

Public Document Pack

Mid Devon District Council

Electoral Review Committee

Monday, 7 November 2022 at 5.30 pm
Phoenix Chamber

Next ordinary meeting
Date Not Specified

Please Note: This meeting will take place at Phoenix House and members of the Public and Press are able to attend via Zoom. If you are intending to attend in person please contact the committee clerk in advance, in order that numbers of people can be appropriately managed in physical meeting rooms

[Join Zoom Meeting Here](#)

Meeting ID: 886 2847 7276
Passcode: 222352

One tap mobile
08002605801,,88628477276#,,,,*222352# United Kingdom Toll-free
08003582817,,88628477276#,,,,*222352# United Kingdom Toll-free

Dial by your location
0 800 260 5801 United Kingdom Toll-free
0 800 358 2817 United Kingdom Toll-free
0 800 031 5717 United Kingdom Toll-free

Membership

Cllr R J Chesterton
Cllr S J Clist
Cllr Mrs F J Colthorpe
Cllr D R Coren
Cllr R M Deed
Cllr C J Eginton
Cllr R Evans
Cllr Mrs E J Lloyd
Cllr R F Radford
Cllr L D Taylor
Cllr B G J Warren
Cllr J Wright

AGENDA

Members are reminded of the need to make declarations of interest prior to any discussion which may take place

- 1 **Apologies**
To receive any apologies for absence.
- 2 **Public Question Time**
To receive any items relating to items on the agenda from members of the public and replies thereto.

Note: A maximum of 30 minutes is allowed for this item.
- 3 **Declarations of Interest under the Code of Conduct**
To record any interests on agenda matters.
- 4 **Minutes of the previous meeting (To Follow)**
To consider whether to approve the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting held on 1st November 2022.
- 5 **Community Governance Review (JM) (Pages 3 - 60)**
Report from the Director of Business Improvement and Operations.

Stephen Walford
Chief Executive
Friday, 28 October 2022

Meeting Information

From 7 May 2021, the law requires all councils to hold formal meetings in person. The Council will enable all people to continue to participate in meetings via Zoom.

If you want to ask a question or speak, email your full name to Committee@middevon.gov.uk by no later than 4pm on the day before the meeting. This will ensure that your name is on the list to speak and will help us ensure that you are not missed. Notification in this way will ensure the meeting runs as smoothly as possible.

If you would like a copy of the Agenda in another format (for example in large print) please contact Andrew Seaman on: E-Mail: aseaman@middevon.gov.uk

Public Wi-Fi is available in all meeting rooms

1.

ELECTORAL REVIEW COMMITTEE 7 NOVEMBER 2022

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2022

Cabinet Member(s): Leader of the Council, Bob Deed
Responsible Officer: Jill May, Returning Officer / Director of Business Improvement and Operations

Reason for Report: To enable Members to reach a decision in respect of any recommended proposals for consideration for the second consultation stage.

Recommendation: That the Electoral Review Committee reviews submissions from the second public consultation and recommends to full Council final recommendations for changes to parish boundaries and the numbers of parish councillors in each parish council.

Financial Implications: £45k has been set aside in the budget to undertake this review.

Budget and Policy Framework: None directly arising from this report.

Legal Implications: Section 81 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 provides that it is for the Council to decide the terms of reference of any community governance review.

Risk Assessment: Local democracy and representation is impeded.

Equality Impact Assessment: No equality issues have been highlighted in this report.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: A community governance review supports and facilitates local democracy and local representation.

Impact on Climate Change: No climate change issues have been highlighted in this report.

1.0 Introduction/Background

1.1 The Electoral Review of Mid Devon Parish Councils (CGR 2022) commenced on 15 December 2021, with the first stage of the consultation period, which concluded on 28 February 2022. In total, 77 'submissions' were received during that period. The Electoral Review Committee (ERC) received all the submissions and a corresponding spreadsheet in advance of the meetings, which were considered at two 'informal' meetings on 5 and 16 May 2022. Two informal and one formal meeting of the ERC were held in May and 6 June respectively.

1.2 Members were also advised that under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Local Government Boundary Commission has already decided to effect changes in respect of Crediton,

Cullompton and Tiverton Town Councils. As a consequence, the current CGR does not include those areas.

- 1.3 On 6 July approval was sought from Council for the first set of proposals put forward by the ERC and to move on to conduct a second public consultation. This was agreed. The second consultation took place from 23 August to 23 October 2022. In total 86 'submissions' were received during that period.
- 1.4 Following on from the closure of the second public consultation consideration of the responses together with the initial proposals from the first consultation are raised in this report. These which will need to be formally considered by the Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2022 and if more time is required then subsequently at a further meeting on 7 November 2022. The submissions have been set out in the attached summaries – Appendices A,B and C.

2.0 Review of Number of Parish Councillors

- 2.1 Part of the CGR involves a review of the number of parish councillors for each parish and parish ward (where applicable). The attached Table sets out the details of the existing numbers – Appendix D. There have been some comments in the second stage consultation on the proposals put forward from the 6 July meeting which will also need to be reviewed.

3.0 The Next Steps

- 3.1 The ERC is invited to consider the second stage submissions and to put forward final recommendations to full Council which will meet on 1 December 2022.

Contact for more Information: Jill May, Director of Business Improvement and Operations (jmay@middevon.gov.uk)

List of Background Papers: Consultation responses

List of Appendices: Summary of discussions on submissions received – Appendix and Existing number of parish councillors – Appendix

Mid Devon District Council Community Governance Review (CGR) 2022

Electoral review of parish areas

Outline

The Council commenced its review of parish council boundaries and the number of parish councillors for each parish in December 2021. The First Stage of public consultation, seeking views from a wide range of groups and individuals, including all the parish councils within the Mid Devon District Council area, elected representatives and others that had an interest, was concluded at the end of February 2022. As a result, the Council received 77 submissions, expressing their views ranging from changes to existing parish council boundaries to making no changes. A number of submissions included very detailed reasoning for change and maps to support their submissions.

Electoral Review Committee (ERC)

The ERC members considered all the submissions and ‘met’ on three occasions to discuss each one and the summary below sets out the Committee’s draft proposals for the second stage of consultation, which will commence in August 2022.

Areas that are excluded from the review are: CREDITON, CULLOMPTON and TIVERTON Town Councils. The boundaries and the corresponding number of councillors for each Town Council, has been determined by The Local Government Boundary Commission for England on its conclusion of the District Council ward boundary electoral review, published in January 2021.

At the conclusion of the second consultation period, the ERC will recommend its draft proposals to the Council.

Second Stage Consultation

Having considered all submissions received by the end of February, the ERC is now seeking views on its draft proposals for the future structure of parish boundaries and where appropriate, outlined its reasons for such proposals.

1. During the first consultation stage, no submissions were received from a number of parish areas and as such, the draft proposals for those parishes have been listed as “NO CHANGE”. However, the **ERC would still consider any representations for change and/or receive support for the draft proposals from parish councils and other interested persons.**
2. Those parishes are listed below:

Bampton; Bickleigh; Bow; Brushford; Butterleigh; Cadbury; Chawleigh; Cheriton Fitzpaine; Clannaborough; Clayhanger; Colebrooke; Cruwys Morchard; Culmstock; Down St Mary; Eggesford; Hemyock; Hockworthy; Holcombe Rogus; Huntsham; Kennerleigh; Lapford; Poughill; Sampford Peverell; Stockleigh English; Stockleigh Pomeroy; Templeton; Thorverton;

Uplowman; Upton Hellions; Washford Pyne; Wembworthy; Woolfardisworthy; Zeal Monachorum.

3. At the same time, a number of submissions were received requesting “NO CHANGE” to parish boundaries, which are listed below:

Clayhidon; Coldridge; Copplestone; Morchard Bishop; Newton St Cyres; Nymet Rowland; Oakford; Puddington; Shobrooke; Washfield.

4. A number of submissions were received from both parish councils and local residents requesting that certain parish council boundaries be changed, which are set out below:

Bradninch Town Council

The Town Council is currently made up of the Town Ward and Rural Ward. A proposal was submitted to that the two parish wards be set up a single ward. However, due to the fact that the Parliamentary Boundary runs through the Town Council area, it was an electoral requirement to keep the two parish wards as they exist. Given that the number of electors in the rural ward is only slightly over 1,000, the Town Council suggested that the number of councillors be set as

- i) Bradninch (Rural Ward) be reduced from 2 to 1
- ii) Bradninch (Town Ward) be increased from 10 to 11

Burlescombe

Whilst the parish council had submitted a response of no change to its boundaries, it had requested that the number of parish councillors be reduced from 9 to 7. However, following further information from the parish council it appears that some issues had arisen that this may now not be the case. The ERC has, therefore, decided that it would invite further comments for the Second Stage consultation.

Cheriton Bishop

A submission was received requesting that an area of land east of the existing parish boundary be included within the Cheriton Bishop boundary. However, the area of land concerned is within another local authority area and cannot therefore take place.

Crediton Hamlets

A number of submissions from individuals had been received with regard to the creation of a ‘Yeoford’ Parish, although no map specifying the potential boundary was submitted. As the Electoral Review Terms of Reference (ToR) does not include a provision for creating new parishes, this could not be considered.

[By way of explanation, the provision of creating new parishes under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIHA) 2007, was brought in to encourage the creation of new parishes in those areas that were un-parished. This is not the case in respect of Crediton Hamlet PC.]

The parish council also submitted a representation opposing the idea of a separate 'parish' for Yeoford. If the existing Yeoford parish ward was removed from their parish, leaving only Hookway, it would not be large enough in respect of the electorate to be a viable separate parish.

Therefore, the ERC takes the view that the Crediton Parish Council should remain a single parish.

However, given the number of electors within the Yeoford ward of the parish, it is **proposed that the number of parish councillors for that ward be increased from 5 to 7.**

Cruwys Morchard and Thelbridge (Normansland Village)

A submission was received concerning that the area was split by the two district ward boundaries of Sandford & Creedy ward, and Way ward. Under the new district ward boundaries that come into effect in May 2023, this would bring both areas into a single district ward (Way). However, the village still lies between both parishes (53 properties in Cruwys Morchard PC and 56 properties in Thelbridge PC). As such, the ERC would welcome the views from the parish councils and residents.

Hittisleigh

Following on from the first stage submission (no. 33) regarding the fringes of the parish boundary and subsequent comments considered by the ERC has agreed that further consultation should take place and the views of neighbouring parish councils be invited.

Kentisbeare

The parish council requested that Dulford Home Farm to Broad Road (Hunters Lodge) and Lower Kingsford – new road, be transferred to the parish boundary. However, this is not possible as these properties are within the local authority area of East Devon.

Loxbeare

Request for the parish to become part of Tiverton parish. As the boundaries for Tiverton Town Council have already been determined by the Local Government Boundary Commission, Loxbeare cannot be included. The proposal is to make no changes to the parish boundary.

Morebath

A submission was received suggesting that the parish should be merged with Bampton Parish Council. However, no formal representation from Bampton

Town Council has been received. As Morebath's only boundaries are with Bampton, it was agreed that this should be put forward for the 2nd Stage giving the opportunity for making any further representations from both councils and residents.

Sandford

The parish council submitted a proposal that "Knathorne" and "Rolestone" (on the boundary with Sandford and Morchard Bishop) to be included inside the Sandford Parish Boundary. As a consequence, Morchard Bishop Parish Council has consulted with the residents affected, who have all expressed their views that they wished to remain within their existing parish boundaries. The ERC has therefore concluded that there should be no change to the boundaries.

Stoodleigh

Two submissions were received concerning the boundaries of the parishes of Stoodleigh, Templeton and Washield, affected by the A361. Although it has a minimal effect, it was decided to seek further submissions at this consultation stage.

Halberton, Willand and Uffculme

The most complexed submissions related to those submitted by the parish councils of Halberton, Willand and Uffculme, plus a number of individual representations.

Halberton PC is geographically the largest of the three parishes and lies entirely within the District ward of Halberton. Uffculme PC is warded with the Village Ward in the District Ward of Lower Culm and the Ashill Ward in the District Ward of Upper Culm. Willand PC lies entirely within the District Ward of Lower Culm.

There is long history of disagreement concerning the boundaries between Halberton and Uffculme and Halberton and Willand, partly stoked by perceived difficulties in road communication brought about by the construction of the M5 motorway. This appears to have been exacerbated by the recent housing development at Lucombe Park situated on the outskirts of Uffculme village, but within Halberton parish.

Other concerns relating to the Mid Devon Business Park and Bidwell were also considered.

Therefore, the ERC proposed the following options for Halberton, Willand and Uffculme form part of the stage 2 public consultation:

Option 1 – Lucombe Park move from Halberton to Uffculme and the Mid Devon Business Park move from Halberton to Willand.

Option 2 – Option 1 (as set out above) together with the area north east of Bridwell Avenue be moved from Halberton to Uffculme.

Option 3 – Options 1 and 2 (as set out above) together with Hitchcocks.

The Council would seek to receive the views of both individuals and the parish councils.

