

Parish consultation responses: no changes proposed

Parish	Response
Whitchurch and Ganarew	Content with status quo. Described the current number of Councillors as 'about right'.
Titley and District group parish council	Content with status quo. Noted that they would strongly oppose a proposal to merge the group into a single parish council or to swap group members with a neighbouring parish.
Wyeside group parish council	Content with status quo. The council expressed that in the interest of saving money, the group would not want to be part of a CGR.
Breinton parish council	Content with status quo. The parish described that they were not likely to cooperate in a review of the numbers of seats on the parish council. The parish described that they were in a good position to accept greater powers devolved down to the parish level
Marstow parish council	The parish stated that they would not be interested in a review of the number of councillors, and that they do not wish to be merged or amalgamated with another parish council.
Bodenham parish council	Content with status quo.
Marden parish council	Content with status quo.
Aston Ingham parish council	Content with status quo.
Pembridge parish council	Content with status quo.
Eardisley group parish council	Content with status quo.
Sutton parish council	Content with status quo.
Pyons group parish council	Content with status quo.
Cusop parish council	Content with status quo.
Brilley parish council	Content with status quo.
Luston parish council	Content with status quo.
Humber, Ford & Stoke Prior parish council	Content with status quo.
Holme Lacy parish council	Content with status quo.
St Weonards parish council	Content with status quo.
Llanwarne & District group parish council	Content with status quo.
Kentchurch parish council	Content with status quo. It was noted that production of the parish's neighbourhood plan had demonstrated a distinct community of identity and challenges from neighbouring parishes.
Kingsland parish council	Content with status quo.
Orleton parish council	Content with status quo.

Richards castle parish council	Content with status quo.
Little Dewchurch parish council	Content with status quo. The parish expressed that they did not consider a CGR to be a cost effective exercise in the current climate.
Mathon parish council	Content with status quo.
How Caple, Sollers Hope & Yatton group parish council	Content with status quo.
Kings Caple parish council	Content with status quo.
Brockhampton & Much Fawley group parish council	Content with status quo.
Thornbury parish council	Content with status quo.
Llangarron	Content with status quo.
Leintwardine group parish council	Content with status quo.
Lyonshall parish council	Content with status quo.
Ocle Pychard parish council	Content with status quo.
Ashperton parish council	Content with status quo.
Leominster Town Council	It was described that the eastern boundary of the parish was illogical being separated from the town by both a waterway and road. The complexity of merging rural parishes with the town council was noted. The parish expressed that due to the time and resources required in operating a CGR, it was decided not to pursue one.
Aconbury parish meeting	Content with status quo. The parish described that meetings of the parish would normally attract 7-10 residents. It was felt that the parish had a clear voice and would not wish to dilute this by merging with a neighbouring parish council.
Ewyas Harold group parish council	Content with status quo. Noted that they had been contacted by Longtown group parish council who were interested in swapping Walterstone parish council between the groups.
Wellington Heath parish council	Content with status quo.
Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor group parish council	Content with status quo. The group had discussed merging but had seen no obvious benefit. It was noted that the parish would be open to proposals of neighbouring parishes.
Walford parish council	Content with status quo. The parish did not see a need for a CGR.
Wigmore group parish council	Content with status quo.
Yarkhill parish council	Content with status quo.
Stapleton group parish council	Content with status quo. It was expressed that there was not a clear reason to merge the group into a single parish council.

Parish consultation responses: changes proposed

Parish	Response
Hereford City Council	“The City Council’s view was that the city of Hereford is an established geographical and political entity in its own right and the borders of the parish council are correct as they are. There is an anomaly forced upon us by the Boundary Commission for England regarding ward sizes and with two city wards (Victoria Park and Racecourse – which is fraction of the size of any other city ward) being represented at county level by the member for Homer and Shelwick. This also creates an anomaly with that county councillor representing people in two parliamentary constituencies. We do not wish to absorb Homer and Shelwick into the City, but would prefer a realignment of county wards to fits the boundary of the city more appropriately.”
Callow & Haywood group parish council	Indicated interest in cooperated with a CGR. No particular issues were identified.
Goodrich parish council	Indicated interest in cooperated with a CGR. No particular issues were identified.
Bishops Frome parish council	Indicated interest in cooperated with a CGR. No particular issues were identified. Described a CGR as progression.
Bartestree & Lugwardine group parish council	Indicated interest in cooperated with a CGR. No particular issues were identified.
Longtown group parish council	Proposed that the parish of Walterstone could instead be included Ewyas Harold group parish council.
Belmont Rural parish council	Proposed two significant boundary changes. Firstly that the urban area of Woodfield gardens, including the Belmont Abbey complex be incorporated within Belmont Rural. Secondly it was proposed that the streets Sycamore, and Cedar avenues be incorporated within Belmont Rural as they are only accessible through the ward, this represents a boundary anomaly.
Welsh Newton & Llanrothal	Proposed that the number of councillors on Llanrothal parish be increased by one to reflect recent changes in population. This would not create an equal number of electors per councillor across the group.
Kilpeck group parish council	Proposed that the group be merged into a single parish council.

