

EXECUTIVE – 11 SEPTEMBER 2018

**BACKGROUND PAPER TO THE REPORT BY EXECUTIVE MEMBER
FOR FINANCE AND SUPPORT SERVICES**

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF BUNTINGFORD
TOWN COUNCIL**

RESPONSES TO SECOND STAGE CONSULTATION

Contents

Document 101:	Copy of response from Buntingford Town Council
Document 102:	Copy of response from Cottered & Throcking Parish Council
Table:	Schedule of all second stage consultation responses received



Buntingford Town Council

The Manor House - High Street
Buntingford - Hertfordshire - SG9 9AB

John Williams,
Electoral Services Officer,
East Herts Council,
Wallfields,
Hertford,
SG13 8EQ.

28th June 2018

Dear Mr Williams,

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council Boundary – Consultation on Draft Recommendations.

I write on behalf of Buntingford Town Council to fully support the draft recommendations for the Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council. The proposals enhance the well-being of residents, the positive contribution to the provision of services, the promotion of the feeling of local community and the creation of a viable administrative unit. The Town Council also fully supports the change to the relevant District Ward boundaries to align them with the revised parish boundaries.

Our letter of the 12th March clearly outlines our rationale as outlined below:

We believe that electors who reside or will reside in the development to the north of Buntingford and Parkside identify clearly with the parish of Buntingford. Currently both of these areas fall within the parish boundary of Cottered, the settlement of which is in the region of 2.7 miles from the areas under review. The centre of Buntingford is a short walk from the properties and all services and amenities required are provided in Buntingford. In addition, the new development north of Buntingford is divided, in that some of the site falls within the Buntingford parish boundary and some falls within the Cottered boundary. The Town Council now delivers its newsletters and circulars to all properties on the new development and Parkside, effectively engaging with these residents to facilitate participation in the decision making process. Residents visit the Town Council offices to obtain information and advice on amongst other things, transport links, Highways issues and planning matters.

If the parish boundary is revised, residents of the two areas (north of Buntingford and Parkside), will contribute to the precept that promotes the well-being of their area and provides the services required in that area. Democratically, the residents would be able to vote for the local Councillors who most represent them and provide the services that they use. The revision will provide for effective and convenient local government

The development north of Buntingford has been included within the settlement boundary of Buntingford in the adopted Buntingford Community Area Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging East Herts District Plan.

The areas under consideration reflect the distinct community identity of Buntingford. A parish boundary which includes the proposed areas is clearly definable and identifiable with the built up area of the town.

To conclude, the Town Council firmly believes that development taking place north of Buntingford and Parkside should fall within the Parish Boundary of Buntingford

Yours sincerely

COTTERED and THROCKING PARISH COUNCIL

26th July 2018

Mr John Williams
Electoral Services Officer
East Herts Council
Wallfields
Pegs Lane
Hertford
SG13 8EQ

Dear Mr Williams

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council

SECOND STAGE CONSULTATION

Please find enclosed Cottered and Throcking Parish Council's Second Stage Consultation submission with regard to the Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council draft recommendations.

On behalf of Cottered and Throcking Council

Yours sincerely

Enc. Second Stage Consultation Submission by Cottered and Throcking Parish Council

By email 26th July 2018

Hard copy posted 26th July 2018

COTTERED and THROCKING PARISH COUNCIL

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

Second Stage Consultation Submission by Cottered and Throcking Parish Council

To East Hertfordshire District Council

July 2018

(1) The strongly held belief of Cottered and Throcking Parish Council (CTPC) is that the draft recommendation of East Herts District Council (EHDC) in respect of Area A is ill-considered, unjustified, inappropriate and simply wrong. Equally strongly held is its belief that the process by which EHDC has arrived at this draft recommendation is opaque and defective.

(2) We have found absolutely no indication that the views expressed and submissions made by CTPC and by other local organisations and individual residents have been assessed against the criteria set out in published guidance or weighed against opposing views and submissions. This is certainly not for want of trying on our part. When we queried this with your Electoral Services Officer (John Williams) he directed us to the minutes of meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (17 April) and of the Executive (24 April). Those minutes contain no trace of any material discussion or comparison to validate their draft recommendation. Nor had Mr. Williams made any recommendation (with or without reasons) which might simply be adopted at those meetings. The source of and justification for the draft recommendation are wholly unclear at that stage. We also watched the webcast of your Council meeting (16 May). At that meeting the responsible councillor did no more than refer to some aspects of published guidance with which the draft recommendation was not inconsistent. There was certainly, as before, no discussion or assessment of evidence. That seems to us a very low standard to set when considering whether to adopt a draft recommendation, particularly when a considerable body of evidence has been provided by respondents which may justify a different draft recommendation.