5. Another important part of the CGR relates to the number of councillors to be elected to each parish council.

Listed below are those parishes that the ERC has proposed for consultation with the relative parish councils and to also invite all other parish councils to respond with any proposals for change:

- i) Bradninch (Rural Ward) be reduced from 2 to 1
- ii) Bradninch (Town Ward) be increased from 10 to 11
- iii) Burlescombe be reduced from 9 to 7
- iv) Cheriton Fitzpaine be reduced from 9 to 8
- v) Colebrooke be reduced from 9 to 7
- vi) Copplestone be increased from 7 to 9
- vii) Crediton Hamlets (Yeoford Ward) be increased from 5 to 7
- viii) Silverton (North Ward) be reduced from 2 to 1
- ix) Silverton (Village Ward) be increased from 9 to 10
- x) Willand be increased from 11 to 12

This page is intentionally left blank

Submission 2/1

Date: 23/08/2022 15:27:05 **Charles Sheldrick**

Comments: As Chair of Cheriton Fitzpaine Parish Council I am very disappointed that we have not had any formal notice of the proposal to reduce out number of Cllrs from 9 to 8. As we have had significant new building in and around the village I can see no justification for this. The lack of communication is typical of the way rural Parish Councils are treated by District and County Councils.

Submission 2/2

Date: 23/08/2022 15:50 **Denise Kingdon** Parish Clerk Cheriton Fitzpaine

Comments: On receiving the below email our Parish Council would like to let you know they are very concerned that we have not had a formal notice of the proposal to cut our numbers, particularly as our population is increasing. Please could you come back to me with an explanation I can pass on to the Parish Council. [Note: The Parish Review Consultant has responded to this enquiry]

Submission 2/3

Date: 23/08/2022 19:01:35 **Robert Evans** MDDC councillor

Comments: I would like to comment in the proposals for Halberton, Willand and Uffculme I believe option 3 makes perfect sense given past decisions that have been made and influenced by the community within Willand and Uffculme in relation to planning applications and decisions. Option 3 builds on community ownership and belonging and would help to remove the current frustrations felt by many within these villages set against the lack of involvement Halberton have had in past applications that had no effect what so ever within the Halberton community yet had and continues to have a direct impact of the lives of those within the two villages. An application for some 90 houses way eventually agreed after an appeal to an inspector, yet within his summary he clearly identified that the impact of construction and the facilities to be used would belong to Uffculme. The impact was so great that the section 106 had to be gifted to uffculme from Halberton, a nonsense in its self that this had to be gifted! All recent comment on planning applications within the identified area has been made by residents that are impacted m NOT A SINGLE comment has been received from any individual from Halberton as they are clearly not effected. Argument has been heard that is both dated and unrealistic in that Halberton PC feel aggrieved at the possibility of in their words "losing our land" yet the land in question sits some 5 Miles away from Halberton and the opposite side of the M5!! Common sense must prevail and we must not allow a small minority of individuals from a distant and unaffected community to have any influence on "if" , "how" or even when speculative applications are treated when the effects have no bearing whatsoever in the residents they represent and the section 106 funds could and have in the past been used in a way that have no benefit for those communities that are effected. Option Three please.

Submission 2/4

Date: 24/08/2022 08:04:23 **Angela Cheshire** Uffculme

Comments: IF the boundary involving Uffculme/Willand/Halberton cannot be the M5, THEN I think OPTION 3 should be adopted.

Submission 2/5

Date: 24/08/2022 16:47:06 **John Wescott** Bampton

Comments: Morebath. There is no need to change the current situation regarding adding Morebath to Bampton. As stated, Bampton did not suggest the change. A single Morebath resident, who was until recently on the Parish Council made the suggestion. There has not been any survey of the parish residents, or any reason explained why a change will benefit by joining with the neighbouring parish. Having lived in the parish far longer than the proposer of this idea, along with several other local residents oppose such an idea. Currently six council members run the council with the assistance of an excellent parish clerk. Such ideas split the community and so do not require further discussion.

Submission 2/6

Date: 25/08/2022 09:36:19 **Christopher Bell** Lurley

Comments: We live in the Loxbeare parish. I see that there was a proposal to make that part of Tiverton which, thankfully, was rejected on procedural grounds. Hopefully the status quo will survive unchanged during the rest of this process, but if we are threatened with amalgamation please can I request that we remain

separate. This is not an urban area!

Submission 2/7

Date: 27/08/2022 16:12:06 **Christopher Hudson** Hemyock

Comments: Merge parishes

Submission 2/8

Date: 27/08/2022 16:39:28 **Steve Wildey** Uffculme

Comments: I have lived in Uffculme for over 35 years and find it hard to understand how the land on both sides of the Uffculme straight and Bridwell Park are not part of Uffculme Parish but part of Halberton. Why should Halberton Parish have any say in what goes on miles away from their main community. Option 3 with the inclusion of Bridwell Park should sit within the Parish of Uffculme and contribute to it financially as well as being governed within the Uffculme Parish rules.

Submission 2/9

Date: 28/08/2022 10:35:55 **Jane Broom** Willand

Comments: Halberton, willand, Uffculme. Option 3 looks good but could extend the area east of road 3181 to divide between Uffculme and Willand parish, therefore making the 'Uffculme straight' more consistent, and within a parish near to them, rather than feeling like a satellite area.

Submission 2/10

Date: 28/08/2022 13:12:42 **Christine Scantlebury** Uffculme

Comments: I totally agree with Option 2 but think that Hitchcocks Business Park should be part of Willand.

Submission 2/11

Date: 02/09/2022 07:13:46 **Hilary Taylor** Sandford

Comments: I like be in Sandford and am concerned that the current Parish Council set up is much too large for our area. The council never have enough candidates for the 12 and are opted in. So I would like to suggest that we have a smaller council and one that is elected by the community. I feel strongly about this because I don't like the current council listen to or are representative of the community. There have been several issues raised, including road safety, which although the council talked about it, they did nothing to address the concerns raised. A smaller more representative council would be more effective. Also I am not sure how Parish Clerks are reviewed, but ours does need reviewing.

Submission 2/12

Date: 04/09/2022 08:11:52 **Steven McCulloch** Sandford

Comments: As a resident of Sandford parish, I would like to propose the parish council is reduced from 12 to 8. In the 7 years I've been in the village there has never been 12 councillors and therefore, they are always co-opted. The reduction would mean a proper democratic process to elect people that best represent the village.

Submission 2/13

Date: 05/09/2022 22:30:34 **Roy Keeling** Uffculme

Comments: I would like phase 3 please

Submission 2/14

Date: 05/09/2022 22:32:21 **Natalie Keeling** Uffculme

Comments: I would like phase three of the parish review please

Submission 2/15

Date: 07/09/2022 11:51 **Anthony Kidd** Uffculme

Comments: I would like to comment briefly on the Parish Review Consultation proposals - I am an Uffculme resident. I would like to support Option 3 relating to revision of the current Halberton and Uffculme parish boundaries. It makes complete sense to include the Lucombe Park development, both the recently built houses and those under construction, in Uffculme parish. These houses are contiguous to the village of Uffculme, and their inhabitants use Uffculme facilities - schools, surgery, shops, etc - and regard themselves as belonging to Uffculme. Bridwell Park and area should also become part of Uffculme parish. Its owners think of themselves as Uffculme residents, for example the Uffculme Show is held in Bridwell Park, and the park and

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

cafe is extensively used by Uffculme residents. The Hitchcocks and Langlands Business Estates are also naturally connected to Uffculme, and certainly not to Halberton, on the other side of the M5. It makes sense that parish boundaries reflect local realities, giving access to the relevant precept to enable Uffculme Parish Council to provide services to these areas, and allowing the Parish Council and the Uffculme community to make their views known on developments in these areas, which are of far more relevance to Uffculme than they are to Halberton inhabitants. The ecclesiastical parish boundaries were changed a few years ago to reflect these realities (and in fact transferred rather more land to Uffculme and Willand parishes I believe, which would be preferable - you will have access to these boundaries). I appreciate that it is potentially a simpler process to change the ecclesiastical boundaries, and that there is no direct relationship with the civil parish boundaries, but nevertheless I believe it is setting a useful precedent).

Submission 2/16

Date: 08/09/2022 10:13:31 **Nick Silk** Sandford

Comments: Sandford Parish Devon. Please reduce our council from 12 to 8. My reasons are as follows: 1. We need elected representation that have told us what their vision is and a little about their background and skill sets that make them suitable candidates for a parish councillor seat 2. Our present council backs away from consulting with the parish on key issues (e.g., a. SPC instigated a parking review with no input from the residents. b. They went ahead with Jubilee celebration plans, with no public consultation, which did not include a street party as most other villages in this area organised for their villagers. c. They did however, in February, end of COVID restrictions, hold a public meeting on a housing issue - Creedy 2. They could have held a Jubilee consultative meeting as well. 3. A smaller number of councillors will make council meetings more effective and hopefully lead to more villagers being involved in sub committees for the benefit of the whole village, 4. Less councillors will make it a lot less bureaucratic. The same items come back month after month with no one resolving them hence blocking critical time to expand on new ideas that would benefit the community. 5. Less councillors will make them more visible and more accountable as people will know who they are. 6. They will be elected rather than approved by the present council and co-opted as now.

Submission 2/17

Date: 09/09/2022 09:31:28 **Rachael Kneale** Uffculme

Comments: Out of the three proposals for the Halberton/Willand/Uffculme boundary review I would support option 3. The village of Uffculme is directly affected by what happens around both Langlands and Hitchcock's industrial estates, whereas Halberton is not impacted at all. There has been significant development to Hitchcock's, Langlands and Pleasant Streams over the last few years and local objections to recent development in these areas is testament to the negative impact they have had. Ideally the Halberton Parish Boundary should stop at the M5 and the areas that are east of the M5 should be given over to Willand and Uffculme Parishes, but option 3 goes part way to establishing this.

Submission 2/18

Date: 13/09/2022 14:44:56 **Miss Chellingsworth** Nymet Rowland

Comments: I strongly believe that Nymet Rowland should be merged with another area and not have its own PC. Having so few houses 14 and the PC being made up of several members of those households means that there is an inherent bias and automatic problem in this being run in a fair way given half the population are on it and half not! At times ridiculous decisions appear to be made such as one resident PC member not agreeing to pay an 80+ resident for his continual weekly upkeep of the church grounds using his own equipment and petrol - appalling! planning decisions although limited in their power appear to become too big an issue and focus and those in the incrowd sail through as members and those not, well, it can be seen on the planning portal how people behave. Removal of a PC for Nymet would solve these issues and make for a much happier community.

Submission 2/19

Date: 4/09/2022 22:09 **Richard Ward** Sandford

Comments: Thank you for providing us with this consultation opportunity. I have a number of proposals to put forward which I feel would improve the effectiveness of our and other parish councils: 1. Parish Name and area – Because they have been around for a while I think they should remain broadly similar in size and name. Keeping the names will help develop a sense of identity and belonging for residents. That is important to encourage a greater sense of community. 2. Size of the committee – Sandford parish council needs to have less delegates. It's too big, unwieldy and bureaucratic. No-one new will join because unless you bring 5 mates

with you at election time you won't be able to make a difference. I accept that there needs to be a balance between youth and experience. It is important to understand how the Council hierarchy works, but I think that can be enabled by my third suggestion. 3. Grouping Parishes for officer support – For Sandford Parish Council and others to flourish what we really need is more professional support. If say 6 parish councils clubbed together it would enable them to pay a professional wage to a full time, well-resourced Parish Clerk would high calibre applicants who could really spark community activity and involvement! A clerk properly supported by MDDC or DCC would help ensure that governance is not left to chance and enable parishes to share ideas. If the parish councils could share back office functions it would ensure they would have up to date arrangements to comply with GDPR and or child protection. By making sure the clerks were managed properly, trained and offered a real career it would attract people of the right calibre. It would enable and empower parish councillors to do their job, confident that they had proper back up. It would also ensure greater equity between areas in the level of engagement. The reason that many areas didn't engage with phase one is that they didn't know about it. If I hadn't got involved with a parking consultation I would have no idea this consultation was going on. 4. Social Capital – The current system relies on a sort of feudal system which works well if your parish attracts the right sort of community minded residents. Better professional support services should be enabling the building of social capital in the community. People are usually happy to rally around a good idea

Submission 2/20

Date: 29/09/2022 14:02:08 **Debbie Leigh** Uffculme

Comments: Hello, on behalf of Selgars Mill - a residential venue located at EX15 3DA on the 'Uffculme Straight' we would prefer to be in the parish of Uffculme rather than Halberton. We do a lot of community based work e.g having volunteers, and have good connections with the village of Uffculme. It seems an anomaly to be in the Halberton parish. We also have a major problem from an accessibility point of view as there is no footpath to Uffculme or Willand - hopefully a review of parish boundary's would also include the ability to walk to the village centre that one is located near to.

Submission 2/21

Date: 30/09/2022 00:04:04 **Robert Furmedge** Tiverton

Comments: Relating to Halberton, Willand and Uffculme options. Given there is a no change option - which I would prefer. Option 1 has some logic given that a) Lucombe Park residential is co-located and could be seen as an extension to Uffculme village and thus should be within Uffculme Parish. b) Mid Devon Business Park, could similarly be seen as an extension to the Willand industrial estate. It should be noted that Halberton footpath 35 should also be transferred to Willand should this option be selected. Option 2, I see no reason for proposal to be approved. There is no changes that have been made in this area that would indicate it would be better served by Uffculme parish council. Option 3, As I understand it, both Hitchcocks and Langlands Business Parks and Halberton PC have a long working relationship relating to planning applications and other matters, this appears to be working well and as such moving the boundary would mean building new relationships and upsetting the status quo for no obvious reasons. Summary, of the three options given. Option 1 is preferred, options 2 and 3 are strongly opposed.

