

Appendix A – Agreed or Potential matters for inclusion in terms of reference of CGR

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
<b>Boundary of Bury St Edmunds with adjoining Parishes</b>						
1	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-West Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Fornham All Saints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fornham</li> <li>•St Olaves</li> </ul>	Whether or not existing parish governance arrangements should be amended in respect of new homes and/or employment land included in the strategic growth site. If amendments are needed, this could be through changes to existing parish boundaries or wards and/or the creation of new parish(es).	Not applicable – already considered by the Working Party in November 2014 and adopted for inclusion in the CGR by full Council in December 2014.	Yes – already agreed
2	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "West Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Westley</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Barrow</li> <li>•Minden</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
3	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Great Barton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Moreton Hall</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
4	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Moreton Hall" <i>(See para 1.3.1 of report regarding description)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Rushbrooke with Rougham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Moreton Hall</li> <li>•Rougham</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
5	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "South-East Bury St Edmunds"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Nowton</li> <li>•Rushbrooke with Rougham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Horringer and Whelnetham</li> <li>•Rougham</li> <li>•Southgate</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
6	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Suffolk Business Park"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Rushbrooke with Rougham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Moreton Hall</li> <li>•Rougham</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	<p>For completeness, it may also make sense, as part of the review of issue 4 above, to consider the adjoining strategic employment growth site which will extend the Suffolk Business Park. The current parish boundary divides this site.</p> <p>The Town Council concurs that all growth sites should be reviewed.</p>	
7	Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Rushbrooke with Rougham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Eastgate</li> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Moreton Hall</li> <li>•Rougham</li> </ul>	The CGR will look at the proposal of Cllr Beckwith to create an entirely new parish of Moreton Hall (by removing these properties from existing parished areas). The initial consultation for the review will seek views on potential boundaries as well as electoral	Not applicable – already considered by the Working Party in November 2014 and adopted for inclusion in the CGR by full Council in December 2014.	Yes – already agreed

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
				arrangements. Since this element of the review will need to link with issues 4, 6 and 8, it will potentially affect Great Barton and/or Rushbrooke with Rougham parishes.		
8	29 Primack Road 67 Mortimer Road 87 Mortimer Road 89 Mortimer Road 91 Mortimer Road 93 Mortimer Road 95 Mortimer Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Rushbrooke with Rougham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Moreton Hall</li> <li>•Rougham</li> </ul>	<p>The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Rushbrooke with Rougham in the vicinity of Mortimer and Primack Roads.</p> <p>This matter will be considered alongside issues 4, 6 and 7.</p>	<p>The current boundary, dating back to 2001 (and a CGR starting in 1999), was intended to incorporate all of the new properties in Moreton Hall envisaged in the 1998 Local Plan.</p> <p>The precise location of the final stages of this development mean that 7 properties in the new Moreton Hall development are technically still in Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish. The completion of this development also means that there is now the ability to use a physical feature (e.g. a road) to define a boundary (if applicable).</p> <p>The Electoral Registration</p>	

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
					Officer strongly recommends that this matter is included in the CGR. This view is supported by feedback received from affected residents and local councillors at the recent elections. It is also supported by the Town Council.	
9	71, 73 and 75 Home Farm Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Nowton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Southgate</li> <li>•Horringer and Whelnetham</li> </ul>	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Nowton to the rear of 71, 73 and 75 Home Farm Lane	<p>Although the three properties are all included in the Southgate electoral register (so the CGR would not result in any change to representation), the current historical boundary dissects their rear gardens, which has caused confusion. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to completely encompass the curtilages of these three properties.</p> <p>This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.</p>	