(3) We attach as Appendix 1 a print-out of the exchange of emails on these subjects between EHDC and our Councillor Colin Bayles. These make clear that we have by no means waited until now to bring these concerns to your attention and that we have not had satisfactory answers to our questions.

(4) For clarity, we accept that your Electoral Services Officer (John Williams) reported consultation responses fully and accurately. He did not make a recommendation, presumably because he was not invited to do so.

(5) The methods used to make local organisations and residents aware of the review and then of the draft recommendation - for instance a small batch of leaflets delivered to the local Rector - were far from thorough and were certainly ineffective to judge from door-to-door visits made and repeated by our councillors. The methods used to encourage and collect responses were defective - for instance a website process which was difficult to access and understand and which frequently failed.

COTTERED and THROCKING PARISH COUNCIL

(6) Please be aware that in preparing to give our views on the draft recommendation, our councillors have within the last week or so again visited and spoken to residents in Parkside and on the new development. Several were unaware of the review and the draft recommendation – this underlines what we have said above about EHDC's failure genuinely to encourage local input. None supported the draft recommendation – this is consistent with what we reported to you in our earlier submission. It also justifies our reminding you of published guidance that attention is to be paid to the views of residents in the area potentially to be moved from one council's area to another. Mr. Williams confirmed, when asked by our Councillor Colin Bayles, that the weight to be given to the views of any particular respondent was a matter for EHDC members but that he intended to highlight in his report the views of residents in Area A. Sadly but unmistakably, CTPC has found no indication in your minutes or elsewhere that your members attributed any weight whatsoever to the express views of Area A residents sent direct to you and/or as collected and reported by us.

(7) We noted that during your council meeting (16 May), EHDC members who are also members of Bishops Stortford Town Council announced that they would not speak about the proposed re-positioning of the Bishops Stortford/Thorley boundary, presumably in case they might be thought biased. In contrast, East Herts and County Councillor Jeff Jones, whose enthusiasm for subsuming Parkside and the new development into Buntingford has long been well known, spoke in support of the Buntingford draft recommendation but without explaining why. Whilst we do not presume to comment on the correctness of this or otherwise from a procedural point of view, it has certainly not helped to convince us that EHDC was determined to see our feeling and the feelings of area A residents taken into account. We regret to say that our own East Herts ward councillor, in spite of our repeated requests that he ensure EHDC heard and understood our position, spoke only to welcome and congratulate your new chairman.

(8) On 30th June 2017 our Councillor Colin Bayles had what seemed a very useful meeting with your Chief Executive Liz Watts and your Legal Services Manager Victoria Clothier. It was explained to him exactly which published guidance would inform the review process and where to find it. It was also suggested that it would be appropriate to look at examples of the process in practice and the decisions made, particularly in reviews carried out recently in South Cambridgeshire and St. Edmundsbury. In making its previous submission CTPC took great care to study and understand all this guidance and to show how it should be applied appropriately in the circumstances. It also examined the South Cambridgeshire and St. Edmundsbury reviews, set out for your council the respects in which the circumstances of those reviews reflected or differed from the circumstances of the Buntingford review and demonstrated where the decisions in those reviews did or did not amount to powerful precedents for a decision in the Buntingford review. We attach as Appendix 2 a print-out of the exchange of emails about this between Victoria Clothier and our Councillor Colin Bayles.

(9) As far as we can tell this time and effort were entirely wasted. We might in due course have to accept that your council was not persuaded by this substantial part of our submission but we certainly find it wholly unacceptable that, as far as we can ascertain, what it contained was not analysed or weighed against other factors seen by other respondents as supporting the draft recommendation now made by your council.

COTTERED and THROCKING PARISH COUNCIL

(10) When the review process was already well advanced and in the light of the draft recommendation which by then seemed likely to be adopted, you proposed a corresponding re-positioning of the district council ward and county council division boundaries. Our understanding of the relevant guidance is that these should have been proposed and considered at and from the outset of the review as part and parcel of the parish/town council boundary proposal.