Submission 2/22

Date: 30/09/2022 09:13:24 **John Hodge** Thorverton

Comments: I Think Thorverton Parish Council should stay as it is, it works well currently.

Submission 2/23

Date: 30/09/2022 10:00:19 **Pemmy Clapham** Colebrooke PC

Comments: Colebrooke Parish Council resolved at the meeting on 27th September to object to the proposed reduction in councillors from 9 to 7. Due to the size and dispersal of the area within the parish, the Council would like to keep to 9 councillors as we have representatives from the outlying hamlets.

Submission 2/24

Date: 30/09/2022 12:20:22 **Leslie Findlay** Holcombe PC

Comments: Holcombe Rogus Parish Council have discussed this matter and have no changes they wish to propose. They are satisfied with the number of Councillors we have and no issues with the boundaries.

Submission 2/25

Date: 01/10/2022 15:14:19 **Stefanie Disley** EX15 1DW

Comments: I support Uffculme Parish Council's submission to include Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks business park within the Parish Boundaries.

Submission 2/26

Date: 02/10/2022 08:23:53 **Richard Somerwill** Bickleigh

Comments: Bickleigh, North of the Exe is administered by the Tiverton West ward. Areas of debate include river management, traffic management on bridge, development of the Trout pub, the village playing field and PROW. However, it is very much overlooked and could easily be administered by Bickleigh's active Parish Council.

Submission 2/27

Date: 02/10/2022 08:40:06 **Trevor Emms** Uffculme

Comments: All at Treetops wish to register their whole hearted support for Uffculme Parish Council's reasons (contained in their submission to the Boundary Review Commission) to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme.

Submission 2/28

Date: 02/10/2022 18:03:48 **Kevin Woodward** Uffculme

Comments: I am happy that this review is happening- it makes sense that boundaries change to deal with modern administration requirements.

Submission 2/29

Date: 02/10/2022 18:52:02 **Kay Davey** Uffculme

Comments: In the boundary review - option 3, move all three roads/estates into uffculme parish

Submission 2/30

Date: 02/10/2022 19:06:59 **Tony Naylor** Uffculme

Comments: All boundaries should include roads, buildings or business's that have a direct impact on the village of Uffculme. I support option C

Submission 2/31

Date: 02/10/2022 21:03:24 **Kathryn Magurire** Craddock

Comments: Move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme

Submission 2/32

Date: 03/10/2022 07:18:53 **Henry Carew** Seckerleigh

Comments: Halberton parish boundaries should be left as they are. There is no compelling reason to hand parts of Halberton parish to either Willand or Uffculme.

Submission 2/33

Date: 03/10/2022 07:58:39 **Henry Carew** Seckerleigh

Comments: I wish to propose that the area covered by the post code EX16 4PJ, known as Seckerleigh, which includes 5 dwellings, be moved from Halberton Parish Council to Butterleigh Parish Council. Seckerleigh is situated far from Halberton and, being rural has very little in common with Halberton whilst Seckerleigh is close to and has much in common with Butterleigh.

Submission 2/34

Date: 03/10/2022 10:08:38 **Roger Norton** Uffculme

Comments: I support the "move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Ave and Hitchcocks to Uffculme"

Submission 2/35

Date: 03/10/2022 11:54:06 **Stephen Longley** Uffculme

Comments: Option 3 please

Submission 2/36

Date: 03/10/2022 12:33:40 **Anita Calcraft** Culmstock

Comments: I am concerned with the merging of parishes that the larger centres of population will get all the funding and small parishes will be left behind

Submission 2/37

Date: 03/10/2022 12:40:22 **Katie Stanbury** Uffculme

Comments: We bought our first home at Lucombe Park and are very much part of the Uffculme community. We use many of the facilities in Uffculme, such as being registered at the Doctors surgery, we visit the local pub and cafes on a regular basis, we use the local shops/ post office/ secondary school facilities and have recently reserved a nursery place at Uffculme Kingswood for my unborn child. We also attend many of the local events. We would be very much favourable for the boundaries to moved to reflect at least Lucombe Park becoming part of the Uffculme Parish based on our above comments.

Submission 2/38

Date: 03/10/2022 18:41:56 **Louise Eamres** Uffculme

Comments: I am a resident of Oak Gardens on the Lucombe Park Development and fully support being included within the Parish of Uffculme. To me this makes sense as a community evolves for the boundaries to meet the reality of the people using the facilities. My children go to the Primary School and we are very much involved in that community and part of the Church. We would welcome the ability to sign up for things such as allotments based in the Parish. We are also currently not able to take an active role in some parts of Parish life due to officially being resident 'across the border'. Thank you for your consideration.

Submission 2/39

Date: 03/10/2022 18:56:43 **Bob Eames** Uffculme

Comments: I think we should move the Lucombe Park development and its new bit Oakleigh Gardens, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme Parish

Submission 2/40

Date: 04/10/2022 07:55:59 **Tony Lindsell** Uffculme

Comments: Halberton, Willand & Uffculme - Option 3 must be the preferred option. Luccombe Park, Bridwell & Hitchcocks are naturally associated with Uffculme and immediately next to it whereas Halberton village must be several miles away and has no logical association with any of them. Luccombe Park and Bridwell, in particular, use Uffculme Village as their provider of local services and in deed provide support to the village themselves. The Hitchcocks development has now expanded so that it is touching the edge of the village. In order to provide for any future developments Option 3 is the only one that is practical and sensible.

Submission 2/41

Date: 04/10/2022 09:18:05 **Ruth Stemp** Uffculme

Comments: Uffculme Parish Council proposals:-Luccombe Park,Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks I support the move of all into Uffculme Parish.

Submission 2/42

Date: 04/10/2022 11:36:59 **Joanne Smith** Uffculme

Comments: I fully support UPC in their application to have these areas officially included within the Uffculme boundaries. These specific locations use or will use the services provided within the UPC area and this will have an impact on the residents of the village. It is very unfair that funds are allocated to surrounding parishes/area budgets when they are not in fact providing the services required.

Submission 2/43

Date: 04/10/2022 12:36:15 **Sharon Taylor-Brown** Uffculme

Comments: I would like Option 3 – Options 1 and 2 together with Hitchcocks, as I believe that all of these areas impact physically on our village of Uffculme and the local community, therefore we should be involved in any planning decisions but more importantly we feel that the new estates are part of our village and as such should legally become part of our parish so that they feel a closer connection to village life not just estates etc in between two / three communities.

Submission 2/44

Date: 04/10/2022 13:07:05 **Jasmine Cruse** Uffculme

Comments: As a resident of Lucombe park (now oakleigh gardens) I have to push for all 3 areas to be included in the uffculme parish. We are part of the wonderful village and I think it's only right to extend the parish area outwards to cover our estate, Bridwell avenue and Hitchcock.

Submission 2/45

Date: 04/10/2022 13:27:59 **John Sellick** Uffculme

Comments: I support moving Luccombe Park, Hitchcocks and Bridwell into Uffculme (option 3). As a resident of Luccombe Park, it makes little sense to me for any of the orphaned parts of Harberton that lie east of the M5 to remain as-is, particularly given that to get to Harberton from here, one has to travel through another parish.

Submission 2/46

Date: 04/10/2022 14:25:52 **Adam Cruse** Uffculme

Comments: I think that option 3 is the most suitable. This will include Bridwell and Lucombe Park within Uffculme Parish Council boundary.

Submission 2/47

Date: 04/10/2022 14:54:44 **Wendy Edwards** Halwill Junction

Comments: We need Parish Councils - they are the voice of the local people and as such should remain. Many of our ancestors fought for this right to be able to choose what is good for the area or not so good. How can this be correct when decisions will be made at Government level where they do not know about the local areas where their people live?

Submission 2/48

Date: 04/10/2022 15:00:05 **Christine Scantlebury** Uffculme

Comments: As a long time resident of Uffculme, I see it spreading further into neighbouring parishes. Luccombe Park the new estate should be under Uffculme Parish as people living there use Uffculme facilities. Perhaps Bridewell Avenue and Hitchcock's Business Park should also be brought into Uffculme Parish.

Submission 2/49

Date: 04/10/2022 17:15:19 **Russell and Julie Spence** Uffculme

Comments: We agree with UPC's proposal that all three locations - Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Industrial Estate - be moved into the UPC area.

Submission 2/50

Date: 04/10/2022 17:24:21 **Michael Pollard** Uffculme

Comments: Uffculme. I consider Option 3 to be the most sensible option as it would do away with so many anomalies in the current boundary lay out.

Submission 2/51

Date: 04/10/2022 20:47:00 **Clerk, Thorverton PC**

Comments: Thorverton Parish Council reaffirms its previous comments (which do not seem to have been properly submitted) as follows: Thorverton Parish Council can see no benefit in reducing the number of Councillors as there will be no savings made as there are no costs involved. Thorverton Parish Council has, in recent electoral cycles, found no difficulty in finding ten or more willing candidates. The current number of Councillors (10) helps to spread the load of these projects and makes for good progress with working parties. The Parish boundary for Thorverton seems broadly correct as we share little in common with the adjacent Parishes and already have full agenda with many projects ongoing. Council expressed concern that the second call for comments had showed Thorverton as 'no response' when the Council had responded 'no change'.

Submission 2/52

Date: 04/10/2022 21:37:23 **Thomas Warner** Uffculme

Comments: Regarding the proposed submission from Uffculme Parish Council to the boundary review commission. I would vote wholly in favour of they're proposed option 3. That is, to bring Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcock's in to Uffculme. It makes sense both from a community and geographical point

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

of view. In particular as a resident in Lucombe park I feel we are a part of the Uffculme community and as such, residential matters that would be best suited under the Uffculme councils remit. I feel this is especially important regarding ongoing and future projects such as traffic matters, roads, bus stops etc.

Submission 2/53

Date: 06/10/2022 06:38:13 **Janet Fox**

Comments: Option 3 for Uffculme new boundary. These areas have a huge impact in Uffculme village in terms of traffic and numbers of children attending Uffculme Primary School and should therefore be within Uffculme Parish boundary so we at least get their rates.

Submission 2/54

Date: 06/10/2022 06:51:09 **Nikki Padet** Culmstock

Comments: Ref Uffculme boundaries. I support the described option 3 as I feel this will best serve both residents of these areas and the wider users of local services such as health care, education and public transport.

Submission 2/55

Date: 06/10/2022 15:19 **Richard Persey** Willand

Comments: Please see my email below confirming my objection to the alteration of Halberton Parish boundaries. If you require anything further then please do not hesitate to contact me. Hitchcocks HQ, Hitchcocks Business Park, Willand, Devon EX15 3FA. **Subject: Halberton Parish Council Boundaries.** Please accept this email as my full support for Hitchcocks Business Park to stay within the boundaries of Halberton Parish Council. Halberton Parish Council have supported everything the business has achieved to date, shown support in our further growth and I enjoy working with everyone involved. With this in mind, I would object to the proposed alteration to the boundaries.

Submission 2/56

Date: 07/10/2022 11:47:24 **Michael Cuthbertson** Uffculme

Comments: In the Halberton-Willand-Uffculme review, I fully support Option 3 (with Option 2 as secondary). The centre of Uffculme is 1 mile or less from most of the areas included, whereas the centre of Halberton is approx. 4 miles away. Residents in these areas generally identify as part of Uffculme, have Uffculme addresses, support Uffculme businesses, attend Uffculme community events (including those at Bridwell Park, ironically also in Halberton Parish), and use Uffculme facilities & infrastructure - yet they must cast their vote in a polling station in Halberton & vote for Parish Councillors in a remote Parish supported by their precept. Uffculme PC don't appear to be a statutory consultee on planning applications on its doorstep which directly affect the Parish, its infrastructure & residents, nor does it benefit from the precept generated from any new housing developments. On the other hand, Halberton PC are detached from developments happening on the other side of the M5 & are not directly affected, so they cannot in all honesty realistically assess the impact or engage meaningfully with residents who are, to all intents & purposes, part of Uffculme. "This is the way it has been for 150 years" isn't a valid reason to prevent a sensible review & revision of the status quo when so much has changed in that time. This CGR is the ideal opportunity for the historical boundaries of Halberton Parish to be brought into the 21st century to reflect modern era changes in development of the area & the needs of council tax paying residents & electors, most of whom have nothing other than an administrative & precept connection to Halberton. Even after Option 3, there will still be a "Halberton bulge" in the area between the B3181 & the border SE of the B3440. This area would be far better served moving into Uffculme (Selgars Mill has an Uffculme address) or Willand & it makes no sense to leave it as part of Halberton Parish until the next CGR, whenever that may be.

Submission 2/57

Date: 07/10/2022 13:31:14 **Chris Hill** Uffculme

Comments: Re Uffculme Parish I strongly believe that Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks should all be moved to Uffculme parish

Submission 2/58

Date: 08/10/2022 08:26:55 **Charlotte Boyce** Uffculme

Comments: I support option 3 concerning Uffculme parish boundaries.