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
10	School Bungalow, Hardwick Middle School, Mayfield Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Nowton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Southgate</li> <li>•Horringer and Whelmetham</li> </ul>	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Nowton in relation to Hardwick Middle School.	This property (currently in Nowton parish) can only be accessed through the school site, off Mayfield Road i.e. Bury St Edmunds. The Electoral Registration Officer believes this is anomalous and could be examined in the CGR if desired. This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.	
11	136 Newmarket Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Westley</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Minden</li> <li>•Barrow</li> </ul>	<p>The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Westley</p> <p>This matter will be considered alongside issue 2.</p>	It has recently been identified that this single property, the last on Newmarket Road as you leave Bury St Edmunds, is technically within Westley Parish. This appears anomalous and the Electoral Registration Officer suggests it is considered as part of the CGR irrespective of the outcome of issue 2. This is consistent with the Town Council consultation response which asked that any anomalies regarding properties immediately adjoining its boundary be examined.	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
12	Properties on Thetford Road, Barton Hill, Russell Baron Road, Ord Road, Manners Road, Gilstrap Road and Kytson Road in the south of Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve Parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fornham</li> <li>•Eastgate</li> <li>•Northgate</li> <li>•Risbygate</li> </ul>	The parish boundary between Bury St Edmunds and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve	<p>This is a request received from Bury St Edmunds Town Council.</p> <p>The CGR in 1999/2000 consulted the parish council and residents on this issue and it was concluded at that time that no change was needed or desired. The Town Council, which did not exist until 2003, believes that, after 15 years, another consultation may be in order.</p>	
<b>Boundary of Haverhill with adjoining Parishes and Essex</b>						
13	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-West Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill</li> <li>•Little Wratting</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill North</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
14	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "North-East Haverhill"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill</li> <li>•Kedington</li> <li>•Little Wratting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill East</li> <li>•Haverhill North</li> <li>•Kedington</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	As per 1. above	Yes – already agreed
15	Vision 2031 Strategic Site "Hanchett End" (Haverhill Research Park)  <i>(All of the area bounded by the</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill West</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	As per 1. above	For completeness, it may also make sense, as part of this CGR, to consider the Haverhill Research Park so that all nine Vision 2031 strategic sites are examined.	

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
	<i>A1017, A1307 and Hanchett End)</i>				The Town Council has also requested that this matter be included in the CGR. Its view (applicable to this issue and all others in this section) is that the changes proposed rationalise existing boundaries, have marginal impact on existing residents and businesses, are easily identifiable natural boundaries and ensure appropriate provision of local services and facilities.	
16	County boundary between Suffolk and Essex adjacent to Haverhill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> <li>•Kedington</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill East</li> <li>•Haverhill South</li> <li>•Haverhill West</li> <li>•Kedington</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> </ul>	The boundary between Essex and Suffolk around Haverhill. <i>The Borough Council does not have the ability to make changes to county boundaries as part of this CGR but could consult on this issue and raise these concerns with the Local Government Boundary Commission and ask them to carry out a Principal Area Boundary Review.</i>	<p>The Town Council believes that the county boundary should be adjusted to follow the route of the A1017 from the "Spirit of Enterprise" roundabout to the "Sturmer Village" roundabout.</p> <p>Specifically it highlights businesses in the area bounded by A1017, Bumpstead Road and Helions Bumpstead Road.</p> <p>It may also be sensible to consult on the boundary in the vicinity of the Haverhill Golf Club and East Town Park for completeness.</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
<b>Boundary of Clare and Poslingford</b>						
17	Hermitage Farmhouse, Snow Hill, Clare (CO10 8QE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Clare</li> <li>•Poslingford</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cavendish</li> <li>•Clare</li> </ul>	Boundary between Clare and Poslingford in vicinity of Hermitage Farm	The current boundary dissects the property, which has caused confusion. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to ensure that the farm buildings are completely in one parish or the other.	
<b>Boundary of Culford, Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve and Hengrave</b>						
18	Oak Lodge, Mill Road, Hengrave (IP28 6LP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Culford</li> <li>•Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve</li> <li>•Hengrave</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fornham</li> <li>•Risby</li> </ul>	Boundary between Culford, Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve and Hengrave in vicinity of Mill Road	Oak Lodge is currently registered in Culford Parish but the boundary with Fornham St Genevieve dissects the curtilage of this outlying property. To avoid future confusion the Electoral Registration Officer suggests that the boundary be reviewed.	
<b>Boundary of Culford and Ingham</b>						
19	Lodge Farmhouse, Lodge Farm, Seven Hills, Ingham (IP31 1PT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Culford</li> <li>•Ingham</li> </ul>	Risby	Boundary between Culford and Ingham Parish in vicinity of Lodge Farm	This property is technically in Culford Parish but has previously been associated with Ingham Parish. It is accessed from Ingham and electors would be likely to drive through Ingham to get to Culford. The ERO suggests	