(11) In the view of CTPC the draft recommendation adopted is wrong and the process by which it has been reached is wrong. Such is the strength of public feeling in our communities that we may feel duty-bound to use all available mechanisms to challenge the process and the recommendation.

Signed

Chairman Cottered & Throcking Parish Council

Date

26th July 2018

Appendix 1

Re: Community Governance Review - Buntingford Town Council

Colin Bayles

Reply

Williams John (John.Williams@eastherts.gov.uk)

Watts Liz (Liz.Watts@eastherts.gov.uk)

23/05/18

John Williams

Thank you.

Colin Bayles

From: Williams John <John.Williams@eastherts.gov.uk>

Sent: 22 May 2018 16:57

To: 'Colin Bayles'

Cc: Watts Liz

Subject: RE: Community Governance Review - Buntingford Town Council

Dear Councillor Bayles,

Thank you for your e-mail.

As mentioned below the recommendations to the Council arose from discussion at the meeting of the Executive on 24 April, which meeting in turn took into account the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 April.

I therefore attach for your information the draft minutes of those two meetings. Items 434 (Overview and Scrutiny Committee) and 455 (Executive) refer.

Best regards,

John Williams

Electoral Services Officer

Direct Dial: 01279 502147

East Herts Council

Wallfields

Pegs Lane

Hertford

SG13 8EQ
john.williams@eastherts.gov.uk
www.eastherts.gov.uk

Please note my working days are Monday and Tuesday
If the matter is urgent please contact and copy in jessica.brucher@eastherts.gov.uk who works from
Wednesday to Friday.

Sent: 21 May 2018 13:09
To: Williams John; Watts Liz
Subject: Re: Community Governance Review -Buntingford Town Council

21/05/18

John Williams

I do not suggest that views expressed and submissions made were reported less than fully and accurately to councillors. What I really need to know is how (through whatever committee or otherwise) the recommendation was arrived at.

I may not dispute the validity of the rather few facts stated in support of the recommendation (as recited in the full council meeting) nor that on those facts the recommendation is consistent with guidance.

On the other hand I have not seen or heard any analysis and weighing by the council of the facts, guidance, precedents and reasoning set out in our submission and others which may justify a conclusion that the council's recommendation is more consistent with the guidance or in some relevant respect better than our proposal (namely that the boundary should stay where it is).

Where may I find that?

Colin Bayles (Cottered and Throcking PC)

From: Williams John <John.Williams@eastherts.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 May 2018 15:49
To: 'Colin Bayles'
Subject: RE: Community Governance Review -Buntingford Town Council

Dear Councillor Bayles,

Thank you for your e-mails below. As you have mentioned, the Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council was considered by East Herts Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 April and the Executive on 24 April.

The Executive took into account all relevant information including the responses received to the initial consultation and the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and made

recommendations to the Council for its consideration when agreeing the draft recommendations of the Community Governance Review.

The Executive's recommendations were that the area between the A10 bypass and Ermine Street to the north of Park Farm Industrial Estate (currently in Cottered Parish) should be transferred to Buntingford Town Council, but that the land occupied by Buntingford Business Park (currently in Aspenden Parish) should not.

As you know, the Council met yesterday (16 May) to agree the draft recommendations for the review. The Council endorsed the recommendations of the Executive in this regard. You may view the report and accompanying documents considered by the Council meeting on the EHDC website at <http://democracy.eastherts.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=158&Mid=3147&J=1> (item 10b refers).

However this does not represent the final outcome of the review. The Council's draft recommendations will now be subject to a further round of public consultation and all comments received will be considered before the final decision is made in October 2018. I will be writing next week to interested parties, including Cottered and Throcking Parish Council, to notify them of the Council's draft recommendations and to invite their further comments during this second round of consultation which will continue until 27 July 2018.

Best regards,

John

John Williams
Electoral Services Officer
Direct Dial: 01279 502147
East Herts Council
Wallfields
Pegs Lane
Hertford
SG13 8EQ
john.williams@eastherts.gov.uk
www.eastherts.gov.uk

From: Colin Bayles
Sent: 16 May 2018 23:03
To: Williams John
Subject: Fw: Community Governance Review -Buntingford Town Council

16/05/18

John Williams

A few minutes after sending the email below, I thought of looking at the webcast of this evening's council meeting and the agenda for it. For the first time I saw the draft recommendation, which seemed barely influenced by the consultation responses and submissions let alone based on them. I then watched while the draft recommendation was endorsed unanimously by the council after Councillor Jeff Jones had spoken in support of it.