Submission 2/59

Date: 08/10/2022 11:14:42 **Richard Taylor** Uffculme

Comments: Boundary Review: Uffculme Parish - I fully support Option 3 of the three draft proposals currently being considered. Namely to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Business Park to Uffculme.

Submission 2/60

Date: 08/10/2022 13:56:03 **Dawn Johnson** Uffculme

Comments: As a homeowner in Lucombe Park ,uffculme I feel it would be appropriate for the whole of the Lucombe Park estate and Bridwell Avenue to be a part of the Uffculme Parish . I have never used any of Halbertons facilities and can't see myself ever using them. I regularly use the surgery in uffculme as well as the shops and other community services.

Submission 2/61

Date: 08/10/2022 14:19:22 **Jeremy Johnson** Uffculme

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this long overdue review. I am FULLY supportive of adding Lucombe Park and Bridwell Avenue to the Uffculme Parish but not supportive of adding Hitchcocks industrial estate. As a Lucombe Park resident I regularly use Uffculme parish services, which are all within a short walk. I have never knowingly used Halberton parish services and consider myself to be an Uffculme resident and regularly support Uffculme parish events. I am not supportive of adding the Hitchcocks industrial estate as I do not believe this is in keeping with the village vibe and status. Besides, adding the industrial estate would further encourage the gap between the two to be filled with more residential or even more industrial units. Finally, as a Homeowner at the eastern boundary of the Lucombe Park estate, I believe that the 4 properties behind the original 'Harvesters' property are already part of the Uffculme parish. A recent land registry search showed these properties to be part of the Uffculme Parish, not Halberton. If this is indeed the case, the case would be quite clear to add the rest of the estate.

Submission 2/62

Date: 09/10/2022 23:08:53 **Sarah Rock-Evans** Uffculme

Comments: As a resident of Yondercott near Uffculme I support option 3 in the proposals as this would bring Luccombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Business Park into Uffculme parish which is the nearest settlement to these developments.

Submission 2/63

Date: 01/10/2022 09:53:57 **Gordon Guest** Cullompton

Comments: Colophon town council submitted a detailed response about changing boundaries. This is not mentioned. Cullompton and willand boundaries should join and Galveston move back. Colophon should expand to include all land covered by the garden village. Boundaries in South of parish need to be reorganised so they are more cohesive.

Submission 2/64

Date: 13/10/2022 10:27:34 **Graham Robinson** Uffculme

Comments: As a resident of Uffculme, I feel it is only fair that the village boundaries are amended to ensure that village facilities being used by people within the catchment area are suitably accounted for in annual financial figures and that monies are not allocated to neighbouring parishes who are not actually involved in the provision of these facilities. I therefore support option three - the proposal to transfer Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue, and Hitchcocks to Uffculme.

Submission 2/65

Date: 13 October 2022 12:21 **Malcolm Vallance** Sandford Parish Clerk

Comments: Sandford Parish is in the District of Mid Devon and is situated approximately two miles north of Crediton and some ten miles from Exeter. The parish comprises the village of Sandford and the hamlets of Newbuildings, West Sandford and East Village together with outlying farms and cottage with a total population in excess of 1200. Sandford is a large rural parish with a great sense of community, and has two pubs, a community shop with Post Office owned and run by the community, a primary school, a recreation ground, plus a Parish Hall and two Churches and many local organisations and clubs. There is also a dedicated footpath/cycleway from Sandford village to Crediton via the 'Millennium Green'. In February 2022 the Parish

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

Council discussed the MDDC 2022 Parishes Boundary Review. It is now agreed, following contact with Morchard Bishop Parish Council, to discuss a suggestion to include some properties on the boundary between our two Parishes that NO changes were needed following discussion with the home owners involved. It is still felt that the Parish Boundary with the A3072 forming the natural Boundary between Sandford and Crediton should remain. It was not felt any major changes were necessary to the number of Parish Councillors currently 12. At the moment, following the death of our Chairman, we co-opted one extra Parish Councillor at our October 2022 meeting and are now back up to our total compliment of twelve Parish Councillors. We understand that there is now a suggestion to reduce the number of Sandford Parish Councillors (in the MDDC Planning Review 2) to Six. As stated Sandford geographically is one of the largest Parish Councils in Devon, and as the Parish is split into three parts (Sandford Village, East Village, and New Buildings). The suggestion for six Parish Councillors just would not be practical if we are to deal with everything going on in Sandford with a development at Weavers Way for 13 dwelling and numerous other planning applications for more than one property. There is a development for 257 homes in the Parish at Pedlars Pool (Lisbetts Grange) currently at the "Reserved Matters" for planning discussions. The school site, reserved in the development for five years, is subject to funding being made available by Devon County Council. Sandford Parish Council would encourage inclusion of this school in the plans of DCC for the future. Depending on demographic development and trends MDDC may wish to extend this reserved matter at a future date for the benefit of the community. The proposal to reduce the complement of Councillors is not sound if the interests of the Parish are to be best served in the experience of SPC. SPC will continue to seek the diversity of the Council by encouraging participation directly and indirectly in its purposes and role. This second consultation is invited to agree with the SPC. We trust our comments will be studied, and noted, once the closure for comments occurs on 23rd October 2022.

Submission2/66

Date: 17/10/2022 12:50:24 **Rachel Hodder** Cheriton Bishop PC

Comments: Cheriton Bishop Parish Council understands that some residents of the parish who live on the boundary of Hittisleigh Parish have expressed a preference to join Hittisleigh. Cheriton Bishop Parish Councillors support Cllr Coren's proposal for a boundary realignment to reflect this.

Submission 2/67

Date: 18/10/2022 08:34:11 **Tim Pointing** Uffculme

Comments: Uffculme Parish Boundary to be extended to include: 1. Luccombe Park, Langlands and Selgars Mill 2. Hitchcocks Business Park 3. Bridwell Estate. Uffculmes parish boundary should extend up to the M5, which would be a sensible boundary between it and the Halberton Parish. The businesses and residents in these areas fall within the natural catchment and environs of the Uffculme Parish and have more impact on the Uffculme village and those living there than Halberton. Decisions have been made to build many houses and develop large industrial sites in these areas, which in turn have placed significant pressures on the village of Uffculme. It is time that Uffculme has a more direct role in determining what happens on its door step and the boundary should be changed to reflect this.

Submission 2/68

Date: 18/10/2022 12:28:17 **Dawn McNally** Uffculme

Comments: Regarding the boundary review for Uffculme I would go for option 3 to include Bridwell Park, Lucombe Park & Hitchcocks.

Submission 2/69

Date: 18/10/2022 14:15 **Mrs McGeever** Halberton

Comments: Halberton Parish Council. The view of the Parish Council is that change for changes sake is not necessary and that the services provided by each parish and the precepts levied are comparable across the district. The consensus is that there is no need for change to the historic parish boundary and the Parish Council wish to re-iterate this view to the Parish Boundary Review.

Submission 2/70

Date: 18/10/2022 15:27:10 **Gemma Cole** Uffculme

Comments: Of the three options available for comment Uffculme Parish Council will, of course, support Option 3 - incorporating all additional areas for inclusion within the boundary of Uffculme. It is believed that by incorporating these areas within Uffculme, it will enable residents to be included as part of the community

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

that is already known as theirs, as well as enabling the Council to officially assist where necessary. Support of Option 3 is one that is also echoed with individual residents - many of which have advised of their support.

Submission 2/71

Date: 18/10/2022 16:09 **Rachel Hodder** Crediton Hamlets PC

Comments: Crediton Hamlets Parish Council discussed the ERC's suggestions for Crediton Hamlets Parish at its October meeting. Councillors resolved: to thank the ERC for their recommendation that Yeoford should remain in Crediton Hamlets Parish. Councillors do genuinely feel this is the best way forward for the parish as a whole; and that Councillors would prefer the parish boundary should remain as it is now. Councillors also discussed the ERC's suggestion that the number of councillors for the Yeo Ward be increased from five to seven, increasing the total number of councillors to eleven. Councillors understand that this decision is based on population in the Yeo Ward. Councillors resolved not to support this recommendation. They would prefer that representation remains as it is now ie five councillors from the Yeo Ward and four councillors from the Hookway Ward. This is because: the Yeo Ward is already well represented, with five of the nine councillors the Yeo Ward therefore already controls a majority there have never sufficient applicants for vacant seats to trigger an election in the parish councillors are therefore concerned the seats would therefore not be filled eleven councillors is unwieldy for a parish with a low precept and will increase demands on the precept.

Submission 2/72

Date: 18/10/2022 21:25:08 **Rita Balado** Uffculme

Comments: I support option 3 regarding changing boundaries as I know this will be beneficial to Uffculme having a say about properties that are so close to the centre of Uffculme and any decisions made about them will impact on Uffculme

Submission 2/73

Date: 19/10/2022 09:40:07 **Janet de Rochefort** Thelbridge

Comments: Just to reinforce my previous point, it would make sense for Nomansland to be in a single parish, rather than split between two. Alignment of the parish boundaries with the new district wards would make for better district councillor representation on behalf of the whole of Nomansland.

Submission 2/74

Date: 19/10/2022 12:25:46 **John O'Connor** Uffculme

Comments: I support option 3 of moving Lucombe Park, Bridwell and Hitchcocks into Uffculme.

Submission 2/75

Date: 19/10/2022 15:46:20 **Sue Longworth** Uffculme

Comments: Uffculme parish should include Langlands and Hitchcock business parks as well as the quarry area up to the A38.

Submission 2/76

Date: 19/10/2022 19:26:22 **Chris Coopey** Uffculme

Comments: I appreciate the opportunity given by the Electoral Review Committee (ERC) to seek views on the draft proposals for the future structure of parish boundaries. As a resident I am particularly interested in the 3 options for Uffculme. On reflection, and in the interests of future proofing the Parish boundary my view is that Option 3 is the better choice. I think Options 1 & 2 are absolutely necessary in any event, as these areas are part of Uffculme in all but Parish name. However, if any further developments take place (and that seems extremely likely in the Langlands and Hitchcock quadrant) that area too will essentially be joined to Uffculme, and the same arguments will apply. I feel strongly that local communities should have their say in local matters and Option 3 is therefore, I think, the fairest and most democratic way forward.

Submission 24a

Submission Date: 23/01/2022 12:05:50 **Carolyn Guscott** Cheriton Bishop

Comments: Please consider incorporating the property of The Orchard, Forder, Cheriton Bishop EX6 6HP within the Cheriton Bishop Parish as it currently sits on the border within the Hittisleigh Parish.

Reasons being:

1. The immediate neighbouring properties of Partridge Farm & West Ford are within the same hamlet of

- Forder yet are in the Cheriton Bishop Parish.
2. We all have the same postcode.
 3. Telephone Exchange the same.
 4. MDDC Cheriton Bishop waste / recycling collections the same.

Submission 2/77

Date: 20/10/2022 19:52 **Camela Burgess** Willand

Comments: Thank you for the leaflet regarding the Halberton parish boundary consultation. I have wished to express my views on our situation for some time. On moving to Muxbeare Lane (EX15 2JH) 6 years ago I was extremely surprised to learn that it was within Halberton parish rather than Willand. This has been a annoyance when having to travel to Halberton to vote, rather than being able to walk around the corner to vote in Willand. But more importantly, we had no say in the councillor for our own village in the local elections of May 2021. Instead we could only vote for the councillor for Tiverton East, which felt entirely meaningless. Given that the lane is officially located within Willand village, and geographically sits between Willand and Uffculme, it would surely be logical for it to be located within a parish boundary that allows its residents to vote in the elections that concern them most? I suggest that all the land in the Halberton parish that sits to the East of the M5 should be changed to be included in either Willand or Uffculme parish, depending on their postal address. This would remove the somewhat ludicrous situation we are currently in. Suggesting that the new Lucombe Park development should be included in Halberton parish is inappropriate for the same reason. I also disagree with the comments about polling stations on the leaflet. Unless online voting can be developed, easy access to stations is imperative. Postal voting is unlikely to be as popular with younger voters, and therefore making access as easy as possible is important to help include the younger vote.

