the M11, around which currently Haslingfield lies.

We are also led to believe there are proposals for a new Park & Ride on this land, but we ask the question, "Why?". There is already a P&R just the other side of the junction, and if another is needed, surely it would be more prudent to have it further out, encouraging people to use buses and trains into the city and relieving pressure on the A10, which is a constant bottle-neck through Harston. But, if this is the proposal for use of this area, then making it part of Trumpington brings it within the Cambridge City Boundary and easier to get through planning – if so, we consider this a very cynical ploy on the part of the Planning Department, which again threatens the Green Belt around the City of Cambridge.

Respondents 26 and 27

We support the view that the area that Haslingfield (*Parish, south of the M11*) want to divest should be incorporated into the Hauxton Parish and not part of Trumpington Meadows.

Respondents 28 and 29

As long-time residents of Hauxton (37 years) we are surprised and alarmed that you are proposing changes to our parish boundaries. We were supportive of the Redrow development of the former agro-chemical 'Fisons' factory brownfield site and do not consider ourselves to be NIMBYs, but this proposal is illogical. Neither do we consider that we have been adequately informed as to South Cambridgeshire's plans

Residents of Trumpington will have no concern (other than self-interest) as to the proposed use of the land south of the M11. As residents of Hauxton we must be consulted with respect to this area, and we will actively pursue this. We have recently returned from a month in the USA so this has come 'out of the blue' ... we hope that you will be able to note our objection at this late date

Respondent 30

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No. Exten the city boundaries to the M11 as a natural boundary, transfer the A10 corridor to Hauxton Parish Council.

Respondent 31

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the map? No. What alternative do you propose? Any arrangement that uses the M11 to separate Hauxton from Trumpington – otherwise, Hauxton will lose any influence over future planning issues that directly affect the residents. The draft recommendation is for the new civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? – Yes

Respondent 32

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the map? No. I consider that the area under review should be incorporated into the existing Hauxton Parish. Any development planned in the are, either now or in the future, would have a greater impact on the village of Hauxton (compared to neighbouring parishes). I would therefore wish for the area to fall directly under the remit of Hauxton Parish Council, so that we have greater influence on decisions affecting the area.

Should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? No
There is no recommendation for the new civil parish to be warded; should a new civil parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? No

The draft recommendations if for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? No

Respondent 33

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No. I consider that the area under review should be incorporated into the existing Hauxton Parish. Any development planned in the area, either now or in the future, would have a greater impact on the village of Hauxton (compared to neighbouring parishes). I would therefore wish for the area to fall directly under the remit of Hauxton Parish Council, so that we have greater influence on decisions affecting the area.

Should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? No
There is no recommendation for the new civil parish to be warded; should a new civil parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? No

Respondent 34

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? Yes, but with different boundaries to those proposed. I feel that the land on the south side of the M11 should become part of Hauxton Parish. The land north of the M11 becomes part of Trumpington Meadows, the Grantchester section as proposed.

If a new civil parish is created, then is a parish council the right choice for the community governance? Should an alternative style be adopted, such as a community council? I don't support the creation of a new civil parish. If existing boundaries are changed with areas added to existing parishes, no new parish exists. Should an intermediate arrangement be made, for example a parish meeting? No
There is no recommendation for the new civil parish to be warded; should a new civil parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? No

The draft recommendations if for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes

Respondent 35

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No. I would like to bring to your attention the fact that Hauxton seems to have been omitted from these talks and I think that this land should be transferred from Haslingfield to the parish of Hauxton, with the intention of retaining it as a piece of rural countryside for as long as possible and not, within a few years, becoming another part of the city!

Respondent 36

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No. Hauxton is currently in a state of growth with new homes (Hauxton Meadow) currently being built on the old Bayer site adjacent to Hauxton Mill. I believe there is a need for open green parks for its new increased population boarding this space.

With this in mind I would like to propose that the area extending south of the M11, bounded by the River Cam as far south as Hauxton Mill, with the new boundary formed along the current boundary between the parishes of Haslingfield and Harston to be transferred to Hauxton parish.

parish be created, would you consider warding necessary? Yes.

The draft recommendations if for the civil parish to be represented by a council of 9 elected members; should a new civil parish be created, would you support the proposal for 9 elected members? Yes.

Respondent 37

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No.

Respondent 38

Should the existing boundaries be altered and the new parished area be created as outlined in the proposal? No. The boundary for Hauxton parish should be extended to include land south of the M11, so that the M11 forms the natural boundary between Hauxton and Trumpington/city. With Hauxton Meadows development on one side of the A10 and sports facilities and additional houses planned on the other side of the A10 south of the M11, Hauxton community is developing and the sense of community developing with it – the proposal for a new parish to be developed to include this area of land is not supportive of the local community; would reduce the effectiveness and delivery of local services and reduce community engagement. The proposal to exclude the area south of the M11 within Hauxton boundaries is devious and compromising for Hauxton villagers who want to take responsibility for their community and not to become a suburb/extension of Trumpington/city and remain a vibrant, flourishing are. It makes no sense to incorporate this area into another parish.

Respondent 39

Hauxton Parish Council proposed taking the section of Haslingfield Parish south of the M11 into Hauxton Parish. I strongly support that proposal on the basis that the two cottages on Westfield Road (leading from the A10 adjacent to Hauxton Mill) are part of Hauxton Parish. These two dwellings adjoin the arable land south of the M11 that is Haslingfield Parish at present.

The common sense, topographical Northern boundary for Hauxton Parish is the M11. Now that Hauxton Meadows housing is underway it is essential that Hauxton Mill and the river corridor receives proper attention. Introducing a second parish (Trumpington Meadows) into the equation is unhelpful for the successful transition from factory brownfield site (with a neglected historic water mill) to a doubling in the population of Hauxton.

Hauxton residents value the green belt separation between Cambridge and Hauxton provided by the arable land south of the M11. The only logical basis for including that land in Trumpington Meadows Parish boundary is the intention to spread Cambridge housing, business or transport south beyond the M11.

Respondent 40

I would like to lend my support to Hauxton Parish Council with regard to their proposal to incorporate the area south of the M11 into Hauxton Parish.

If the area was included with Trumpington I feel sure that proposals to re-site the Park and Ride to this location would follow very quickly. Then would follow an application to build more houses on the vacated site, adding to the already difficult traffic problems.

South Cambs (Other Parishes)

Harston Parish

Respondent 41

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

The section of the new proposed parish south of the M11 should come under the jurisdiction of Hauxton Parish Council.

Respondent 42

Should the existing parish boundaries be altered and the new parish area be created as outline in the map – No

Create a new parish but limit it to the City side of the M11. The south/west side of the M11 should be incorporated into Hauxton parish. This would give continuity of responsibility for development alongside the A10 up to the M11 to Hauxton Parish.

Histon and Impington

Respondent 43

Ideally this area would become part of Cambridge City Council but if this cannot happen then a new parish may be the best solution.

Name: Byron's Park

Style: A community council would seem more suitable in the 21st century.

If not an intermediate arrangement should be made, for example a parish meeting. A council represented by a complement of nine elected members is supported.