Please explain what happens next and what opportunities we have to influence or challenge it.

Thank you.

Colin Bayles (Cottered PC)

From: Colin Bayles
Sent: 16 May 2018 18:30
To: Williams John
Subject: Community Governance Review -Buntingford Town Council

16/05/18

John Williams

You have kindly provided our PC with the schedule of responses and a covering report summarising those responses. You have said that these documents will be reported to two council committees (both in April) and that they will discuss the review. You then mention that the draft recommendations are scheduled to be agreed at the council meeting on 16th May (today). Where and when have these draft recommendations been generated? You have not referred to recommendations earlier, only to a summary of responses. The recommendations were not put to the April committees, from what you say, but they will be put to today's council meeting. Were they generated by the April committees? Or by you between the April committees and today's council meeting?

Should we not have seen draft recommendations as soon as they were available?

Of course, I may have got hold of the wrong end of the stick but none of my PC colleagues nor our clerk have better or different information. Please will you explain?

Thank you

Colin Bayles (Cottered PC)

Appendix 2

RE: Cottered and Throcking (Civil) Parish Boundary with
Buntingford

Watts Liz

Reply

Dear Mr Bayler

The leader of the council has forwarded your e-mail to me, having received it from Oliver Heald. I am pleased to be able to reply directly.

District Councils were given the responsibility to carry out community governance reviews in the Local Government Involvement in Health Act 2007. In general, they tend to be undertaken where there has been, or is predicted to be, a change in population, or local issues which impact current governance arrangements. The council committed to undertake a community governance review of Buntingford's boundary last year, although this review has not yet started. (Any change would not come into place until the next parish elections in 2019).

I would like to reassure you that the review will be independent and that the views of Cottered will be considered alongside those of Buntingford. Residents, local organisations and other interested parties will be consulted and all views will be taken into account. East Herts council has no views either way about whether the boundary should be changed - the answer will be determined by the consultation process itself and the views of local people.

If you would like the opportunity to discuss the review, please do not hesitate to fix some time with my PA, Jo Voorncliffe, and I will be happy to go through the process with you and address any concerns you may have.

Yours sincerely

Liz

Liz Watts
Chief Executive
East Herts Council
T: 01992531650
M: 07994 549076
@ceeasthertsdc

RE: Cottered and Throcking (Civil) Parish Boundary with
Buntingford

Watts Liz

Reply

You

No problem Mr Bayles

I'll wait to hear from you.

Best

Liz

Liz Watts
Chief Executive
East Herts Council
T: 01992531450
M: 07988 543078
@easthertsdc

From: Colin Bayles
Sent: 22 May 2017 16:46
To: Watts Liz
Subject: Re: Cottered and Throcking (Civil) Parish Boundary with Buntingford

22/05/17

Liz Watts

Thank you for your email.

We have a parish council meeting tomorrow evening. I will report what you have said to my colleagues and I expect they will ask me to take up your offer of a discussion.

Colin Bayles

Re: Community Governance Review : Buntingford

Colin Bayles

Reply

Clothier Victoria

30/06/17

Victoria Clothier

Thank you.

Colin Bayles

From: Clothier Victoria
Sent: 30 June 2017 12:02
To:
Cc: Watts Liz
Subject: Community Governance Review : Buntingford

Dear Colin

Further to your request I write to confirm that you attended the council's offices this morning to meet with myself and Liz Watts in respect of the above matter.

As discussed, the process in relation to the CGR will be transparent and engaging with opportunities for us to present submissions at various stages. It was confirmed that the process will not commence before September 2017, with a drop down date being April 2018.

Further information can be obtained from the CLG Guidance on Community Governance Reviews. For a more specific application of the process in practice you can look at the CGR carried out by South Cambs and St Edmundsbury on their respective websites. You also have the CGR flowchart from the Association of Electoral Administrators.

If you require a presence from the council to discuss any queries in respect of this at a PC meeting then please let us know.

Many thanks

Regards

Victoria

Victoria Clothier

Legal Services Manager
Legal and Democratic Services

Draft Law 1137 02/10/05
March 27/01 01/2004

For: John Doe
Watkins Street and
Hwy 100 1000

encl.