Submission 2/78

Date: 21/10/2022 12:07 **Barbara Bodkin** Willand PC

Comments: Second Consultation Halberton, Willand and Uffculme *Response of Willand Parish Council*. Willand Parish Council originally submitted their suggested proposals which incorporated the outcome of discussions between themselves and Uffculme Parish Council. A detailed map was also submitted which clearly showed the suggested changes and boundaries. The Willand Parish Council submission is fully recorded in the consultation document as submission numbered 23. Willand Parish Council still stands by the recommendation made at that time and the information and arguments put forward to justify and support it. It is apparent from the current consultation document that a compromise solution has been attempted to be found which has led to three potential options being put forward. Any one of these options will leave anomalies and will not address the potential future development of the area which could be addressed if the original suggested Parish Boundary changes were adopted and implemented. The following comments are made in relation to the three suggested options – none of which, singularly or as a whole, meet a common-sense resolution to improve the management and governance of the area. Option 1. Lucombe Park should be made part of Uffculme Parish but as shown on the map is just an ‘add on’ with no clear feature as a boundary. The map for the Mid Devon Business Park only extends to take in Phase 1. Phase 2 now has planning approval and all roads and drainage have been put in place and units are expected. Access is only available from Four Cross Way Roundabout [Willand] and is then through Phase 1. Suitable amendments of the map for the area have been shared with Officers but have not been amended with the consultation documents. Option 2. This meets the representation of the owner of Bridwell Park to be part of Uffculme and the road boundary on the East side of the estate does make a natural boundary but when it meets the B3040 Uffculme Road it does not incorporate Lucombe Park to the South therefore still leaving it looking as an ‘add on’. The map in relation to Mid Devon Business Park is still wrong. Option 3. This is nearer to the original submission put in by Willand Parish Council in relation to the Uffculme section of the ‘Halberton Bulge’. South of the Uffculme straight the suggested boundary was nearer Willand by using the road down to Selgars Mill and then a water course to the boundary. If one looks at the map or Google Earth it will be seen that to the South of the Uffculme Straight there would just be five fields left in Halberton and they are part of Quicks Farm where the buildings are in Willand Parish in any case. To the North of the Uffculme Straight will be 5 fields and then there is the solar farm and then a

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

small complex of industrial buildings but all of this is within the 'ownership' of Hitchcocks Farm. This whole area to the South of the B3181 would be a small section retained by Halberton which if one looks at the map would sit better within Willand Parish. The map for the Mid Devon Business Park in Willand needs extending as mentioned in the two options above. Further Observation. The Halberton land to the North of the B3181 contains three farms one of which is seeking to expand with building industrial units. There are also industrial units behind chicken houses just to the North of the Willand Boundary. All of these properties are more connected to Willand than Halberton in that they use Willand facilities and the areas for work are within walking and cycling distance of Willand but lack infrastructure connecting with the village – footpaths and cycleways. Conclusion. Willand Parish Council have a preference for their original submission and this would help with the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan. Option 3, with the amended plan for Mid Devon Business Park, is the nearest to their suggestion but this would leave small and unconnected parcels of land with Halberton for no sensible reason.

Submission 2/79

Date: 21/10/2022 16:20:41 **Sarah Goody** Parish Clerk

Comments: Wembworthy Parish Council would like the review to consider combining the Parish to include Eggesford and Brushford parish meetings. This would give them better representation and a chance to benefit from the precept to improve their communities.

Submission 2/80

Date: 21/10/2022 17:07:19 **Antoinette Teasdale** Uffculme

Comments: It seems logical that Lucombe Park and Bridwell Avenue should moved to Uffculme as they use the facilities of the village. However, To my mind Option 3 would seems to be the best one. Any further development at Hitchcocks would have an impact on the village of Uffculme so it seems right it should be considered within the village boundary.

Submission 2/81

Date: 21/10/2022 **Sue Squire** Parish Clerk

Comments: Morebath Parish Council discussed the option of merging with Bampton town Council at the May Parish Council meeting. The Parish Council voted in favour of remaining as a separate Parish Council. The consultation was discussed further on 27 September 2022 and the Parish Council is providing this submission based on the decision made in the May meeting.

Submission 2/82

Date: 21/10/2022 20:14:19 **Jeni Fulton Price** Uffculme

Comments: I would strongly support Option 3 - moving Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme Parish. The current arrangement of these areas being part of Halberton Parish, whilst historical, make no sense in the current, modern context. The M5 forms a logical boundary now and creates a very clear separation from the main village and surrounds of Halberton. These areas (Lucombe Park, Hitchcocks) have the most impact on Uffculme Parish in terms of use of/pressure upon local services, impact of traffic etc. but currently the Parish Council receives no financial contribution and is not initially consulted on planning related matters in these areas. Bridwell Park and Bridwell Avenue are seen as a 'natural' part of Uffculme given the growth of the village during the past century or more. There is no logical reason not to include them in Uffculme Parish - long gone are the historic connections of Squire and Halberton Parish Church! This is surely a historical anomaly which needs to be corrected for more efficient local government reflecting the reality of the 21st century situation. Halberton village and surrounds are not impacted in any way by new housing and business at Lucombe Park and Hitchcocks and any future development there. Please therefore use this boundary review to make what is a logical and very common sense change to reflect the real life situation which currently exists.

Submission 2/83

Date: 22/10/2022 14:06:00 **Annie Saunter** Uffculme

Comments: I wish to support proposal for Option 3 with regard to Uffculme boundaries

Submission 2/84

Date: 22/10/2022 18:28:48 **Ann Hill** Uffculme

Comments: I opt for option 3 and I live in Uffculme.

Submission 2/85

Date: 23/10/2022 16:48 **Uffculme PC**

Contents: Uffculme Parish Council Consultation Response to Parish Boundary Community Governance Review – Second Stage Consultation

Uffculme Parish Council is pleased that the Electoral Review Committee (ERC) has highlighted the complexities in respect of the Boundaries of Uffculme/Willand/Halberton. This has been raised by the Parish Councils of both Uffculme and Willand for some time. The first review seemed to generate a considerable response in respect of the current boundaries by residents of Willand and Uffculme Parishes raising concerns of where the current boundary lies and the practical, day to day issues faced. We also note the representation made by Halberton Parish Council and also that of Ray Radford, which is referred to below in more detail. Uffculme Parish Council whole heartedly feels that the Parish Boundary should be amended to be in line with Option 3, as presented by the ERC.

Uffculme stands by all of the items raised and set out in the first stage consultation and since submission and publication the Parish Council has received feedback on the scope of the response prepared. It is apparent that the ERC has also taken account of the representation. However, to give further context to the options set out in the second stage we make the following comments:

Option 1

Whilst this option would seem to deal with the expansion of Uffculme to include the Lucombe Park development it does nothing to support Uffculme with future planning right on the edge of the village. The Boundary being so close to the settlement limits of Uffculme could see this exact same issue develop in years to come. It has become apparent through representations of the public and also the ERC's publication that this issue has highlighted added difficulties in respect of planning and serving the community. Therefore option 1 does nothing to support the items set out in the Inspector's decision in granting the permission for the development of Lucombe Park.

Option 2

This option seems to take account of the submission made by Lord Ivar Mountbatten, it again does nothing to help the village of Uffculme in respect of future development being so close to the settlement limits of the village. The Parish Council feels strongly that Bridwell Park, in its entirety, should fall part of Uffculme.

Option 3

Having put together this map it seems the most practical out of the three options presented, however, the map still has a significant flaw in that Halberton retain a chunk of land between Uffculme and Willand, for no apparent reason. Uffculme Parish Council feel that the land which is shown to be retained by Halberton has very little purpose. The Parish Council feels that as developments grow we will be faced Uffculme Parish Council Consultation Response to Parish Boundary Community Governance Review – Second Stage Consultation again by an area which is effectively 'lost' and uncared for. The natural boundary of the B3181 is the most logical point to adopt a practical boundary. We feel the boundary for Willand should be extended to meet the suggested boundary of Uffculme.

There are several representations made by members of the public in respect of the need to move the Halberton boundary back to the M5 – it is disappointing that the ERC has not taken a bolder move in taking account of the representations made. Unfortunately, many many people have taken the time to be involved in this review, however, it seems that their contributions have not fully been taken into account in respect of the ERC's three options.

We feel that the developments of Lucombe Park, Langlands and Hitchcocks have far greater impact on the Parishioners of Uffculme and therefore the reallocation of this land is a practical option for the community. Representation made by Halberton Parish Council. Within the representation made by Halberton at the first stage they make reference to there being no significant changes being made. Uffculme disputes this opinion – when the Parish Boundaries were last reviewed Hitchcocks Business Park did not exist, neither did Lucombe Park. These are significant developments – anyone can see that and the impact that they have on the Communities living in the village of Uffculme – for Halberton to say that these are not significant is a perfect

Mid Devon District Council CGR Parish Review - Second Stage Consultation Submissions

demonstration that Halberton does not feel impacted – whereas Uffculme is – this demonstrates the need to readdress the boundary to parcel the land into the Parish who are impacted on a daily basis.

Halberton's claim that they have not received communication in respect for the need to change is simply not correct – the Parish Council of Uffculme has raised this and is also aware of residents too.

Representation made by Cllr Ray Radford. The Submission by Ray Radford is headed up as being made from his position as County Councillor – the area covered is the Parishes of Uffculme and Willand. However, the submission makes reference to activities of Halberton Parish Council – we feel that the representation is not transparent in respect of the 'hat' which Ray is wearing and therefore could be construed as bias, unless the standard interest reporting requirements are considered by the ERC in respect of conflicts.

In addition the representation states that during the District Boundary Review the 'Inspector decided in our favour to keep the District Boundaries as they are'. The Inspector made reference to a review at Parish level needing to be determined prior to consideration for the District Boundary in question. This therefore further demonstrates the complexities in this area and the need for change. Uffculme Parish Council Consultation Response to Parish Boundary Community Governance Review – Second Stage Consultation

It is clear by the high number of considered representations of people living within the village of Uffculme that there is a need for change – it does not seem in contrast that residents have spoken out in favour of leaving as is. Other than Halberton Parish Council and Ray Radford, there is very little support not to address the current boundaries and address the expansion that has impacted the residents of Uffculme and Willand on a practical level.

Uffculme Parish Council would be willing to attend a meeting with representative of the ERC to discuss this representation further.

Uffculme Parish Council

23 October 2022.

Submission 2/86

Date: 23/10/2022 18:02:20 **Priscilla Jane Whitefield** Uffculme

Comments: I support the OPTION 3 of the boundary review to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue, and Hitchcock into Uffculme Parish.

This page is intentionally left blank

<u>current parish</u>	<u>current parish ward</u>	<u>Proposed new parish/parish ward</u>	<u>current district ward</u>	<u>new district ward</u>	<u>Electors</u>	<u>Current Number of Cllrs</u>
Bampton (incl Shillingford)			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern	1484	9
Bickleigh			Cadbury	Cadbury	190	5
Bow			Upper Yeo	Upper Yeo & Taw	1020	9
Bradninch	Bradninch (Rural Ward) (Tiverton and Honiton Constituency)		Cullompton Outer	Bradninch	117	2
Bradninch	Bradninch (Town Ward) (Central Devon Constituency)		Bradninch	Bradninch	1517	10
Brushford			Taw	Upper Yeo & Taw	48	PM
Burlescombe (incl Westleigh)			Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	756	9
Butterleigh			Cullompton Outer	Halberton	100	PM
Cadbury			Cadbury	Cadbury	116	PM
Cadeleigh			Cadbury	Cadbury	159	PM
Chawleigh			Taw Vale	Taw Vale	536	9
Cheriton Bishop			Yeo	Yeo	625	8
Cheriton Bishop						
Cheriton Fitzpaine			Way	Way	774	9
Cheriton Fitzpaine						
Clannaborough			Upper Yeo	Upper Yeo & Taw	54	PM

Clayhanger	(grouped with Hockworthy and Huntsham)		Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	103	5
Clayhidon			Upper Culm	Upper Culm	394	7
Coldridge			Taw	Upper Yeo & Taw	303	7
Colebrooke			Upper Yeo	Yeo	371	9
Copplestone			Yeo	Upper Yeo & Taw	1078	7
Crediton Hamlets	Crediton Hamlets (Hookway Ward)		Yeo	Yeo	176	4
Crediton Hamlets	Crediton Hamlets (Yeoford Ward)		Yeo	Yeo	920	5
Crediton Hamlets						
Cruwys Morchard			Way	Way	413	8
Culmstock			Upper Culm	Upper Culm	757	10
Down St Mary			Taw	Upper Yeo & Taw	309	7
Eggesford			Taw	Upper Yeo & Taw	75	PM
Halberton			Halberton	Halberton	1422	11
Halberton						
Halberton						

Halberton						
Halberton						
Hemyock			Upper Culm	Upper Culm	1808	10
Hittisleigh			Yeo	Yeo	106	7
Hittisleigh				Yeo		
Hockworthy	(grouped with Clayhanger and Huntsham)		Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	145	5
Holcombe Rogus			Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	416	9
Huntsham	(grouped with Hockworthy and Clayhanger)		Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	119	5
Kennerleigh			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	66	PM
Kentisbeare (incl Blackborough)			Cullompton Outer	Lower Culm	782	10
Lapford			Taw Vale	Taw Vale	876	10
Loxbeare			Clare & Shuttern	Tiverton Westexe	143	PM
Morchard Bishop			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	864	11
Morebath			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern	285	7

Morebath						
Newton St Cyres			Newbrooke	Yeo	743	9
Nymet Rowland			Taw	Taw Vale	88	5
Oakford			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern	327	8
Poughill			Way	Way	168	5
Puddington			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	169	5
Sampford Peverell			Canonsleigh	Canonsleigh	1081	9
Sandford			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	998	12
Sandford						

Sandford

Sandford

Sandford						
Shobrooke			Newbrooke	Sandford & Creedy	423	9
Silverton	Silverton (North Ward)		Cadbury	Cadbury	97	2
Silverton	Silverton (Village Ward)		Silverton	Silverton	1557	9
Stockleigh English			Sandford & Creedy	Way	54	PM
Stockleigh Pomeroy			Newbrooke	Cadbury	96	PM
Stoodleigh			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern	261	7
Stoodleigh			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern		
Templeton			Clare & Shuttern	Tiverton Westexe	116	5