No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
					that the situation could be clarified through the CGR.	
<b>Boundary of Denston and Stansfield</b>						
20	Elm Farm and associated cottages, Assington Green, Stansfield (CO10 8LY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Denston</li> <li>•Stansfield</li> </ul>	Cavendish	Boundary between the parishes of Denston and Stansfield in vicinity of Elm Farm	Stansfield Parish Council believe these four properties in Denston Parish are closer to Stansfield geographically and in terms of community identity	
<b>Boundary of Fornham All Saints and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve</b>						
21	Area between Fornham Lock Bridge and the Sheepwash Bridge, adjacent to the sewage works entrance, Fornham St Martin.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fornham All Saints</li> <li>•Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve</li> </ul>	Fornham	Boundary between the parishes of Fornham All Saints and Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve along the B1106.	This issue has been identified by a parish councillor who identifies that there are two detached properties between the two bridges, which are officially in Fornham All Saints parish, and that it appears that the boundary between the two parishes follows the old course of the River Lark, prior to its canalisation around 1700. Consequently the councillor has suggested this area be included in the CGR so both parish councils and the residents can consider if a change is needed or not.	
<b>Representation of electors at RAF Honington</b>						
22	RAF Honington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Honington cum Sapiston</li> <li>•Troston</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bardwell</li> <li>•Pakenham</li> </ul>	Parish boundaries and ward arrangements in respect of RAF Honington (and their	This issue has been raised by a parish councillor. Unlike in Troston (which also contains parts of RAF Honington),	

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
				<p>consequential impact upon Borough, County and Parliamentary representation).</p> <p><i>At present, the Village Ward of Honington Parish is within:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the Borough Council's Bardwell Ward;</i></li> <li>• <i>Suffolk County Council's Blackbourn Division; and</i></li> <li>• <i>West Suffolk Parliamentary Constituency.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The Station Ward is within:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the Borough Council's Pakenham Ward;</i></li> <li>• <i>Suffolk County Council's Thingoe North Division; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Bury St Edmunds Parliamentary Constituency.</i></li> </ul>	<p>electors from the RAF station have been in their own parish ward since a Principal Area review by the Boundary Commission in 2001 (to achieve the required electoral equality between Borough wards).</p> <p>Given the transitory nature of the base's population, the Parish Council finds it is almost impossible to find anyone to stand for election. In consequence the station is always represented from someone from Honington or Sapiston, and the problem becomes finding someone from the station to propose and second them. In consequence, the councillor feels this warding arrangement should be removed.</p> <p>In addition to this specific request, the Working Party may wish to consider whether to look more widely at how the RAF station is represented at all tiers of local government, and in terms of parliamentary</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
					constituencies, so this can inform subsequent boundary reviews if necessary.	
<b>Boundary of Market Weston and Thelnetham</b>						
23	Weathercock House, New Common Road, Market Weston (IP22 2PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Market Weston</li> <li>•Thelnetham</li> </ul>	Barningham	Boundary between Market Weston and Thelnetham in the vicinity of Weathercock House.	The current boundary dissects the property. The Electoral Registration Officer therefore recommends that the CGR looks at whether the parish boundary should be slightly adjusted to resolve this.	
<b>Boundary of Ousden (St Edmundsbury) and Dalham (Forest Heath District)</b>						
24	Properties on Dunstall Green Road between Ousden and Dalham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Dalham (FHDC)</li> <li>•Ousden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Wickham-brook</li> <li>•South Ward (FHDC)</li> </ul>	The boundary between St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Districts in the vicinity of Dalham and Ousden. <i>The Borough Council does not have the ability to make changes to district boundaries as part of this CGR but could consult on this issue and raise these concerns with the Local Government Boundary Commission and ask them to carry out a Principal Area Boundary Review.</i>	<p>Ousden Parish Council would like a review of Dunstall Green Road with a view to removing what it sees as the anomaly that Evered on Pound Green is in Dalham, along with the properties from Lilac Cottage to the Barn and Hill House, whilst Matthew’s Rest is in Ousden.</p> <p>The Council feels it would make more sense for the properties along Dunstall Green Road which geographically are already in Ousden to become part of the parish of Ousden.</p>	