Peterchruch parish council	Expressed that the parish represents a distinct community of identity to neighbouring parish councils within the golden valley. It was proposed that the number of seats on the parish council be increased by one to reflect population change.
Pencombe parish council	Did not identify any specific needs for change. However it was expressed that a CGR would be good practice even if no changes were required as a result.
Border group parish council	The parish described that they were open to swapping members of their group with neighbouring parishes, amending the number of seats on individual parishes, and to merging into a single parish council.
Dorstone Parish Council	The parish proposed amalgamating two small groups of houses located near to the parish boundary within the parish.
Wellington parish council	Expressed an interest in cooperating with a CGR. It was noted that the council could not currently fill a vacant seat on the council.
Shobdon parish council	Proposed increasing the number of seats on the parish council by one or two to reflect increases in population.
Madley parish council	Indicated interest in cooperated with a CGR. No particular issues were identified.
Bromyard & Winslow Town Council	Expressed dissatisfaction with the warding arrangements imposed by the LGBCE. It was expressed that the ward boundary along the town's high street was something which the council opposed. The town council proposed that the number of seats be reduced from 14 and 4, to 12 and 3 for the respective wards.
Moreton on Lugg parish council	It was identified that the settlement Aylus Cottages represented a boundary anomaly and proposed that this be included in the parish of Wellington.
Bredenbury and District group parish council	It was noted that the parish of Grendon Bishop was over-represented given its size. It was proposed that the balance be readdressed.
Brockhampton group parish council	It was noted that there had been some difficulty co-opting members onto vacant seats of the council. It was proposed that the number of councillors within the parish be amended.
Ledbury Town Council	The town council discussed the inclusion of rural parishes within the town council. The town council expressed concern that significant changes may be the responsibility of the boundary commission.
Bishopstone & District group parish council	It was noted that there had been difficulty filling a number of vacant seats. As a result it

	was proposed that the number of seats on the council be reviewed.
Hentland & Ballingham group parish council	Proposed that the boundaries of the parish be amended due to the odd shape of the group parish.

Ward Member Consultation Responses	
Ward	Response
Leominster North and Rural	“The Review was discussed by Leominster Town Council and a couple of the Parish Councils in the ward at their meetings. The consensus across the board was that there was no need for any change and that the current status quo was acceptable. There are no vacancies on the various parish councils and they are all working effectively. I am also perfectly happy with the present arrangements and feel that further work in this area would not constitute good use of Council Taxpayers money.”
Golden Valley South	The ward member was satisfied with the proposal for Walterstone parish to be swapped from Longtown to Ewyas Harold group parish council.
Belmont Rural	Agreed with the suggestions made by the Parish Council with regard to the two changes.
Hampton	<p>It was noted that the village of Risbury, while informally represented at parish council meetings was not represented by its own parish unlike other settlements within the parish.</p> <p>It was suggested that Hampton Charles parish meeting could be amalgamated into a neighbouring parish, possibly Hatfield so as to benefit from a local plan.</p> <p>It was noted that Bredendbury parish being underrepresented in comparison to other members of its group was an anomaly and that the member agreed with the parish’s proposal to address this.</p>
Sutton Walls	“I fully support the comments of all three Parish Councils in Sutton Walls Ward area - No changes for Marden Parish Council - remains the same. No changes for Sutton St. Nicholas Parish Council - remains the same. However, I agree with the issue raised by Morten on Lugg Parish Council “border anomaly” - Aylus Hills

	<p>Cottages are set apart (some distance away) from Moreton on Lugg Village but are just within the Parish boundary. Aylus Hills Cottages are indeed located much closer to the Village of Wellington & Wellington Parish. Hence, I fully support the Parish Council's view that "properties at the settlement Aylus Hills Cottages would be better represented in Wellington" "</p>
Arrow	<p>It was noted that the only proposals for a CGR within the ward had come from Shobdon parish. The ward member endorsed the changes as proposed.</p>
Birch	<p>With the increasing workload being demanded at a very local level we will have to ask much more from our parish councils fewer but larger parish councils may appeal to a new type of parish councillor.</p>
Bromyard West	<p>"Bromyard also struggles to find enough people to come forward to be councillors. (8 being co-opted in May). The council is not currently at full strength. Bromyard has an issue with the Ward boundary now running up the High Street, splitting the town. This caused some confusion at May's election but the town may get used to the situation, I have no obvious alternative if numbers of electors per Hereford councillor are to be roughly equal. Otherwise Bromyard could be treated as a single ward with the current rural areas of Bromyard West joining Bringsty Bromyard to create a rural ward which surrounds Bromyard as an urban ward?"</p>
Bromyard Bringsty	<p>The ward member discussed the formal or informal amalgamation of rural parishes surrounding Bromyard and adopting a new strategic approach to parish governance in the area.</p>
Mortimer	<p>I fully support the views of those of my Parish Councils who have responded. I have also spoken to Stapleton PC and Aymestrey both of whom I believe have not formally responded and who have informed me that they are happy for their present arrangements to continue. I therefore am happy with the existing arrangements.</p>
Kerne Bridge	<p>"With respect to my views as Kerne Bridge Ward Councillor on this consultation, I am writing to confirm that I support the common</p>

	<p>expressed view of my 3 parish councils in this matter - that I do not propose any changes in response to the initial consultation and express my satisfaction with the status quo.”</p>
<p>Newton Farm</p>	<p>“How sad that the Boundary Commission’s Review of Herefordshire Council Ward Boundaries became a nonsense as regards actual Ward boundaries within Hereford City which in turn, created new boundaries for Wards within our City Parish Council!</p> <p>Hereford City Parish Council had and still retains 18 Elected Members fulfilling their duties within 16 Wards. Electorate numbers per New Ward have a huge variance! Having said this, it is important for City Ward Boundaries to coincide with County Ward Boundaries in the City else more confusion will follow.</p> <p>So, it appears the only solution remaining would be to reduce city Council Member numbers to 16 to coincide with the status quo !6 now existing Wards and wait for the Core Strategy new housing numbers to be developed.”</p>