Thelbridge			Sandford & Creedy	Way	282	7
Thorverton			Cadbury	Cadbury	796	10
Thorverton						
Uffculme	Uffculme (Village Ward)		Lower Culm	Lower Culm	1954	11
Uffculme	Uffculme (Ashill Ward)		Upper Culm	Upper Culm	433	2
Uffculme						
Uffculme						

Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						

Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						

Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uffculme						
Uplowman			Halberton	Canonsleigh	293	7
Upton Hellions			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	57	PM
Washfield			Clare & Shuttern	Clare and Shuttern	308	7
Washford Pyne			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	97	5
Wembworthy			Taw	Taw Vale	223	7

Willand			Lower Culm	Lower Culm	2736	11
Willand						
Willand						

Willand						
Woolfardisworthy			Sandford & Creedy	Sandford & Creedy	141	PM
Zeal Monachorum			Taw	Upper Yeo & Taw	339	7
General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						

General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						
General (all parishes)						

APPENDIX C

<u>current parish</u>	<u>Stage 2 Submission Number</u>	<u>Comments from first round of consultation</u>
Bampton (incl Shillingford)		
Bickleigh	26	Bickleigh, North of the Exe is administered by the Tiverton West ward. Areas of debate include river management, traffic management on bridge, development of the Trout pub, the village playing field and PROW. However, it is very much overlooked and could easily be administered by Bickleigh's active Parish Council.
Bow		
Bradninch		
Bradninch		
Brushford		
Burlescombe (incl)		
Butterleigh		
Cadbury		
Cadeleigh		
Chawleigh		
Cheriton Bishop		
Cheriton Bishop	66	Cheriton Bishop Parish Council understands that some residents of the parish who live on the boundary of Hittisleigh Parish have expressed a preference to join Hittisleigh. Cheriton Bishop Parish Councillors support Cllr Coren's proposal for a boundary realignment to reflect this.
Cheriton Fitzpaine	1	As Chair of Cheriton Fitzpaine Parish Council I am very disappointed that we have not had any formal notice of the proposal to reduce out number of Cllrs from 9 to 8. As we have had significant new building in and around the village I can see no justification for this. The lack of communication is typical of the way rural Parish Councils are treated by District and County Councils.
Cheriton Fitzpaine	2	On receiving the below email our Parish Council would like to let you know they are very concerned that we have not had a formal notice of the proposal to cut our numbers, particularly as our population is increasing. Please could you come back to me with an explanation I can pass on to the Parish Council. [Note: The Parish Review Consultant has responded to this enquiry]
Clannaborough		

Clayhanger		
Clayhidon		
Coldridge		
Colebrooke	23	Colebrooke Parish Council resolved at the meeting on 27th September to object to the proposed reduction in councillors from 9 to 7. Due to the size and dispersal of the area within the parish, the Council would like to keep to 9 councillors as we have representatives from the outlying hamlets.
Copplestone		
Crediton Hamlets		
Crediton Hamlets		
Crediton Hamlets	71	Crediton Hamlets Parish Council discussed the ERC's suggestions for Crediton Hamlets Parish at its October meeting. Councillors resolved: to thank the ERC for their recommendation that Yeoford should remain in Crediton Hamlets Parish. Councillors do genuinely feel this is the best way forward for the parish as a whole; and that Councillors would prefer the parish boundary should remain as it is now Councillors also discussed the ERC's suggestion that the number of councillors for the Yeo Ward be increased from five to seven, increasing the total number of councillors to eleven. Councillors understand that this decision is based on population in the Yeo Ward. Councillors resolved not to support this recommendation. They would prefer that representation remains as it is now ie five councillors from the Yeo Ward and four councillors from the Hookway Ward. This is because: the Yeo Ward is already well represented, with five of the nine councillors the Yeo Ward therefore already controls a majority there have never sufficient applicants for vacant seats to trigger an election in the parish councillors are therefore concerned the seats would therefore not be filled eleven councillors is unwieldy for a parish with a low precept and will increase demands on the precept.
Cruwys Morchard		
Culmstock		
Down St Mary		
Eggesford		
Halberton		
Halberton	32	Halberton parish boundaries should be left as they are. There is no compelling reason to hand parts of Halberton parish to either Willand or Uffculme.
Halberton	33	I wish to propose that the area covered by the post code EX16 4PJ, known as Seckerleigh, which includes 5 dwellings, be moved from Halberton Parish Council to Butterleigh Parish Council. Seckerleigh is situated far from Halberton and, being rural has very little in common with Halberton whilst Seckerleigh is close to and has much in common with Butterleigh.

Halberton	55	Please see my email below confirming my objection to the alteration of Halberton Parish boundaries. If you require anything further then please do not hesitate to contact me. Hitchcocks HQ, Hitchcocks Business Park, Willand, Devon EX15 3FA. Subject: Halberton Parish Council Boundaries. Please accept this email as my full support for Hitchcocks Business Park to stay within the boundaries of Halberton Parish Council. Halberton Parish Council have supported everything the business has achieved to date, shown support in our further growth and I enjoy working with everyone involved. With this in mind, I would object to the proposed alteration to the boundaries.
Halberton	69	Halberton Parish Council. The view of the Parish Council is that change for changes sake is not necessary and that the services provided by each parish and the precepts levied are comparable across the district. The consensus is that there is no need for change to the historic parish boundary and the Parish Council wish to re-iterate this view to the Parish Boundary Review.
Hemyock		
Hittisleigh		
Hittisleigh		
Hockworthy		
Holcombe Rogus	24	Holcombe Rogus Parish Council have discussed this matter and have no changes they wish to propose. They are satisfied with the number of Councillors we have and no issues with the boundaries.
Huntsham		
Kennerleigh		
Kentisbeare (incl		
Lapford		
Loxbeare	6	We live in the Loxbeare parish. I see that there was a proposal to make that part of Tiverton which, thankfully, was rejected on procedural grounds. Hopefully the status quo will survive unchanged during the rest of this process, but if we are threatened with amalgamation please can I request that we remain separate. This is not an urban area!
Morchard Bishop		
Morebath	5	Morebath. There is no need to change the current situation regarding adding Morebath to Bampton. As stated, Bampton did not suggest the change. A single Morebath resident, who was until recently on the Parish Council made the suggestion. There has not been any survey of the parish residents, or any reason explained why a change will benefit by joining with the neighbouring parish. Having lived in the parish far longer than the proposer of this idea, along with several other local residents oppose such an idea. Currently six council members run the council with the assistance of an excellent parish clerk. Such ideas split the community and so do not require further discussion.

Morebath	81	Morebath Parish Council discussed the option of merging with Bampton town Council at the May Parish Council meeting. The Parish Council voted in favour of remaining as a separate Parish Council. The consultation was discussed further on 27 September 2022 and the Parish Council is providing this submission based on the decision made in the May meeting.
Newton St Cyres		
Nymet Rowland	18	I strongly believe that Nymet Rowland should be merged with another area and not have its own PC. Having so few houses 14 and the PC being made up of several members of those households means that there is an inherit bias and automatic problem in this being run in a fair way given half the population are on it and half not! At times ridiculous decisions appear to be made such as one resident PC member not agreeing to pay an 80+ resident for his continual weekly upkeep of the church grounds using his own equipment and petrol - appalling! planning decisions although limited in their power appear to become too big an issue and focus and those in the incrowd sail through as members and those not, well, it can be seen on the planning portal how people behave. Removal of a PC for Nymet would solve these issues and make for a much happier community.
Oakford		
Poughill		
Puddington		
Sampford Peverell		
Sandford	11	I like be in Sandford and am concerned that the current Parish Council set up is much too large for our area. The council never have enough candidates for the 12 and are opted in. So I would like to suggest that we have a smaller council and one that is elected by the community. I feel strongly about this because I don't like the current council listen to or are representative of the community. There have been several issues raised, including road safety, which although the council talked about it, they did nothing to address the concerns raised. A smaller more representative council would be more effective. Also I am not sure how Parish Clerks are reviewed, but ours does need reviewing.
Sandford	12	As a resident of Sandford parish, I would like to propose the parish council is reduced from 12 to 8. In the 7 years I've been in the village there has never been 12 councillors and therefore, they are always co-opted. The reduction would mean a proper democratic process to elect people that best represent the village.

Sandford	16	<p>Sandford Parish Devon. Please reduce our council from 12 to 8. My reasons are as follows: 1. We need elected representation that have told us what their vision is and a little about their background and skill sets that make them suitable candidates for a parish councillor seat 2. Our present council backs away from consulting with the parish on key issues (e.g., a. SPC instigated a parking review with no input from the residents. b. They went ahead with Jubilee celebration plans, with no public consultation, which did not include a street party as most other villages in this area organised for their villagers. c. They did however, in February, end of COVID restrictions, hold a public meeting on a housing issue - Creedy 2. They could have held a Jubilee consultative meeting as well. 3. A smaller number of councillors will make council meetings more effective and hopefully lead to more villagers being involved in sub committees for the benefit of the whole village, 4. Less councillors will make it a lot less bureaucratic. The same items come back month after month with no one resolving them hence blocking critical time to expand on new ideas that would benefit the community. 5. Less councillors will make them more visible and more accountable as people will know who they are. 6. They will be elected rather than approved by the present council and co-opted as now.</p>
Sandford	19	<p>Thank you for providing us with this consultation opportunity. I have a number of proposals to put forward which I feel would improve the effectiveness of our and other parish councils: 1. Parish Name and area – Because they have been around for a while I think they should remain broadly similar in size and name. Keeping the names will help develop a sense of identity and belonging for residents. That is important to encourage a greater sense of community. 2. Size of the committee – Sandford parish council needs to have less delegates. It's too big, unwieldy and bureaucratic. No-one new will join because unless you bring 5 mates with you at election time you won't be able to make a difference. I accept that there needs to be a balance between youth and experience. It is important to understand how the Council hierarchy works, but I think that can be enabled by my third suggestion. 3. Grouping Parishes for officer support – For Sandford Parish Council and others to flourish what we really need is more professional support. If say 6 parish councils clubbed together it would enable them to pay a professional wage to a full time, well-resourced Parish Clerk would high calibre applicants who could really spark community activity and involvement! A clerk properly supported by MDDC or DCC would help ensure that governance is not left to chance and enable parishes to share ideas. If the parish councils could share back office functions it would ensure they would have up to date arrangements to comply with GDPR and or child protection. By making sure the clerks were managed properly, trained and offered a real career it would attract people of the right calibre. It would enable and empower parish councillors to do their job, confident that they had proper back up. It would also ensure greater equity between areas in the level of engagement. The reason that many areas didn't engage with phase one is that they didn't know about it. If I hadn't got involved with a parking consultation I would have no idea this consultation was going on. 4. Social Capital – The current system relies on a sort of feudal system which works well if your parish attracts the right sort of community minded residents. Better professional support services should be enabling the building of social capital in the community. People are usually happy to rally around a good idea</p>

	65	<p>Sandford Parish is in the District of Mid Devon and is situated approximately two miles north of Crediton and some ten miles from Exeter. The parish comprises the village of Sandford and the hamlets of Newbuildings, West Sandford and East Village together with outlying farms and cottage with a total population in excess of 1200. Sandford is a large rural parish with a great sense of community, and has two pubs, a community shop with Post Office owned and run by the community, a primary school, a recreation ground, plus a Parish Hall and two Churches and many local organisations and clubs. There is also a dedicated footpath/cycleway from Sandford village to Crediton via the 'Millennium Green'. In February 2022 the Parish Council discussed the MDDC 2022 Parishes Boundary Review. It is now agreed, following contact with Morchard Bishop Parish Council, to discuss a suggestion to include some properties on the boundary between our two Parishes that NO changes were needed following discussion with the home owners involved. It is still felt that the Parish Boundary with the A3072 forming the natural Boundary between Sandford and Crediton should remain. It was not felt any major changes were necessary to the number of Parish Councillors currently 12. At the moment, following the death of our Chairman, we co-opted one extra Parish Councillor at our October 2022 meeting and are now back up to our total compliment of twelve Parish Councillors. We understand that there is now a suggestion to reduce the number of Sandford Parish Councillors (in the MDDC Planning Review 2) to Six. As stated Sandford geographically is one of the largest Parish Councils in Devon, and as the Parish is split into three parts (Sandford Village, East Village, and New Buildings). The suggestion for six Parish Councillors just would not be practical if we are to deal with everything going on in Sandford with a development at Weavers Way for 13 dwelling and numerous other planning applications for more than one property. There is a development for 257 homes in the Parish at Pedlars Pool (Lisbetts Grange) currently at the "Reserved Matters" for planning discussions. The school site, reserved in the development for five years, is subject to funding being made available by Devon County Council. Sandford Parish Council would encourage inclusion of this school in the plans of DCC for the future. Depending on demographic development and trends MDDC may wish to extend this reserved matter at a future date for the benefit of the community. The proposal to reduce the complement of Councillors is not sound if the interests of the Parish are to be best served in the experience of SPC. SPC will continue to seek the diversity of the Council by encouraging participation directly and indirectly in its purposes and role. This second consultation is invited to agree with the SPC. We trust our comments will be studied, and noted, once the closure for comments occurs on 23rd October 2022.</p>
Sandford		
Shobrooke		
Silverton		
Silverton		
Stockleigh English		
Stockleigh Pomeroy		
Stoodleigh		
Stoodleigh		
Templeton		