No.	Area or Properties Under Review	Parishes Directly Affected	Borough Wards Directly Affected	Matters on which CGR will or could focus	Supporting Evidence <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	Included in CGR or not <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
<b>Size of Stansfield Parish Council</b>						
25	Stansfield Parish Council	Stansfield	Cavendish	Number of councillors for Stansfield Parish Council	Stansfield Parish Council has asked if it might have seven councillors instead of six in common with other nearby villages of the same size to assist in effective governance.	
<b>Size of town councils and consequential changes to Borough wards and County Council divisions</b>						
26	Bury St Edmunds parish and surrounding villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>•All surrounding parishes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•All Bury St Edmunds Wards</li> <li>•Barrow</li> <li>•Fornham</li> <li>•Great Barton</li> <li>•Rougham</li> <li>•Horringer and Whelnetham</li> </ul>	Consequential impacts and changes to the Borough wards and County divisions representing Bury St Edmunds and surrounding villages associated with any proposed changes to parish boundaries or wards. Changes may be in the form of boundaries and numbers of councillors.	<p>Borough and County Councillor Nettleton has requested that any proposed changes to the external and ward boundaries of Bury St Edmunds parish (i.e. town council) should also be considered in the context of their consequential impact upon Borough Council wards and County Council divisions. Similarly, he believes it is important that the review of the proposal to create a new parish for Moreton Hall is looked at in the same context.</p> <p>This view is supported by the Electoral Registration Officer.</p>	Yes – this is an implicit requirement under the guidance
27	Haverhill and surrounding villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Haverhill</li> <li>•All surrounding parishes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•All Haverhill wards</li> <li>•Withersfield</li> <li>•Kedington</li> </ul>	Consequential impacts and changes to the Borough wards and County divisions representing Haverhill and surrounding	The Town Council believes that, as development of substantial housing and associated infrastructure progresses, there will be a requirement to consider either	Yes – this is an implicit requirement under the guidance

**APPENDIX A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Area or Properties Under Review</b>	<b>Parishes Directly Affected</b>	<b>Borough Wards Directly Affected</b>	<b>Matters on which CGR will or could focus</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b> <i>(including results of consultation where applicable)</i>	<b>Included in CGR or not</b> <i>(where blank, Working Party to consider)</i>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
				villages associated with any changes to parish boundaries or wards. Changes may be in the form of boundaries and numbers of councillors.	additional wards or adjusting existing ward boundaries.  This view is supported by the Electoral Registration Officer.	
28	Haverhill Town Council	Haverhill	All Haverhill Wards	The number of Haverhill town councillors.	A resident has written to indicate that he believes that 16 town councillors is too many for a town the size of Haverhill, and that 10 would be more appropriate, thereby cutting down on the workload of the Clerk and costs.	
<b>Great and Little Thurlow Parish Councils</b>						
29	Great and Little Thurlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Great Thurlow</li> <li>•Little Thurlow</li> </ul>	Withersfield	Whether or not to combine the parish councils of Great and Little Thurlow.	Little Thurlow Parish Council has asked that an independent review be carried out into the need for two parish councils for Thurlow.	