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council - Second stage consultation responses

No.	Channel	Postcode	Age range	Connection	Buntingford/Cottered - Do you agree that the parish boundary between Buntingford and Cottered should be changed so that the area between the A10 bypass and Ermine Street to the north of Park Farm Industrial Estate, including Parkside and the new housing development known as 'The Maples', is transferred from Cottered Parish Council to Buntingford Town Council? (& comments/reasons)	District Ward boundaries - If the above changes to the parish boundary go ahead, do you agree that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England should be asked to change the relevant District Ward boundaries where necessary to align them with the revised parish boundaries? (& comments/reasons)	Buntingford/Aspenden - Do you agree that the area occupied by Buntingford Business Park should remain within Aspenden Parish and that no change should be made to the parish boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden? (& comments/reasons)	Do you have any other comments on the parish boundary or on the arrangements for town/parish governance in the area?
1	Webform	SG9 9SS	35-49	Local resident	No The reason for my response is simple, as a resident of the affected area I can testify that absolutely no communication, information or otherwise has been received from Buntingford Town Council detailing why the proposed parish boundary change would be beneficial to the affected residents. This lack of communication and/or transparency would suggest a contemptuous attitude towards the views and wishes of residents in the affected area. In real world terms, if the proposed boundary change were to take effect, I feel that the only real beneficiary, at least in a financial sense, would be Buntingford Town Council and that the affected residents, as well as the residents of the Cottered and Throcking Parish as a whole and the Parish Council body will lose out. Incorporating this area within the Buntingford boundary will not add to the social cohesion of residents, as residents of the new estates (and some not so new) already within this boundary are seen as outsiders and ne'er-do-wells by some. Remaining in the Cottered and Throcking Parish gives us an identity as being a separate entity and a social cohesion within this satellite community that can only be found in villages and hamlets. Just ask any villager whether they want to be absorbed into the nearest town!	Don't know	No	
2	Webform	SG9 9RX	50-64	Local resident	No The Buntingford Council have not wanted this area within their control until the new housing estate was built and are depriving a smaller Council of funds to improve their services. The grass verge opposite the estate is not maintained and overgrown and makes it difficult to see our road onto Ermine Street. The move will increase our taxes	Because I do not agree with the change to the parish boundaries proposed	Yes This is all about a revenue chiding exercise by Buntingford Council and increases our taxes.	
3	Webform	HP4 1RS	65-75	Other - owners of land that is in the proposed boundary change	Yes With the development of land north of the Park Farm estate it more naturally should be managed by Buntingford Town Council, and its extension to Parkside follows that extension.	Representation should follow the proposed change.	Yes The closeness of Aspenden to Buntingford means that Buntingford Business Park can rightly be represented by Aspenden	None
4	Webform	SG9 9RT	50-64	Local resident	No The Maples is joining Buntingford, however Parkside does not. Although our Post Code is the same as Parkside we are separate from them. However, none of us have the same benefits as Buntingford residents, eg street lighting so why should we have to pay the same high rates. We want to remain part of Cottered Parish.	We don't want it to change at all.	Don't know	
5	Webform	SG9 9RT	50-64	Local resident	No There is absolutely no necessity to combine the area between the A10 and Ermine Street to Buntingford Town Council. We will not receive any benefit, only a higher cost.		Yes	
6	Webform	SG9 9DR	65-75	Local resident	Yes The properties are nearer to Buntingford and will be affected by any decisions taken by BTC. It makes sense to use the by pass as the new boundary	Same as above	Don't know	Web Using the by pass as the new boundary to Buntingford leaves them out but they are nearer Buntingford than Aspenden and will be affected by any development etc in Buntingford.

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council - Second stage consultation responses