Thelbridge	73	Just to reinforce my previous point, it would make sense for Nomansland to be in a single parish, rather than split between two. Alignment of the parish boundaries with the new district wards would make for better district councillor representation on behalf of the whole of Nomansland.
Thorverton	22	I Think Thorverton Parish Council should stay as it is, it works well currently.
Thorverton	51	Thorverton Parish Council reaffirms its previous comments (which do not seem to have been properly submitted) as follows: Thorverton Parish Council can see no benefit in reducing the number of Councillors as there will be no savings made as there are no costs involved. Thorverton Parish Council has, in recent electoral cycles, found no difficulty in finding ten or more willing candidates. The current number of Councillors (10) helps to spread the load of these projects and makes for good progress with working parties. The Parish boundary for Thorverton seems broadly correct as we share little in common with the adjacent Parishes and already have full agenda with many projects ongoing. Council expressed concern that the second call for comments had showed Thorverton as 'no response' when the Council had responded 'no change'.
Uffculme		
Uffculme		
Uffculme	3	I would like to comment in the proposals for Halberton, Willand and Uffculme I believe option 3 makes perfect sense given past decisions that have been made and influenced by the community within Willand and Uffculme in relation to planning applications and decisions. Option 3 builds on community ownership and belonging and would help to remove the current frustrations felt by many within these villages set against the lack of involvement Halberton have had in past applications that had no effect what so ever within the Halberton community yet had and continues to have a direct impact of the lives of those within the two villages. An application for some 90 houses way eventually agreed after an appeal to an inspector, yet within his summary he clearly identified that the impact of construction and the facilities to be used would belong to Uffculme. The impact was so great that the section 106 had to be gifted to uffculme from Halberton, a nonsense in its self that this had to be gifted! All recent comment on planning applications within the identified area has been made by residents that are impacted m NOT A SINGLE comment has been received from any individual from Halberton as they are clearly not effected. Argument has been heard that is both dated and unrealistic in that Halberton PC feel aggrieved at the possibility of in their words "losing our land" yet the land in question sits some 5 Miles away from Halberton and the opposite side of the M5!! Common sense must prevail and we must not allow a small minority of individuals from a distant and unaffected community to have any influence on "if" , "how" or even when speculative applications are treated when the effects have no bearing whatsoever in the residents they represent and the section 106 funds could and have in the past been used in a way that have no benefit for those communities that are effected. Option Three please.
Uffculme	4	IF the boundary involving Uffculme/Willand/Halberton cannot be the M5, THEN I think OPTION 3 should be adopted.

Uffculme	8	I have lived in Uffculme for over 35 years and find it hard to understand how the land on both sides of the Uffculme straight and Bridwell Park are not part of Uffculme Parish but part of Halberton. Why should Halberton Parish have any say in what goes on miles away from their main community. Option 3 with the inclusion of Bridwell Park should sit within the Parish of Uffculme and contribute to it financially as well as being governed within the Uffculme Parish rules.
Uffculme	9	Halberton, Willand, Uffculme. Option 3 looks good but could extend the area east of road 3181 to divide between Uffculme and Willand parish, therefore making the 'Uffculme straight' more consistent, and within a parish near to them, rather than feeling like a satellite area.
Uffculme	10	I totally agree with Option 2 but think that Hitchcocks Business Park should be part of Willand.
Uffculme	13	I would like phase 3 please
Uffculme	14	I would like phase three of the parish review please
Uffculme	15	I would like to comment briefly on the Parish Review Consultation proposals - I am an Uffculme resident. I would like to support Option 3 relating to revision of the current Halberton and Uffculme parish boundaries. It makes complete sense to include the Lucombe Park development, both the recently built houses and those under construction, in Uffculme parish. These houses are contiguous to the village of Uffculme, and their inhabitants use Uffculme facilities - schools, surgery, shops, etc - and regard themselves as belonging to Uffculme. Bridwell Park and area should also become part of Uffculme parish. Its owners think of themselves as Uffculme residents, for example the Uffculme Show is held in Bridwell Park, and the park and cafe is extensively used by Uffculme residents. The Hitchcocks and Langlands Business Estates are also naturally connected to Uffculme, and certainly not to Halberton, on the other side of the M5. It makes sense that parish boundaries reflect local realities, giving access to the relevant precept to enable Uffculme Parish Council to provide services to these areas, and allowing the Parish Council and the Uffculme community to make their views known on developments in these areas, which are of far more relevance to Uffculme than they are to Halberton inhabitants. The ecclesiastical parish boundaries were changed a few years ago to reflect these realities (and in fact transferred rather more land to Uffculme and Willand parishes I believe, which would be preferable - you will have access to these boundaries). I appreciate that it is potentially a simpler process to change the ecclesiastical boundaries, and that there is no direct relationship with the civil parish boundaries, but nevertheless I believe it is setting a useful precedent).
Uffculme	17	Out of the three proposals for the Halberton/Willand/Uffculme boundary review I would support option 3. The village of Uffculme is directly affected by what happens around both Langlands and Hitchcock's industrial estates, whereas Halberton is not impacted at all. There has been significant development to Hitchcock's, Langlands and Pleasant Streams over the last few years and local objections to recent development in these areas is testament to the negative impact they have had. Ideally the Halberton Parish Boundary should stop at the M5 and the areas that are east of the M5 should be given over to Willand and Uffculme Parishes, but option 3 goes part way to establishing this.

Uffculme	20	Hello, on behalf of Selgars Mill - a residential venue located at EX15 3DA on the 'Uffculme Straight' we would prefer to be in the parish of Uffculme rather than Halberton. We do a lot of community based work e.g having volunteers, and have good connections with the village of Uffculme. It seems an anomaly to be in the Halberton parish. We also have a major problem from an accessibility point of view as there is no footpath to Uffculme or Willand - hopefully a review of parish boundary's would also include the ability to walk to the village centre that one is located near to.
Uffculme	25	I support Uffculme Parish Council's submission to include Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks business park within the Parish Boundaries.
Uffculme	21	Relating to Halberton, Willand and Uffculme options. Given there is a no change option - which I would prefer. Option 1 has some logic given that a) Lucombe Park residential is co-located and could be seen as an extension to Uffculme village and thus should be within Uffculme Parish. b) Mid Devon Business Park, could similarly be seen as an extension to the Willand industrial estate. It should be noted that Halberton footpath 35 should also be transferred to Willand should this option be selected. Option 2, I see no reason for proposal to be approved. There is no changes that have been made in this area that would indicate it would be better served by Uffculme parish council. Option 3, As I understand it, both Hitchcocks and Langlands Business Parks and Halberton PC have a long working relationship relating to planning applications and other matters, this appears to be working well and as such moving the boundary would mean building new relationships and upsetting the status quo for no obvious reasons. Summary, of the three options given. Option 1 is preferred, options 2 and 3 are strongly opposed.
Uffculme	27	All at Treetops wish to register their whole hearted support for Uffculme Parish Council's reasons (contained in their submission to the Boundary Review Commission) to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme.
Uffculme	28	I am happy that this review is happening- it makes sense that boundaries change to deal with modern administration requirements.
Uffculme	29	In the boundary review - option 3, move all three roads/estates into uffculme parish
Uffculme	30	All boundaries should include roads, buildings or business's that have a direct impact on the village of Uffculme. I support option C
Uffculme	31	Move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme
Uffculme	34	I support the "move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Ave and Hittchcocks to Uffculme"
Uffculme	35	Option 3 please
Uffculme	37	We bought our first home at Lucombe Park and are very much part of the Uffculme community. We use many of the facilities in Uffculme, such as being registered at the Doctors surgery, we visit the local pub and cafes on a regular basis, we use the local shops/ post office/ secondary school facilities and have recently reserved a nursery place at Uffculme Kingswood for my unborn child. We also attend many of the local events. We would be very much favourable for the boundaries to moved to reflect at least Lucombe Park becoming part of the Uffculme Parish based on our above comments.

Uffculme	38	I am a resident of Oak Gardens on the Lucombe Park Development and fully support being included within the Parish of Uffculme. To me this makes sense as a community evolves for the boundaries to meet the reality of the people using the facilities. My children go to the Primary School and we are very much involved in that community and part of the Church. We would welcome the ability to sign up for things such as allotments based in the Parish. We are also currently not able to take an active role in some parts of Parish life due to officially being resident 'across the border'.
Uffculme	39	I think we should move the Lucombe Park development and its new bit Oakleigh Gardens, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme Parish
Uffculme	40	Halberton, Willand & Uffculme - Option 3 must be the preferred option. Luccombe Park, Bridwell & Hitchcocks are naturally associated with Uffculme and immediately next to it whereas Halberton village must be several miles away and has no logical association with any of them. Luccombe Park and Bridwell, in particular, use Uffculme Village as their provider of local services and in deed provide support to the village themselves. The Hitchcocks development has now expanded so that it is touching the edge of the village. In order to provide for any future developments Option 3 is the only one that is practical and sensible.
Uffculme	41	Uffculme Parish Council proposals:-Luccombe Park,Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks I support the move of all into Uffculme Parish.
Uffculme	42	I fully support UPC in their application to have these areas officially included within the Uffculme boundaries. These specific locations use or will use the services provided within the UPC area and this will have an impact on the residents of the village. It is very unfair that funds are allocated to surrounding parishes/area budgets when they are not in fact providing the services required.
Uffculme	43	I would like Option 3 – Options 1 and 2 together with Hitchcocks, as I believe that all of these areas impact physically on our village of Uffculme and the local community, therefore we should be involved in any planning decisions but more importantly we feel that the new estates are part of our village and as such should legally become part of our parish so that they feel a closer connection to village life not just estates etc in between two / three communities.
Uffculme	44	As a resident of Lucombe park (now oakleigh gardens) I have to push for all 3 areas to be included in the uffculme parish. We are part of the wonderful village and I think it's only right to extend the parish area outwards to cover our estate, Bridwell avenue and Hitchcock.
Uffculme	45	I support moving Luccombe Park, Hitchcocks and Bridwell into Uffculme (option 3). As a resident of Luccombe Park, it makes little sense to me for any of the orphaned parts of Harberton that lie east of the M5 to remain as-is, particularly given that to get to Harberton from here, one has to travel through another parish.
Uffculme	46	I think that option 3 is the most suitable. This will include Bridwell and Lucombe Park within Uffculme Parish Council boundary.
Uffculme	48	As a long time resident of Uffculme, I see it spreading further into neighbouring parishes. Luccombe Park the new estate should be under Uffculme Parish as people living there use Uffculme facilities. Perhaps Bridewell Avenue and Hitchcock's Business Park should also be brought into Uffculme Parish.
Uffculme	48	We agree with UPC's proposal that all three locations - Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Industrial Estate - be moved into the UPC area.

Uffculme	50	Uffculme. I consider Option 3 to be the most sensible option as it would do away with so many anomalies in the current boundary lay out.
Uffculme	52	Regarding the proposed submission from Uffculme Parish Council to the boundary review commission. I would vote wholly in favour of they're proposed option 3. That is, to bring Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcock's in to Uffculme. It makes sense both from a community and geographical point of view. In particular as a resident in Lucombe park I feel we are a part of the uffculme community and as such, residential matters that would be best suited under the Uffculme councils remit. I feel this is especially important regarding ongoing and future projects such a traffic matters, roads, bus stops etc.
Uffculme	53	Option 3 for Uffculme new boundary. These areas have a huge impact in Uffculme village in terms of traffic and numbers of children attending Uffculme Primary School and should therefore be within Uffculme Parish boundary so we at least get their rates.
Uffculme	54	Ref Uffculme boundaries. I support the described option 3 as I feel this will best serve both residents of these areas and the wider users of local services such as health care, education and public transport.
Uffculme	56	In the Halberton-Willand-Uffculme review, I fully support Option 3 (with Option 2 as secondary). The centre of Uffculme is 1 mile or less from most of the areas included, whereas the centre of Halberton is approx. 4 miles away. Residents in these areas generally identify as part of Uffculme, have Uffculme addresses, support Uffculme businesses, attend Uffculme community events (including those at Bridwell Park, ironically also in Halberton Parish), and use Uffculme facilities & infrastructure - yet they must cast their vote in a polling station in Halberton & vote for Parish Councillors in a remote Parish supported by their precept. Uffculme PC don't appear to be a statutory consultee on planning applications on its doorstep which directly affect the Parish, its infrastructure & residents, nor does it benefit from the precept generated from any new housing developments. On the other hand, Halberton PC are detached from developments happening on the other side of the M5 & are not directly affected, so they cannot in all honesty realistically assess the impact or engage meaningfully with residents who are, to all intents & purposes, part of Uffculme. "This is the way it has been for 150 years" isn't a valid reason to prevent a sensible review & revision of the status quo when so much has changed in that time. This CGR is the ideal opportunity for the historical boundaries of Halberton Parish to be brought into the 21st century to reflect modern era changes in development of the area & the needs of council tax paying residents & electors, most of whom have nothing other than an administrative & precept connection to Halberton. Even after Option 3, there will still be a "Halberton bulge" in the area between the B3181 & the border SE of the B3440. This area would be far better served moving into Uffculme (Selgars Mill has an Uffculme address) or Willand & it makes no sense to leave it as part of Halberton Parish until the next CGR, whenever that may be.
Uffculme	57	Re Uffculme Parish I strongly believe that Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks should all be moved to Uffculme parish
Uffculme	58	I support option 3 concerning Uffculme parish boundaries.
Uffculme	59	Boundary Review: Uffculme Parish - I fully support Option 3 of the three draft proposals currently being considered. Namely to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Business Park to Uffculme.

Uffculme	60	As a homeowner in Lucombe Park ,uffculme I feel it would be appropriate for the whole of the Lucombe Park estate and Bridwell Avenue to be a part of the Uffculme Parish . I have never used any of Halbertons facilities and can't see myself ever using them. I regularly use the surgery in uffculme as well as the shops and other community services.
Uffculme	61	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this long overdue review. I am FULLY supportive of adding Lucombe Park and Bridwell Avenue to the Uffculme Parish but not supportive of adding Hitchcocks industrial estate. As a Lucombe Park resident I regularly use Uffculme parish services, which are all within a short walk. I have never knowingly used Halberton parish services and consider myself to be an Uffculme resident and regularly support Uffculme parish events. I am not supportive of adding the Hitchcocks industrial estate as I do not believe this is in keeping with the village vibe and status. Besides, adding the industrial estate would further encourage the gap between the two to be filled with more residential or even more industrial units. Finally, as a Homeowner at the eastern boundary of the Lucombe Park estate, I believe that the 4 properties behind the original 'Harvesters' property are already part of the Uffculme parish. A recent land registry search showed these properties to be part of the Uffculme Parish, not Halberton. If this is indeed the case, the case would be quite clear to add the rest of the estate.
Uffculme	62	As a resident of Yondercott near Uffculme I support option 3 in the proposals as this would bring Luccombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks Business Park into Uffculme parish which is the nearest settlement to these developments.
Uffculme	64	As a resident of Uffculme, I feel it is only fair that the village boundaries are amended to ensure that village facilities being used by people within the catchment area are suitably accounted for in annual financial figures and that monies are not allocated to neighbouring parishes who are not actually involved in the provision of these facilities. I therefore support option three - the proposal to transfer Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue, and Hitchcocks to Uffculme.
Uffculme	67	Uffculme Parish Boundary to be extended to include: 1. Luccombe Park, Langlands and Selgars Mill 2. Hitchcocks Business Park 3. Bridwell Estate. Uffculmes parish boundary should extend up to the M5, which would be a sensible boundary between it and the Halberton Parish. The businesses and residents in these areas fall within the natural catchment and environs of the Uffculme Parish and have more impact on the Uffculme village and those living there than Halberton. Decisions have been made to build many houses and develop large industrial sites in these areas, which in turn have placed significant pressures on the village of Uffculme. It is time that Uffculme has a more direct role in determining what happens on its door step and the boundary should be changed to reflect this.
Uffculme	68	Regarding the boundary review for Uffculme I would go for option 3 to include Bridwell Park, Lucombe Park & Hitchcocks.
Uffculme	70	Of the three options available for comment Uffculme Parish Council will, of course, support Option 3 - incorporating all additional areas for inclusion within the boundary of Uffculme. It is believed that by incorporating these areas within Uffculme, it will enable residents to be included as part of the community that is already known as theirs, as well as enabling the Council to officially assist where necessary. Support of Option 3 is one that is also echoed with individual residents - many of which have advised of their support.
Uffculme	72	I support option 3 regarding changing boundaries as I know this will be beneficial to Uffculme having a say about properties that are so close to the centre of Uffculme and any decisions made about them will impact on Uffculme
Uffculme	74	I support option 3 of moving Lucombe Park, Bridwell and Hitchcocks into Uffculme.

Uffculme	75	Uffculme parish should include Langlands and Hitchcock business parks as well as the quarry area up to the A38.
Uffculme	76	I appreciate the opportunity given by the Electoral Review Committee (ERC) to seek views on the draft proposals for the future structure of parish boundaries. As a resident I am particularly interested in the 3 options for Uffculme. On reflection, and in the interests of future proofing the Parish boundary my view is that Option 3 is the better choice. I think Options 1 & 2 are absolutely necessary in any event, as these areas are part of Uffculme in all but Parish name. However, if any further developments take place (and that seems extremely likely in the Langlands and Hitchcock quadrant) that area too will essentially be joined to Uffculme, and the same arguments will apply. I feel strongly that local communities should have their say in local matters and Option 3 is therefore, I think, the fairest and most democratic way forward.
Uffculme	80	It seems logical that Lucombe Park and Bridwell Avenue should moved to Uffculme as they use the facilities of the village. However, To my mind Option 3 would seems to be the best one. Any further development at Hitchcocks would have an impact on the village of Uffculme so it seems right it should be considered within the village boundary.
Uffculme	82	I would strongly support Option 3 - moving Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue and Hitchcocks to Uffculme Parish. The current arrangement of these areas being part of Halberton Parish, whilst historical, make no sense in the current, modern context. The M5 forms a logical boundary now and creates a very clear separation from the main village and surrounds of Halberton. These areas (Lucombe Park, Hitchcocks) have the most impact on Uffculme Parish in terms of use of/pressure upon local services, impact of traffic etc. but currently the Parish Council receives no financial contribution and is not initially consulted on planning related matters in these areas. Bridwell Park and Bridwell Avenue are seen as a 'natural' part of Uffculme given the growth of the village during the past century or more. There is no logical reason not to include them in Uffculme Parish - long gone are the historic connections of Squire and Halberton Parish Church! This is surely a historical anomaly which needs to be corrected for more efficient local government reflecting the reality of the 21st century situation. Halberton village and surrounds are not impacted in any way by new housing and business at Lucombe Park and Hitchcocks and any future development there. Please therefore use this boundary review to make what is a logical and very common sense change to reflect the real life situation which currently exists.
Uffculme	83	I wish to support proposal for Option 3 with regard to Uffculme boundaries
Uffculme	84	I opt for option 3 and I live in Uffculme.
Uffculme	85	Uffculme Parish Council - see full submission
Uffculme	86	I support the OPTION 3 of the boundary review to move Lucombe Park, Bridwell Avenue, and Hitchcock into Uffculme Parish.
Uplowman		
Upton Hellions		
Washfield		
Washford Pyne		
Wembworthy	79	Wembworthy Parish Council would like the review to consider combining the Parish to include Eggesford and Brushford parish meetings. This would give them better representation and a chance to benefit from the precept to improve their communities.

Willand		
Willand	63	Colophon town council submitted a detailed response about changing boundaries. This is not mentioned. Cullompton and willand boundaries should join and Galveston move back. Colophon should expand to include all land covered by the garden village. Boundaries in South of parish need to be reorganised so they are more cohesive.
Willand	77	Thank you for the leaflet regarding the Halberton parish boundary consultation. I have wished to express my views on our situation for some time. On moving to Muxbeare Lane (EX15 2JH) 6 years ago I was extremely surprised to learn that it was within Halberton parish rather than Willand. This has been a annoyance when having to travel to Halberton to vote, rather than being able to walk around the corner to vote in Willand. But more importantly, we had no say in the councillor for our own village in the local elections of May 2021. Instead we could only vote for the councillor for Tiverton East, which felt entirely meaningless. Given that the lane is officially located within Willand village, and geographically sits between Willand and Uffculme, it would surely be logical for it to be located within a parish boundary that allows its residents to vote in the elections that concern them most? I suggest that all the land in the Halberton parish that sits to the East of the M5 should be changed to be included in either Willand or Uffculme parish, depending on their postal address. This would remove the somewhat ludicrous situation we are currently in. Suggesting that the new Lucombe Park development should be included in Halberton parish is inappropriate for the same reason. I also disagree with the comments about polling stations on the leaflet. Unless online voting can be developed, easy access to stations is imperative. Postal voting is unlikely to be as popular with younger voters, and therefore making access as easy as possible is important to help include the younger vote.

Willand Woolfardisworthy Zeal Monachorum	78	<p>Second Consultation Halberton, Willand and Uffculme response of Willand Parish Council. Willand Parish Council originally submitted their suggested proposals which incorporated the outcome of discussions between themselves and Uffculme Parish Council. A detailed map was also submitted which clearly showed the suggested changes and boundaries. The Willand Parish Council submission is fully recorded in the consultation document as submission numbered 23. Willand Parish Council still stands by the recommendation made at that time and the information and arguments put forward to justify and support it. It is apparent from the current consultation document that a compromise solution has been attempted to be found which has led to three potential options being put forward. Any one of these options will leave anomalies and will not address the potential future development of the area which could be addressed if the original suggested Parish Boundary changes were adopted and implemented. The following comments are made in relation to the three suggested options – none of which, singularly or as a whole, meet a common-sense resolution to improve the management and governance of the area. Option 1. Lucombe Park should be made part of Uffculme Parish but as shown on the map is just an ‘add on’ with no clear feature as a boundary. The map for the Mid Devon Business Park only extends to take in Phase 1. Phase 2 now has planning approval and all roads and drainage have been put in place and units are expected. Access is only available from Four Cross Way Roundabout [Willand] and is then through Phase 1. Suitable amendments of the map for the area have been shared with Officers but have not been amended with the consultation documents. Option 2. This meets the representation of the owner of Bridwell Park to be part of Uffculme and the road boundary on the East side of the estate does make a natural boundary but when it meets the B3040 Uffculme Road it does not incorporate Lucombe Park to the South therefore still leaving it looking as an ‘add on’. The map in relation to Mid Devon Business Park is still wrong. Option 3. This is nearer to the original submission put in by Willand Parish Council in relation to the Uffculme section of the ‘Halberton Bulge’. South of the Uffculme straight the suggested boundary was nearer Willand by using the road down to Selgars Mill and then a water course to the boundary. If one looks at the map or Google Earth it will be seen that to the South of the Uffculme Straight there would just be five fields left in Halberton and they are part of Quicks Farm where the buildings are in Willand Parish in any case. To the North of the Uffculme Straight will be 5 fields and then there is the solar farm and then a small complex of industrial buildings but all of this is within the ‘ownership’ of Hitchcocks Farm. This whole area to the South of the B3181 would be a small section retained by Halberton which if one looks at the map would sit better within Willand Parish. The map for the Mid Devon Business Park in Willand needs extending as mentioned in the two options above. Further Observation. The Halberton land to the North of the B3181 contains three farms one of which is seeking to expand with building industrial units. There are also industrial units behind chicken houses just to the North of the Willand Boundary. All of these properties are more connected to Willand than Halberton in that they use Willand facilities and the areas for work are within walking and cycling distance of</p>	
General (all paris	7	Merge parishes	
General (all paris	36	I am concerned with the merging of parishes that the larger centres if population will get all the funding and small parishes will be left behind	

General (all paris	47	We need Parish Councils - they are the voice of the local people and as such should remain. Many of our ancestors fought for this right to be able to choose what is good for the area or not so good. How can this be correct when decisions will be made at Government level where they do not know about the local areas where their people live?
General (all paris		
General (all paris		
General (all paris		
General (all paris		
General (all paris		

Parish Council	Number of cllrs	candidates 2019	candidates 2015	Electors (2025)	Proposed No. Cllrs
Bampton	9	11	12	1599	
Bickleigh	5	0	5	208	
Bow	9	7	9	1083	
Bradninch (Rural Ward)	2	1	1	123	
Bradninch (Town Ward)	10	6	10	1591	
Burlescombe	9	1	4	791	
Chawleigh	9	5	8	559	
Cheriton Bishop	8	7	9	641	
Cheriton Fitzpaine	9	8	7	787	
Clayhanger	5	3	3	111	
Clayhidon	7	6	8	411	
Coldridge	7	8	7	305	
Colebrooke	9	7	7	353	
Copplestone	7	7	5	1045	
Crediton Hamlets (Hookway Ward)	4	3	3	191	
Crediton Hamlets (Yeoford Ward)	5	5	4	975	
Cruwys Morchard	8	7	6	423	
Culmstock	10	6	4	766	
Down St Mary	7	5	6	300	
Halberton	11	6	6	1462	
Hemyock	10	11	12	1820	
Hittisleigh	7	6	7	109	
Hockworthy	5	4	4	163	
Holcombe Rogus	9	8	9	426	
Huntsham	5	3	4	128	
Kentisbeare	10	11	10	792	

Lapford	10	12	8	892	
Morchard Bishop	11	11	10	915	
Morebath	7	3	10	274	
Newton St Cyres	9	7	6	778	
Nymet Rowland	5	5	5	98	
Oakford	8	13	7	333	
Poughill	5	3	3	168	
Puddington	5	3	0	175	
Sampford Peverell	9	4	4	1210	
Sandford	12	9	9	1405	
Shobrooke	9	7	5	466	
Silverton (North Ward)	2	0	0	99	
Silverton (Village Ward)	9	7	9	1612	
Stoodleigh	7	6	8	258	
Templeton	5	3	3	125	
Thelbridge	7	7	7	292	
Thorverton	10	11	12	826	
Uffculme (Ashill Ward)	2	2	2	435	
Uffculme (Village Ward)	11	9	8	1986	
Uplozman	7	6	7	289	
Washfield	7	5	5	318	
Washford Pyne	5	5	5	96	
Wembworthy	7	4	3	225	
Willand	11	10	6	2839	
Zeal Monachorum	7	6	5	354	