No.	Channel	Postcode	Age range	Connection	Buntingford/Cottered - Do you agree that the parish boundary between Buntingford and Cottered should be changed so that the area between the A10 bypass and Ermine Street to the north of Park Farm Industrial Estate, including Parkside and the new housing development known as The Maples, is transferred from Cottered Parish Council to Buntingford Town Council? (& comments/reasons)	District Ward Boundaries - If the above changes to the parish boundary go ahead, do you agree that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England should be asked to change the relevant District Ward boundaries where necessary to align them with the revised parish boundaries? (& comments/reasons)	Buntingford/Aspenden - Do you agree that the area occupied by Buntingford Business Park should remain within Aspenden Parish and that no change should be made to the parish boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden? (& comments/reasons)	Do you have any other comments on the parish boundary or on the arrangements for town/parish governance in the area?	
7	Webform	SG9 9QD	50-64	Local resident	No The review is unnecessary and not broadly supported by residents in Cottered Parish including those new residents in Area A - it therefore makes a mockery of a democratic society if these changes were approved. Changing the boundary would adversely affect Cottered Parish who would be deprived of much needed funds from the new home bonus, which is suspect is the real driver being this proposal. Perhaps Buntingford Town Council should be asked if they believe this proposal should be approved IF the new home bonus relevant to the current approved housing plans in Area A were to be given to Cottered Parish. These funds are vital to support the Parish of Cottered in their much needed plans for traffic calming measures along the A 507.	No	Yes The proposed boundary review is unnecessary and not broadly supported		
8	Webform	SG9 9AA	35-49	Local resident	Yes The Maples sit at the Top of Buntingford High Street so for all purposes is within Buntingford. For shopping and Schools and Medical the Residents would use Buntingford Services so it's only right they contribute to our Towns Budget.	Yes It would just make sense.	No The same as The Maples. It's part of our Town and despite there's no residents isn't the point. It would benefit the town in relation to income in Tax. Those working there recognise being in Buntingford and it all helps in making our Town more Community minded.		
9	Webform	SG9 9SS	65-75	Local resident	No Lower Council Tax, if remaining in Cottered Parish Council. Cannot see any benefits in changing. Discount on hire of Cottered village hall.	No No benefit from changing	Yes Cannot see any benefits in changing.	We would be happier that parish boundary and town/parish governance remain as they are now.	
10	Webform	SG9 9SL	50-64	Local resident	No I think it is interesting to note that when the A10 by-pass was built many years ago, it was suggested this land be moved to Buntingford Town Council, but nothing was done about it then! Now, many years later, and with the reality of a large, new housing development (The Maples) being built on this land, Buntingford Town Council have become greedy and want to transfer the area to gain financially from it.	Don't know	Yes I see no reason why it is necessary to change.		
11	Webform	SG9 9SS	50-64	Local resident	No Why should it move and I am made to pay more in council tax? It works perfectly well as it is!	No Because I do not agree with any changes	Don't know		
12	Webform	SG9 9RT	50-64	Local resident	No We have close links with cottered, it has been our parish for as long as we have lived here. Married in the parish and use it's facilities (i.e. Guide camp, pub and village hall) and participate in events regularly. An increase in council tax and loss of subsidy @ the village hall would be a financial loss to us. We are proud to be a part of the parish and would like to remain so.	No I don't see the need to change any boundaries	Don't know Don't know	It is for the residents in Aspenden to comment.	
13	Webform	SG9 9QX	65-75	Local resident	No This site has been part of our Parish for Hundreds of Years, this development would have provided a new dynamic environment that would have energized new social boundaries within the community. It would appear that statements have been made that the only interest that Buntingford Town has, is the finances that it will bring them, nothing with regard to the heritage.	No A democratic process has not been followed, with the significant number of objections outweighing those for the proposal in the first consultation all these were totally ignored. The current residents at Redrow have not been consulted nor in the majority know anything about the process, as with Thorley it appears that EHDC are just bullying those Parishes into submission, due to the representation on EHDC by the appropriate Town councils. Was there any declaration of interest at the vote in the Chambers?	No	This was just used as a smoke screen to capture the main Financial prize. Surely BTC should have an interest in this area, as its one of the biggest areas for employment in the area.	The publicity for both parts of the consultation process has been a trial sham with none of those affected residents either having been spoken to or received any printed matter on the subject.

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council - Second stage consultation responses

No.	Channel	Postcode	Age range	Connection	Buntingford/Cottered - Do you agree that the parish boundary between Buntingford and Cottered should be changed so that the area between the A10 bypass and Ermine Street to the north of Park Farm Industrial Estate, including Parkside and the new housing development known as The Maples, is transferred from Cottered Parish Council to Buntingford Town Council? (& comments/reasons)	District Ward Boundaries - If the above changes to the parish boundary go ahead, do you agree that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England should be asked to change the relevant District Ward boundaries where necessary to align them with the revised parish boundaries? (& comments/reasons)	Buntingford/Aspenden - Do you agree that the area occupied by Buntingford Business Park should remain within Aspenden Parish and that no change should be made to the parish boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden? (& comments/reasons)	Do you have any other comments on the parish boundary or on the arrangements for town/parish governance in the area?
14	Letter	SG9 9RT		Local resident	No Having looked at the initial report regarding the proposed boundary changes, it seems to me that the majority of those resident in the area which the town council wants to annex are opposed to the idea. According to East Herts Council's website, statutory guidance sets out the criteria to be used when arriving at recommendations. Our household is included in the community in the area and many of our connections and interests are centred outside the area. Although we use some of the facilities in Buntingford, this does not mean that in all cases they are more important to us than the facilities which we use elsewhere. Furthermore, the effectiveness of community governance is not affected only by its proximity to the area governed. Whilst not wanting to denigrate the good intentions of the town council in arranging various activities and events, many of these are not ones which we would choose to attend and thus they are not of direct benefit to us. It is also noteworthy that a modest field has been left undeveloped between the Redrow development and Parkside. Was this not intended to represent an area of "no-man's land" between communities? And would it not help to prevent urban sprawl? If one glances briefly at the map, the proposed annexation looks a peculiarly long spike into the countryside! The first round of public consultation on the town council's proposal showed that a majority of respondents were opposed to the town council's proposals. Why is East Herts Council still proposing to make the changes and probably disregard the wishes of the majority of residents?			
15	E-mail			Local resident	No My husband and I are very disappointed that you have not taken the views or even looked at our views and concerns to the above. We live at Parkside 1 mile outside of Buntingford and have really enjoyed being part of Cottered Parish. We have felt very much part of the Cottered community and regularly receive updates as to what is going on in Cottered. We moved to Parkside because we wanted to feel part of a small village community with rural values and we love using all Cottered facilities throughout the year. Buntingford is now a very fast growing town and is seeing alot off new developments popping up and our small road of 10 houses and Redrow should not have a huge impact on Buntingfords finances. Buntingford Parish is already receiving an enormous amount of money from these new developments and this is fantastic for the town but have you considered what effect this is going to have on the surrounding villages if we were to become part of Buntingford. Cottered needs Parkside and the Redrow development to sustain the village and what it has to offer. Cottered needs growth to develop its small community and village and without this these small villages will eventually die. Please look into the above and reconsider Parkside and Redrow joining Buntingford Parish.			

Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council - Second stage consultation responses

No.	Channel	Postcode	Age range	Connection	Buntingford/Cottered - Do you agree that the parish boundary between Buntingford and Cottered should be changed so that the area between the A10 bypass and Ermine Street to the north of Park Farm Industrial Estate, including Parkside and the new housing development known as The Maples, is transferred from Cottered Parish Council to Buntingford Town Council? (& comments/reasons)	District Ward Boundaries - If the above changes to the parish boundary go ahead, do you agree that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England should be asked to change the relevant District Ward boundaries where necessary to align them with the revised parish boundaries? (& comments/reasons)	Buntingford/Aspenden - Do you agree that the area occupied by Buntingford Business Park should remain within Aspenden Parish and that no change should be made to the parish boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden? (& comments/reasons)	Do you have any other comments on the parish boundary or on the arrangements for town/parish governance in the area?
16	E-mail			Local resident	<p>No</p> <p>My view is: I can't see any point or advantage in this proposal, why change the boundary that has been in place for how many years(?). Isn't Buntingford being built up enough as it is over the past several years bring in people that do not appreciate the meaning of living in a semi rural community! Would not mind if they lived as a community but, they do not think of their surrounding neighbours and environment and want to live as if they live on a council estate in "Tottenham" bringing all their ways with them with them. Being loud, argumentative, rudeness, and not taking in to consideration the community! There are more robberies now along with every thing else. When you walk down Ermine Street into the town the smell of drugs in the air is rife. The town is too small to sustain a community now growing so much that doctors' surgeries are so over subscribed to get an appointment well I don't have to say any more! I would rather be linked with Cottered Council than Buntingford. How much more do you want to destroy the Historic Market Town of Buntingford. Give me Cottered every time. I write this email with sadness.</p>			
101	Letter by e-mail				Yes	Yes	See letter of 28.06.2018 (doc. 101)	
102	Letter by e-mail				No		See letter of 26.07.2018 (doc. 102)	